

DELSU Journal of Management Sciences *Abbr. Title: Deljoms, FMS*

ISSN: (Online) : 2756-3731

Research Article

OPEN ACCESS Volume 7 Number 1 June, 2025

Venue Attributes and Wedding Banquet Choice: An Empirical Evidence of Couples in Lagos State Nigeria

Mercy Busayo Bello¹

School of Applied Sciences, Federal Polytechnic Auchi, Auchi, Edo State, Nigeria, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2218-8238.

Yekinni Ojo Bello²

Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3844-0290.

Publication Date: 2025/06/30

Abstract

Studies that examined the association between venue attributes and wedding banquet choice in respect of Lagos State, Nigeria is under reported. The current study therefore filled this research gap. The study adopted a quantitative research design, hence used structured questionnaires to collect data from 323 couples in each of the 37 selected events centers in the 20 LGAS in Lagos State. Data that were collected was analysed using Partial Least Squares_Structural Equation Modeling. The result show that three of the six tested hypotheses, four of the relationships were proven to be supported and two failed to support. By confirming the link between venue attributes and wedding banquet choice, hence this study offers an insightful report on the venue attributes that stimulates wedding banquet choice in Lagos State. Therefore, managers and operators of events centre business in Lagos State should give quality attention to the seating capacity of their facilities, consider accessible location, institute affordable and friendly tariff structure, and ensure undisrupted power supply system to attract and sustain wedding function patrons in their facilities. This research contributes to the broader base of consumer behaviour and wedding events literature.

Keywords: Venue Attributes, Wedding Banquet Choice, Lagos State, Events Industry, PLS_SEM.

Introduction

Hosting events is considered as a fundamental part of the society and a complex phenomenon (Moufakkir & Pernecky, 2014). According to Quinn (2013), the awareness and usage of event centers to hosting events is on the rise. It is estimated that a billion events take place every year, having a significant impact on the global genuine progress indicators (GPI) (Silvers, 2008; Tassiopoulos, 2020). Globally, the business of hosting events contributed about US\$1.5 trillion to the global gross domestic product (GDP) in 2017 (Oxford Economics, 2018). In the United Kingdom, facilities that host events otherwise known as event centers worth £42.8 billion in 2016 (Baan, 2019). According to Lock (2021) the market size of event centers in the United States was valued at US\$4.89 billion. Event centers sub sector supports on an average 252,000 direct and indirect jobs and contributed US\$7.7 billion to South Africa's

GDP in 2019 (South Africa National Convention Bureau, 2020). Pegged at US\$20 billion, the events industry in Nigeria is estimated to be among the most extravagant in the world (Ndiomewese, 2017), hence often times, a venue could be priced for as high as ₦4 million. Report has it that an average Nigerian company or middle-class family spends over \$15,000 per event. With Lagos State alone reportedly hosting over 20,000 events monthly in 2015, with earnings amounted to about \$300,000,000 annually according to association of professional party organizers and events center managers of Nigeria (Ndiomewese, 2017). Even more revealing is the fact that venue rentals take up about 5% of event costs -- more reason it is baffling how little scholarly attention is given to popular indices to securing venues among event centers patrons.

It is pertinent to emphasised that, the contributions of weddings to sustainable events center business cannot be over emphasized. Wedding reception is often customarily held at a banquet facility often called events center after the signing of the marriage certificate at the government marriage registrar (Lau & Hui, 2010; Dianna, 2019). This denotes that events center is a key wedding element in event planning. According to a recent global survey of brides, intended couples spend between US\$12,343 and US\$14,006 (i.e., 40% to 50%) of their wedding budget to hire venue used for the wedding reception (Price, 2021). In Nigeria, stagging wedding reception in an events center is fast becoming an important the Nigerian marriage component of ceremonial culture. Forbes reports that Nigerian elites spend an average of 2 million dollars on their dream weddings (Thisday Newspaper, 2025). In Lagos State, depending on its location, size and features, wedding venues can go for between US\$1,000 to US\$20,000 per day (Thisday Newspaper, 2025).

