

Evaluation of Users' Satisfaction with Landscape Design Features in Selected Resort Centres in Southwest Nigeria

OLATUNBOSUN OLUWATIGBEMIGA EMMANUEL¹, AMAO FUNMILAYO LANREWAJU²,
BELLO ISMAIL ABIODUN³, OYEWOLE EMMANUEL GBENGA⁴, ADEKIITAN DORCAS
ADEDAMOLA⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}*Department of Architecture, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, Ladoke Akintola University of
Technology, Ogbomoso, Oyo State, Nigeria*

Abstract- *This study evaluated users' satisfaction with landscape design features in selected resort centres in Southwest Nigeria. The study adopted a mixed-methods design that combined field observation, structured questionnaires and key informant interviews. A total of 356 questionnaires were administered to resort users across six resort centres, while managers and landscape personnel provided qualitative insights. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to analyse the data. The findings show that the resorts possess a broad range of landscape elements, with trees and ornamental vegetation (89.6%), lawns and open green spaces (86.0%), and pedestrian walkways (82.0%) being the most common features. Overall assessment of the landscape design was moderate (grand mean MWV = 3.26), with maintenance recording the lowest rating (MWV = 2.97). Users' satisfaction was also moderate (grand mean MWV = 3.20), driven mainly by scenic beauty, natural shade and fresh air, but constrained by weak plant diversity, thermal discomfort and insufficient shaded areas. Cleanliness (MWV = 3.66), maintenance (MWV = 3.60) and accessibility (MWV = 3.54) were the strongest determinants of satisfaction. ANOVA results showed significant differences across resorts in both landscape assessment ($F = 4.127$, $p = 0.003$) and satisfaction factors ($F = 4.384$, $p = 0.002$). The study concludes that resort landscapes perform best when visual quality, comfort, circulation and maintenance are treated as an integrated design system.*

Keywords: *Resort Landscapes, User Satisfaction, Landscape Design, Circulation, Southwest Nigeria.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Resort development has become an important expression of tourism planning because it combines leisure, accommodation and outdoor experience within a single destination. In tropical settings, however, the success of a resort is determined not

only by its buildings and services but also by the quality of its landscape environment, which shapes comfort, imageability and patronage (Pizam & Tasci, 2019; Kastenholz et al., 2020). Landscape design features such as vegetation, seating, shaded paths and water elements are therefore not decorative extras; they are functional systems that influence how users move, relax and evaluate the resort experience (Rahman & Abdullah, 2023; Li et al., 2021).

Within Southwest Nigeria, resorts occupy a growing place in the leisure economy, yet many of them still show uneven landscape quality, weak maintenance culture and limited integration between built form and outdoor space. Previous studies have linked visitor comfort and satisfaction to shade, circulation, greenery and environmental quality, but fewer have combined these variables into a comparative assessment across multiple resort centres (Ayejuyo et al., 2025). As a result, design decisions are often made without enough evidence about which landscape features matter most to users and which deficiencies most strongly reduce satisfaction.

This study evaluates users' satisfaction with landscape design features in selected resort centres in Southwest Nigeria and translates the findings into design implications for a proposed resort hotel at Ado-Awaye, Iseyin, Oyo State. The choice of Ado-Awaye is significant because of its unique topography, suspended lake and eco-tourism potential, which together create a strong case for a landscape-led resort proposal (Olaniyi & Bada, 2020; Olaniyi et al., 2020; Egbejule, 2024). The article is structured around the concepts of resort planning, landscape design and user satisfaction, followed by

the research methodology, findings and design implications.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Resort as a tourism and spatial system

A resort is commonly understood as a self-contained destination that brings together lodging, recreation, hospitality services and outdoor amenities in one planned environment (Pizam & Tasci, 2019; King, 2022). Unlike standard hotels, resorts depend heavily on their external setting because leisure is produced not only indoors but also through open spaces, scenery and movement across the site. In this sense, the landscape becomes part of the product, shaping the first impression, the daily experience and the memory a visitor carries away from the place. The evolution of resort development shows a shift from elite health retreats to mass leisure destinations and, more recently, to experience-based and sustainability-oriented environments (Gunn & Var, 2002; Kastenholz et al., 2020).

