

Perception of Security of a Tourist Destination on the Case of the Czech Republic in the Year Preceding the COVID-19 Pandemic

Veronika A. Polišenská

ORCID: 0000-0002-8872-4534

Jan Polišenský

ORCID: 0000-0003-3010-0590

University of Finance and Administration in Prague, Czech Republic

Abstract. The study aimed to determine what security concerns are taken into account during the selection of a tourist destination. The research data were collected in 2019 from respondents belonging to various age groups ($N = 2,065$) in the Czech Republic, using online and paper questionnaires. The analysis of answers resulted in the formation of 84 individual concepts, which were subsequently summed into nine categories. They include acute threats, country, economic and political state of the country, environmental characteristics, health and hygiene, personal reasons, religion, social situation in the country and travelling preferences. The results provide an insight into people's perceptions of travel destinations in terms of security and show which issues deter visitors from entering a given country. Such opinions are important to many security agencies that deal with threats against tourists, as well as to those involved in promoting security among tourists.

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0015.6558

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0015.6558>

Keywords: security, travel, country, opinion

Dedication: This work was supported under student project No. 7427/2018/06, with a particular focus on the research of the University of Finance and Administration in Prague, Czech Republic.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Ondřej Cón, František Hyhlík, Sára Kaukušová, Nikola Zelenková, Gabriela Vokřilová and Nikola Zahradníková, the students of the University of Finance and Administration in Prague, Czech Republic, who helped us collect the questionnaires, transcribe the answers and pre-code the data.

Introduction

For the past two decades, we have been witnessing a significant increase in the movement of people, goods and information across countries and continents. In the age of globalisation, we continue to observe the creation of a global village. Mobility does not involve solely goods but also people. Technology and a higher standard of living, especially in developed countries, make holiday and leisure both

more affordable and more common. At the same time, the selection of a tourist destination involves a series of complex decisions, which are usually personal, as well as based on inner beliefs and perceptions.

That is why the process of choosing a tourist destination is different for every individual who considers different aspects. Some people make their decisions based on the weather, others on the length of the journey to their destination. However, the element that is most commonly taken into account is security of a given tourist destination. Therefore, this article aims to establish what safety concerns are considered when selecting a tourist destination.

Background

The notion of security is interdisciplinary, ranging from psychology, sociology, international relations and political science to technical and engineering fields. Therefore, there is a wide variety of definitions of security as its meaning is not objectively definable.¹

Security can be characterised as a notion linked to the presence of a threat. Based on this description, Walt defines security as 'conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states, and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war.'² On the other hand, security can be also defined as the absence of threats, as Lawrence Krause and Joseph Nye state: 'security is the absence of acute threats to the minimal acceptable levels of the basic values that a people consider essential to its survival.'³ Barry Buzan defines security as 'pursuit of freedom from threats.'⁴

There are also other points of view that focus on security. It can be discussed in terms of the character of threats, institutes that aim to provide security or institutes that should be protected. Scientific literature differentiates between domestic security and one that originated abroad, as well as between soft and hard security. Furthermore, social sciences distinguish subjective and objective security, as well.⁵

Security is closely linked to the term 'threat'. In the field of international relations, a threat is a situation in which one agent or a group of agents has either the capability or intention to inflict a negative consequence on another agent or group

¹ Buzan B, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Security Analysis in the Post-Cold War Era*. Brighton: Weatsheaf, 1991.

² Walt S.M, *The Renaissance of Security Studies*. *International Studies Quarterly*, 1991, Vol. 35, Issue 2, p. 212.

³ Krause L, Nye J, *Reflections on the Economics and Politics of International Economic Organisations*, [in:] *World Politics and International Economics*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1975, p. 330.

⁴ Buzan B, p. 18.

⁵ Lutz D.S, *Security / International Security Policy (Sicherheit/Internationale Sicherheitspolitik)*, [in:] *Small Political Lexicon (Kleines Lexikon der Politik)*. München: C.H.Beck, 2001.

of agents.⁶ However, threats are not found objectively but rather constitute social facts based on a collective understanding.⁷ Therefore, a threat is an independent variable that can or intends to endanger specific values. The severity of the threat depends on the values that we want to secure. It can be natural in origin and non-intentional or artificial and intentional.

Overall, the issue of security is considered to be very political. No country, group or even individual wants to be associated with a place characterised by a low level of security. The said level, better yet, the opinion about and perception of security are linked to the prestige and power status of a given country. These opinions and perceptions affect the decision-making process when selecting a potential travel destination.