The choice of a venue for wedding banquet is therefore a complex decision influenced by many factors. Hence, must reflect the needs and preferences, and personalities of the prospective couples (Van der Wagen, 2005; Bowdin et al., 2006). It is pertinent to state that the proliferation of event centers and facilities for different events especially wedding banquet in Lagos State in recent time is a genuine response to the increasing demand for professional event management services by prospective couples. Sustaining the growing trend of event centers' business in Nigeria and Lagos State in particular requires the understanding of the needs of the event centers' patrons especially the intending couples in respect of the venue attributes and how it impacts on their choice of the venue for wedding banquet. Hence, this provides event centers' owners and managers with the required information to develop and market their product offerings that best cater to the needs of the market. To the best of our knowledge, the existing event management literature emerging in the countries particularly Nigeria has virtually not empirically determined and published studies on couples' behaviour with regard to choose venue for wedding banquet. To fill this gap, this research aims to examine the relationship between venue attributes, and wedding banquet choice among Nigerian couples in Lagos State.

Literature Review The Concept of Venue Attributes

Van der Wagen (2005) sees venue attributes as the unique specifications, including the facility's location, capacity, creative theme or image, availability, and accessibility that contribute to the total experience of the customers. Callen and Hoyes (2000) defined venue attributes as a compendium of services and designs such as the facility's convenience, cleanliness, lighting, decoration, audio equipment, accommodation, and price capable of attracting and meeting the needs of the customers. Bello and Bello (2019) defined attributes as those venues-bond venue amenities with aesthetic values used as the basis for banquet facility marketing and a focal point for customers' activities and spending. Venue attributes is also defined as human features and designated permanent amenities, which are controlled and managed for the enjoyment, amusement, and entertainment of the visiting public (Bello & Bello, 2017). Mazlina et al. (2015) defined venue attributes as those exceptional fixed and movable criteria that shape the selection of a banquet facility among the patrons. The index in the above definitions shows that venue attributes is seen as the mixture of the different elements that defined the quality and the appealing nature of the banquet facility.

The Meaning of Wedding Banquet Choice

Wedding banquet choice is defined as the selection of a spot over the other due to uniquely identified facilities or features for a wedding reception (Tromczynski & Stanfar, 2006; Le Falher et al., 2015). The concept is seen as the selection of a site with the specific purpose of hosting wedding events (Olanga et al., 2015). Wedding banquet choice is defined as a series of decisions that involve an individual's cognitive processes to select a venue for a wedding event (Lau & Hui, 2010). It explained the selection of a venue to meet a definite wedding reception need or function satisfactorily (Pike, 2008; Saayman, 2006). According to Yoo and Zhao (2010), wedding banquet choice is defined as the decisionmaking process of selecting a venue for a wedding event (Yoo & Zhao, 2010; Mair & Thompson, 2009). It explained the decisionmaking process involved in selecting a venue over another based on implicit cognition and environmental variables for a weeding event (Lau & Hui, 2010; Guan et al., 2015).

Theoretical Underpinning: The Choice-sets Model

The choice-sets model has been widely employed in consumer research to explaining individual's decision-making process (Jang et al., 2009). The model has received a great deal of attention due to its simplicity, practical advantages, and theoretical soundness. Therefore, the model is often used to explain the destination selection process among couples (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005; Jang et al., 2009). The model is recently been applied to banquet venue choice among intending couples. The model, therefore, opined that intending couples evaluate different elements such as venue-related and personal attributes before their final decision on the choice of a venue for a wedding banquet (Callan & Hoyes, 2000; Lau & Hui, 2010; Guan et al., 2015). This model is being applied in the current study to explaining venue-related attributes in the context of the banquet facility choice among the intending couples in Lagos state.

Empirical Review and Hypothesis Development

Sitting Capacity and Wedding Banquet Choice

The sitting capacity of the venue explains the condition in which the venue has the available space to accommodate the guests (Callan & Hoyes, 2000; Wells, 2007). Sitting capacity is one of the main attributes that is considered to be important when one chooses a venue facility for a wedding (Comas & Moscardo, 2005; Wells, 2007). The capacity of a venue is identified as the main attribute when deciding on a venue facility for a wedding (Lau & Hui, 2010; Tassiopoulos, 2010). Van der Baan (2018) determined the attributes that contributed to the wedding venue selection of prospective brides in the Gauteng province of South Africa. The result shows that the sitting capacity of the venue facility is the third most important choice attribute.

Overall Maintenance and Wedding Banquet Choice

The overall maintenance of the venues' buildings and facilities is important to the acceptance of the overall image of a venue (Saayman, 2000; Chan, 2010). The results of the selected attributes of a venue for a wedding banquet among Hong Kong prospective wedding couples indicated that the overall maintenance of the facility is the most important requirement contributing to the perfect wedding venue selection (Lau & Hui, 2010). In a study on creating marketing strategies for the wedding business unit of Amari Atrium Hotel, it was reported that the extent of venue facility maintenance is one of the most important requirements contributing to the perfect wedding venue selection (Suvagondha & Soparat, 2008). Van der Baan (2018) determined the attributes contributing to the wedding venue selection of prospective brides in the Gauteng province of South Africa. The result shows that the overall maintenance of the venue facility is the most important choice attribute.