Contemporary resort planning emphasises ecological sensitivity, local identity and visitor well-being rather than purely formal luxury. This shift is especially relevant in tropical regions where climate-responsive landscape design must help control heat, guide circulation and support outdoor use throughout the year (Sanusi & Bidin, 2020; Li et al., 2021). In Nigeria, resorts such as Ikogosi, La Campagne Tropicana, Whispering Palms and Green Legacy demonstrate the tourism value of combining natural attraction with planned leisure settings. Yet studies continue to show that weak maintenance, poor spatial coordination and fragmented landscape treatment can reduce user satisfaction even when the site possesses strong natural potential (Olaniyi & Bada, 2020; Ayejuyo et al., 2025). The literature therefore supports the view that resort success depends on the deliberate design and management of the outdoor environment, not only on the presence of scenic landforms.

2.2 Landscape design in resort environments

Landscape design is the intentional planning and composition of outdoor space so that aesthetic quality, functional movement and ecological

performance work together (Sanoff, 2018; Li et al., 2021). In resort contexts, this means arranging vegetation, paths, water features, seating and lighting in ways that make the environment attractive, legible and comfortable. The designer is not merely decorating the site; the designer is constructing an experience that shapes behaviour and emotional response.

Theoretical work on legibility, restorative environments and spatial organization has helped explain why users respond positively to coherent landscapes. Lynch's legibility ideas, together with attention restoration and stress recovery perspectives, suggest that clear paths, recognisable landmarks, shaded pauses and green views reduce confusion and support psychological restoration (Kaplan & Kaplan, 2018; White et al., 2019; Rahman & Abdullah, 2023). In resorts, this translates into paths that connect attractions clearly, planting that frames movement, and resting spaces that invite slower engagement with the site.

Recent studies also emphasise that landscape design in hospitality is tied to destination branding and repeat visitation. Where landscapes are visually unified, well maintained and responsive to local climate, users tend to interpret the resort as higher quality and more welcoming (Song & Park, 2021; Wang & Liu, 2022). Conversely, weak maintenance and visual clutter can undermine even strong architectural design. The literature therefore positions landscape design as a strategic rather than secondary component of resort planning.

2.3 User perception and satisfaction

User satisfaction in resort settings is a multi-dimensional concept that includes comfort, visual appeal, accessibility, safety and the ease with which people can use the space (Pawłowska, 2021; Balsas, 2023). Unlike purely architectural evaluation, satisfaction studies focus on what users actually feel and report after interacting with the environment. This matters because a site may be technically complete yet still fail if visitors experience heat stress, poor wayfinding or weak seating provision. Environmental psychology and tourism studies show that perception is shaped by sensory

cues and by social expectations. Natural shade, air movement, planting diversity and clear circulation can reduce fatigue and improve enjoyment, while cluttered or poorly maintained spaces may create discomfort even when the resort is visually rich (White et al., 2019; Li & Sullivan, 2020; Ferreira & Almeida, 2024).

In tropical resorts, these effects are amplified by climate, since heat and sun exposure quickly affect willingness to remain outdoors. Studies from comparable settings also show that the factors that most strongly drive satisfaction are often maintenance, cleanliness, accessibility and visual quality rather than the mere presence of landscape elements (Ayejuyo et al., 2025). This finding is important for the present study because it suggests that user satisfaction is linked to how landscape features are organised, cared for and experienced over time. It is not enough to provide greenery; the greenery must be usable, legible and sustained.

2.4 Types and roles of landscape features

Landscape features in resorts typically fall into softscape, hardscape, natural and recreational components. Softscape elements such as trees, shrubs, lawns and flower beds contribute shade, ecological character and visual richness, while hardscape elements such as walkways, terraces, signage and seating give structure and support movement (Ayeji et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2022). In well-planned resorts, these components are integrated so that the visitor experiences continuity between natural and built elements. Water bodies and shaded outdoor amenities also perform important experiential and microclimatic functions. They provide cooling, acoustic relief and focal points that strengthen the identity of the resort, especially in hot humid environments (Chiesura, 2019; Jiménez-Beltrán et al., 2021).

