

## PERCEIVED RISK AND ANXIETY AMONG TOURIST VISITING ANDHRA PRADESH

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Kota Neela Mani Kanta, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Uday Sankar Allam, <sup>3</sup>Dr. C Kiranmai, <sup>4</sup>Dr. Pichili Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy and <sup>5</sup>Dr. P Srivalli

<sup>1</sup>Assistant professor, Department of Tourism Management, Vikrama Simhapuri University, Nellore, Andhra Pradesh

<sup>2,3</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Bio Technology, Vikrama Simhapuri University, Nellore

<sup>4</sup>Department of Life Science & Bioinformatics, Assam University Diphu Campus, Diphu-782462, KA, Assam

<sup>5</sup>Post Graduate Teacher, Dept of Humanities, Akshara Vidyalaya, Nellore

<sup>1</sup> kotamani2003@yahoo.co.in and <sup>5</sup>kotasrivalli87@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

*Perceived Risk and Anxiety are significant factors of that influence tourist arrivals to a particular destination. The tourist needs to feel that visit to a particular destination have less risk and high anxiety. Henceforth the present study is sought to understand the perceptions of tourists pertaining to Risk and Anxiety. The study is conducted among tourists visiting popular tourist destinations present in Andhra Pradesh. Andhra Pradesh is chosen because it has faced many ups and downs during its bifurcation, there was huge revenue loss to the residual Andhra Pradesh. It has also affected the functioning of various industries in the state including Tourism sector which was affected more. The study has followed descriptive research design, convenience sampling method in selection of tourist. The enumerator has visited the various popular destinations of Andhra Pradesh and distributed questionnaire to tourist and collected the opinions. The study results finds that majority of the tourist perceive less risk and anxious while visiting the destinations in Andhra Pradesh. The study is helpful in understanding the perception of the tourist visiting various destinations of Andhra Pradesh.*

**Keywords:** *Perceived Risk, Anxiety, Safety, Destination and Andhra Pradesh*

**JEL Classification:** M1

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The travel and tourism industry is seen as highly fragile industry, since its demand is highly dependent on the many factors like natural, human caused disasters, social or political issues, infectious diseases and so on. Tourist choice to travel or not to travel to a particular destination is his personal choice, dependent on the various criteria he will choose. For an instance, travel and tourism demand is most vulnerable to

Terrorism activities, the tourist will be reluctant to visit such destinations due to safety and security issues; this is evident from a study conducted on the countries of Israel, Lebanon and Turkey, statistical analysis reveals that domestic and transnational terrorism in each of the three countries affects visitor arrivals to that country but the results vary across terrorism intensity (Bassil, C., Saleh, A. S., & Anwar, S. 2017). The present scenario is true evidence; the outbreak of corona virus (COVID-19) is making a chaos throughout the world sparing no country. The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) is expecting loosing of 50 Millions tourism jobs due to the deteriorating demand of travel and tourism due to countries undergoing lockdown situations to protect from this deadly virus. In addition it will affect the world GDP, were travel and tourism alone contributes 10% of global GDP. Hence it is evident from the above discussion that tourist need to feel less risky in visiting a destination.

Travel Anxiety is conceptualized in various studies as the feeling felt by the tourist pre travel and during the visit of a tourist destination. The present study is confined to measure the anxiety levels of tourist during their visit of tourist destinations. The tourist should feel less anxious in visiting the destinations, subjective to the attractions, infrastructure and other facilities available at the destinations they visit. The lower the anxiety in visiting the destinations means the tourist has more liking towards the places they visit. Henceforth they give positive word of mouth communication about the destination they visited going back to their relatives and neighbors.