On-site Accommodation and Wedding Banquet Choice

On-site accommodations are the rooms where the bride dresses and stays overnight, including hosting the invited guests (Rodgerson & Wolfaardt. 2015). Accommodation facilities at the venue premises deliver a good impression to the wedding guests (Comas & Moscardo, 2005). Callen and Hoyes (2000) investigated event venue choice indicators for different types of events and observed that wedding organisers consider on-site accommodation as the deciding factor. Van der Baan (2018) determined the attributes contributing to the wedding venue selection of prospective brides in the Gauteng province of South Africa. The result shows that on-site accommodation is one of the most important choice attributes of the venue facility.

Location / Accessibility and Wedding Banquet Choice

Location refers to the physical position of the venue and its accessibility. A good location increases the value of the venue facility (Callan & Hoyes, 2000), hence convenient for the guests attending the wedding. Callen and Hoyes (2000) determined event venue choice attributes for different types of occasions and observed that wedding organisers consider location/accessibility as the deciding factor. Lau and Hui (2010) examined the selection attributes of wedding banquet venues among Hong Kong prospective wedding couples. The study found price and location as the determining factors. Van der Baan (2018) determined the attributes contributing to the wedding venue selection of prospective brides in the Gauteng province of South Africa. The result shows that location is one of the most important choice attributes of a venue facility for a wedding.

Cost / Affordability and Wedding Banquet Choice

The cost/affordability attribute explains the financial value of the venue rental, food and beverage, setting package, and equipment expenses (Lau & Hui, 2010). Lockyer (2005) reviewed several studies and finds that cost/affordability is the most important consideration in the selection of event centers. Callen and Hoyes (2000) investigated the requirements of event organisers when choosing unusual venues for types of events, and observed that wedding organisers consider the cost of the facility as the most determining factor for event center choice. Lau and Hui (2010) examined the selection attributes of the wedding banquet venues among Hong Kong prospective wedding couples. The study found cost/affordability as one of the determining factors. Seebaluck et al. (2015) examined the push and pull motives for the choice of Mauritius as the wedding destination. The study illustrated that reasonable costs of a wedding venue are a major pull factor. Comas and Moscardo (2005) opined that prospective wedding couples confessed that the price of the venue facility is one of their biggest considerations when deciding on wedding banquet venues.

Power Supply Capability and Wedding Banquet Choice

Power is a very important factor at a venue during an event. It is therefore important to know the capability of the venue to manage power outlets so that power failures can be avoided during the event is one of the major indicators for banquet facility choice (Tasssiopoulos, 2005). During larger events, an electrical technician should attend, in case additional power needs occur during the event (Shone & Parry, 2004). The venue must be able to supply adequate lighting to enhance the guests' well-being (Lin, 2011). In their study of prospective wedding couples' choice of a venue for a wedding, it was reported that the power supply capability of the facility influences the decision of the couples (Callan & Hoyes, 2000).

Operational Framework

In this study, a venue facility choice model that explains the attributes that influence couples to choose a venue facility for a wedding in Lagos state is proposed. The hypothetical model shows six attributes as independent variables that predict the choice of a venue for the wedding reception. The consideration of these attributes, whether conscious or unconscious determines the final choice of a venue among the couples in Lagos state as shown in Figure 1.1.



Figure 1: Showing Venues' Attributes Model for Wedding Banquet Choice by Couples in Lagos State.

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study used copies of a structured questionnaire to gather relevant data to determine the relationship between venues' attributes and venues' choice for a wedding function in Lagos State, hence a quantitative research design.

Instrumentation

The 42 items related to venue attributes were derived from the study of Van der Baan (2018) and modified into 24 relevant items used in this study with venues' sitting capacity having 4 items; On-site accommodation- 7 items; Venues' location/accessibility - 5 items; Cost/affordability - 5 items, and Power supply capability - 3 items. Furthermore, a 6-item hotel physical environment scale developed by Bello & Bello (2021) was modified and used to measure overall venue maintenance attributes in this study. In addition, a 5- items hotel choice scale in Bello (2018) was adapted for wedding banquet choice by the couples in Lagos State. Each of the 35- items in the instrument was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree.