The definition of a tourist destination states that it is 'a geographical unit visited by tourists being a self-contained centre.'⁸ As a geographical unit, a tourist destination also possesses many characteristics which attract or deter tourists. They include landscape, culture, transport, experience⁹ political stability of the region¹⁰ and the overall security of the destination.

It is apparent that this definition concentrates solely on the geographical features of tourist destinations. However, in recent years, authors have been more inclined to explore their subjectivity.¹¹ For this reason, Seaton and Bennett¹² expanded the aforementioned definition by including intangible characteristics, which represent feelings, beliefs and opinions of an individual about a given destination. These feelings, beliefs and opinions can be summarised as a perception of a tourist destination.

Perception influences an individual's behaviour since it aids in understanding the social and physical environment around the.¹³ With regard to tourist destinations, the perception of security constitutes a major factor influencing a person's decision

⁶ Davis J.W, Threats and Promises: The Pursuit of International Influence. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000, p. 10.

⁷ Ruggie J.G, What makes the world hang together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist challenge. *International Organization*, 1998, Vol. 52, Issue 4.

⁸ Goeldner C.R, Ritchie J.R.B, Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies. Hoboken: Wiley, 2003, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

⁹ Framke W, The 'Destination': A Problematic Concept. Paper presented at 10th Nordic Tourism Research Conference, Vasa, 2001, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

¹⁰ Neumayer E, The Impact of Political Violence on Tourism: Dynamic Cross-National Estimation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2004, Vol. 48, Issue 2.

¹¹ Hu Y, Ritchie J.B, Measuring Destination Attractiveness: A Contextual Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1993, Vol. 32, Issue 2, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

¹² Seaton A.V, Bennett M.M, Marketing Tourism Products. London: Thomson Business Press, 1997, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

¹³ Bempah S.A, Øyhus A.O, The role of social perception in disaster risk reduction: beliefs, perception, and attitudes regarding flood disasters in communities along the Volta River, Ghana, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 2017, Vol. 23.

to visit a particular place¹⁴ or cancel plans¹⁵, which affects the tourist's behaviour at the destination. Moreover, negative perceptions may induce fear to visit certain tourist destinations.¹⁶ To sum up, tourists decide where to travel based on their perceptions rather than reality.¹⁷

Similarly to the perception of security, each person's perception of risk may vary greatly between individuals.¹⁸ Generally, risk is defined as 'an exposure to certain threats and dangers'¹⁹, while perceived risk is characterised as 'an individual's subjective assessment of the real risk present at any time.'²⁰

For example, Dickson and Dolnicar²¹ established ten types of risk concerning international travel:

1. Equipment/functional: mechanical, equipment and/or organisational problems;
2. Financial: the experience will not provide value for money;
3. Health: the possibility of becoming sick;
4. Physical: physical danger or injury;
5. Political instability: being caught up in a political turmoil;
6. Psychological: disappointment with the travel experience;
7. Satisfaction: lack of satisfaction with the experience;
8. Social: risk of disapproval by others due to the choice of the destination;
9. Terrorism: being caught in a terrorist act;
10. Time: travel experience was a waste of time.

Therefore, in the case of some individuals, the perception of risk can influence their decision not to travel to a certain destination. On the other hand, others

¹⁴ Beirman D, United States: September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. The impact on American and global tourism, [in:] Restoring tourism destinations in crisis: A strategic marketing approach, Oxon: CABI Publishing, 2003, [in:] Amir A.F, Ismail M, See T, Sustainable tourist environment: Perception of international women travelers on safety and security in Kuala Lumpur, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014, Vol. 168.

¹⁵ Irvine W, Anderson A.R, The Effect of Disaster on Peripheral Tourism Places and the Disaffection of Prospective Visitors, [in:] Tourism, Security & Safety: From Theory to Practice, 2006. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

¹⁶ Amir A.F, Ismail M, See T, Sustainable tourist environment: Perception of international women travelers on safety and security in Kuala Lumpur, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014, Vol. 168.

¹⁷ Roehl W.S, Fesenmaier D.R, Risk Perceptions and Pleasure Travel: an Exploratory Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1992, Vol. 30. Issue 4.

¹⁸ Dickson T, Dolnicar S, No risk, no fun: The role of perceived risk in adventure tourism, CD Proceedings of the 13th International Research Conference of the Council of Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE 2004), 2004. *Electronic source*: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30389108_No_risk_no_fun_The_role_of_perceived_risk_in_adventure_tourism, accessed: 4.07.2021.

¹⁹ Reisinger Y, Mavondo F, Travel Anxiety and Intention to Travel Internationally: Implication of Travel Risk Perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 2005, Vol. 43, [in:] Korstanje M, Re-visiting Risk Perception Theory in the Context of Travel. *e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR)*, 2009, Vol. 7, Issue 4. *Electronic source*: <http://list.rtps.tamu.edu/ertr/>, accessed: 4.07.2021.

