



E-ISSN: 2706-9591
P-ISSN: 2706-9583
www.tourismjournal.net
IJTHM 2021; 3(1): 01-04
Received: 01-11-2020
Accepted: 04-12-2020

Kidanu Melese
Lecturer, Department of
Tourism Management, Assosa
University, Assosa,
Benishangul-Gumuz, Ethiopia

International tourist's perception on safety and security in Africa: A case analysis of Ethiopia

Kidanu Melese

Abstract

This paper underlines various factors those are responsible for tourist safety and security in Ethiopia. The study addresses and assesses views of international tourists on safety, supporting services at touristic area in Ethiopia. In order to examine the perception on safety and security factors such as; supporting services, risk less, serious crime, annoyance and overall perception were analysed against gender, experience, age, origin, purpose of visit and length of stay through ANOVA and t-tests.

Keywords: Tourist perceptions, safety and security, Ethiopia

Introduction

Tourism business has been expanding in developing countries, mainly driven by international tourism. Indeed, there are many factors which influence where tourists choose to go on holiday; one of those factors is the safety or perceived safety of the destination (Ronald & Kenneth, 2003) ^[4]. Currently, the state of tourism in many developing countries becomes at risk; those are created either by man-made or natural disasters. Mainly shortage of foreign exchange to manage rescue service and infrastructure are inadequate to cope (UNWTO, 1996) ^[6]. As it is stated in the document of the World Tourism Organization (1996) that -more than any other economic activity, the success or failure of a tourism destination depends on being able to provide a safe and secure environment for visitors. However, this is not easy, as many kinds of literature stated that developing countries may not able to provide western standard safety. Tosun, (2000) ^[5] contented that especially developing countries, where the economy is less industrialized and high rates of poverty are common; they have the problem in controlling potential risk factors and developing their tourism sector.

According to Huxley (2018) ^[2] most of the time Ethiopia could be suggested as remarkably safe for tourists. As a result of supporting service problems in Ethiopia; tour operators, both European and Ethiopian, were not likely to recommend Ethiopia as a destination. If client expectations are high on accommodation quality; while poor sanitation systems is perceived, especially at the heritage sites the hotels are other annoyances to tourists (World Bank, 2006) ^[8]. Besides, Walle (2010) ^[7] persuade that, Ethiopia's tourist products and a tourist preference has recognized an African average both before coming to and after visiting Ethiopia.

Under the alarming situation, and also Kebed, (2018) ^[3] argued that, on warding 2016 following political turmoil in Ethiopia and civil unrest resulted drastically decreases tourist inflow to the country; and deforming its image unfortunately. While Ahmed, (2009) ^[1] findings confronts that, years of wars and political instability have been institute to deter tourism demand in the short run.

Research methods and approaches

This study tries to underline the perceptions of international tourists on safety and security after visiting Ethiopia. Therefore, the specific objective of the study is:

1. To assess views of international tourists on safety, supporting services at touristic area in Ethiopia

To address the specific objective a cross-sectional research design was used. The subjects of this study were international tourists particularly who departed in March 2019. Primary data for the study were collected from international tourists through questionnaires in the month

Corresponding Author:
Kidanu Melese
Lecturer, Department of
Tourism Management, Assosa
University, Assosa,
Benishangul-Gumuz, Ethiopia

of March, 2019. Since the study was undertaken in country level, the population of the tourist numbers are above 500. The main data gathering tool in this study was survey questionnaires. Finally, the researcher was administering the questionnaire at the departures points of Bole international airport, Addis Ababa. The collected data were presented and analyzed by both descriptive statistics such as frequency and mean and inferential statistics such as Independent t-test, ANOVA and Chi-square test in addition; Independent group t-tests and (ANOVA) were conducted to examine the influence of profiles of tourists on the perceived safety & security. In order to maintain the reliability and validity of the instrument, the study conducted a pilot survey to construct questionnaires. The reliability of the study was also checked by Cronbach alpha based on items below 0.6 were rejected to maintain internal consistency of the questionnaire.

Results and Discussions

In order to examine the perception on safety and security factors such as; (i) Supporting services (ii) Risk less (iii) Serious crime (iv) Annoyance and (v) overall perception were analysed against gender, experience, age, origin, purpose of visit and length of stay.

Perception by gender

An independent-Group T-test was conducted to compare the safety and security attributes of Ethiopia and overall safety and security evaluation by international tourists. As below Table-1 show, there was no significant difference in relation to gender to level that safety of supporting services; security profile and overall safety status of the country. This result supported by those scholars (Gibson & Jordan, 1998; Carr, 2001) risk perception doesn't influence by gender alone other demographic factors also should be considered; Despite the fact, between gender and risk perception have an insignificant relationship.