Research Population and Sample Size

The research population for this study comprised 65 registered event centers in the 20 LGAs in Lagos State (Registered Hospitality and Tourism Enterprise in Lagos, 2021). The researcher selected 37 of the 65 registered event centers through a systematic random sampling technique. This study, therefore, focused on the couples that patronised the services of the 37 selected event centers for their wedding, thus, an infinite population. To determine the exact sample size for the present study, the suggestion in Freneund and William (2009) in (Bello, 2022) was upheld. Applying this formula, the sample size put at 323 was obtained as follows.

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

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

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

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

$$N = 323$$

The researcher personally visited each of the 37 selected event centers in the 20 LGAS in Lagos State and, thus, administered the structured questionnaires until the sample size of 323 was met.

Data Analysis

Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling (PLS SEM) approach that explores the linear relationships between multiple independent variables and single or multiple dependent variables (Hair et al., 2014) was adopted for the analysis of the data collected in this study. This was done with the aid of SmartPLS v4. Software. The PLS-SEM relies on pre-specified networks relationships between constructs and as well their measures (Hair et al., 2014) thus, making it different from the regular regression approach.

Results

Demographic Distribution of Respondents

The gender distribution of the respondents indicates that 63.2% of the respondents are Male and 36.8% are Female. This implied that majority of the respondents that participated in the study are male. In respect to the respondent's marital status, 66.9% of the respondents are Married, 32.2% are Singles, 0.6% are Others and 0.3% are Divorcees. This implies that majority of the respondents that participated in the study are Married, followed by the Singles. The religion distribution of the respondents used in the study includes: Christianity (13.6%), Islam (71.8%) and Others (14.6%). This shows that majority of the participants in the study are Muslims followed by Christians with only very few Others participated. In respect to academic qualification of the respondents, 35.9% bagged National diploma. Master degree (33.4%), and Bachelor degree (30.7%). This shows that majority of the participants in the study are holders of National diploma followed by holders of Master degree, and lastly holders of Bachelor degree.

Assessment of Measurement Model

The hypothesized model of this study was evaluated for its construct reliability including, convergent and discriminants validity using SmartPLS 4.0 (Hair et al. 2014; Ringle et al., 2005). As part of the requirement for the evaluation of the validity and reliability of the hypothesized model, the researchers examined factor loadings of all items of the study variables. The result of the factor loadings of the initial hypothesized model shows that 9 out of 35 items (i.e., SEC1, OVM1, OVM2, OVM5, OSA1, OSA2, OSA5, OSA6, and OSA7) has factor loadings less

than the acceptable threshold of 0.7 (Hair et al. 2014; 2017). In view of these, the 9 items were deleted from the initial hypothesized model, one item at a time starting from the lowest loading. Having deleted all the items with the low factor loadings, the final hypothesized model yielded a better result hence, fit well with the data as shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2. Hypothesised model with fit factor loadings. Source: Researcher's Computation (2025).

Furthermore, the result of the final hypothesized measurement indicators such as Cronbach alpha (α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE)

including, factor loadings of all the items in the study variables yielded a better result as presented in Table 1.