²⁰ Haddock C, Managing Risks in Outdoor Activities. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Mountain Safety Council, 1993.

²¹ Dickson T, Dolnicar S, No risk, no fun..., *op.cit.*

perceive risk as something that is expected, as Walle²² notes: 'the absence of risk may decrease the satisfaction the participant receives from a would-be adventure'.

The perception of risk does not affect only the decision-making process but also the behaviour of an individual at the tourist destination. Dickon and Dolnicar²³ claim that the relation between perceived risk and desired risk influences travellers' behaviour on the trip regardless of whether they are seeking greater or lesser risk. In their view, risk is central to tourist behaviour.

Since risk is considered to be a part of tourist behaviour, perception of risk or security is not only important to the travellers themselves but also to the destinations, as they aim to attract tourists.²⁴

All in all, the perception of security or risks influences the individual's decision to visit a certain tourist destination. Therefore, the following question arises: what safety concerns are taken into consideration when selecting a tourist destination?

Research design

The presented research was conducted according to the principles of qualitative research, whose aim is to use methods to uncover and understand what is the basis of certain situations²⁵ and in compliance with the framework of the grounded theory.²⁶

The collected data were analysed using the concept-indicator model²⁷ where the answers (**data**) are divided into data fragments (**indicators**) and subsequently assigned to **individual concepts** using the **open coding** technique.²⁸

Indicators are data fragments (parts of answers)²⁹ and can be defined as something that truly exists, something that is found within the data, what indicates the presence of a certain concrete, generally defined event. On the other hand, **individual concepts** are codes attributed to the individual indicators or groups of indicators. The concept is not present in the data itself but entered by the researcher.³⁰

²² Walle A.H, Pursuing Risk or Insight: Marketing Adventures. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1997, Vol. 24, Issue 2.

²³ Dickson T, Dolnicar S, No risk, no fun..., *op.cit.*

²⁴ Michalkó G, Tourism geography and human ecology (Turizmusföldrajz és humánökológia), KJF MTA Földrajztudományi Kutató Intézet, Budapest-Székesfehérvár, 2005, [in:] Kővári I, Zimányi K, Safety and Security in the Age of Global Tourism. *APSTRACT: Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 2011, Vol. 5, Issue 3–4.

²⁵ Strauss A, Corbin J, Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc., 1998, p. 11.

²⁶ Strauss A.L, Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1987.

²⁷ Glaser B, Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory. Mill Valley: Sociology Press, 1978, [in:] Strauss A.L, Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. New York, 1987.

²⁸ Švaříček R, Šedová K, Qualitative Research in Pedagogical Sciences (Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách). Portál, 2014.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*

These individual concepts are further combined into a broader category based on unified criteria.³¹

Tab. 1. The overview of the open coding based on the grounded theory³²

| Level | Function in the analysis |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Data fragments | Indicators |
| 2. Code | Individual concepts |
| 3. Category | Variables |

Source: Authors' own study

Data and Methods

Research sample

The research sample consisted of 2,065 respondents from the Czech Republic (52.4% female, 47.4% male, 0.2% with gender unknown). The age of the participants ranged from 15 to 81 years old. The sample included 28 (1.4%) 15–18 year-olds; 585 (28.4%) 19–25 year-olds; 228 (11.1%) 26–30 year-olds; 341 (16.5%) 31–40 year-olds; 324 (15.7%) 41–50 year-olds; 286 (13.9%) 51–60 year olds; 160 (7.8%) 61–70 year-olds; 98 (4.8%) 71–80 year-olds; and 12 (0.6%) 81 years-olds and older individuals. Thus, respondents between the age of 15–60 comprised 87% of the research sample while those aged 61 and above comprised 13.2%.

The educational level of the sample was varied: 72 subjects (3.5%) finished basic education, 233 (11.3%) had completed high school education without state examination, 956 (46.3%) had completed high school education with state examination, 350 (17%) had obtained a Bachelor's degree, 291 (14.1%), had a Master's degree, while 59 (2.9%) had PhD.

According to the Statistical Office of the Czech Republic, in 2017 the population of this country consisted of 10,590 million persons of whom 5,208 million (49.2%) were male and 5,382 million (50.8%) were female. Individuals between 15–64 years of age amounted to 6,899 million (65.02%) of the total population (and 77.2% beyond the age of 0–14) and those aged 65 years old and above amounted to 2,040 million (19.22%) (and 22% beyond the age of 0–14).³³ In 2017, 33.4% of the population had completed primary education, 61.9% secondary education (without state examination), 40.6% secondary education (with state examination) and 19.4% had received higher education.³⁴

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*, p. 91.