Andhra Pradesh State is focusing on travel and tourism as one of the domains in economic development. Andhra Pradesh too has witnessed natural and human caused disasters like - Hudhud in the year 2014 caused 61 deaths within Andhra Pradesh and an estimated damage of 21908 crore's. The riots and protests during Telangana Udyamam in 2012-2014 stalled the economic development and tourist flow in Andhra Pradesh. Recently in Feb 2016 the terrific activity of firing Ratnachel Express by the mob of Kapu Sangam at Tuni in East Godavri Districts has terrified the tourists and local community. In view of above, this study identifies significance to understand the beliefs regarding travel risk and anxiety of tourists visiting popular places in Andhra Pradesh. Hence the study is sought to understand the perceptions of travel risk and anxiety of tourists.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

The dictionary meaning of Risk is “a situation involving exposure to danger”, consumer researchers believe risk as uncertainty of buying a product or service, unfavorable consequences of purchase (Cunningham, 1967; Dowling & Staelin 1994). Hence it can be understood that Risk is having two components, first “chance” and second “danger”. Risk is a probability of unfavorable consequence faced by a person while purchase of a product or service (Yvette Reisinger & Felix Mavondo, 2006). Risk influences the perceptions of individuals and thereby the decision process of the tourist, when the decisions are uncertain

can create emotions and anxiety (Karl, 2018; Reichel et al., 2007). Purchases that are risky generate anxiety and fear of unknown consequences (Yvette Reisinger & Felix Mavondo, 2006). Risk can be classified into real and perceived risk, where real risk is unfavorable consequences the tourist really may face and perceived risk is a opinion/assumption of unfavorable consequences made by tourist (Rundmo and Nordfjaern 2017). The real risk is assessed by the providers and takes necessary steps to minimize the risk to the tourist. Whereas perceived risk is assessed by the tourist and measured for a particular context (Haddock, 1993).

Risk associated with tourism can be classified into five major risks such as terrorism (Richter, 2003), war and political instability (Sonmez, Apostolopoulos, & Tarlow, 1999), health (Richter, 2003), crime (Dimanche & Lepetic, 1999), and cultural and language difficulties (Basala & Klenosky, 2001). These risks are of growing importance in the global tourism environment and present threats not only to tourists but also host societies and the tourist's home nations (Richter, 2003). In a study conducted by Fennell (2017) developed a comprehensive model that offers insights into travel perceived risk and fear. The models spell a total of six components of related factors involved travel risk and fear such as "characteristics of tourists, fear-inducing factors of a trip, strategies to reduce fear, travel stage, fear intensity, and fear responses".

There are adequate studies conducted on Perceived Risk such as demographical studies (Crouch, 2008; Gibson and Yiannakis 2002), cultural differences, antecedents (Garg, 2013) and consequence studies of travel risk (Tavitiyaman and Qu, 2013, Kozak, Crotts, and Law, 2007; Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty, 2009), personal characteristics of tourist (Lepp & Gibson, 2003, 2008; Adam, 2015; Fuchs & Reichel, 2011; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Reichel et al., 2007; Karl, 2018). These studies have made remarkable contribution to the literature on Travel Risk. The studies focused on demographical factors such as age, gender, educational qualification to understand the variance in perceptions among the groups (Crouch, 2008; Gibson and Yiannakis 2002). Garg, 2013 has studies on the influence of cultural differences on the perception of travel risk. The factors leading to assumption of perceived risk like various types of risk such as health (Han, 2005), safety (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006; Han, 2005; Lepp & Gibson, 2003), crime (Howard, 2009; Khajuria & Khanna, 2014; Lepp & Gibson, 2003), false practices (Adam, 2015; Khajuria & Khanna, 2014; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2012), mass crowd risk (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2012), communication (Han, 2005) and political risks (Sönmez & Graefe, 1998) were determined. The personal characteristics such as tourist role (e.g. Lepp & Gibson, 2003, 2008), previous travel experience (e.g. Adam, 2015; Fuchs & Reichel, 2011; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Reichel et al., 2007), gender (Carr, 2001; Mitchell & Vassos, 1998; Reichel et al., 2007), personality traits (Breivik, 1996; Maritz, Yeh, & Shieh, 2013), educational levels and travel frequency (Karl, 2018) and nationality/culture (Mitchell & Vassos, 1998; Pizam et al., 2004; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006).