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Latent Variable	Items	Loadings	Cronbach	Composite Reliability	AVE
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Seating Canacity	SEC 2	0.881	0 700	0.874	0.608
SIE 3 0.773 SEC 4 0.848 Overall OVM 3 0.788 0.799 0.867 0.620 Maintenance OVM 4 0.820 0.786 0 0 Orsite OSA 3 0.882 0.766 0.766 Accommodation OSA 4 0.869 0.624 Location LOA 1 0.711 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 2 0.877 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 3 0.868 0.868 0.847 0.892 0.624 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 COA 2 0.757 0.824 0.875 0.584 COA 3 0.753 0.604 0.810 COA 5 0.727 0.824 0.804 0.759 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 3 0.867 0.852 <td>Seating Capacity</td> <td>SEC 2</td> <td>0.773</td> <td>0.700</td> <td>0.0/4</td> <td>0.070</td>	Seating Capacity	SEC 2	0.773	0.700	0.0/4	0.070
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} Overall & OVM 3 & 0.788 & 0.799 & 0.867 & 0.620 \\ Maintenance & OVM 4 & 0.820 & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$		SEC 3	0.848			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Overall	OVM 3	0.788	0 799	0.867	0.620
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Maintenance	OVM 4	0.780	0.777	0.007	0.020
OVM 6 0.756 On-site OSA 3 0.882 0.766 Accommodation OSA 4 0.869 0.766 Location LOA 1 0.711 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 2 0.877 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 3 0.868 0.755 0.892 0.624 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost / Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost / Affordability PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding	Widintenditee	OVM 5	0.820			
$\begin{array}{ccccc} On-site & OSA 3 & 0.882 & 0.766 \\ Accommodation & OSA 4 & 0.869 \\ Location & LOA 1 & 0.711 & 0.847 & 0.892 & 0.624 \\ Accessibility & LOA 2 & 0.877 \\ & LOA 3 & 0.868 \\ & LOA 4 & 0.725 \\ & LOA 5 & 0.753 \\ & Cost/ Affordability & COA 1 & 0.772 & 0.824 & 0.875 & 0.584 \\ & COA 2 & 0.757 \\ & COA 3 & 0.753 \\ & COA 4 & 0.810 \\ & COA 5 & 0.727 \\ Power & Supply & PSC 1 & 0.846 & 0.841 & 0.904 & 0.759 \\ Capacity & PSC 2 & 0.900 \\ PSC 3 & 0.867 \\ Wedding Banquet & VEC 1 & 0.779 & 0.852 & 0.894 & 0.628 \\ Choice & VEC 2 & 0.824 \\ VEC 3 & 0.788 \end{array}$		OVM 6	0.756			
AccommodationOSA 4 0.862 0.700 AccommodationLOA 1 0.711 0.847 0.892 0.624 AccessibilityLOA 2 0.877 0.847 0.892 0.624 AccessibilityLOA 2 0.877 0.847 0.892 0.624 AccessibilityLOA 3 0.868 0.875 0.584 Cost/ AffordabilityCOA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost/ AffordabilityCOA 2 0.757 0.824 0.904 0.759 PowerSupplyPSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 CapacityPSC 2 0.900 0.852 0.894 0.628 WeddingBanquetVEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 ChoiceVEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.894 0.628	On-site	OSA 3	0.882			0 766
Location LOA 1 0.711 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 2 0.877 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 2 0.877 0.847 0.892 0.624 Accessibility LOA 3 0.868 0.868 0.847 0.892 0.624 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.725 0.824 0.875 0.584 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 CoA 3 0.753 0.753 0.604 0.810 0.604 0.759 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.788	Accommodation	OSA 4	0.869			0.700
LocationLorin 1 0.711 0.811 0.817 0.872 0.621 AccessibilityLOA 2 0.877 0.877 0.672 0.672 LOA 3 0.868 $LOA 4$ 0.725 $LOA 5$ 0.753 Cost/ AffordabilityCOA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 CoA 2 0.757 $COA 3$ 0.753 $COA 4$ 0.810 COA 5 0.727 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 PowerSupplyPSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 CapacityPSC 2 0.900 $PSC 3$ 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding BanquetVEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 ChoiceVEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.788	Location	LOA 1	0.009	0.847	0.892	0 624
$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mbox{Lor} 12 & 0.077 \\ \mbox{LOA 3} & 0.868 \\ \mbox{LOA 4} & 0.725 \\ \mbox{LOA 5} & 0.753 \\ \mbox{COA 1} & 0.772 & 0.824 & 0.875 & 0.584 \\ \mbox{COA 2} & 0.757 \\ \mbox{COA 3} & 0.753 \\ \mbox{COA 4} & 0.810 \\ \mbox{COA 5} & 0.727 \\ \mbox{Power} & \mbox{Supply} & \mbox{PSC 1} & 0.846 & 0.841 & 0.904 & 0.759 \\ \mbox{Capacity} & \mbox{PSC 2} & 0.900 \\ \mbox{PSC 3} & 0.867 \\ \mbox{Wedding Banquet} & \mbox{VEC 1} & 0.779 & 0.852 & 0.894 & 0.628 \\ \mbox{Choice} & \mbox{VEC 2} & 0.824 \\ \mbox{VEC 3} & 0.788 \end{array}$	Accessibility	LOA 2	0.877	0.017	0.092	0.021
LOA 4 0.725 LOA 5 0.753 Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 COA 2 0.757 COA 3 0.753 0.600 0.584 COA 2 0.757 COA 3 0.753 0.584 COA 3 0.753 0.824 0.875 0.584 COA 4 0.810 COA 5 0.727 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.628	recessionity	LOA 3	0.868			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		LOA 4	0.725			
Cost/ Affordability COA 1 0.772 0.824 0.875 0.584 COA 2 0.757 0.004 3 0.753 0.004 4 0.810 COA 3 0.753 0.004 4 0.810 0.004 4 0.810 COA 5 0.727 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.628		LOA 5	0.753			
COA 2 0.757 COA 3 0.753 COA 4 0.810 COA 5 0.727 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.788 0.779	Cost/ Affordability	COA 1	0.772	0.824	0.875	0.584
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	5	COA 2	0.757			
COA 4 0.810 COA 5 0.727 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.628		COA 3	0.753			
COA 5 0.727 Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.788 0.852 0.894 0.628		COA 4	0.810			
Power Supply PSC 1 0.846 0.841 0.904 0.759 Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 0.852 0.894 0.628 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788 0.788 0.894 0.628		COA 5	0.727			
Capacity PSC 2 0.900 PSC 3 0.867 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788	Power Supply	PSC 1	0.846	0.841	0.904	0.759
PSC 3 0.867 Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 0.788 0.788 0.852 0.894 0.628	Capacity	PSC 2	0.900			
Wedding Banquet VEC 1 0.779 0.852 0.894 0.628 Choice VEC 2 0.824 0.778 0.778 0.852 0.894 0.628	1 5	PSC 3	0.867			
Choice VEC 2 0.824 VEC 3 0.788	Wedding Banquet	VEC 1	0.779	0.852	0.894	0.628
VEC 3 0.788	Choice	VEC 2	0.824			
		VEC 3	0.788			
VEC 4 0.763		VEC 4	0.763			
VEC 5 0.806		VEC 5	0.806			

