



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Examination of Tourism Security Concerns with Reference to India

Smita Mishra^{1*}, Tanvi Gupta² and Mamta Rani³

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This research study was conducted to examine the various factors which could be related to the security concerns for tourism industry specifically for India. The study encompasses an empirical assessment of the identified factors through review of literature in terms of their statistically significant relationship with the tourism security.

Originality/scope: This study is conducted originally for Indian sub-continent. It has taken into consideration the recent data (2021-2022) collected during the investigation. It has huge future scope as tourism industry one of the largest revenue-generating sectors & studying the trends in security concerns can provide insights for further research.

Methodology: The data was collected through a self-structured questionnaire with Cronbach's alpha $>.06$ from 349 respondents online. The main factors chosen were crime rate, wars, socio-political unrest, environmental threats and spread of infectious diseases. Their summation of score reflected the overall security status of tourism in India.

Limitations: Resource limitation is indispensable in any research study and so is the case here. A limited respondent base could be approached due to time constraint.

Implications: This study has both academic and practical implications. Apart from adding information to the existing literature, this also goes a long way in understanding how secure is Indian tourism considered and what could be the measure taken for enhancing the security status.

Keywords: Security concerns, Tourism, Socio-political unrest, Environmental threats, Infectious diseases

INTRODUCTION

India is known as the most popular destination, especially for tourists as it has a rich cultural heritage and myriad attraction places. Every year, millions of visitors from the world are seen in different parts of India. Tourism has a prominent impact on society. Not only society, but it also has a big contribution to the world's economy (Jangra *et al.*, 2021). The Indian government has implemented numerous campaigns and schemes to attract foreign tourists. The government aim to develop tourism industry and also wants to increase revenue in next 10 years while already started working on ultimate tourist place (Hazra, 2018). Focusing on digital promotion of culture tourism in India is highly required over other models of tourism. India is still yet not able to maintain sustainability due to gap between resources available and information provided (Menon *et al.*, 2021).

Tourism industry is a stronger pillar of a country's economy (Yadav Quereshi, 2021). However, after 2019, COVID19 has disturbed almost all the industry. If we talk about the tourism industry, then it was almost over. The sudden closure of everything at the beginning of COVID 19 was a big blow to the

¹Dean, Maharishi School of Business Studies, Maharishi University of Information Technology

²Assistant Professor, NDIM, New Delhi, India

³Associate Professor, GIBS, New Delhi, India

*Corresponding author email id: smita.mishra@muit.in

How to cite this article: Mishra, S., Gupta, T. and Rani, M. (2023). Examination of Tourism Security Concerns with Reference to India. *Optimization*, 15(1): 1-13.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

tourism industry. When countries started realizing that COVID 19 is a deadly virus, there was no other option but to shut everything down. Now when many countries have already stepped forward and decided to lift restrictions, they also believe that proper planning and management will maintain the remarkable progress of the tourism industry (Chang and Wu, 2021).

Tourophobia is common in individual the reason behind its crises that are caused due to some man made or natural disasters. The tourists are very selective in terms of destination selection. They identify the sensitive place because they believe tourism place should not have any connection with crimes, wars, or any type of threats Kadir Cakar (2020). Crime rate, terrorism, food safety, health issue, natural disasters these are concerning area for all those who wants to enjoy a happy time with friends and family. The example can be learnt from Malaysia who were the safest place for the tourists, are now facing challenges due to some short and long-term incidents (Ayob and Masron, 2014). In many countries, most of the destinations were vulnerable to political, economic and social stability. Security and safety directly influence to the travelers so now international community believe that the government, agency and news media report should always warn about the risk associated with particular destinations. However, now government is more focused and concerned for the safety of tourists and they immediately issue travel advisory (Breda and Costa, 2005).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Safety and security whether in India or abroad is a basic need of any citizen. A safe and secure environment is always required for tourists and it is the responsibility of the government to maintain and provide security arrangements at tourist destinations, as tourism sector does not only help in economic