Travel Anxiety can be explained as subjective feeling of travelers or tourist, being nervous, apprehensive, stressed, vulnerable, uncomfortable, disturbed, scared (McIntyre & Roggenbuck, 1998) and frustrated (Hullett & Witte, 2001). The anxiety occurs in tourists as consequence of being exposed to risk or uncertainty situations during their travel. Griffith and Albanese (1996) define “anxiety as a stronger than normal feeling of insecurity”. According to Gudykunst and Hammer (1988), anxiety “refers to the fear of negative consequences” (p. 126). The reasons of being anxious could be fear of terrorist attacks, kidnapping, bombing and so on. There are several studies documented the development of stress fear, shock, and depression related to the terrorist attacks of September 11th, 2001 (Galea et al., 2002; Raphael, Natelson, Janal, & Nayak, 2002; Rosenheck, Schuster, Stein, & Jaycox, 2002; Schuster et al., 2001).

Further tourists may hold fear and feel threatened by crime, language difficulties, and limited knowledge of their locality (Barker, Page, & Meyer, 2003). Lynch (1960) suggests that unfamiliarity and difficulties in a new environment may have implications for a sense of security and emotional instability (see also Young, Morris, Cameron, & Haslett, 1997). The most common travel-related anxieties that bring fear include traveling long distances, driving on highways, traveling by train and by metro (Center for Travel Anxiety, 2002), take-off and landing of aircraft, flight delays, and baggage reclaim (McIntosh et al., 1998). Every traveler experiences anxiety to a certain degree when facing risk or uncertainty. Some, however, may feel more anxious than others.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The study is a Quantitative research approach with descriptive research design, describes the phenomena existing in the form of perceptions of tourists. Consequently the study adopts descriptive study design to describe levels of perceptions of the study variables. The descriptive study also involves collecting the opinions of tourists through structured questionnaire surveys. The major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists at present. The study describes the tourist perceptions towards the Risk and Anxiety towards the tourist destinations in Andhra Pradesh. The sampling method followed by the study is non-probabilistic-Convenience sampling method. The researcher has distributed questionnaire to tourists visiting various tourist destinations in Andhra Pradesh by personal administration.

The study considered a Margin of error equal to standard of 5%, Confidence level 95%, Population size of 20,000 and Response distribution of 50%. Finally the calculated value of sample size is 377. The study has considered 400 sample size by rounding to the nearest value of calculated sample size. The sample size is taken higher at the popular destinations like Tirupathi, Vishakhapatnam, Vijayawada and Rajahmundry because the density of tourists and destinations are high comparatively to other tourist destinations.

Perceived Anxiety is determined as the positive opinion of the tourist which exhibits the enthusiasm of the

tourist to visit the destination. Perceived anxiety is influenced by many factors such as the culture, personality and motivation of the tourist. However these factors are personal factors to the tourist. These factors can change from person to person. Hence it is important to consider the factors which influence the Perceived Anxiety that are common for the entire tourist, like Perceived Safety and Risk. Hence the study considers examining the influence and association of Perceived Safety and Risk on Perceived Anxiety. The perceived anxiety of the tourists is measured by adopting the bi polar phrased suitable for measuring tourist experience at the particular destination. The bi polar phrases adopted for the study are Calm – Worried, Relaxed –Tensed, Composed – Stressed, Comfortable – Uneasy and Cheerful – Anxious. These phrases are to be rated on Five scale.