At the same time, recreational spaces such as lawns, relaxation courts and viewing decks allow for flexible use by families, couples and groups. This multifunctionality is central to contemporary resort design because it combines ecological value with social utility (Lozano-Oyola et al., 2020; Yao & Jiang, 2023). The literature further shows that the

absence of one category of features can reduce the effectiveness of the whole landscape system. For example, rich vegetation without seating or circulation still leaves the site underused, while impressive pathways without shade can be uncomfortable in tropical climates. Successful resort landscapes therefore depend on balance: the designer must align ecology, circulation, maintenance and human use into a coherent outdoor system (Vogt et al., 2021; Zhang & Chen, 2021).

2.5 Synthesis and research gap

Taken together, the literature establishes that landscape design is central to user satisfaction in resort environments, but it also shows that many studies remain fragmented, focusing on single sites, isolated features or general tourism potential rather than on a comparative user-based assessment. This creates a gap between what is often discussed as design theory and what is actually experienced by visitors. A user-centred comparative study is therefore needed to identify which features matter most in practice.

The Southwest Nigerian context is especially important because the region combines climate stress, rapid urbanisation and a strong tourism base. Yet many resorts still struggle with maintenance, circulation clarity, shade provision and the effective integration of softscape and hardscape components (Olaniyi & Bada, 2020; Olobatoyan & Ikudayisi, 2025). Evidence that links these physical conditions to user satisfaction can help shift resort design away from aesthetic display alone toward more functional and climate-responsive planning.

This study addresses that gap by examining landscape features, user satisfaction and the factors that influence satisfaction across selected resort centres, then translating the findings into a design proposal for Ado-Awaye. The approach is consistent with the literature's call for integrated planning that combines environmental comfort, identity and usability with long-term management (Li et al., 2021; Ferreira & Almeida, 2024).

III. METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a mixed-methods design that combined quantitative and qualitative approaches in order to capture both the measurable characteristics of resort landscapes and the lived experience of users. This design is appropriate for studies of spatial quality because it allows the researcher to compare observed landscape features with users' perceptions of comfort, accessibility and satisfaction (Sanoff, 2018; Pawłowska, 2021). The selected resorts were drawn from Southwest Nigeria, and the study focused on six representative centres with visible landscape elements and active visitor use. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires administered to 356 resort users and through field observation of the landscape environments. The questionnaire captured socio-economic characteristics, landscape assessment and satisfaction ratings, while the observation schedule documented the presence and arrangement of landscape features such as trees, lawns, walkways, seating, signage, lighting and water features.

Key informant interviews with resort managers and landscape personnel supplemented the survey data by providing operational insights into maintenance practices, circulation challenges and design intentions. The data were analysed using frequencies, percentages, mean weighted values and one-way ANOVA. Mean weighted values were used to assess the relative strength of the respondents' perceptions, while ANOVA was applied to test whether differences existed among the selected resorts in the assessment of landscape design and in the factors influencing satisfaction.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

The respondent profile shows a broad and relatively balanced user base. Females constituted 53.9% of respondents, while males accounted for 46.1%, indicating that the resorts were used by both genders in almost equal measure. The age profile was concentrated in the economically active range, with most respondents falling between 18 and 45 years. This suggests that the selected resorts functioned as leisure destinations for young adults and middle-aged visitors who are likely to value atmosphere, comfort and visual quality. Residential distribution also matters because 59.0% of respondents came from within the state, 33.7% from outside the state and 7.3% from outside the country.

This pattern indicates that the resorts served both local recreation and wider tourism demand. Visit frequency further shows that 39.3% of users visited occasionally and 33.7% were first-time visitors, suggesting that the resorts attracted both repeat and exploratory patronage. Such diversity makes user-centred landscape design especially important, because different visitor groups may interpret and use the same outdoor space in different ways. The demographic pattern aligns with the broader literature on resort perception, which shows that user needs vary with age, mobility and cultural background (Sharma & Singh, 2020; Lin et al., 2022). It also implies that circulation systems, seating provision, safety features and wayfinding should be designed to accommodate a mixed audience rather than a single user type.

