Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

PRIVATE SECTOR REMITTANCES AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN CALABAR, CROSS RIVER STATE.

Frederick Offiong Bassey Department of Marketing, University of Calabar

Mbaze-Ebock Vivian Arrey

Department of Marketing, University of Calabar

Christian Egon Ibe

Department of Geography, University of Calabar

ABSTRACT This study examined Private Sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State. Data for the study was collected through participatory interviews, records from Cross River State Internal Revenue Service, Cross River State Tourism Bureau, journals and textbooks. The data generated were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as tables, charts simple percentages. It was observed that the decline in revenue remittances by private sector to government for tourism development was as a result of government policy on taxation in Calabar, Cross River State. Among recommendations made was that Government should provide a legislation to encourage the private sector organizations to do business and most importantly reduce taxes as these may hinder tourism development.

KEYWORDS: Private sector, remittance, tourism development, Calabar, Cross River State

INTRODUCTION

Tourism which involves travel of non-permanent stay of person(s) to a home away from home for not more than twelve months for leisure, business, or other needs has the ability to generate income for many Nations and improve their economies when the private sector is actively involved (Seentanah, Juwaheer and Subaha, 2011). Tourism can be of benefit to host destinations in no small measure, where government provide the enabling environment and allow private sector to drive it. Countries such as The Gambia, South Africa, Costa Rica, Seychelles, Tonga Vanuatu, Bahamas and Tanzania has been transform through the power of tourism. Private sector comprises agencies that are engaged in the provision of essential services such as building and running hotels and other forms of accommodation, provide catering, communication, travel and tour and transportation services. This may have prompted Godwin (2001) to posit that, they also develop tourism sites, recreational resorts and establish amusement parks, game village, and package family vacations and make tourist buy things that in a way can improve their vacations, such as local craft, local cuisine and local wineries.

The enormous natural, cultural and manmade tourism attractions in Cross River State such as Obudu ranch resort, Agbokim waterfall, Kwa falls, canopy walkway, the legendary Mary Slessor house at Akpab Okoyong, Old residency museum, Ikom monolith, Tinapa premier resort, marina resort, Afi wildlife sanctuary, Calabar carnival and many more, motivated the private sector to invest in accommodation, travel and tour, resorts, communication and eatery. Today, these private tourism organizations has cause the emergence of other tourism support services such as laundry services, restaurant, mobile phone operators and other auxiliary services, which has position Calabar and indeed Cross River State as a tourism destination.

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

Statement of the problem

Tourism development is a concern of many stakeholders in the tourism industry in developing nations and Nigeria in particular. However, Eun and Resnick (2007) observed that the slow growth of the industry is as a result of little participation by the private sector. In spite of the fact that private sector indicated interest in driving tourism in Cross River State and Calabar in particular, however, their presence seems to be declining because government policies have made them stay of business. The tax regime has cause the folding up of some of their businesses, such as eateries, restaurants, communication industries among others. The fluctuations in government revenue have discouraged them in investing efficiently in the industry. Similarly, reports from Cross River State Tourism Bureau (2013), indicate that out of 344 accommodation establishments spread across the state, that were functional and doing business in 2009 and 2013, 44 of them have been converted to other uses. In addition, some of these private tourism organizations, during non-festive periods lack patronage due to absence of utilities such as electricity, portable water and security. This has caused seasonal fluctuations in terms of employment, income generation and rise and fall of major tourism indicators. According to Ahmed (2008), Despite the pragmatic effort made by government to develop the tourism sector and huge investment made between 2006 and 2007, totaling more than 30 billion naira in Cross River State, the state has not obtain matching revenue from the tourism sector. The state is depending on remittances from tourism organizations to bring about the needed socio-economic growth after losing all its oil wells to Akwa Ibom State and the gradual less oil economy. The study seeks to examine private sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Crosss River State.