development but it has an impact on many other areas (Hamarneh and Jerabek, 2018). From time to time, the rules relating to security and safety in tourism sectors are changed in the tourism sector. Policymakers, social scientists, and specialists need to understand the future of tourism to avoid uncertainty, anxiety, and fear factors in the tourism industry (Korstanj, 2020). India has always been a famous place for international tourists because of the variety of destinations, different types of cultures, and diversity. However, there have also been seen crime graphs, especially among women tourists. Such incidents have maligned India's image, leading to considerable decline in international tourists visiting India. It has declined India's GDP (Basak *et al.*, 2015). In tourism industry, safety and security have been given importance especially after 9/11 incident. Therefore, academicians and practitioners have already started working for the long-term solutions for avoiding the associated negative impact. Kashmir is known as heaven of India, and every year large number of tourists from international community visit and enjoy many beautiful places. However, safety and security perceptions of tourists who visited Kashmir have negative impact due to terror attacks on regular interval (Chauhan, 2007).

The author has examined and assessed the perception of visitors of five developing countries the United Kingdom, the USA, Germany, China and India and has also tried to understand what they think about the information provided to them related to safety and security and whether that information is trustworthy. The author has also found from research that there is no big difference in sense of thought among all five nationalists (Preko and Gyepi-Garbrah, 2021). In the research paper (Shaikh, 2018), the author has discussed safety issues in Goa which was known as one of the safest tourist places for international travellers for a long time. However, the incidents like different types of crimes against tourists,

deaths of foreign travellers due to natural causes, drowning deaths as well as death due to heavy doses of drugs have now become major issues. In this regard, different perceptions of local and foreign tourists have also been explained. The author has tried to identify the government response to deal with these types of crisis situations as well as the possible actions to fight safety issues. The research paper on Antalya's Tourist Security: A Gap Analysis of Expectations vs Perceptions (Terrah *et al.*, 2020) has found out why the security of tourism is the heart of the prosperity for the tourism sector. For any country, the tourism industry provides a significant role as well as contributes to the country's GDP, thus, it is the responsibility of authorities to make all efforts to protect the tourists. This study has focused on security measures, especially in Antalya hotels, restaurants and shopping malls.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objectives

Objective 1: To examine the relationship between crime rate and security status in Indian tourism.

Objective 2: To examine the relationship between wars and security status in Indian tourism.

Objective 3: To examine the relationship between socio-political unrest and security status in Indian tourism.

Objective 4: To examine the relationship between environmental threats and security status in Indian tourism.

Objective 5: To examine the relationship between infectious diseases and security status in Indian tourism.

Hypothesis

H1: There is significant relationship between crime rate and security status in Indian tourism.

H2: There is significant relationship between wars and security status in Indian tourism.

H3: There is significant relationship between socio-political unrest and security status in Indian tourism.

H4: There is significant relationship between environmental threats and security status in Indian tourism.

H5: There is significant relationship between infectious diseases and security status in Indian tourism.

The data was collected through a self-structured questionnaire with Cronbach's alpha $>.06$ from 349 respondents online using convenience sampling. The sample size taken for the retail customers taken in the study is 349 (Creative Research Systems, 2003). With this sample size, the marginal error calculated is less than 5%, thus, there is 95% confidence level and hence, the sample size is justified (Niles, 2006). The main factors chosen were crime rate, wars, socio-political unrest, environmental threats and spread of infectious diseases. These factors were marked for responses on Likert's 5-point scale. Their summation of score reflected the overall security status of tourism in India. Multiple regression was used to examine the relationship between the dependent and the independent variables.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Impact of 'Crime rate' on Security Status of Indian Tourism

It was documented from Table 1 that the mean score for security status of Indian tourism was 95 and the highest mean score for 'Crime rate' was the highest for its first variable (CR1) as 2.77 (s.d.=1.18) and the lowest for the third variable (CR3) as 2.70 (s.d.=1.21) for a total of 349 respondents.

Table 2 given below reflected statistically positive correlation between the independent variables of Crime rate component and Tourism security status score as $p<0.05$.