Table 4.1: Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 356)

1. Gender Distribution							
Gender	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Male	10 (45.5)	21 (47.7)	30 (46.2)	40 (45.5)	35 (45.5)	28 (46.7)	164 (46.1)
Female	12 (54.5)	23 (52.3)	35 (53.8)	48 (54.5)	42 (54.5)	32 (53.3)	192 (53.9)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
2. Age Group Distribution							

Age Group	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
18–25	5 (22.7)	10 (22.7)	14 (21.5)	18 (20.5)	16 (20.8)	12 (20.0)	75 (21.1)
26–35	5 (22.7)	9 (20.5)	13 (20.0)	18 (20.5)	15 (19.5)	12 (20.0)	72 (20.2)
36–45	5 (22.7)	10 (22.7)	14 (21.5)	19 (21.6)	16 (20.8)	13 (21.7)	77 (21.6)
46–55	3 (13.6)	7 (15.9)	10 (15.4)	13 (14.7)	12 (15.6)	9 (15.0)	54 (15.2)
Above 55	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	14 (21.5)	20 (22.7)	18 (23.4)	14 (23.3)	78 (21.9)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
3. Marital Status Distribution							
Status	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Single	8 (36.4)	15 (34.1)	23 (35.4)	31 (35.2)	27 (35.1)	21 (35.0)	125 (35.1)
Married	10 (45.5)	21 (47.7)	31 (47.7)	41 (46.6)	36 (46.8)	28 (46.7)	167 (46.9)
Divorced	2 (9.1)	4 (9.1)	6 (9.2)	8 (9.1)	7 (9.1)	5 (8.3)	32 (9.0)
Widowed	2 (9.1)	4 (9.1)	5 (7.7)	8 (9.1)	7 (9.1)	6 (10.0)	32 (9.0)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
4. Employment Status Distribution							
Status	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Student	5 (22.7)	10 (22.7)	14 (21.5)	20 (22.7)	17 (22.1)	14 (23.3)	80 (22.5)
Civil Servant	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	12 (18.5)	16 (18.2)	14 (18.2)	11 (18.3)	65 (18.3)
Self-employed	4 (18.2)	9 (20.5)	12 (18.5)	17 (19.3)	15 (19.5)	12 (20.0)	69 (19.4)
Unemployed	3 (13.6)	7 (15.9)	10 (15.4)	14 (15.9)	13 (16.9)	10 (16.7)	57 (16.0)
Retired	6 (27.3)	10 (22.7)	17 (26.2)	21 (23.9)	18 (23.4)	13 (21.7)	85 (23.9)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
5. Educational Level							
Level	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Primary	2 (9.1)	4 (9.1)	6 (9.2)	7 (8.0)	6 (7.8)	5 (8.3)	30 (8.4)
Secondary	5 (22.7)	10 (22.7)	14 (21.5)	18 (20.5)	16 (20.8)	12 (20.0)	75 (21.1)
ND/NCE	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	12 (18.5)	15 (17.0)	13 (16.9)	11 (18.3)	63 (17.7)
HND/BSc.	7 (31.8)	14 (31.8)	20 (30.8)	27 (30.7)	24 (31.2)	18 (30.0)	110 (30.9)

Postgraduate	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	13 (20.0)	21 (23.9)	18 (23.4)	14 (23.3)	78 (21.9)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
6. Monthly Income							
Income	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
< ₦50,000	6 (27.3)	12 (27.3)	18 (27.7)	22 (25.0)	20 (26.0)	15 (25.0)	93 (26.1)
₦50k–₦100k	7 (31.8)	14 (31.8)	20 (30.8)	27 (30.7)	24 (31.2)	18 (30.0)	110 (30.9)
₦101k–₦200k	5 (22.7)	10 (22.7)	15 (23.1)	21 (23.9)	18 (23.4)	14 (23.3)	83 (23.3)
> ₦200k	4 (18.2)	8 (18.2)	12 (18.5)	18 (20.5)	15 (19.5)	13 (21.7)	70 (19.7)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
7. Religion							
Religion	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Christian	13 (59.1)	26 (59.1)	38 (58.5)	52 (59.1)	46 (59.7)	35 (58.3)	210 (59.0)
Muslim	7 (31.8)	15 (34.1)	22 (33.8)	30 (34.1)	25 (32.5)	21 (35.0)	120 (33.7)
Traditional	1 (4.5)	2 (4.5)	3 (4.5)	4 (4.5)	3 (3.9)	2 (3.3)	15 (4.2)
Others	1 (4.5)	1 (2.3)	2 (3.1)	2 (2.3)	3 (3.9)	2 (3.3)	11 (3.1)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
8. Ethnicity							
Ethnicity	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Yoruba	15 (68.2)	30 (68.2)	44 (67.7)	59 (67.0)	52 (67.5)	40 (66.7)	240 (67.4)
Hausa	3 (13.6)	6 (13.6)	8 (12.3)	11 (12.5)	10 (13.0)	7 (11.7)	45 (12.6)
Igbo	3 (13.6)	6 (13.6)	10 (15.4)	14 (15.9)	12 (15.6)	10 (16.7)	55 (15.4)
Others	1 (4.5)	2 (4.5)	3 (4.5)	4 (4.5)	3 (3.9)	3 (5.0)	16 (4.5)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
9. Place of Residence							
Residence	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Within State	13 (59.1)	26 (59.1)	38 (58.5)	52 (59.1)	46 (59.7)	35 (58.3)	210 (59.0)
Outside State	7 (31.8)	15 (34.1)	22 (33.8)	30 (34.1)	25 (32.5)	21 (35.0)	120 (33.7)
International	2 (9.1)	3 (6.8)	5 (7.7)	6 (6.8)	6 (7.8)	4 (6.7)	26 (7.3)

Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)
10. Visit Frequency							
Frequency	Zenababs	Ikogosi	Ilaji	Green Legacy	La Champagne	FFA	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
First Time	7 (31.8)	15 (34.1)	22 (33.8)	30 (34.1)	26 (33.8)	20 (33.3)	120 (33.7)
Occasionally	9 (40.9)	17 (38.6)	25 (38.5)	34 (38.6)	30 (39.0)	25 (41.7)	140 (39.3)
Monthly	3 (13.6)	7 (15.9)	10 (15.4)	14 (15.9)	12 (15.6)	10 (16.7)	56 (15.7)
Frequently	3 (13.6)	5 (11.4)	8 (12.3)	10 (11.4)	9 (11.7)	5 (8.3)	40 (11.2)
Total	22 (100)	44 (100)	65 (100)	88 (100)	77 (100)	60 (100)	356 (100)

4.2 Identification and assessment of landscape design features

Field observation confirmed that the selected resorts possessed a wide range of landscape elements. Trees and ornamental vegetation were the most common features (89.6%), followed by lawns and open green spaces (86.0%) and pedestrian walkways (82.0%). Shrubs and hedges (78.7%) and outdoor seating facilities (75.0%) were also widely present, showing that the resorts had made reasonable provision for ecological character and outdoor use. However, more specialised features such as signage (62.9%) and parking landscape (60.1%) were less consistently provided.

Respondents' assessment of the landscape design features produced a moderate overall grand mean of 3.26. The highest rating was for the extent to which the landscape promotes comfort, relaxation and outdoor experience (MWV = 3.54), followed by

visual quality (MWV = 3.47) and strategic placement for accessibility and circulation (MWV = 3.34). These results indicate that the resorts succeeded to a reasonable extent in creating pleasant outdoor settings and recognisable spatial environments.

The weakest area was maintenance (MWV = 2.97), followed by the integration of softscape and hardscape elements (MWV = 3.11) and the diversity of landscape features supporting recreation and social interaction (MWV = 3.11). The ANOVA result confirms that users did not perceive the resorts uniformly, as differences in landscape assessment were statistically significant ($F = 4.127$, $p = 0.003$).

This finding is consistent with the literature showing that maintenance culture, management commitment and resource allocation strongly shape the quality of resort landscapes (Song & Park, 2021; Ferreira & Almeida, 2024).

Table 4.2: Identification of Available Landscape Design Features within the Selected Resort Centres (n = 356)

S/N	Landscape Design Feature	Zenababs Half Moon Resort	Ikogosi Warm & Cold Spring	Ilaji Hotels & Resorts	Green Legacy Resort	La Campagne Tropicana	FFA Resort Centre	Total (N)	Percentage (%)
1.	Trees and ornamental vegetation	19	39	58	80	70	53	319	89.6
2.	Lawns and open green spaces	18	37	56	76	68	51	306	86.0
3.	Pedestrian walkways	17	36	53	72	65	49	292	82.0