Perceived Risk of tourist is determined as the risk of financial, functional, physical, social, psychological, time, satisfaction and so on in visiting a destination. The identified reasons of the above said risks are diseases, crime, natural disasters, hygiene, transportation, culture/language barriers, uncertainty of destination laws, and regulation prevailing at the destination. The present study is interested to understand the perception of Risk in the opinions of tourist visiting the destinations present in Andhra Pradesh. Hence the presented has framed the following questions for collecting the opinions of the tourist such as 1) I may face mechanical, equipment or organisational problems during travel or at destinations (Transport, attractions, accommodations and etc.). 2. I may be sick while travelling to a destination. 3. There is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel to a location (accidents). 4. I may face problems due to political turmoil in the region being visited. 5. Possibility that travel experience will not reflect my personality or self image (disappointment with travel experience). 6. I may have personal satisfaction after my travel. 7. My travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion. 8. There is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination. 9. There is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel. 10. I may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems during my travel to a destination. The tourist has to rate the above questions on 5 point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The study applies simple descriptive statistic technique such as frequency, graphical and weighted means for describing the opinions of tourists pertaining to travel risk and anxiety.

#### **4. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SAMPLE**

The tourist visiting various destinations in Andhra Pradesh are been consulted for their opinions regarding the Travel Safety, Anxiety, Risk and Intention of Future Travel. The demographical profile of the tourists are discussed in detail is as follows. The statistical analysis of data reveals that the tourists visiting various destinations of Andhra Pradesh reveal that majority of the tourist are in the age group of 25-30 years (N = 249, 51.7%) followed by 31-40 Years (N = 150, 31.1%) and the rest of the tourists are in the age group of

41-50 Years (N= 33, 6.8%), 51-60 years (N = 33, 6.8 %) and 61 and above years (N = 17, 3.5%). Majority of the tourists are men (N = 294, 61.0%) comparative to women (N = 188, 39.0%). In addition the tourists in the annual income group of 2-5 Lacs (N= 279, 57.9%) are majority when compared to rest of the tourist in order 6-10 Lacs (N = 92, 19.1%), 11-15 Lacs (N = 48, 10.0%), 16-20 Lacs (N = 36, 7.5%) and 21 and above Lacs (N = 27, 5.6%),

The study results reveal that the tourists with education qualification of Intermediate (N = 175, 36.3%) followed by degree (N = 120, 24.9%) are majority comparatively to the rest of the tourists with following qualification in order SSC, (N = 26, 5.4%), Post Graduate (N = 62, 12.9%) and others (N = 99, 20.5%). The majority of the tourists visiting various destinations are from South India (N = 199, 41.3%), East India (N = 84, 17.4 %), West India (N = 56, 11.6%), Central (N = 38, 7.7%) and Foreign Nations (N = 29, 6.1%).

### TRAVEL ANXIETY

The following section explains the opinions of the tourist regarding their anxiety in and experience they gained during the visit of the particular destination. The study has considered bipolar question structure ranging from Calm to Worried, Relaxed to Tensed, Composed to stressed, Comfortable to Uneasy and Cheerful to Anxious. The statistical results are been tabulated as follows. Majority of the tourists felt calm (Weighted Mean = 3.67), relaxed (Weighted Mean = 3.28), composed (Weighted Mean = 3.61), comfortable (Weighted Mean = 3.51) and cheerful (Weighted Mean = 3.63) during the visit to the destination. The data is been tabulated and presented as follows.

**Table:** Weighted Means – Travel Anxiety

SL.No	Parameter- Travel Anxiety	Weighted Mean
1	Calm	3.67
2	Relaxed	3.28
3	Composed	3.61
4	Comfortable	3.51
5	Cheerful	3.63

The frequency distribution reveal that 118 (24.5%) of tourists opine they felt calm in visiting the particular destination, 187 (38.8%) tourists opine that they felt somewhat calm in visiting the destination. Contrary to above 87 (18.0%) tourists were undecided on their opinions, 81 (16.8%) felt somewhat worried and 9 (1.9%) felt they are worried. Overall the majority of the respondents opined that they felt calm in visiting the particular destination.

The descriptive statistics of the study reveal that 66 (13.7 %) of tourists opine they felt Relaxed in visiting

the particular destination, 170 (35.3 %) tourists opine that they felt somewhat relaxed in visiting the destination. Contrary to above 104 (21.6 %) tourists were undecided on their opinions, 119 (24.7 %) felt somewhat tensed and 23 (4.8 %) felt they are tensed. Hence it can be understood that majority of the tourist opine that they felt relaxed in visiting the particular destination.