³³ Czech Statistical Office, 2021. *Electronic source*: <https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/74413697/32020318a05.pdf/7d1e99de-cfaa-4a8d-b533-1ab3dcd94f16?version=1.2>, accessed: 10.11.2021.

³⁴ Czech Statistical Office, 2021. *Electronic source*: https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/74413697/32020318_eng.pdf/0617421a-a6f0-4e47-9bf8-7b6d96e05111?version=1.0, accessed: 10.11.2021.

The ratio between males and females included in the study reflects the ratio of the total population of the Czech Republic. The age ratio between the two groups — 15–60 year-olds and individuals aged 60 and above — is comparably similar due to the fact that the research sample was divided at the age of 60, whereas the official statistics divided the population at the age of 65. The main difference between our sample and the total Czech population lies in education, which influences the manner in which the questionnaires were distributed.

Data collection

Online and paper questionnaires were filled by 2,065 respondents in the Czech Republic in 2019. The respondents were approached through the information system at the university. Subsequently, the questionnaires were spread using the snowball technique, *i.e.* students approached people of similar age, which acted as a further limiting criterion.³⁵

Although the questionnaire consisted of 53 questions, only one pertained to this article — **what would deter you from visiting a certain country?** The question was open-ended in order to allow the respondents to express their opinions without any outside influences and answer spontaneously.³⁶

Process of analysis

The 2,065 answers obtained were first divided into 2,819 data fragments (**indicators**).

Tab. 2. Example of a division of answers into data fragments (indicators)

| Answer | Indicator — criminality | Indicator — terrorism | Indicator — political situation, regime | Indicator — demonstrations, protests | Indicator — prices |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| Criminality, bad political situation — demonstrations, risk of terrorism | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Political regime, criminality, prices | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |

Source: Authors' own study

These indicators were then assigned (coded) into 84 separate **individual concepts** using the open coding technique.

³⁵ Miovský M, Qualitative Approach and Methods in Psychological Research (Kvalitativní přístup a metody v psychologickém výzkumu). Grada, 2006.

³⁶ Reja U, Manfreda K.L, Hlebec V, Vehovar V, Open-ended vs. Close-ended Questions in Web Questionnaires. *Developments in Applied Statistics*, 2003, Vol. 19.

Tab. 3. Example of an assignment of indicators into specific individual concepts

| Indicator | Indicator | Indicator | Individual concept |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| inner feelings | emotions | fear | emotions |
| distance | aeroplane | far away | distance |

Source: Authors' own study

Finally, individual concepts were further combined according to unified criteria, which has resulted in the formation of nine **categories**.

Tab. 4. Example of a combination of individual concepts into categories

| Individual concept | Category |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Illnesses, epidemics | Health |
| Necessity of vaccinations | Health |
| Threat to life and health | Health |
| Food | Health |
| Bad hygienic conditions | Health |
| Bad healthcare | Health |
| My own health | |

Source: Authors' own study

Results

The initial coding of the **data fragments** (indicators) has resulted in the formation of 84 **individual concepts** (Appendix 1).

The individual concepts were subsequently combined according to unified criteria, which has resulted in the creation of **nine categories**.

Tab. 5. Categories

| | Categories |
|---|---|
| 1 | Acute threats |
| 2 | Country |
| 3 | Economic and political state of the country |
| 4 | Environmental characteristics |
| 5 | Health and hygiene |
| 6 | Personal reasons |
| 7 | Religion |
| 8 | Social situation in the country |
| 9 | Travelling preferences |

Source: Authors' own study

Individual concepts comprising the specific categories include:

1. **Acute threats** — this category covered individual concepts such as assassinations, attacks and violence, the country's attitude towards women, coups, criminality, demonstrations and protests, drugs, elections, instability of the country, kidnappings, the level of security in the country, the state of emergency, strikes, terrorism, unrests, violation of human rights, war, and warnings issued by the Foreign Ministry.

2. **Country** — this item included countries characterised as 'Arabic', as well as Australia, Egypt, France, India, Iraq, Iran, Japan, Russia, Spain, Ukraine, USA and Yemen.

3. **Economic and political state of the country** — this category consisted of conditions required to enter the country, the current situation in the country, economic reasons (such as the currency of the country), laws and state system, level of unemployment, low economic development, low quality of accommodation, political situation, poverty, prices, quality of services.

4. **Environmental characteristics** — which included animals, animal cruelty, climate, animal hunting, bad condition of the environment (pollution), natural disasters, squalor, unknown environment, weather.