Table 1: Results of the measurement model

Source: Researcher's Computation (2025).

As shown in Table 1, the results of the convergent validity of the final hypothesized model shows that the factor loadings of all the items in the study variables were statistically significant and exceeded the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.7 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Also, the average variance extracted (AVE) exceed the minimum acceptable threshold value of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014). In addition, the model was assessed for

the internal consistency of the data hence, Cronbach Alpha (α), and Composite Reliability (CR) values for all the variables meet the required threshold of 0.7. This implies that all the variables in this study have a satisfactory level of internal consistency. In addition, the discriminant validity of the final hypothesized model was assessed to assure external consistency of the data as

shown in Table 2.

Constructs	Cost/ Affordabilit	Location Accessibilit	On-site Accommodatio	Overall Maintenanc	Power Supply	Venue Choic
	у	у	n	e	Capacit	e
	•	•			y	
Cost/						
Affordability						
Location	0.666					
Accessibility						
On-site	0.074	0.060				
Accommodatio						
n						
Overall	0.614	0.716	0.075			
Maintenance						
Power	0.419	0.294	0.088	0.405		
Supply						
Capacity						
Seating	0.661	0.740	0.086	0.823	0.410	
Capacity						
Wedding	0.708	0.659	0.089	0.625	0.454	0.769
Banquet						
Choice						
C	L	(202E)				

Table 2: Discriminant validity of the variables

Source: Researcher's Computation (2025).

In Table 2, the correlation between the latent variables, were compared with the square root of AVEs (Hair et al., 2014). The result shown that the square root of AVEs along the diagonal as shown in Table 2 are lower than the correlations between the constructs. This validates fulfilment of the discriminant validity requirement.

Structural Hypotheses Model Testing

The significance of the path coefficients is determined by the beta values of the coefficient of the regression and t-values which is calculated using the bootstrapping method (Hair et al., 2014). The rule of thumb of critical t-values for a two tailed test of 1.96 (significance level = 5%) is considered to be significant (Hair et al., 2014), hence Figure 3.



Figure 2. Hypothesized structural relationship model. Source: Researcher's Computation (2025).

As shown in Figure 3 based on the objectives of this study, six direct hypothesized relationships were tested. The result shows that four of the relationships were proven to be supported and two not supported. Furthermore, Table 3 show that hypotheses that were supported and accepted have t-value >1.96 while the rejected hypotheses have t-value < 1.96 hence, show the effect of individual latent constructs (i.e., venue attributes) on the dependent variable (i.e., wedding banquet choice).

S/n	Hypothesized	Path	Standard	t-	Findings	f-	Effect
	Path			Value		Square	Size
1.	SEC -> VEC	0.521	0.316	4.559	Supported	0.236	Medium
2.	OVM -> VEC	-0.128	0.041	0.742	Fail to	0.015	Small
					Support		
3.	OSA -> VEC	-0.035	-0.028	0.672	Fail to	0.004	Small
					Support		
4.	LOA -> VEC	0.132	0.168	2.438	Supported	0.022	Small
5.	COA -> VEC	0.326	0.285	5.138	Supported	0.161	Small
6.	PSC -> VEC	0.111	0.119	2.466	Supported	0.032	Small

Table 3: Summary of direct hypotheses testing

*P<0.05

Source: Researcher's Computation (2025).