The descriptive statistics of the study reveal that 113 (23.4 %) of tourists opine they felt composed in visiting the particular destination, 182 (37.8 %) tourists opine that they felt somewhat composed in visiting the destination. Contrary to above 88 (18.3 %) tourists were undecided on their opinions, 86 (17.8 %) felt somewhat stressed and 13 (2.7 %) felt they are stressed in visiting the particular destination. Hence it can be understood that majority of the tourist opine that they felt composed in visiting the particular destination.

**Table:** Frequency Distribution – Travel Anxiety

SR. No	Parameters- Travel Anxiety	Scale				
		Calm	Somewhat Calm	Neutral	Somewhat Worried	Worried
1	Calm- Worried	118 (24.5%)	187 (38.8%)	87 (18.0%)	81 (16.8%)	9 (1.9%)
2	Relaxed – Tensed	66 (13.7%)	170 (35.3%)	104 (21.6%)	119 (24.7%)	23 (4.8%)
3	Composed - Stressed	113 (23.4 %)	182 (37.8 %)	88 (18.3 %)	86 (17.8 %)	13 (2.7 %)
4	Comfortable- Uneasy	103 (21.4 %)	183 (38.0 %)	87 (18.0 %)	79 (16.4 %)	13 (2.7 %)
5	Cheerful - Anxious	90 (18.7 %)	226 (46.9 %)	82 (17.0 %)	68 (14.1 %)	16 (3.3 %)

The study data reveal that 103 (21.4 %) of tourists opine they felt comfortable in visiting the particular destination, 183 (38.0 %) tourists opine that they felt somewhat comfortable in visiting the destination. Contrary to above 87 (18.0 %) tourists were undecided on their opinions, 79 (16.4 %) felt somewhat uneasy and 13 (2.7 %) felt they are uneasy in visiting the particular destination. Hence it can be understood that majority of the tourist opine that they felt comfortable in visiting the particular destination.

The descriptive statistics of the study reveal that 90 (18.7 %) of tourists opine they felt Cheerful in visiting the particular destination, 226 (46.9 %) tourists opine that they felt somewhat cheerful in visiting the

destination. Contrary to above 82 (17.0 %) tourists were undecided on their opinions, 68 (14.1 %) felt somewhat anxious and 16 (3.3 %) felt they are anxious in visiting the particular destination. Hence it can be understood that majority of the tourist opine that they felt comfortable in visiting the particular destination.

### TRAVEL RISK

The study has collected the opinions of tourists regarding the perceived risk they encountered while travelling to various tourist destination in Andhra Pradesh. To collect the opinions the study has framed ten questions, the frequency distribution of individual questions are discussed as follows.

120(24.7%) and 215 (44.6%) of tourists disagreed that they may face any mechanical, equipment or organizational problems during travel or at destinations. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 70 (14.5%) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment on the mechanical, equipment and organizational problems during travel. 66 (13.7%) and 11 (2.3%) of tourists agreed that they may face mechanical, equipment or organizational problems during travel or at destinations. Hence it can be concluded that majority of the tourists disagree that they may face mechanical, equipment or organizational problems during travel or at destinations.

101 (21.0%) and 224 (46.5 %) of tourists disagreed that they may be sick while travelling to a destination. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 108 (22.4 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that they may be sick while travelling to a destination. 44 (9.1 %) and 5 (1.0 %) of tourists agreed that they may be sick while travelling to a destination. Hence it can be interpreted that majority of the tourists disagree that they may be sick while travelling to a destination.