5. **Health and hygiene** — this category covered concepts such as diseases and epidemics, food, health, hygienic conditions, low quality of healthcare in the country, necessity of vaccinations, threats to life and health.

6. **Personal reasons** — including age, fear, 'I do not know what would deter me', knowledge of the language, 'many things would deter me', 'nothing would deter me', personal reasons, personal attitude.

7. **Religion** — this category pertained to the description of the religious situation in the country.

8. **Social situation in the country** — this item involved culture, discrimination, dissatisfaction of citizens, homelessness, the mentality of people, migrants, negative attitudes of people towards foreigners, unkind or annoying people, racism, social situations, specific ethnicity.

9. **Traveling preferences** — covering bad reviews, distance, historical monuments, little experiences, unattractive country, the reputation of the country, travelling by aeroplane, travelling trends, overly touristy country, transport to the destination (car accidents).

Discussion

The aim of the article was to explore what safety concerns are taken into consideration when choosing a tourist destination. In order to achieve that objective, the respondents were asked to answer the following question: What would deter you from visiting a country? The obtained responses were analysed using open coding based on the grounded theory.³⁷

The open coding of 2,065 answers has resulted in the formation of nine categories, including acute threats, country, economic and political state of the country, environmental characteristics, health and hygiene, personal reasons, religion, social situation in the country, travelling preferences. They represent the **perception**

³⁷ Švaříček R, Šedová K, Qualitative Research in ..., *op.cit.*

of elements that would deter people from visiting a given country. Although the perception of security is a major factor in determining a tourist destination,³⁸ the authors frequently consider security of tourist destinations as one of their characteristics.³⁹

When analysing these categories, it is possible to notice their similarity to the **characteristics of a tourist destination** defined by Framke, Neumayer and Kovári and Zimanyi⁴⁰ — landscape, culture, transport, experience, political stability of the region, as well as safety and security. When the respondents were asked what would deter them from visiting a country, their answers reflected opinions, feelings and beliefs compliant with **intangible characteristics of a tourist destination**.⁴¹

However, it is our belief that the results of the research show that security of the destination is not one of its characteristics but rather an element that **permeates** all characteristics of a tourist destination. This conclusion is based on the fact that we have learned the opinions and beliefs **on the deterrents of travel** and, although the obtained categories reflect the characteristics of a tourist destination, they revolve around safety and security.

Moreover, the study reveals that instead of security, answers of **the respondents focused mainly on threats and dangers**. Therefore, it is possible to state that even though countries constituting tourist destinations are usually discussed in terms of safety and security, the individuals (*i.e.* tourists and travellers) more frequently take into account the risks and threats the country may entail.

Conclusion and implications

It can be concluded that the issue of security of a tourist destination does not constitute its specific characteristic, but rather **all characteristics of a tourist destination should be viewed through the scope of security**. This can also be applied when looking at the 2015 Concept of the foreign policy of the Czech Republic.⁴² Although it does not clearly establish tourist destinations that could be potential threats to the Czech citizens, it outlines the situation in the selected countries. The nine categories, which represent the perceptions of what would deter people from visiting a country, are also an underlying theme to the security

³⁸ Roehl W.S, Fesenmaier D.R, Risk Perceptions and Pleasure Travel: an Exploratory Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1992, Vol. 30. Issue 4. Beirman D, United States: September..., Irvine and Anderson, The Effect of Disaster...

³⁹ Hu Y, Ritchie J.B, Measuring Destination Attractiveness: A Contextual Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1993. Vol. 32, Issue 2, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

⁴⁰ Framke W, The 'Destination': A Problematic Concept. Paper presented at 10th Nordic Tourism Research Conference, Vasa, 2001, [in:] Żemła M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4, Neumayer E, The Impact of ..., Kóvári I, Zimányi K, Safety and Security...

⁴¹ Beirman D, United States: September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. The impact on American and global tourism, [in:] Restoring tourism destinations in crisis: A strategic marketing approach, Oxon: CABI Publishing, 2003, [in:] Amir, *et.al.*

⁴² Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic, 2021. *Electronic source*: https://www.mzv.cz/jnp/cz/zahranicni_vztahy/analyzy_a_koncepcie/koncepcie_zahranicni_politiky_cr.html, accessed: 10.11.2021.

threats presented in the 2015 Security strategy of the Czech Republic⁴³ that include the weakening of the mechanism of security cooperation, instability and regional conflicts, terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber attacks, negative aspects of international migration, extremism, organised crime, threats to the functioning of critical infrastructure, interruption in strategic supplies and energy supply, natural catastrophes and other exceptional events.