Objectives of the study

The objective of the study is to assess private sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State between 2011 and 2015. The specific objectives were to;

1 Examine the effect of accommodation sector remittances to government on tourism development in Calabar,

2 Investigate the impact of eatery sector remittances on tourism development in the study area

3 Assess the influence of recreational resorts remittances to government in the study area

4 Examine the impact of travel and tour remittances on tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State

5 Assess the impact of transportation sector remittances to the state for tourism development

6 Examine whether remittances made by communication sector influence tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State.

Research questions

The following research questions were raised to guide the study;

- 1 What are the remittances made by the various tourism private sectors!
- 2 Do remittances made by accommodation sector improve tourism development!
- 3 To what extent do eatery sector remittances influence development in the study area!
- 4 Is there any way in which travel and tour remittances improve Calabar!
- 5 Does a transportation sector remittance significantly improve the study area!

6 To what extent do communication sector remittances influence tourism development in the state!

LITERATURE REVIEW

Tourism is derived from the word "tour" which means travelling for pleasure, education, or business in which several places are visited and return to the starting point (Webster, 1991). Tourism has the ability to impact socio-economic lives of people and become a source of foreign exchange. In a study conducted by Hall (2003) 'The socio-economic impact of Tourism' noted that in Maldives, tourism accounts for 65.9 percent of their exports. He further observed that in Vanuatu, Fiji and Tonga, it has contributed more than 60 percent of their Gross Domestic Exports. Roe and Godwin (2003) corroborated Hall's view by inferring from their analysis that in Vanuatu, the tourism sector has contributed not less than 5 percent of its total earnings. A survey conducted by National Bureau of Statistics (2012) revealed that revenues and levies from hospitality industry of the tourism sector recorded N1.149 million in 2004 and rose to N100 million in 2009. The figures however rose to N1.232 billion in 2011. This prompted Tunde (2012) to posit that, to sustain this remittances trend, apart from over 897,500 jobs the hospitality has created, which represent 1.4 percent of Nigeria total work force in 2002, Nigeria government need to do more to improve tourism development in the country. The neglected tourism attractions need to be developed and rehabilitated to increase tourist arrivals and patronage in order to contribute to job creation and improvement of the economy. This is why states such as Cross River, Plateau and Bauchi were motivated to invest heavily in their tourism sector of the economy as part of efforts to diversify the Nation's economy (Akpan and Obang, 2012).

Tourism as a sector of the economy is used to as a developmental strategy due to its economic effects such as generating foreign exchange, creating employment and stimulating local economies through remittances made by organizations doing businesses in the industry. Government relies on array of taxes and other levies to generate funds which in turn used to provide infrastructural development. Taxation depending on its design and application can also act to stimulate or dampen economic activity in specific sectors. Although sector specific taxes are normally created with good intent, as a means to create total revenue and possibly stimulate economic activity, the total effects of these taxes are often felt in short term and negative repercussion can result (WTTTP, 2001). Studies by Rivera and Larde (2002) on "the effect of remittances on poverty reduction in certain regions of South America" revealed that in the year 2000, remittances made especially by private sector to government helped reduce the national poverty rate by 4.2 percent. It also enables government to provide infrastructure and social amenities such as roads, electricity, clean water and clinics. Similarly, Cox-Edwards and Ureta (2003) in their study "the role of remittance in education of children" revealed that, in rural areas, the probability that a child from a household receiving a 100-dollar remittance per month leaves primary school better than that of a child from a household not receiving a remittance. They posit that remittances received by government especially from the private sector can improve the tourism drive in terms of financing the relevant government agencies in driving tourism through provision of ambience, clean water, create and maintain roads to the various attractions sites. Similarly, a survey conducted by Ibe, (2016) on "Private Sector and Tourism Development in Calabar" revealed that remittances made by tourism business operating in Calabar is used to finance government agencies such as Calabar Urban Development Authority, Directorate of Public Transportation as well as provide roads, electricity, security and maintain develop tourism attractions in Calabar, Cross River State. The study seeks to examine private sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State.

METHODOLOGY

Study area:

This study area is Calabar, Cross River State.