SL. No	Travel Risk- Parameter	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I may face mechanical, equipment or organizational problems during travel or at destinations	11 (2.3%)	66 (13.7%)	70 (14.5%)	215 (44.6%)	120 (24.7%)
2	I may be sick while travelling to a destination	5 (1.0 %)	44 (9.1 %)	108 (22.4 %)	224 (46.5 %)	101 (21.0%)
3	There is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel to a location	2 (0.4 %)	26 (5.4%)	75 (15.6 %)	253 (52.5 %)	126 (26.1%)
4	I may face problems due to political turmoil in the region	9 (1.9%)	60 (12.4%)	75 (15.6 %)	229 (47.5)	109 (22.6 %)



	being visited					
5	Possibility that travel experience will not reflect my personality or self image	15 (3.1 %)	75 (15.6 %)	110 (22.8 %)	160 (33.2 %)	122 (25.3 %)
6	I may have personal satisfaction after my travel	120 (24.9 %)	223 (46.3 %)	77 (16.0 %)	49 (10.2 %)	13 (2.7 %)
7	My travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion.	104 (21.6 %)	240 (49.8 %)	89 (18.5 %)	43 (8.9 %)	6 (1.2 %)
8	There is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination	12 (2.5 %)	37 (7.7 %)	107 (22.2 %)	221 (45.9 %)	105 (21.8 %)
9	There is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel.	14 (2.9 %)	71 (14.7 %)	165 (34.2 %)	158 (32.8 %)	74 (15.4 %)
10	I may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems during my travel to a destination.	12 (2.5 %)	33 (6.8 %)	139 (28.8 %)	201 (41.7 %)	97 (20.1 %)

126 (26.1 %) and 253 (52.5 %) of tourists disagreed that there is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 75 (15.6 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that they there is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel. 26 (5.4 %) and 2 (0.4 %) of tourists agreed that there is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel. Hence it can be interpreted that majority of the tourists disagree that there is possibility of facing physical danger or injury during my travel.

109 (22.6 %) and 229 (47.5 %) of tourists disagreed that they may face problems due to political turmoil in the region being visited. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 75 (15.6 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that they face problems due to political turmoil in the region being visited. 60 (12.4 %) and 9 (1.9 %) of tourists agreed that they may face problems due to political turmoil in the region being visited. Hence it can be interpreted that majority of the tourists disagree that they may face problems due to political turmoil in the region being visited.

122 (25.3 %) and 160 (33.2 %) of tourists disagreed the possibility that travel experience will not reflect my

personality or self image. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 110 (22.8 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment the possibility that travel experience will not reflect my personality or self image. 75 (15.6 %) and 15 (3.1 %) of tourists agreed that there is possibility that travel experience will not reflect my personality or self image. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists disagree the possibility that travel experience will not reflect my personality or self image.

120 (24.9 %) and 223 (46.3 %) of tourists agreed that they may have personal satisfaction after their travel. In contrary to the above opinions of tourists, 77 (16.0 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that they may have personal satisfaction after their travel. 49 (10.2 %) and 13 (2.7 %) of tourists disagreed that they may have personal satisfaction after their travel. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists agree that they may have personal satisfaction after their travel.

104 (21.6 %) and 240 (49.8 %) of tourists agreed that there travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion. 89 (18.5 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that there travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion. 43 (8.9 %) and 6 (1.2 %) of tourists disagreed that there travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion.. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists agree that there travel choice/experience may affect by others (family/friends) opinion.

105 (21.8 %) and 221 (45.9 %) of tourists disagreed that there is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination. 107 (22.2 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that there is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination. 37 (7.7 %) and 12 (2.5 %) of tourists agreed that there is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination.. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists disagree that there is a possibility of involved in terrorist act during my travel to a destination.

74 (15.4 %) and 158 (32.8 %) of tourists disagreed that there is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel. 165 (34.2 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that there is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel. 71 (14.7 %) and 14 (2.9 %) of tourists agreed that there is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel.. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists disagree that there is a possibility of taking too much time or be a waste of time in visiting a destination or travel.