Table 1: Independent group t-tests examining safety and security factors by gender

Males/Females						
Factors	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Supporting services	3.39	0.78	3.50	0.77	-1.44	.987
Risk less	3.64	1.07	3.56	1.10	.688	.280
Serious crime	1.95	0.92	2.02	0.92	-.718	.868
Annoyance	2.79	0.98	2.73	0.97	.926	.599
Overall perception	3.93	0.67	3.96	0.66	-.573	.603

Perception by experience

In relation to experience independent-group t-test was conducted to compare the safety supporting services for experienced and No-experience tourists. There was no significant difference in both supporting safety and security profile levelling.

Table 2: Independent group t-tests examining safety and security factors risks by experience

Experienced/No-experience						
Factors	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t	p
Supporting services	3.44	0.81	3.46	0.71	-.264	.115
Risk less	3.67	1.08	3.47	1.08	1.76	.756
Serious crime	1.89	0.92	2.17	0.91	-2.84	.913
Annoyance	2.72	1.00	2.84	0.92	-1.14	.182
Overall perception	3.95	0.71	3.92	0.57	.485	.015

However, it shows a significant difference in overall safety and security evaluation parts with scores for Experienced (M=3.95, SD=0.71) and No-Experience [M=3.92, SD=0.57; t (320)=.485, p=.015]; but still There are no magnitude differences in the means at all (eta squared=.000).

Perception by age

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of age on levels of safety and security in relation to Riskless, crime, annoyances profile, Subjects were divided into three groups according to their age (under 30 Group; 30-45 Group; and 45 & above group). In the Health and food, Riskless factors, There was a statistically significant difference at the (P<.05) level scores; for the three age groups [F (2, 397) = 8.30, p=.00]. However, reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was slightly small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .04. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group under 30 (M=3.27, SD=1.15) was significantly different by being low from both groups with 30-45Group, (M=3.85, SD=1.01) above 45 Group (M=3.68, SD=1.04). While no significant deferences between the two groups been found.

Table 3: One way ANOVA examining safety & security perceptions by international tourist's age

Factors	Under 30	30-45 (Age)	Above 45 (Age)	F	P
Supporting services	3.40	3.61	3.39	2.75	0.06
Risk less (Health & food)	3.27	3.85	3.68	8.30	0.00
Serious crime	2.34	2.09	1.73	17.51	0.00
Annoyance	2.95	2.85	2.60	5.16	0.00
Overall perception	3.79	3.95	4.03	4.87	0.00

In relation to crime leveling, There was a statistically significant difference at the (P<.05) level in scores, for the three age groups [F (2, 397) = 17.51, p=.00] following this Post Hoc indicate that, above 45 age group were assumed small crime acts with the mean (M=1.73, SD=.87) significantly different with other groups likely under 30 age group (M=2.34, SD=.88) 30 to 45 Group (M=2.09, SD=.94). With statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was medium. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .08. Consequently in this group also level the annoyances happen in their stay at Ethiopia, Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group under 30 (M=2.95, SD=.97) was significantly different from above 45 Group (M=2.60, SD=.98) However, reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .02.

Regarding overall safety perception, There was a statistically significant difference at the (P<.05) level in scores for the three age groups [F (2, 397) = 8.99, p=.00]. Also statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was large. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 10. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for above 45 Group (M=4.03, SD=.673). Was significantly different from Group under 30 (M=3.79, SD=.604) whereas others did not differ significantly.

Perception by origin

ANOVA revealed that mean of Supporting services were significantly at ($p=0.00$) different among tourist Origin. Tukey HSD post hoc analyses revealed that American origin was higher in leveling Supporting services than Europe

origin and others continents origin, while, ANOVA revealed no significant at ($P<0.05$) relationship between origin with security profile and the level overall safety evaluation (Table-4).

Table 4: One way ANOVA examining safety & security perceptions by international tourist origin

Factors	America	Europe	Others	F	P
Supporting services	3.80	3.32	3.39	13.63	0.00
Risk less (Health & food)	3.69	3.57	3.60	0.44	0.64
Serious crime	2.09	1.97	1.88	1.06	0.34
Annoyance	2.85	2.77	2.55	1.73	0.17
Overall perception	4.02	3.93	3.87	0.91	0.40

Perception by purpose of visit

As the ANOVA showed that the mean of Supporting services was significantly at ($p=0.00$) different among tourist purpose of visit. As Tukey HSD post hoc analyses revealed that business purpose tourists were higher in

leveling Supporting services than Vacationer and whereas others did not differ significantly. Whereas, purpose visit no significant at ($P<0.05$) in leveling security profile and overall safety evaluation upon the reference of ANOVA table.