Furthermore, individuals travelling to their destinations focus more on the threats and dangers as opposed to security, which the country advertises. That is why security agencies should be aware of this discrepancy and take it into account when approaching potential visitors.

The results provide implications, which security agencies should consider when creating **safety instructional materials** for possible visitors. They suggest what should be the focus of materials since it is the destinations' responsibility to ensure a safe and secure stay of its visitors.⁴⁴ Tourists are vulnerable because they are temporary visitors to communities, which they are not familiar with. Therefore, the scope and aim of the safety instructional materials are crucial for travellers. It must be noted that the research was conducted before the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic. However, as our results show, health and hygiene were important and frequently considered even before the pandemic, as 78 respondents stated that 'diseases and pandemics' is an issue they take into account when selecting a tourist destination.

Furthermore, it would be beneficial to compare the results of the study with those of other research projects carried out around the world. This research was conducted in the Czech Republic, which is a landlocked country located in Central Europe with a population of 10.59 million. Yet the resulting nine categories correspond to items mentioned, for example, by Sonmez and Grafe⁴⁵ who established ten types of risk relating to international travel. Thus, it is possible to assume that the main deterrents to visiting a country (*i.e.* the perception of threats and risks) are quite universal and pertain to individuals from various countries and cultures, as well as having different experiences.

References

1. Amir A.F, Ismail M, See T, Sustainable tourist environment: Perception of international women travelers on safety and security in Kuala Lumpur, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014, Vol. 168.
2. Beirman D, United States: September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. The impact on American and global tourism, [in:] *Restoring tourism destinations in crisis: A strategic marketing approach*, Oxon: CABI Publishing, 2003.

⁴³ Ministry of Defense of the Czech Republic, 2021. *Electronic source*: https://www.mocr.army.cz/images/id_40001_50000/46088/Bezpecnostni_strategie_2015.pdf, accessed: 10.11. 2021.

⁴⁴ Amir A.F, Ismail M, See T, Sustainable tourist environment: Perception of international women travelers on safety and security in Kuala Lumpur, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2014, Vol. 168.

⁴⁵ Sonmez S.F, Graefe A.R, Determining Future Travel Behavior from Past Travel Experience and Perceptions of Risk and Safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1998, Vol. 37, Issue 2; [in:] Dickson and Dolnicar,

3. Bempah S.A, Øyhus A.O, The role of social perception in disaster risk reduction: beliefs, perception, and attitudes regarding flood disasters in communities along the Volta River, Ghana, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 2017, Vol. 23.
4. Buzan B, People, States and Fear: An Agenda for Security Analysis in the Post-Cold War Era. Brighton: Weatsheaf, 1991.
5. Davis J.W, Threats and Promises: The Pursuit of International Influence. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
6. Dickson T, Dolnicar S, No risk, no fun: The role of perceived risk in adventure tourism, CD Proceedings of the 13th International Research Conference of the Council of Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE 2004), 2004. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30389108_No_risk_no_fun_The_role_of_perceived_risk_in_adventure_tourism
7. Echtner C. M, Ritchie J. R. B, The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Images. *Journal of Travel Studies*, 1991, Vol. 2, Issue 2.
8. Ferjenčík J, Introduction to Methodology of Psychological Research: How to Research Human Mind (Úvod do metodologie psychologického výzkumu: Jak zkoumat lidskou duši). Portál, 2010.
9. Framke W, The 'Destination': A Problematic Concept. Paper presented at 10th Nordic Tourism Research Conference, Vasa, 2001.
10. Glaser B, Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory. Mill Valley: Sociology Press, 1978.
11. Goeldner C. R, Ritchie J. R. B, Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies. Hoboken: Willey, 2003.
12. Haddock C, Managing Risks in Outdoor Activities. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Mountain Safety Council, 1993.
13. Hu Y, Ritchie J. B, Measuring Destination Attractiveness: A Contextual Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1993.Vol. 32, Issue 2.
14. Irvine W, Anderson A. R, The Effect of Disaster on Peripheral Tourism Places and the Disaffection of Prospective Visitors, [in:] *Tourism, Security & Safety: From Theory to Practice*, 2006. Oxford:Butterworth-Heinemann.
15. Korstanje M, Re-visiting Risk Perception Theory in the Context of Travel. *e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR)*, 2009, Vol. 7, Issue 4. Retrieved from: <http://list.rtps.tamu.edu/ertr/>, accessed: 4.07.2021.
16. Kővári I, Zimányi K, Safety and Security in the Age of Global Tourism. *APSTRACT: Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, 2011, Vol. 5, Issue 3–4.
17. Krause L, Nye J, Reflections on the Economics and Politics of International Economic Organisations, [in:] *World Politics and International Economics*.Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1975.
18. Lutz D.S,Security / International Security Policy (Sicherheit/Internationale Sicherheitspolitik), [in:] *Small Political Lexicon (Kleines Lexikon der Politik)*. München: C.H.Beck, 2001.
19. Miovský M, Qualitative Approach and Methods in Psychological Research (Kvalitativní přístup a metody v psychologickém výzkumu). Grada, 2006.
20. Michalkó G, Tourism geography and human ecology (Turizmusföldrajz és humánökológia), KJF MTA Földrajztudományi Kutató Intézet, Budapest-Székes fehérvár, 2005.