Table 1: Descriptive analysis of ‘crime rate’ variables and ‘Tourism security status’

	Mean	Std. deviation
Tourism security status score	95.00	37.72
CR1	2.77	1.18
CR2	2.71	1.21
CR3	2.70	1.18
CR4	2.72	1.22
CR5	2.72	1.22

Table 3 documented that a fit model was obtained using the given variables. With enter method, $F_{(5,343)}=2788.98$ at $p<0.05$ and from Table 4, the regression equation given below was obtained:

$$\text{Tourism security status} = 2.029 + 0.207(\text{CR1}) + 0.255(\text{CR2}) + 0.215(\text{CR3}) + 0.223(\text{CR4}) + 0.189(\text{CR5})$$

This showed that with 0.207 units change in CR1, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.255 units change in CR2, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.215 units change in CR3, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.223 units change in CR4, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.189 units change in CR5, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. Since, for all the given variables of ‘Crime rate’, statistical relationship came out to be significant at 5% level of significance as $p<0.05$. Hence, H_0 was

Table 2: Correlations for crime rate variables and tourism security status

		Tourism security status score	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5
Pearson Correlation	Tourism security status score	1.000	.891	.902	.907	.897	.878
	CR1	.891	1.000	.779	.778	.758	.790
	CR2	.902	.779	1.000	.799	.770	.752
	CR3	.907	.778	.799	1.000	.824	.760
	CR4	.897	.758	.770	.824	1.000	.761
	CR5	.878	.790	.752	.760	.761	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tourism security status score	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	CR1	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	CR2	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	CR3	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	CR4	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	CR5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.

Table 3: ANOVA^a for crime rate and tourism security status

Model		Sum of square WR	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	483426.26	5	96685.253	2788.98	0.001 ^b
	Residual	11890.73	343	34.667		
	Total	495316.99	348			

^aDependent Variable: Tourism security status; ^bPredictors: (Constant), CR5, CR2, CR4, CR1, CR3

Table 4: Coefficients^a for crime rate variables

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.029	0.851		2.385	0.018
	CR1	6.571	0.511	0.207	12.863	0.001
	CR2	7.962	0.496	0.255	16.049	0.001
	CR3	6.841	0.550	0.215	12.427	0.001
	CR4	6.888	0.507	0.223	13.592	0.001
	CR5	5.837	0.475	0.189	12.287	0.001

Dependent Variable: Tourism security status

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for wars variables and Tourism security status

	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Tourism security status score	95.00	37.72	349
WR1	2.73	1.18	349
WR2	2.71	1.23	349
WR3	2.72	1.19	349
WR4	2.70	1.16	349
WR5	2.74	1.22	349

rejected and it was documented that crime rate impacted the Tourism security status.

Impact of 'Wars' component on Tourism security status

It was documented from Table 5 that the mean score for security status of Indian tourism was 95 and the highest mean score for 'wars' was the highest for its fifth variable (WR5) as 2.74 (s.d.=1.22) and the lowest for the fourth variable (WR4) as 2.70 (s.d.=1.16) for a total of 349 respondents.

Table 6: Correlation matrix for 'wars' and tourism security status

		Tourism security status score	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR4	CR5
Pearson Correlation	Tourism security status score	1.000	.889	.905	.900	.897	.868
	WR1	.889	1.000	.786	.768	.755	.762
	WR2	.905	.786	1.000	.811	.786	.734
	WR3	.900	.768	.811	1.000	.813	.725
	WR4	.897	.755	.786	.813	1.000	.762
	WR5	.868	.762	.734	.725	.762	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tourism security status score		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	WR1	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	WR2	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	WR3	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	WR4	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	WR5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Table 6 reflected the statistically positive correlation between the independent variables of wars component and the Tourism security status score of as $p < 0.05$.

Table 7 showed that a fit model was obtained using the stipulated variables. With enter method, $F_{(5,343)} = 2635.93$ at $p < 0.05$ and from Table 8, the given regression equation was obtained:

$$\text{Tourism security status} = 1.690 + 0.212(\text{WR1}) + 0.242(\text{WR2}) + 0.219(\text{WR3}) + 0.208(\text{WR4}) + 0.211(\text{WR5})$$

This implied that with 0.212 units change in WR1, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.242 units change in WR2, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.219 units change in WR3, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.208 units change in WR4, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.211 units change in WR5, the Tourism security status would change by one

unit. Since, all the variables of wars displayed a statistically significant impact on Tourism security status at 5% level of significance at $p < 0.05$. Hence, H_0 is rejected. It can be said that wars impacted the Tourism security status.