Figure 1: Study area map Source: Office of the Surveyor General, Cross River State (2016)

The study area is Calabar. It is made up of two local government areas, Calabar municipality and Calabar south. It is located within southern senatorial district, Cross River State. Calabar lies between Latitudes $4^{0}55^{1}$ and $5^{0}5^{1}$ North of the Equator and is about 21,481sqkm in size (figure 1) and Longitude $8^{0}15^{1}$ and $8^{0}25^{1}$ East of the Greenwich Meridian. It is located in the tropics and shares a common boundary with Akampka Local Government Area in the North, Odukpani Local Government Area in the West, Republic of Cameroon to the East and Gulf of Guinea in the South. It is located on low lying gentle and undulating terrain that forms the coastal plains of South Eastern Nigeria. Calabar is an inter fluvial city that is drained by two major rivers, Cross River and the Great Qua river. The water bodies empty into the Atlantic Ocean through estuaries towards the southern parts of the town.

The study area climate resembles semi-equatorial (monsoonal) type with normal heavy downpours. The climate is made up rainy and dry seasons. Rainy season starts in March and ends in November. The dry season starts in December and ends in February. It has tropical-humid with average temperature ranging between 15° C and 30° C and annual rainfall between 2500-3000mm which support the growth of tropical rainforest mangroves and savanna vegetation. This fantastic climate influences the influx of tourists and visitors to the area.

The creation of the state in 1967 led to unprecedented influx of people into Calabar and its population grew from 99,352 in 1963 to 184,992 in 1983. It rose to about 320,862 in 1991 and projected to be 431,282 in 2002 and in 2006, the population rose to 890,200 people. According to (NPC, 2006), Calabar has an estimated population of 1.9 million people. The increasing number of people into the state and Calabar in particular which constitute the fulcrum of tourism activities increase demand for private sector tourism goods and services.

The area has array of tourist's sites or attractions including Marina Resort, The annual Calabar Carnival, Old Residency Museum, The Mary Slessor Tomb, Bassey Ekpo house, Calabar Drill monkey Ranch, Obong of Calabar Palace, Tinapa Resort, Calabar Centaph and Calabar Stadium. These alongside Obudu Ranch Resort, Obanliku, Agbokim waterfall, Etung, Kwa falls in Akampka local government area, Ababane Lake, Obubra Local government area, Afi mountain walkway canopy in Boki, Ikom Monolith, beaded works of Art, which offers visitors to Calabar and indeed Cross River State a wide range of site attraction. These attractions help buttress Calabar tourism activity in particular and Cross River State in general. Calabar originally has three major ethnic groups namely the Efik, Quas and Efut. The three ethnic groups have strong cultural affinities in their Ekpe culture and other traditional plays and beliefs. Living alongside these three groups are the non-indigenes from other states of the federation and outside the shores of Nigeria. Calabar is usually referred to as land flowing with milk and honey; it is the fabled paradise city. The Efik in particular are gifted in their exquisite art and craft of brass works, beaded shoes, bags, and caps and carved chewing sticks. The Efik Efut and Qua have similar cultural attires and food which is an attraction of tourism. The cultural affiliation of Cross River State and Calabar in particular with other countries of the world including Cuba, Trinidad, Tobago among others have impacted significantly in the tourism development of Cross River State and Calabar in particular.

Similarly, Calabar which comprises of different ethnic groups with diverse culture, lifestyle and language, is the Capital of Cross River State. Other economic activities of the people of Calabar mostly include fishing, trading, boat making and craft. Fishing is carried out along the creeks and swamps of the Cross River valley. Trading is also an important aspect of the people's economic life. Traders deal on goods ranging from local farm products to manufactured goods. The popular market which operates on daily basis includes; watt market, ika-ika qua market and Henshaw town beach market, popular for fish, crab and other delicacies which increase culinary journeys to Calabar and improve remittances to government