4.	Shrubs and hedges	16	34	50	70	63	47	280	78.7
5.	Outdoor seating facilities	15	32	48	68	60	44	267	75.0
6.	Recreational/Open spaces	15	31	47	67	59	43	262	73.6
7.	Landscape lighting	14	30	46	65	58	42	255	71.6
8.	Flower beds	13	28	43	61	54	39	238	66.9
9.	Directional signage	12	26	40	58	51	37	224	62.9
10.	Parking landscape	11	25	39	55	49	35	214	60.1
11.	Outdoor relaxation spaces	10	22	35	51	44	31	193	54.2
	Water features	7	19	28	42	38	24	158	44.4

4.3 Users' satisfaction with landscape design features
Users' satisfaction with the landscape environment was moderate, with an overall grand mean of 3.20. Scenic beauty (MWV = 3.42) and freshness of air (MWV = 3.40) were the most positively rated variables, while natural shade (MWV = 3.35) also contributed to positive perceptions. These results show that the resorts benefited from their natural setting and from vegetation that improved the visual and microclimatic quality of outdoor spaces.

The lower satisfaction scores were recorded for arrangement of landscape elements (MWV = 3.01), adequacy of shaded areas and trees (MWV = 3.01), thermal comfort (MWV = 3.07) and plant variety

(MWV = 3.11). These ratings suggest that users appreciated the general scenery but remained concerned about how the landscape was composed, how much shade was available and how well the environment responded to tropical heat. This pattern mirrors earlier studies that emphasise thermal comfort and spatial organisation as central to satisfaction in outdoor recreational environments (Sanusi & Bidin, 2020; Ayejuyo et al., 2025). The satisfaction results also support the idea that resort landscape quality is experienced most strongly through comfort and sensory response rather than through visual form alone. In other words, the environment must be readable, cool and usable if it is to be valued.

Table 4.3: Users' Satisfaction with Landscape Design Features (n = 356)

S/N	Variables	VD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	S (4)	VS (5)	TWV	MWV	AWV
Aesthetic Quality									
1	Overall landscape appearance	42	56	72	113	73	1187	3.33	237.40
2	Scenic beauty of the environment	40	51	67	117	81	1216	3.42	243.20
3	Variety of plant species	56	67	76	97	60	1106	3.11	221.20
4	Arrangement of landscape elements	61	71	81	88	55	1073	3.01	214.60
5	Harmony between buildings and landscape	52	61	79	98	66	1133	3.18	226.60
Environmental Comfort									
6	Thermal comfort of outdoor spaces	58	68	78	95	57	1093	3.07	218.60
7	Natural shade provided by trees	45	54	69	108	80	1192	3.35	238.40
8	Freshness of air within outdoor spaces	43	50	65	116	82	1212	3.40	242.40
9	Protection from excessive sunlight	57	66	79	96	58	1100	3.09	220.00
10	Adequacy of shaded areas and trees	60	72	83	86	55	1072	3.01	214.40

4.4 Factors influencing users' satisfaction

The factor analysis shows that satisfaction was influenced most strongly by cleanliness (MWV = 3.66), maintenance (MWV = 3.60) and accessibility (MWV = 3.54). These top-ranked items indicate that users judge resort landscapes primarily by how well they are maintained and how easy they are to move through, rather than by the quantity of features alone. Visual attractiveness (MWV = 3.50) and shade provision (MWV = 3.45) followed closely, confirming that visual and climatic comfort operate together in shaping overall satisfaction.

Safety and security (MWV = 3.40), seating and relaxation areas (MWV = 3.35) and pedestrian circulation (MWV = 3.35) occupied the middle range, while the variety of recreational landscape facilities had the lowest score (MWV = 3.33). This ranking suggests that the resorts were more

successful at providing basic comfort conditions than at delivering a highly diverse recreational landscape. It also indicates that the functionality of outdoor space matters more to users than simply increasing the number of amenities.

The ANOVA result for the satisfaction factors also showed significant variation across resorts ($F = 4.384$, $p = 0.002$). This means that the importance users attached to these factors differed according to the resort they visited. Such variation is expected because management practices, spatial layout, vegetation maintenance and circulation quality are rarely identical from one resort to another. Similar findings have been reported in studies of hospitality design, where user satisfaction improves when landscape management is continuous rather than occasional (Li et al., 2021; White et al., 2019).