Table 5: ANOVA examining safety & security perceptions by international tourist purpose of visit

Factors	Business	Vacation	Others	F	P
Supporting services	3.69	3.36	3.56	5.46	0.00
Risk less (Health & food)	4.13	3.47	3.58	10.28	0.00
Serious crime	1.98	1.94	2.19	1.65	0.19
Annoyance	2.56	2.81	2.75	1.72	0.17
Overall perception	3.86	3.98	3.89	1.01	0.36

Other significant different factors were Riskless, still business purpose tourists become at the front to appreciate the health and food-related risk has almost they didn't face with mean score ($M=4.13$, $SD=.67$) with rest groups, actually it will be true since most of them spent in bubble and high standard services, urban area and they may not be the true indicator of activates and happening in wide area. While we look, the actual difference in mean scores among the groups was slightly small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .04.

small differences; in the mean scores between groups; effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .04.

Table 6: ANOVA examining safety & security perceptions by international tourist length of stay

Factors	1-7 days	8-15 days	16-23 days	24 and above	F	p
Supporting services	3.54	3.39	3.60	3.35	1.83	0.14
Risk less (Health & food)	3.83	3.47	3.72	3.50	2.75	0.04
Serious crime	1.95	1.94	1.71	2.24	3.87	0.00
Annoyance	2.61	2.70	2.60	3.14	6.09	0.00
Overall perception	3.87	4.03	4.17	3.76	5.34	0.00

Perception by length of stay

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of length of stay on levels of safety, security profile, and overall evaluation consequently Subjects were divided into four groups according to their Length of stay (1-7 days; 8-15 days; 24 & above days 16-23 days) There was a statistically significant difference at the ($P<0.05$) in leveling health and food-related riskless. Among the four groups [$F(2, 397) = 2.75$, $p=.04$]. However, reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small. In the issues of leveling crime, Group 24 & above days with mean ($M=2.24$, $SD=.93$) was significantly different from Group 16-23 days ($M=1.71$, $SD=.91$). However, other groups did not differ each other significantly to level crime level in Ethiopia. It implies that those who spent more time and explore different are obviously with no reason could understand more than those who short stay and may not face such crime acts. With this fact, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .02. The other variable likely annoyance, 24& above days group with a mean score ($M=3.14$, $SD=.93$) was significantly different from all other groups in labeling Annoyance happening in the country. With actual slightly

Regarding overall safety perception, There was a statistically significant difference at the ($P<.05$) level in [$F(2, 397) = 5.34$, $p=.00$]. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small. This result surprisingly it is in line with the study findings of (Wale, 2010) and (Huxley, 2018) [2] that Ethiopia is reasonably safe to travelers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The study reveals international tourists perceived that safety and security attributes in Ethiopia as moderate status; parameters were constructed into four factors likely; supporting services, riskless of health and local food show better than supporting services such as accommodation, transportation, road quality, and international food availability. Similarly, serious crime and annoyances, also parts of variables closely asses security in Ethiopia serious crime appeared with moderate low status while annoyances levelled as insignificant happen. In this study from the tourist socio-demographic factor age, length of stay and purpose shows more impact in the assessment of safety and security in Ethiopia whereas gender and experience has not show much effect on it. Following are the recommendations

the findings is proposed:

- The Ministry of Tourism in collaboration with Ministry of transport must assure and follow-up the road facility and transportation practices in the touristic area; to undertake on conditions that non-regulated public transportation into manageable regulated form; and the quality of the road also need extensive work.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism should step up and implement policies and regulations that children's as not to scam and hassle tourist with common phrases *Frenji frenzy* and mobbing are around foreigners; and should modernize tourism activities in all touristic area as possible, tourists expect to be 'warmly welcome' than hearing about the routine life of the locals either by the scams or illegal guides.
- At last with alarming issues most of tourism in Ethiopia urban area; failed under embarrassment to international tourists; Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MoCT) in collaboration with different level tourism stakeholder's as well with other concerning body in the city administration level chronic beggars (street children's) connected to public area clean lines need managed and improved comprehensively.

References

1. Ahmed G. Determinants of International Tourist Flows to Ethiopia: A Time Series Analysis. Working Paper, Ethiopian Economics Association (EEA) 2009, 2.
2. Huxley M. Is it Safe to travel in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: founder of Bemused Backpacker 2018.
3. Kebed NS. The Fate of Tourism during and in the Aftermath of Political Instability: Ethiopia Tourism in Focus Case Study. *Tourism Hospit* 2018;7(1).
4. Ronald N, Kenneth P. Crimes Against Tourists 2003. <http://www.igentsconnect.com/content/ip/tec/2000/0000006/00000002/art00002>. [Accessed on 12 December, 2018].
5. Tosun C. Limits to Community Participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management* 2000;21(6).
6. UNWTO. Tourist Safety and Security: Practical Measures for Destinations. ISBN (electronic version) 1996.
7. Walle YM. Tourist Flows and Its Determinants in Ethiopia. Ethiopian Development Research Institute Addis Ababa, Ethiopia 2010, P15-23.
8. World Bank. In Makeda's Footsteps: Towards a Strategy for Pro-Poor Tourism Development. Addis Ababa Ethiopia: Africa Region Private Sector Development 2006.