21. Neumayer E, The Impact of Political Violence on Tourism: Dynamic Cross-National Estimation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2004, Vol. 48, Issue 2.
22. Reja U, Manfreda K.L, Hlebec V, Vehovar V, Open-ended vs. Close-ended Questions in Web Questionnaires. *Developments in Applied Statistics*, 2003, Vol. 19.
23. Reisinger Y, Mavondo F, Travel Anxiety and Intention to Travel Internationally: Implication of Travel Risk Perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 2005, Vol. 43.
24. Roehl W.S, Fesenmaier D.R, Risk Perceptions and Pleasure Travel: an Exploratory Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1992, Vol. 30. Issue 4.
25. Ruggie J.G, What makes the world hang together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist challenge. *International Organization*, 1998, Vol. 52, Issue 4.
26. Seaton A. V, Bennett M. M, Marketing Tourism Products. London: Thomson Business Press, 1997.
27. Sonmez S. F, Graefe A. R, Determining Future Travel Behavior from Past Travel Experience and Perceptions of Risk and Safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1998, Vol. 37, Issue 2.
28. Strauss A, Corbin J, Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc., 1998.
29. Strauss A.L, Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1987.
30. Švaříček R, Šedřová K, Qualitative Research in Pedagogical Sciences (Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách) Portál, 2014.
31. Walt S.M, The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 1991, Vol. 35, Issue 2.
32. Walle A. H, Pursuing Risk or Insight: Marketing Adventures. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1997, Vol. 24, Issue 2.
33. Žemla M, Tourism Destination: The Networking Approach. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, 2016, Vol. 24, Issue 4.

Appendix 1. 84 individual concepts

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | Age |
| 2 | Animals |
| 3 | Arabic countries |
| 4 | Assassinations |
| 5 | Attitude towards women |
| 6 | Australia |
| 7 | Bad healthcare |
| 8 | Bad hygienic conditions |
| 9 | Bad living conditions |
| 10 | Low quality of the environment |
| 11 | Bad reviews |
| 12 | Conditions required to enter the country |
| 13 | Coup |
| 14 | Criminality |
| 15 | Currency |

| | |
|----|--|
| 16 | Demonstrations, protests |
| 17 | Different laws |
| 18 | Dirt, pollution |
| 19 | Discrimination of people |
| 20 | Dissatisfaction of people |
| 21 | Distance |
| 22 | Drugs |
| 23 | Economic underdevelopment, poverty |
| 24 | Economical reasons |
| 25 | Egypt |
| 26 | Elections |
| 27 | Emotions |
| 28 | Food |
| 29 | France |
| 30 | Homeless people |
| 31 | I do not know |
| 32 | Illnesses, epidemics |
| 33 | India |
| 34 | Instability of the country |
| 35 | Iran |
| 36 | Iraq |
| 37 | Japan |
| 38 | Kidnappings |
| 39 | Language |
| 40 | Many things |
| 41 | People's mentality and culture |
| 42 | Monuments |
| 43 | Muslim country and Islam |
| 44 | My own health |
| 45 | Natural disasters |
| 46 | Necessity of vaccination |
| 47 | Negative attitudes of people towards foreigners |
| 48 | Nothing |
| 49 | Annoying and unpleasant people |
| 50 | Personal reasons |
| 51 | Political situation and regime |
| 52 | Prices |
| 53 | Quality of services and low-quality accommodations |
| 54 | Racism |
| 55 | Refugees, migrants, immigrant |
| 56 | Relations, current situation |
| 57 | Religion, religious situation in the country |
| 58 | Reputation of a given country |
| 59 | Russia |
| 60 | Season, a lot of tourists |

| | |
|----|--------------------------------------|
| 61 | Security (insecurity) |
| 62 | Social situation |
| 63 | Spain |
| 64 | Specific ethnicity |
| 65 | State of emergency |
| 66 | Strikes |
| 67 | Syria |
| 68 | Terrorism |
| 69 | Threat to life and healthy |
| 70 | Torture/hunting of animals |
| 71 | Transport |
| 72 | Travelling trends |
| 73 | Ukraine |
| 74 | Unattractivity and a few experiences |
| 75 | Unemployment |
| 76 | Unknown environment |
| 77 | Unrest |
| 78 | USA |
| 79 | Violation of human rights |
| 80 | Violence and conflict |
| 81 | War |
| 82 | Warnings of the Ministry |
| 83 | Weather, climate |
| 84 | Yemen |