Table 4.5: Factors Influencing Users' Satisfaction with Landscape Design Features (n = 356)

S/N	Statement	SD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	TWV	MWV	AWV
1	Easy accessibility to landscape spaces improves my overall satisfaction.	36	45	61	118	96	1261	3.54	252.20
2	The availability of adequate seating and relaxation areas influences my satisfaction.	44	56	70	103	83	1193	3.35	238.60
3	Good circulation and pedestrian walkways improve my experience within the resort.	42	58	69	108	79	1192	3.35	238.40
4	Adequate shade from trees and other landscape elements enhances my comfort.	39	52	65	110	90	1228	3.45	245.60
5	Proper maintenance of landscape facilities influences my level of satisfaction.	34	46	60	105	111	1281	3.60	256.20
6	The visual attractiveness of the landscape contributes to my satisfaction.	37	48	67	108	96	1246	3.50	249.20
7	Safety and security within the landscape areas influence my satisfaction.	41	53	72	102	88	1211	3.40	242.20
8	The variety of recreational landscape facilities influences my decision to use the resort.	46	55	74	99	82	1184	3.33	236.80
9	The cleanliness of the landscape environment affects my overall satisfaction.	32	41	58	109	116	1304	3.66	260.80

V. CONCLUSION

This study found that resort users in Southwest Nigeria are moderately satisfied with existing landscape design features, with satisfaction significantly influenced by cleanliness, maintenance,

accessibility, shade, and visual quality. Although the resorts possess key landscape elements, deficiencies remain in maintenance, feature diversity, and the integration of softscape and hardscape. The significant ANOVA results further indicate notable variations in landscape quality among the resorts.

Overall, the findings highlight the importance of integrated landscape planning and effective management in enhancing user satisfaction and improving the quality of resort environments.

REFERENCES

- [1] Almeida-Santos, C., & Machado, F. (2021). Focalization in resort aesthetics: Landscape identity and visitor memory. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 40, 100880.
- [2] Atolagbe, A. M. O., Amao, F. L., & Ijiyode, B. O. (2025). Evaluating landscape design features and their influence on social interaction in postgraduate hostels in South-Western Nigeria. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journal*.
- [3] Ayejuyo, O. O., Ajayi, O. O., & Raufu, K. A. (2025). Exploring the role of biophilic design elements in enhancing guest well-being in resort hotels: A study from Southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Environmental and Earth Sciences*, 12(1), 14–27.
- [4] Ayeni, D. A., Olotuah, A. O., & Adedeji, Y. M. D. (2013). Appraising landscape design education in architecture departments in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 1(5), 1–10.
- [5] Balsas, C. J. L. (2023). Resort spaces as laboratories of leisure: An ethnographic perspective on tourism design and user experience. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 21(4), 512–530.
- [6] Chiesura, A. (2019). The role of natural landscapes in human well-being. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 185, 12–21.
- [7] Egbejule, E. (2024, December 28). Nigeria's suspended lake: Ado-Awaye hopes for tourist revival. *The Guardian Nigeria*.
- [8] Ferreira, J. A., & Almeida, P. (2024). Circulation, orientation, and guest experience in hospitality design: A multi-method assessment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 116, 103677.
- [9] Feng, X., Huang, Y., & Zhang, J. (2022). Exploring user perception of resort landscapes through qualitative interviews: A grounded theory approach. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 44, 101028.
- [10] Gunn, C. A., & Var, T. (2002). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases*. Routledge.
- [11] IIARD. (2024). Enhancing user circulation in the design of a beach resort in Ibeno, Akwa Ibom State. *Research Journal of Pure Science and Technology*, 7(1), 1–12.
- [12] Jiménez-Beltrán, F. J., López-Guzmán, T., & González Santa Cruz, F. (2021). Sustainability practices and user perception in ecotourism resorts: Evidence from the Mediterranean. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 3768.
- [13] Kaplan, R., & Kaplan, S. (2018). *The experience of nature: A psychological perspective* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Kastenholz, E., Carneiro, M. J., & Marques, C. P. (2020). Planning for sustainable resort tourism: Key principles and practices. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 17(3), 245–264.
- [15] Kim, J., & Lee, S. (2021). Smart hospitality technologies and user perception: Evidence from luxury resorts. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 12(2), 290–306.
- [16] King, B. E. M. (2022). Resort development. In Jafari, J., & Xiao, H. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of tourism*. Springer.
- [17] Li, D., & Sullivan, W. C. (2020). Impact of views to school landscapes on recovery from stress and mental fatigue. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 194, 103694.
- [18] Li, S., Chen, L., & Zhang, X. (2021). Sustainable resort planning: Integrating user experience and environmental stewardship. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(5), 775–794.
- [19] Lin, B., Yu, D., & Xu, L. (2022). Inclusive design principles for multi-use resort landscapes. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 67, 127422.
- [20] Lozano-Oyola, M., Blancas, F. J., González, M., & Caballero, R. (2020). Sustainable tourism indicators: Applications to resorts and