Impact of 'Socio-political unrest' on Tourism security status

It was represented from Table 9 that the mean score for Tourism security status was 95 and the highest

Table 9: Descriptive statistics for security variable

	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Tourism security status score	95.00	37.72	349
SPU1	2.73	1.22	349
SPU2	2.68	1.22	349
SPU3	2.69	1.15	349
SPU4	2.74	1.17	349
SPU5	2.73	1.23	349

Table 7: ANOVA^a for 'wars' and tourism security status score

Model		Sum of square WR	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	RegWRsion	482753.39	5	96550.67	2635.93	0.001 ^b
	WRidual	12563.60	343	36.62		
	Total	495316.99	348			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score; b. Predictors: (Constant), WR5, WR3, WR1, WR4, WR2

Table 8: Coefficients^a for WR variables

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.690	.879		1.923	.055
	WR1	6.757	.515	.212	13.121	.000
	WR2	7.413	.522	.242	14.211	.000
	WR3	6.896	.545	.219	12.659	.000
	WR4	6.716	.550	.208	12.204	.000
	WR5	6.507	.463	.211	14.041	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score

mean score for Security was for its fourth variable (SPU4) with mean score of 2.74 (s.d.=1.17) and the lowest for SPU2 with mean =2.68 (s.d.=1.22) a total sample of 349 Respondents.

Table 10 reflected statistically positive correlation between the independent variables of Security and Tourism security status as $p < 0.05$.

Table 11 showed that a fit model was obtained using the variables. With enter method, $F_{(5,343)} = 97142.67$ at $p < 0.05$ and from Table 12, the given regression equation was obtained:

$$\text{Tourism security status} = 1.785 + 0.210(\text{SPU1}) + 0.200(\text{SPU2}) + 0.244(\text{SPU3}) + 0.208(\text{SPU4}) + 0.235(\text{SPU5})$$

This showed that with 0.210 units change in SPU1, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.200 units change in SPU2, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.244 units change in SPU3, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.208 units change in SPU4, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.235 units change in SPU5, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. Since all the variables of security had an impact on Tourism security status which was statistically significant at 5% level of significance with $p < 0.05$. Hence, H_0 is rejected and it was found that security impacted the Tourism security status.

Table 10: Correlations for security and SPU variables

		Tourism security status score	SPU1	SPU2	SPU3	SPU4	SPU5
Pearson Correlation	Tourism security status score	1.000	.901	.879	.905	.904	.878
	SPU1	.901	1.000	.780	.772	.772	.789
	SPU2	.879	.780	1.000	.789	.759	.700
	SPU3	.905	.772	.789	1.000	.820	.723
	SPU4	.904	.772	.759	.820	1.000	.772
	SPU5	.878	.789	.700	.723	.772	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tourism security status score		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	SPU1	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	SPU2	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	SPU3	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	SPU4	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	SPU5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Table 11: ANOVA^a for security and tourism security status

Model		Sum of square WR	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	485713.38	5	97142.67	3469.52	0.001 ^b
	Residual	9603.61	343	27.99		
	Total	495316.99	348			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score

b. Predictors: (Constant), SPU5, SPU2, SPU3, SPU1, SPU4

Table 12: Coefficients^a for security variables

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.785	.763		2.338	.020
	SPU1	6.470	.459	.210	14.088	.000
	SPU2	6.142	.425	.200	14.441	.000
	SPU3	7.951	.491	.244	16.190	.000
	SPU4	6.672	.486	.208	13.716	.000
	SPU5	7.167	.412	.235	17.400	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score

Table 13: Descriptive statistics for environmental threats and tourism security status score

	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Tourism security status score	95.00	37.72	349
ET1	2.68	1.23	349
ET2	2.65	1.18	349
ET3	2.70	1.21	349
ET4	2.74	1.23	349
ET5	2.73	1.22	349

Impact of 'Environmental threats' on Tourism security status

It was shown in Table 13 that the mean score for Tourism security status was 95 and the highest mean score for environmental threats was shown by ET4 with mean=2.74 (s.d.=1.23) and minimum for ET2 with mean score=2.65 (s.d.=1.18) for a total sample of 349 respondents.