About the Authors

Veronika A. Polišenská, PhD, Lecturer of University of Finance and Administration in Prague, Czech Republic. Field of scientific interest: social and general psychology, forensic psychology, safety, security, perception. E-mail: v.polisen@gmail.com

Jan Polišenský, PhD, Lecturer of University of Finance and Administration in Prague, Czech Republic. Field of scientific interest: social and general psychology, forensic psychology, safety, security, perception. E-mail: jan.polisensky@gmail.com

Streszczenie. Celem przeprowadzonego badania było określenie, jakie kwestie związane z bezpieczeństwem są brane pod uwagę podczas dokonywania wyboru kierunku podróży turystycznych. Dane badawcze zostały zebrane w 2019 roku w Republice Czeskiej od respondentów z różnych grup wiekowych, przy użyciu kwestionariuszy internetowych i w tradycyjnej formie papierowej. Łącznie, badanie objęło 2.065 osób. Po przeanalizowaniu udzielonych odpowiedzi, sformułowano 84 indywidualne koncepty, które następnie zostały zebrane w postaci dziewięciu kategorii tematycznych. Są to: wysoki stopień zagrożenia, państwo, sytuacja ekonomiczna i polityczna kraju, charakterystyka środowiska naturalnego, zdrowie i higiena, uwarunkowania osobiste, religia, sytuacja społeczna w kraju oraz preferencje podróżnicze. Wyniki badania pokazują w jaki sposób postrzegane są miejsca docelowe podróży w kontekście bezpieczeństwa oraz jakie kwestie zniechęcają turystów do przyjazdu do danego kraju. Znajomość opinii osób na powyższe tematy jest w kręgu zainteresowania wielu organów bezpieczeństwa, które zajmują się zagrożeniami dla turystów, a także jest istotna dla instytucji odpowiedzialnych za promowanie bezpieczeństwa wśród turystów.

Zusammenfassung. Ziel der Studie war es zu ermitteln, welche Sicherheitsaspekte bei der Wahl eines Reiseziels berücksichtigt werden. Die Forschungsdaten wurden 2019 in der Tschechischen Republik bei Befragten verschiedener Altersgruppen mithilfe von Onlinefragebögen und traditionellen Papierform erhoben. Insgesamt wurden 2065 Personen befragt. Nach der Analyse der Antworten wurden 84 Einzelbegriffe formuliert, die dann zu neun thematischen Kategorien zusammengefasst wurden. Diese sind: hohes Risiko, Land, wirtschaftliche und politische Situation im Land, Umweltmerkmale, Gesundheit und Hygiene, persönliche Umstände, Religion, soziale Situation im Land und Reisepräferenzen. Die Ergebnisse der Umfrage zeigen, wie Reiseziele in Bezug auf die Sicherheit wahrgenommen werden und welche Probleme Touristen davon abhalten, ein bestimmtes Land zu besuchen. Die Meinung der Menschen zu diesen Themen zu kennen, ist für viele Sicherheitsbehörden, die sich mit der Bedrohung von Touristen befassen, von Interesse, und auch für Institutionen, die für die Förderung der Sicherheit von Touristen zuständig sind, ist es wichtig.

Резюме. Цель проведенного исследования — определить, какие вопросы безопасности учитываются при выборе туристами направления поездки. Данные исследования были проведены в 2019 году в Чешской Республике среди респондентов разных возрастных групп с использованием он-лайн и традиционных бумажных опросников. В целом, в опросе приняли участие 2065 человек. После анализа ответов на вопросы формулировалось 84 отдельных понятий, которые затем были объединены в девять тематических категорий. К ним относятся: высокий риск, страна, экономическая и политическая ситуация в стране, экологические характеристики, здоровье и гигиена, личные условия, религия, социальная ситуация в стране и желания путешественника. Результаты опроса показывают, как определяются направления поездки с точки зрения безопасности и какие факторы являются причиной отказа туристов от посещения той или иной страны. Изучение мнения людей в этой области интересует многие органы безопасности, которые занимаются вопросами угроз для туристов, а также является важным для учреждений, отвечающих за обеспечение безопасности среди туристов.