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Data for this study were obtained from secondary sources. The secondary sources include records from Cross River State Internal Revenue Service, Cross River State Tourism Bureau, journals and textbooks. The various private tourism organizations such as Accommodation (Channel View hotel, Transcorp hotel, Unical hotel, Cross Road hotel, Legacy hotel and Galaxy lodge), Resorts (Airport Gardens homes and Resort, Orange Resort, Marina Resort, Unical Love Garden and Resort and Aquavista Resort), Travel and Tours (Remlords Tours) and Transportation (Calabar Airport transport, Remlords transport and Transcorp Metropolitan Transport services) were purposively selected for the study. The selection is due to available facilities and quality of services they provide in the tourism industry and were certified to operate by Department of Standards and Licensing, Cross River State Tourism Bureau.

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

These were based on accommodation establishments that employ more than twenty staff, eateries that can take up more than twenty-five people and resorts that can take care of ten persons and above, Remlords tours were the only viable travel/tour organization, communication and the only tourism transportation organizations that were viable. Data collected was presented and analyze using descriptive statistical techniques. The descriptive techniques include tables, charts and simple percentages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study examined private sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State

Private sector remittances to government for tourism development

In a bid to assess the effect of private sector in the tourism industry remittances to state government for tourism development, table 1 revealed different forms of taxation on the various private sector organizations. Both the state and local government impose tax and levies on the operators of private tourism business organizations. From the study, out of a totaled N23, 603,904 that were remitted to the state for tourism development within the period, accommodation sector made the highest remittance to government which stood at N13, 801,904, followed by Eatery sector with N3, 540,000, while tour/travel recorded lowest remittance to government which stood at N488, 000. Among the various remittances made, Tourism Development Levy came highest with N12, 603,904 in the state, while business operational levy was seen also to be the highest levy paid at local government by private sector organizations.

Table1:

Private sector remittances to government (2011-2015)

Remittances to state	Accommodation (N)	Eatery	Tour travel (N)	Resort	Transportation	Communication	Total
government	· /	(N)		(ℕ)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Tourism development levy	10670904	800,000	145,000	600,000	388,000	-	12,603904
Food safety inspection fee	107,000	95,000	-	388,000		-	260,000
Signage and advertisement	537,000	480,000	85,000	320,000	175,000	225,000	1,922,000
Waste management	295,000	360,000	35,000	198,000	67,000	180,000	1,135,000
Pollution discharge	314,000	300,000	25,000	130,000	92,000	220,000	932,000
Business premises	160,000	75,000	25,000	50,000	73,000	170,000	553,000
Payee	340,000	235,000	30,000	152,000	82,000	455,000	939,000
Tenement rate	305,000	215,000	40,000	190,000	82,000	290,000	1,122,000
Total	12728904	2,560,000	385,000	1698,000	959,000	1,540,000	19,466,904
Local government							
Business operational levy	295,000	245,000	35,000	147,000	94,000	255,000	1,771,000
General inspection	190,000	205,000	25,000	185,000	54,000	140,000	798,000
Business rate	160,000	160,000	18,000	110,000	42,000	125,000	515,000
Liquor license	105,000	75,000	-	22,000	-	-	202,000
Environmental health certification	115,000	115,000	10,000	42,000	46,000	60,000	388,500
Refuse disposal	208,000	180,000	15,000	115,000	37,000	100,000	555,000
Total	1073000	980,000	103,000	621,000	272,000	580,000	4,220,500
Grand total	13,801,904	3,540,000	488,000	2,319500	1,229,000	2,120,000	23,687,4044