The study also shows that the R-square value of all the constructs put together have the tendency of influencing 70.0% of changes in

wedding banquet choice. The remaining 30.0% is due to other factors and residuals.

Effect Size

Following Cohen (1988) guideline, the effects sizes of dimensions of the independent variable (i.e., Venue attribute on the dependent variable (i.e., venue choice) shows that, Seating capacity dimension could be viewed as medium. The remaining five dimensions of the independent variable (i.e., Cost/ Affordability, Location accessibility,

References

- Baan, D. V. (2019). Determining the attributes contributing to wedding venue selection. North West: North West University.
- Bello, M. B. (2022). Assessment of impact of job satisfaction on turnober intention and employees' performance in the hotel industry in Lagos state. Ado Ekiti, Nigeria: A Ph.D theis sublitted to the college of postgraduate studies, Afebabalola University, Ado Ekiti.
- Bello, Y. O., and Bello, M. B. (2019). Destination attributes and domestic tourists' choice of obudu mountain resort Calabar. Ottoman: Journal of Tourism and Management Research, 4, (3), 515-533.
- Bello, Y. O. (2018). *Hospitlaity and Tourism Economics*. Ondo: Grace Excellent Publishers.
- Bello, Y. O., and Bello, M. B. (2017). *Tourism Planning and Development in an Emerging Economy.* Ondo: Grace Excellent Publishers.
- Bello, Y., and Bello, M. B. (2021). Hotel attributes and customer's choice behaviour: evidence from Port Harcourt city, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 7, (2), 181-193.
- Bowdin G, Allen J, O'Toole W, Harris R and McDonnell I. (2006). *Events Management*. Oxford, UK: Second edition, Elsevier.
- Callan, R.J., and Hoyes, M.K. (2000). A preliminary assessment of the function

On-site accommodation, Overall maintenance, and Power supply capacity), on the dependent variable (i.e., wedding banquet choice) shows small effect size. In line with the argument of Chin et al. (2003), who emphasises that even the minutest strength of f^2 might be considered because, they can affect the dependent variable in their own way.

and conference service product at a UK stately home. *Tourism Management*, 21, (6), 571–581.

- Chan, L. (2010). Selection of hotels: Is the sustainability of a building more important than its aesthetic appearance? Oregon : Oregon State University.
- Chin, W. W., Marcolin, B. L., and Newsted, P. R. (20003). A partial least square latent variable modeling approach for measuring interaction effects: results from a monte carlo simulation study and an electronic-mail emotion/adoption study . *Information System Research*, 14, (2), 189-217.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis: A computer program.* UK: Routledge.
- Comas, M., and Moscardo, G. (2005). Understanding associations and their conference decision-making processes. *Journal of convention & event tourism*, 7, (3-4), 117-138.
- Dianna, V. B. (2019). Determining the attributes contributing to wedding venue selection. UK: The North West University.
- Guan, L., Luo, Y., and Tang, L.R. (2015). An exploratory study of decision makers for choosing wedding banquet venues: push and pull motivations. *International journal of tourism cities*, 1, (2),162-174.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M. and Sarstedt, M. (2017). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling, (2nd ed.). Canada: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

- Hair, J.F, Hult, G. T. M, Ringle, C. M, and Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS_SEM)*. Los Angeles/ London/ New Delhi: Sage.
- Jani, D., Jang, C., and Hwang, Y.H. (2009). Differential Effects of Tourism Resources on the Attractiveness of Destination Bundles. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 9, (1), 23– 36.
- Lau, C., and Hui, S. (2010). Selection attributes of wedding banquet venues: an exploratory study of Hong Kong prospective wedding couples. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29,(2), 268-276.
- Le Falher, G., Gionis, A. and Mathioudakis, M. (2015). Where is the Soho of Rome? Measures and algorithms for finding similar neighborhoods in cities. Helsinki, Finland: Aalto University. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from https://www.aaai.org/ ocs/index.php/ICWSM/ICWSM15/pape r/viewFile/10514/10506
- Lin, C. (2011). Building an infra-structural design and facilities for the disabled. Turku: Abdul Rahman: Faculty Engineering and Science University.
- Lock, S. (2021), Statista. Retrieved from statista: https://www.statista.com/statistics/1176 483/party-and-event-planner-industrymarket-size-us.
- Lockyer, T. (2005). The perceived importance of price as one hotel selection dimension. *Tourism Management*, 26, (4), 529–537.
- Mair, J. and Thompson, K. (2009). The UK association conference attendance decision-making process. *Tourism Management*, 30, (3), 400-409.
- Mazlina, M., Ahmad, S., Sridar, R., and Syamsul, H. M. A. (2015). The Role of

Destination Attributes and Memorable Tourism Experience in Understanding Tourist Revisit Intentions. *American Eurasian Journal of Agriculture and Environment Science*, 32-39.