97 (20.1 %) and 201 (41.7 %) of tourists disagreed that they may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems during my travel to a destination. 139 (28.8 %) of tourists opine that they neither agree nor disagree to comment that they may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems

during my travel to a destination. 33 (6.8 %) and 12 (2.5 %) of tourists agreed that that they may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems during my travel to a destination.. Therefore it can be concluded that majority of the tourists disagree that they may face culture (Food habits, dressing)/language problems during my travel to a destination.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

The study is sought to understand the perceptions of tourists pertaining to Travel Risk and Anxiety visiting various popular destinations in Andhra Pradesh. The significance of understanding the tourist perceptions is to design policy changes by the tourism stake holders for increasing the intentions to travel and visit various destinations. It is observed from the literature and various instances that Travel Risk and Anxiety are significant factors in influencing the tourist traffic to particular destinations. The decision to travel to a destination is weigh on several factors, Travel Risk is a factor which signals the tourist to think about safety and security during the visit of destination. Hence the travel risk should perceive less to attract the tourist to visit a destination. In addition the tourist need to feel calm, comfort and composed while visiting a tourist destination, travel anxiety need to be favorable for a destination to visit repeatedly.

The present study is understands the perceptions of risk and anxiety of tourists visiting popular destination in Andhra Pradesh. The study followed descriptive research design in order to describe the perception levels of tourists. The study follows non probabilistic and convenience sampling method in selection of tourists for the study. The researcher has visited several popular tourist destinations for administering the questionnaire. The data collected is analyzed by employing descriptive statistical techniques.

The study findings reveal that the tourists have overall opinion of less risk in visiting various destinations in Andhra Pradesh. In addition the tourists feel calm, comfortable and composed while visiting tourist destinations. This is a positive sign for the tourism traffic in Andhra Pradesh. Even though there are several instances happened in Andhra Pradesh that dampening the tourist traffic, the tourist opine less risk and anxious in visiting the destinations can be attributed to the factor of time of the study. Since the study is conducted during the normal time the tourist might have opined positively. The study findings could change if it was conducted during the agitations, riots or any other instances that dampens the tourism traffic. However the study of understanding the perceptions of tourist on regular basis could give many insights to the policy makers for enhancing the tourist traffic.

## **6. REFERENCES**

1. Adam, I. (2015). Backpackers' risk perceptions and risk reduction strategies in Ghana. *Tourism Management*, 49, 99–108.

2. Barker, M., Page, S. J., & Meyer, D. (2003). Urban visitor perceptions of safety during a special event. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 355-361.
3. Basala, S. L., & Klenosky, D. B. (2001). Travel-style preferences for visiting a novel destination: A conjoint investigation across the novelty-familiarity continuum. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(2), 172-182.
4. Bassil, C., Saleh, A. S., & Anwar, S. (2017). Terrorism and tourism demand: a case study of Lebanon, Turkey and Israel. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–21.
5. Breivik, G. (1996). Personality, sensation seeking and risk taking among Everest climbers. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 27(3), 308–320.
6. Carr, N. (2001). An exploratory study of gendered differences in young tourists perception of danger within London. *Tourism Management*, 22(5), 565–570.
7. Correia, A., Pimpão, A., & Crouch, G. (2008). Perceived risk and novelty-seeking behavior: The case of tourists on low-cost travel in Algarve (Portugal). In Arch G. Woodside (Ed.), *Advances in culture, tourism and hospitality research* (pp. 1–26). Bingley: Emerald Group.
8. Cunningham, S. (1967). The major dimensions of perceived risk. In D. F. Cox (Ed.), *Risk taking and information handling in consumer behavior* (pp. 82-108). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Dowling, G. R., & Staelin, R. (1994). A model of perceived risk and intended risk-handling activity. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(1), 119-135.
10. Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2006). Tourist destination risk perception: The case of Israel. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 14 (2), 83–108.
11. Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2011). An exploratory inquiry into destination risk perceptions and risk reduction strategies of first time vs. repeat visitors to a highly volatile destination. *Tourism Management*, 32, 266–276.
12. Galea, S., Ahern, J., Resnick, H., Kilpatrick, D., Bucuvalas, M., Gold, J. et al. (2002). Psychological sequelae of the September 11 terrorist attacks in New York City. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 346(13), 982-987.
13. Garg, A. (2013). A study of tourist perception towards travel risk factors in tourist decision making. *Asian Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(1), 47–57.
14. Gibson, H., & Yiannakis, A. (2002). Tourist roles: Needs and the life course. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 358–383.