Source: Authors field work, 2016

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

In examining the effect of accommodation sector remittances on tourism development in Calabar, Table 2 shows remittances made by accommodation sector to government. From the table, out of \$13, 801,904 that was remitted to government for tourism development within the period, Transcorp Hotel remitted \$5, 815,682 followed by Channel View Hotel with \$5, 359,222, while Legacy Hotel remitted \$598, 000 to state government for tourism development. The variation in revenue remittances to government was that Transcorp and Channel View Hotel had a limited number of fifty rooms each and additional facilities such as swimming pool and other indoor recreational facilities such as gym and spa. Furthermore, remittances trend from accommodation sector in figure 2 revealed a constant fall in revenue remittance to government from \$3, 537,146 in 2011 to \$2, 272,990 in 2014. In 2015, the revenue remittance rose again to \$3, 137,198. However, available statistics from Cross River State Internal Revenue Service (2016) indicate that, Tourism Development Levy Remittances Trend between January 2016 and May, 2016 which totaled \$15, 231,843.80 was remitted into the state account by accommodation sector, while between June, 2016 and December, 2016, a total of \$18, 453,324.60 was also remitted into the state account for tourism development

Remittances to state government	Unical Hotel	Channel view	Transcor p Hotel	Galaxy Lodge	Cross road Hotel	Legacy hotel	Total
	(ℕ)	(N)	(ℕ)	(ℕ)	(N)	(ℕ)	(N)
Tourism development levy	180,000	4892,222	5,288,68 2	250,00 0	350,000	250,000	10,670,904
Food safety inspection fee	15,000	25,000	25,000	10,000	12,000	10,000	107000
Signage and advertisement	85,000	112,000	112,000	60,000	75,000	55,000	537000
Waste management	50,000	65,000	65,000	45,000	30,000	25,000	295000
Population discharge	40,000	70,000	70,000	30,000	46,000	38,000	314000
Business premises	25,000	35,000	35,000	25,000	18,000	15,000	160,000
Payee	40,000	85,000	85,000	35,000	30,000	25,000	340,000
Tenement rate	45,000	75,000	75,000	40,000	30,000	20,000	305,000
Total	466500	5359,222	5755682	495000	591000	438000	12728904
Local government							
Business operational levy	40,000	70,000	70,000	35,000	40,000	25,000	295,000
General inspection	30,000	35,000	35,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	190,000
Business rate	25,000	30,000	30,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	160,000
Liquor license	15,000	20,000	20,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	105,000
Environmental health certification	15,000	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	115,000
Refuse disposal	35,000	45,000	45,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	208,000
Total	210000	225,500	225,000	185,00 0	185,000	160,000	1073000
Grand total	676500	5,359,222	5815682	680,000	776000	598,000	13,801,904

 Table 2: Remittances for Accommodation Sector (2011-2015)

Source: Authors' fieldwork, 2016

European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research

Vol.7, No.4, pp.1-16, December 2019

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)



Figure 2: Trend of remittances from accommodation sector to government (2011-2015) Source: Authors field work, 2016

In a bid to investigate the impact of eatery sector remittance on tourism development, table 3 shows that out of a totaled \aleph 3, 540,000 that was remitted to government from eatery sector within the period, De Choice fast foods remitted the highest amount of money \aleph 667,000 in the study. This was followed by Apples fast food who remitted \aleph 612,500 and Mr. Nice fast food who remitted the least at \aleph 537,500. Similarly, figure 3 revealed fluctuations in trend of eatery sector revenue remittances to government from \aleph 779, 900 in 2011 to \aleph 737, 950 in 2012. In 2013, the revenue remittances rose to N1, 071,800 and drops to N649, 940 in 2014, and maintain a little rise in 2015 with \aleph 750, 160.