Table 14 reflected statistically positive correlation between the variables of Feedback management and

Table 14: Correlations for feedback management and tourism security status

		Tourism security status score	ET1	ET2	ET3	ET4	ET5
Pearson Correlation	Tourism security status score	1.000	.875	.896	.909	.901	.884
	ET1	.875	1.000	.793	.771	.738	.747
	ET2	.896	.793	1.000	.821	.754	.728
	ET3	.909	.771	.821	1.000	.815	.756
	ET4	.901	.738	.754	.815	1.000	.780
	ET5	.884	.747	.728	.756	.780	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tourism security status score		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	ET1	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	ET2	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	ET3	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	ET4	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	ET5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Tourism security status $p < 0.05$. Table 15 showed that a fit model was obtained using the stipulated variables. With enter method, $F_{(5,343)} = 96914.74$ at $p < 0.05$ and from Table 16, the regression equation was as obtained:

$$\text{Tourism security status} = 3.367 + 0.176(\text{ET1}) + 0.231(\text{ET2}) + 0.202(\text{ET3}) + 0.245(\text{ET4}) + 0.241(\text{ET5})$$

This implied that with 0.176 units change in ET1, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.231 units change in ET2, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.202 units change in ET3, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.245 units change in ET4, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.241 units change in ET5, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. Since, all the variables of feedback management impacted the Tourism security status which was statistically significant at 5% level of significance. Hence, H_0 is rejected as feedback management impacted the Tourism security status.

Impact of ‘Spread of Infectious Diseases’ on Tourism security status

It was represented from Table 17 that the mean score for tourism security status was 95 and the highest mean score for ‘Spread of Infectious Diseases’ was shown by SID3 (s.d.=1.20) and the lowest by SID5 at mean score=2.66(s.d.=1.19) for a total sample of 349 respondents.

Table 17: Descriptive statistics for spread of infectious diseases and tourism security status

	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Tourism security status score	95.00	37.72	349
SID1	2.67	1.22	349
SID2	2.70	1.17	349
SID3	2.74	1.20	349
SID4	2.73	1.23	349
SID5	2.66	1.19	349

Table 15: ANOVA^a for environmental threats and tourism security status score

Model		Sum of square WR	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	484573.71	5	96914.74	3094.19	0.001 ^b
	Residual	10743.28	343	31.32		
	Total	495316.99	348			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score; b. Predictors: (Constant), ET5, ET2, ET1, ET4, ET3

Table 16: Coefficients^a for environmental threats variables

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.367	.796		4.230	.000
	ET1	5.376	.449	.176	11.977	.000
	ET2	7.377	.503	.231	14.667	.000
	ET3	6.250	.523	.202	11.948	.000
	ET4	7.523	.475	.245	15.840	.000
	ET5	7.390	.437	.241	16.902	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score

Table 18: Correlations for spread of infectious diseases and tourism security status

		Tourism security status score	SID1	SID2	SID3	SID4	SID5
Pearson Correlation	Tourism security status score	1.000	.891	.886	.902	.924	.854
	SID1	.891	1.000	.794	.756	.769	.753
	SID2	.886	.794	1.000	.782	.774	.703
	SID3	.902	.756	.782	1.000	.839	.696
	SID4	.924	.769	.774	.839	1.000	.771
	SID5	.854	.753	.703	.696	.771	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Tourism security status score		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	SID1	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	SID2	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	SID3	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	SID4	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	SID5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Table 19: ANOVA^a for spread of infectious diseases and Tourism security status

Model		Sum of square WR	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	485892.47	5	97178.49	3536.755	.000 ^b
	Residual	9424.52	343	27.47		
	Total	495316.99	348			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security status score; b. Predictors: (Constant), SID5, SID3, SID2, SID1, SID4

Table 18 reflected statistically positive correlation between the variables of spread of infectious diseases and Tourism security status as $p < 0.05$.