- Moufakkir. O and Pernecky. T. (2014). *Ideological, social and cultural aspect of event.* oxfordshire, UK: Cab International.
- Ndiomewese, I. (2017). How OgaVenue is taking hold of the \$20 billion events industry in Nigeria. Retrieved from Techpoint Digest Africa: https://techpoint.africa/2017/05/01/ogav enue-nigerian-events-industry
- Olanga, C., Gesage, B., and Murungi, C. (2015). Planning expertise, variables influencing performance outcomes and management of wedding organization firms in Nairobi Country, Kenya. *African Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure Studies*, 1, (1), 1-28.
- Oxford Economics. (2018). *Economic impact of the us hotel industry*. England: American Hotel and Lodging Association Educational Foundation.
- Price, S. L. (2021). *Statista*. Retrieved from Wedding budget to hire venue : https://www.statista.com/statistics/1176 483/party-and-event-planner-industrymarket-size-us.
- Quinn, B. (2013). Key concepts in event management. London, UK: SAGE.
- Registared Hospitality and Tourism Enterprise. (2021). Retrieved from https://lagosstate.gov.ng/wpcontent/uploads/2020/06/Registardedlist-for-PRO-office.pdf May, 5
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., and Will, A. (2005). *SmartPLS 2.0 (software).SmartPLS, Hamburg.* Retrieved from www. smartpls. de (accessed January 7, 2020).
- Rogerson, J.M., and Wolfaardt, Z. (2015). Wedding tourism in South Africa: an exploratory analysis. *African journal of hospitality*, 4, (2), 1-6.

12

- Saayman, M. (2000). *En route with tourism.* 2nd ed. Potchefstroom: Leisure consultants and publications.
- Saayman, M. (2006). Marketing tourism: products and destination: getting back to basics. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- Seebaluck, N.V., Munhurrun, P.R., & Naidoo, P. & Rughoonauth, P. (2015). An analysis of the push and pull motives for choosing Mauritius as the wedding destination. *Procedia -Social and behavioural Sciences*, 175: 201-209.
- Shone, A. and Parry, B. (2004). Successful event management: a practical handbook. London: Thomson Learning.
- Silvers, J. (2008). Risk management for meetings and events. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Sirakaya, E., and Woodside, A. (2005). Building and testing theories of decision making by travelers. *Tourism Management*, 26, 815–832.
- South Africa National Convention Bureau. (2020). *Event details worksheet*. Johannesburg: SANCB.
- Suvagondha, A., and Soparat, P. (2008). Creating marketing strategies for wedding business unit of Amari Atrium hotel. Västerås, Sweden: Mälardalen University.
- Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivarite statistics (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tassiopoulos, D. (2005). Event management: a professional and developmental approach 2nd ed. Lansdowne: Juta.
- Tassiopoulos, D. (2020). Event management: a developmental and managerial approach 3rd ed. Claremont: Juta.
- Thisday Newspaper. (2025). Shaping the events industry. Retrieved from https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/ 2018/06/20/shaping-the-events-industry
- Tromczynski, E. A. (2006). System, method and computer program product for

managing meeting planning operations. U.S. Patent Application 11/085,794. Retrieved from http://www. google.com/patents/US20060010023

- Van der Baan, D. (2018). Determining the attributes contributing to wedding venue selection. South Africa: North-West University.
- Van der Wagen, L. (2005). Event Management for Tourism, Cultural, Business and Sporting Events. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson/Hospitality Press.
- Wells, M. (2007). *Planning your perfect wedding reception: the ultimate guide.* Australia: eBookwholesaler.
- Yoo, J. J., and Zhao, X. (2010). Revisiting determinants of convention participation decision making. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 27, (1), 179-192.

DELSU Journal www.deljoms.com.ng of

Management 4

Sciences

(DELIOMS)

DELSU Journal www.deljoms.com.ng of

Management15

Sciences

(DELIOMS)