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

Vol.7, No.4, pp.1-16, December 2019

Published by ECRTD-UK

Remittances to state government	Crunches Fries Chicken	Fiesta Fries	Apples food	De choice fast food	Mr. Nice	Mr. Fans	Total
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Tourism development levy	140,000	140,000	14,000	150,000	120,000	110,000	800,000
Food safety inspection fee	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	20,000	15,000	95,000
Signage and advertisement	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	480,000
Waste management	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	360,000
Pollution discharge	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	300,000
Business premises	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,000	12,500	12,500	75,000
Payee	40,000	35,000	45,000	50,000	25,000	40,000	235,000
Tenement rate	30,000	50,000	40,000	40,000	30,000	25,000	215,000
Total	427,500	442,500	442,500	457,500	397,500	392,500	2,560,000
Local government							
Business operational levy	40,000	35,000	40,000	60,000	30,000	40,000	245,000
General inspection	30,000	30,000	35,000	40,000	35,000	35,000	205,000
Business rate	20,000	30,000	25,000	30,000	25,000	30,000	160,000
Liquor license	10,000	10,000	15,000	20,000	5,000	15,000	75,000
Environmental health certification	15,000	15,000	20,000	25,000	20,000	20,000	115,000
Refuse disposal	30,000	30,000	35,000	35,000	25,000	25,000	180,000
Total	145,000	150,000	170,000	210,000	140,000	165,500	980,000
Grand total	572,,000	5902,500	612,500	667,500	537,500	558,000	3,540,000

Table 3:Remittances for Eatery Sector (2011-2015)

Source: Authors' fieldwork, 2016



Figure 3: Trend of remittances from eateries to government (2011-2015) Source: Author's fieldwork, 2016

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

In assessing tourism development through remittances made by recreational resorts in Calabar, table 4 revealed that out of a totaled of \aleph 2, 319, 500 that was remitted by the various recreational resorts to government for tourism development within the period, Marina Resort remitted \aleph 620, 500 while Orange resort paid \aleph 542, 500. However, the remittances trend in figure 4 shows a steady fall in revenue remittances to government. The revenue remittances which fell from \aleph 476,100 in 2011 to \aleph 349,100 in 2014 rose to \aleph 445,650 in 2015.

Remittances to state	Airport	Orange	Marina	Unical	Aqua vista	Total
government	Garden and	Resort	Resort	Resort		
	Homes (N)	(<u>N</u>)	(<u>N</u>)	(N)	(N)	(N)
Tourism development levy	120,000	120,000	120,000	12,000	12,000	600,000
Food safety inspection fee	12,500	12,500	12,500	8,000	12,000	58,000
Signage and advertisement	80,000	80,000	80,000	-	80,000	320,000
Waste management	48,000	48,000	48,000	6,000	48,000	198,000
Pollution discharge	30,000	30,000	30,000	10,000	30,000	130,000
Business premises	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
Payee	20,000	42,000	35,000	15,000	40,000	152,000
Tenement rate	25,000	50,000	50,000	5,000	60,000	190,000
Total	345,500	392,500	385,500	66,000	400,000	1,698,000
Local government						
Business operational levy	30,000	30,000	30,000	12,000	25,000	147,000
General inspection	25,000	25,000	25,000	-	5,000	185,000
Business rate	15,000	15,000	15,000	5,000	30,000	110,000
Liquor license	5,000	5,000	5,000	2,000	5,000	22,000
Environmental health certification	10,000	10,000	10,000	2,500	10,000	42,500
Refuse disposal	15,000	15,000	15,000	10,000	30,000	115,000
Total	100,000	150,000	235,00	31,500	105,000	621,5000
Grand total	445,500	542,500	620,500	97,500	505,500	2,319,500

Table 4 Remittances for Resort (2011-2015)

Source: Authors' field work, 2016

European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research

Vol.7, No.4, pp.1-16, December 2019

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)



Figure 4: Trend of remittances from Resorts to government (2011-2015) Source: Authors fieldwork, 2016

In examining the effect of travel and tour remittances for tourism development in the study area, remittances made from travel/tour sector within the period were $\mathbb{N}488$, 000 as indicated in table 5. However, Tourism Development levy remitted $\mathbb{N}145$, 000 as the highest levy paid, while environmental health certification at local government level was the least levy paid at $\mathbb{N}10$, 000 to government for tourism development. The remittance trend as shown figure 5 revealed an unprecedented increase in revenue remittance to government from $\mathbb{N}106,800$ in 2011 to $\mathbb{N}279,300$ in 2012. The revenue remitted decline again from 279,300 in 2012 to 92,850 in 2013 and maintain its decline until in 2014 when it started picking up again to $\mathbb{N}96$, 650 in 2015.