Table 19 showed that a fit model Was been obtained using the stipulated variables. With enter method, $F_{(5,343)} = 97178.49$ at $p < 0.05$ and from Table 20, the following regression equation was obtained:

$$\text{Tourism security status} = 2.357 + 0.212(\text{SID1}) + 0.196(\text{SID2}) + 0.230(\text{SID3}) + 0.273(\text{SID4}) + 0.186(\text{SID5})$$

This implied that with 0.212 units change in SID1, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.196 units change in SID2, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.230 units change in SID3, the Tourism security

status would change by one unit. With 0.273 units change in SID4, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. With 0.186 units change in SID5, the Tourism security status would change by one unit. Since, all the variables of spread of infectious diseases impacted the Tourism security status which was statistically significant at 5% level of significance with $p < 0.05$. Hence, H_05 is rejected. This showed that spread of infectious diseases impacted the Tourism security status.

DISCUSSION

From the given analysis, it can be inferred that H_01 , H_02 , H_03 , H_04 and H_05 are rejected and it has been proven that crime rate, wars, socio-political unrest,

Table 20: Coefficients^a for spread of infectious diseases variables

Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.357	.759		3.106	.002
	SID1	6.530	.440	.212	14.854	.000
	SID2	6.298	.453	.196	13.891	.000
	SID3	7.201	.469	.230	15.344	.000
	SID4	8.370	.493	.273	16.991	.000
	SID5	5.850	.403	.186	14.525	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Tourism security score

environmental threats and spread of infectious diseases have a statistically significant impact on the security status of Indian tourism. This revelation is a useful input in understanding the respondents' psychology and this knowledge can be better utilized to work on the identified areas so as to enhance tourism, especially after the COVID-19 ruckus. Since, tourism industry is one of the contributing industries in terms of wealth generation for the economy, thus, all kinds of tourism planning agencies along with the Ministry of Tourism can take concrete steps for its betterment by elevating the level of faith of the travelers.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Resource limitation is indispensable in any research study and so is the case here. A limited respondent base could be approached due to time constraint. The factors involved in this study that influenced the tourism security concerned are limited in themselves. There may be possibility of some more possible social security concerns that can be studied in future in order to enhance the sustainability in tourism industry.

CONCLUSION

The five major factors involved in this study influence the security concerns of tourism industry. An entity involved to promote the tourism at a location need to

consider these factors for filling the gap of related concerns and enhancement in tourism at a remote location. Crime Rate is one such factor that threatens the tourists to visit a place. Thus, it is the need of concern authority to deal with crime rate of the area with tourism centric. Wars also do affect the security concerns of tourists. Generally, they ignore to visit the place where there is any war like situation arises or about to arise. The health of socio-political environment is also major concern for the tourism industry to affect the security concern in a nation. A nation needs to maintain their socio-political concerns controlled so that they did not influence security of tourist who visits from remote location to a common place. Environmental Threats are also some natural concern that signals red for the tourists to ignore the place which are sensitive to environmental calamities. The spread of infectious disease needs to be check on equal interval of time in order to protect the health of local people as well as tourists.

REFERENCES

Ayob, N.M. and Masron, T. (2014). Issues of safety and security: New challenging to Malaysia tourism industry. *SHS Web of Conferences*, Vol. 12, 2014, *4th International Conference on Tourism Research (4ICTR)*