- coastal destinations. *Ecological Indicators*, 115, 106426.
- [21] Olaniyi, O. E., & Bada, B. S. (2020). Location suitability of Ado-Awaye suspended lake, Oyo State for mountain tourism: A geospatial approach. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 9(11), 657.
- [22] Olaniyi, O. E., Akinsorotan, O. A., Agboola, O. P., Ajayi, G., & Ogunjemite, B. G. (2020). Degree and socio-demographic predictors of residents' willingness to participate in mountain tourism: The case of Ado-Awaye suspended lake, Nigeria. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9(3), 1–18.
- [23] Olobatoyan, O., & Ikudayisi, A. E. (2025). Sustainability quality of cultural landscapes from tourists' perspective: A comparative assessment of two sites in Nigeria.
- [24] Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2018). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- [25] Pawłowska, A. (2021). Measuring user satisfaction in tourism spaces: The role of questionnaires in capturing perceptions. *Sustainability*, 13(14), 8051.
- [26] Pizam, A., & Tasci, A. D. (2019). *International encyclopedia of hospitality management* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [27] Rahman, M. H., & Abdullah, F. (2023). Enhancing resort user experience through legibility in landscape design. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3247.
- [28] Ramdhan Kurniawan, M. (2024). Cultural integration in resort planning: Local heritage and global tourism demands. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 22(2), 145–163.
- [29] Salawu, A., Muhammad, I. B., & Isa, A. A. (2020). Visual accessibility and wayfinding in Nigerian hospitals: Implications for inclusive design. *Environmental Technology and Science Journal*, 11(2), 77–89.
- [30] Sanoff, H. (2018). *Designing for the user experience in public and private spaces*. Routledge.
- [31] Sanusi, R., & Bidin, S. (2020). Re-naturing cities: Impact of microclimate, human thermal comfort and recreational participation. In *Climate change, hazards and adaptation options* (pp. 545–562). Springer.
- [32] Sharma, R., & Singh, A. (2020). Cultural and demographic influences on resort guest perception: A comparative study. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage and Services Marketing*, 6(2), 29–36.
- [33] Singh, R., & Sharma, P. (2021). Resort design: Integration of natural and built environments. *Tourism Geographies*, 23(3), 451–473.
- [34] Song, H., & Park, J. (2021). Post-occupancy evaluation of resort design: Linking spatial performance and user satisfaction. *Building and Environment*, 197, 107854.
- [35] Vogt, J., Patel, A., & Smith, R. (2021). Human-centered design in landscape architecture: Contemporary approaches. *Landscape Research*, 46(7), 959–975.
- [36] Wang, Y., & Liu, H. (2022). Interior design aesthetics and user experience in luxury resorts: A cross-cultural analysis. *Journal of Interior Design*, 47(5), 65–83.
- [37] White, M. P., Alcock, I., Grellier, J., Bell, S., Elliott, L. R., Gascon, M., & Gualdi, S. (2019). Spending time in nature and mental health: A review of long-term studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1236.
- [38] Yao, Y., & Jiang, M. (2023). Biophilic design in ecotourism resorts: Impacts on user perception and well-being. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(3), 455–474.
- [39] Zhang, Y., & Chen, J. (2021). Spatial organization in resort landscapes: Theoretical models and applications. *Journal of Urban Design*, 26(5), 623–642.
- [40] Zhao, L., Xu, T., & Li, P. (2022). Virtual reality and eye-tracking technologies in assessing user perception of hospitality spaces. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 132, 107245.