Table 5	
Remittances for Travel and Tour (2011-2015)	
Remittances to the state government	Remlords tours (N)
Tourism development levy	145,000
Food safety inspection fee	-
Signage and advertisement	85,000
Waste management	35,000
Pollution discharge	25,000
Business premises	25,000
Payee	30,000
Tenement rate	40,000
Total	385,000
Local government	
Business operational levy	35,000
General inspection	25,000
Business rate	18,000
Liquor license	-
Environmental health certification	10,000
Refuse disposal	15,000
Total	103,000
Grand total	488,000
Source: Authors' fieldwork 2016	,

Source: Authors' fieldwork, 2016

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)



Figure 5: Trend of remittances from tour and travels to government (2011-2015) Source: Author's fieldwork, 2016

Assessing transportation sector remittances impact in the study area, the transportation sector as indicated in table 6 revealed transportation sector remittances to government for tourism development within the period. From the table, out of $\aleph1$, 229,000 remitted to government, Calabar Airport transport services remitted $\aleph431$, 000 while Remlords transport paid $\aleph422$, 000. Figure 6 further showed remittances trend in transportation sector and revealed a constant decline in revenue remittance from $\aleph273$, 600 in 2011 to $\aleph136$,100 in 2013. In 2014, it rose again to $\aleph215$,200 and maintain its rise to $\aleph295$,500 in 2015.

Remittances to state government	Calabar Airport	Remlords	Transcorp	
	Transport Service	Transport	Transport	Total
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(ℕ)
Tourism development levy	135,000	128,000	125,000	388,000
Food safety inspection fee	-	-	-	-
Signage and advertisement	65,000	65,000	45,000	175,000
Waste management	25,000	20,000	22,000	67,000
Population discharge	32,000	35,000	25,000	92,000
Business premises	25,000	28,000	20,000	73,000
Payee	27,000	25,000	30,000	82,000
Tenement rate	25,000	27,000	30,000	82,000
Total	334,000	32,800	1,172,000	959,000
Local government				
Business operational levy	35,000	34,000	25,000	94,000
General inspection	20,000	18,000	15,000	53,000
Business rate	15,000	12,000	15,000	42,000
Liquor license	-	-	-	-
Environmental health certification	12,000	18,000	16,000	46,000
Refuse disposal	15,000	12,000	10,000	37,000
Total	79,000	94,000	81,000	272,000
Grand total	431,000	422,000	253,000	1.229,000

Table 6:Remittances for Transportation sector (2011-2015)

Source: Authors' field work, 2016

European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research

Vol.7, No.4, pp.1-16, December 2019

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)



Figure 6: Trend of remittances from transportation sector to government (2011-2015) Source: Authors fieldwork, 2016

Since communication sector do not pay tourism development levy, in examining whether remittances made by communication sector to government influence tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State, Table 7 revealed that out of $\aleph2$, 120,000 paid by the various communication service providers in the study area within the period, MTN paid $\aleph660$, 000, GLOBACOM paid $\aleph605,000$ while Airtel paid $\aleph485,000$ to government for tourism development. Figure 7 revealed a trend of remittances from communication sector to government within the period and revealed a constant decline in revenue remittance from $\aleph525,200$ in 2011 to $\aleph445,200$ in 2014. In 2015, it rose to $\aleph531,600$. According to Cross River State Internal Revenue Service (2016), this sharp increase in revenue remittance to government policy on ease of doing businesses which was yet to be implemented in the same year. This policy however, may have motivated private tourism organizations to invest efficiently in their various business and increase remittances to government for tourism development.