- Basak, S., Ghosh, R., Sarkar, A. and Chaudhuri, A. (2015). Tourism and need for tourist's protection in India, August 2015. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(8): 11-15.
- Breda, Z. and Costa, C. (2005). Safety and security issues affecting inbound tourism in the people's republic of China In: Mansfeld, Y. and Pizam, A. (Eds.), *Tourism, Safety and Security: From Theory to Practice*, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Çakar, K. (2020). Tourophobia: Fear of travel resulting from man-made or natural disasters, *Tourism Review*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.
- Chauhan, V. (2007). Safety and security perceptions of tourists visiting Kashmir, India", Chen, J.S. (Ed.) *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure (Advances in Hospitality and Leisure*, Vol. 3), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley, pp 3-17.
- Chhabra, J. and Bhattacharjee, M. (2019), Analyzing tourist preferences in India to Crime and threat of terrorism. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 9(6): 527-542.
- Coshall, J.T. (2003). The threat of terrorism as an intervention on international travel flows. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42: 4-12.
- Gautam, S., Tyagi, M., Tyagi, M., Gautam, S. and Gupta, M.K. (2021). Effect of e-crime (Cybercrime) on Indian tourism industry. *International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Topics*, 2(11): 171–173.
- George, R. (2003). Tourist's perceptions of safety and security while visiting cape town. *Tourism Management*, 24: 575–585.
- Hamarneh, I.I. and Jerabek, M.P. (2018). The impact of the security situation on tourism in the countries of the former Yugoslavia. *International Scientific Journal "Security & Future"*, 2(3): 111-115.
- Hanrahan, J.D. and Melly, D. (2019). Biosecurity risk and tourist communication in Ireland. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 22: 45–61.
- Hazra, G. (2018). Indian tourism: Present and future scenarios. *Annals of Art, Culture & Humanities, Peer Reviewed Refereed Research Journal*, 3(2): 63-69.
- Jangra, R., Kaushik, S.P. and Saini, S. (2021). An analysis of tourist's perceptions toward tourism development: Study of cold desert destination, India. *Geography and Sustainability*, 2(1): 48-58.
- Khare, A. and Sathe, S. (2021). A study of tourism choices by tourists in India in new normal. *International Journal of Engineering Management and Economics*, 10(5): 54-64.
- Korstanj, M.E. (2020). Tourism security: A critical insight. *Tourism, Terrorism and Security*, Emerald Publishing, pp 1-20.
- Liliana, P. (2011). Safety and security in tourism. *Case Study: Romania, Forum geographic*, 10(2): 322-328.
- Matakovic, H. and Cunjak Matakovic, I. (2019). The impact of crime on security in tourism. *Security and Defence Quarterly*, 27(5): 1-20.
- Mawby, R.I. (2014). Crime and disorder, security and the tourism industry, *The Handbook of Security. EFUS Tourism and Security Project*, pp 383-403.
- Menon, S., Bhatt, S. and Sharma, S. (2021). A study on envisioning Indian tourism – Through cultural tourism and sustainable digitalization, Article: 1903149 Published online: 5 May 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2021.1903149>.
- Preko, A. and Gyepi-Garbrah, T.F. (2021). Understanding sense of safety and trustworthiness of tourism information among migrant visitors. *International Hospitality Review*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print.
- Rahman, M.K., Gazi, M.A.I., Bhuiyan, M.A. and Rahaman, M.A. (2021) Effect of COVID-19 pandemic on tourist travel risk and management perceptions. *PLoS ONE*, 16(9): e0256486.
- Shaikh, Y.Z. (2018). Safety Issues in Tourism in Goa- A Tourist Perspective, 5(3).
- Sigala, M. (2020). Tourism and COVID-19: Impacts and implications for advancing and resetting industry and research. *Journal of Business Research*, 117: 312–321.
- Subhash, T. (2015), Tourism in India: Potentials. *Challenges and Opportunities*, 21(4).
- Tan, C.H., Chong, X.W. and Ho, S.B. (2017). Significance of safety and security issues on tourism industry in Malaysia, *Sci. Int. (Lahore)*, 29(2): 471-475.
- Tarlow, P.E. (2009). Tourism safety and security, In: T. Jamal, M. Robinson (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, pp 464-480.

- Terrah, A., Wildes, V. and Mistry, T.G. (2020). Antalya's tourist security: A gap analysis of expectations vs perceptions. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 5(2): 150-168.
- Wei, L., Crompton, J.L. and Reid, L.M. (1989). Cultural Conflicts: Experiences of US Visitors to China. *Tourism Management*, 10(4): 322-332.
- Yongguang, Z. and Qionglei, Y. (2022), Sense of safety toward tourism destinations: A social constructivist perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 24p.
- Zouni, G., and Kouremenos, A. (2008). Do tourism providers know their visitors? An investigation of tourism experience at a destination. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(4): 282-297.