Published by ECRTD-UK

Remittances to state government	MTN (N)	GLOBACOM (N)	ETISALAT (N)	AIRTEL (N)	Total (№)
Tourism development levy	-	-	-	-	-
Food safety inspection fee	-	-	-	-	-
Signage and advertisement	120,000	110,000	120,000	115,000	225,000
Waste management	50,000	45,000	45,000	40,000	180,000
Pollution discharge	60,000	65,000	50,000	45,000	220,000
Business premises	45,000	45,000	40,000	40,000	170,000
Payee	120,000	115,000	110,000	110,000	455,000
Tenement rate	80,000	70,000	70,000	65,000	290,000
Total	475,000	450,000	440,000	350,000	1,540,000
Local government					
Business operational levy	60,000	50,000	50,000	45,000	255,000
General inspection	45,000	35,000	30,000	30,000	140,000
Business rate	35,000	30,000	30,000	25,000	125,000
Liquor license	-	-	-	-	-
Environmental health certification	15000	15,000	15000	15000	60,000
Refuse disposal	30,000	25,000	25,000	20,000	100,000
Total	185,000	155,000	150,000	135,000	580,000
Grand total	660,000	605,000	590,000	485,000	2,120,000

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

Source: Authors' field work, 2016



Figure 7: Trend of remittances from communication sector to government (2011-2015) Source: Authors field work, 2016

420000

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

CONCLUSION

The focus of this study has been to examine private sector remittances and tourism development in Calabar, Cross River State. On the premise of this study, it can be concluded that,

Tourism development levy was the highest levy paid at state, while business operational levy was also the highest levy paid at local government.

The decline in revenue remittances by various private tourism sectors to government for tourism development was as a result of government policy on taxation and uneasy environment for doing business within the period.

Remittances made by private tourism organizations are used by government to fund public tourism agencies such as Cross River State Tourism Bureau, Department of Public Transportation and Calabar Urban Development Agency. It is also used to develop the tourism sector through road maintenance, improve electricity, provision of portable water supply, provide security and maintain developed tourism attractions in the study area.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the need for private sector organizations in the tourism industry in Calabar to improve their remittances and contribute significantly, few recommendations are put forward:

1. Government should provide a legislation to encourage the private sector organizations to do business and most importantly reduce tax as these may hinder tourism development.

2. Government must create enabling environment in the state and the need for infrastructural support especially adequate power supply and maintenance to reduce the cost of doing business.

3. Government should play a supervisory role, and also put a framework that would organize programme of activities all-round the year that will make Calabar and indeed Cross River State a tourism destination.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M.Y (2008). Implication of the monetization policy on the 2007 budget. The Guardian, Lagos: The Publishers, June, 15.
- Akpan, E and Obang, C (2012). Tourism: a strategy for sustainable Economic Development in Cross River State, Nigeria; *International Journal of Business. Soc. Sci. 3(5): 124-129.* Cross River State Tourism Bureau (2013) *Statistic analysis of tourism patronage on destination Cross River;* Annual report. Vol. 3, pp-16-21
- Eun, C. & Resnick, B. (2007). *International financial management*. (4th ed.) Bosto: McGraw Hill Irwin. (Chapter 16).
- Godwin, H (2001). *The tourism industry and poverty reduction;* a business primary pro-poor tourism brief –No 2 url http://w.w.w.proportionalism.org.uk/final%20business20brief.paf
- Hall, C. (2003) *Politics and place:* an analysis of power in tourism communities, Oxford, English, 99-114.
- Ibe, C. (2016) Private Sector and Tourism Development in Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. Unpublished Master's Theses in Department of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Calabar, Nigeria.
- Seetanah, B., Juwaheer, T. & Subaha, A. (2011) Does infrastructure matter in tourism development. University of Mauritius Research Journal, 17: 98-108
- Tunde, M (2012) Harnessing Tourism Potentials in Nigeria for Sustainable Development: A Case of Owu Water Falls In Nigeria; j. Sustain. Dev. Afr. Vol.14.
- Webster, S. (1991) Third new international dictionary, Bell and Sons, London p2417

Published by ECRTD-UK

Print ISSN: ISSN 2054-6424(Print), Online ISSN: ISSN 2054-6432(Online)

World Trade & Tourism Tax Policy Centre, Tax theory/ principles/ Tax Issues/ www-traveltaxmsu.edu/intro 2. Htm. May. 2001.