15. Griffith, D., & Albanese, P. (1996). An examination of Plog's psychographics travel model within a student population. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 47-51.
16. Gudykunst, W., & Hammer, M. (1988). Strangers and hosts: An uncertainty reduction base theory of intercultural adaptation. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-cultural adaptation: Current approaches* (pp. 106-139). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
17. Haddock, C. (1993). *Managing risks in outdoor activities*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Mountain Safety Council.
18. Han, J. Y. (2005). *The relationships of perceived risk to personal factors, knowledge of destination, and travel purchase decisions in international leisure travel* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg.
19. Howard, R. (2009). Risky business? Asking tourists what hazards they actually encountered in Thailand. *Tourism Management*, 30(3), 359–365.
20. Hullett, C. R., & Witte, K. (2001). Predicting intercultural adaptation and isolation: Using the extended parallel process model to test anxiety/uncertainty management theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25(2), 125-139.
21. Karl, M. (2018). Risk and uncertainty in travel decision-making: Tourist and destination perspective. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(1), 129–146.
22. Khajuria, S., & Khanna, S. (2014). Tourism risks and crimes at pilgrimage destinations – a case study of Shri Mata Vishnu Devi. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 8(1), 77–93.
23. Kozak, M., Crotts, J. C., & Law, R. (2007). The impact of the perception of risk on international travellers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(4), 233–242.
24. Lepp, A., & Gibson, H. (2003). Tourist roles, perceived risk and international tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 606–624.
25. Lynch, K. (1960). *The image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press.
26. Maritz, A., Yeh, S., & Shieh, C. (2013). Effects of personality trait on perceived risk and travel intention in tourism industry. *Actual Problems of Economics*, 2(3), 103–109.
27. McIntosh, I., Swanson, V., Power, K., Raeside, F., & Dempster, C. (1998). Anxiety and health problems related to air travel. *Journal of Travel Medicine*, 5(4), 198-204.
28. McIntyre, N., & Roggenbuck, J. W. (1998). Nature/person transactions during an outdoor adventure experience: A multi-phasic analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(4) 401-422.

29. Mitchell, V. W., & Vassos, V. (1998). Perceived risk and risk reduction in holiday purchases: A cross-cultural and gender analysis. *Journal of Euromarketing*, 6(3), 47–79.
30. Pizam, A., Jeong, G. H., Reichel, A., van Boemmel, H., Lusson, J. M., Steynberg, L.,...Montmany, N. (2004). The relationship between risk-taking, sensation-seeking, and the tourist behavior of young adults: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3), 251–260.
31. Raphael, K. G., Natelson, B.H., Janal, M. N., & Nayak, S. (2002). A community-based survey of fibromyalgia like pain complaints following the World Trade Center terrorist attacks. *Pain*, 100(1/2), 131-139.
32. Reichel, A., Fuchs, G., & Uriely, N. (2007). Perceived risk and the non-institutionalized tourist role: The case of Israeli student ex-backpackers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 217–226.
33. Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2006). Cultural differences in travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 20(1), 13–31.
34. Richter, L. K. (2003). International tourism and its global public health consequences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 340-347.
35. Rittichainuwat, B. N., & Chakraborty, G. (2009). Perceived travel risks regarding terrorism and disease: The case of Thailand. *Tourism Management*, 30(3), 410–418.
36. Rittichainuwat, B. N., & Chakraborty, G. (2012). Perceptions of importance and what safety is enough. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 42–50.
37. Rosenheck, R., Schuster, M., Stein, B., & Jaycox, L. (2002). Reactions to the events of September 11. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 346(8), 629-630.
38. Rundmo, T., & Nordfjærn, T. (2017). Does risk perception really exist? *Safety Science*, 93, 230–240.
39. Schuster, M. A., Stein, B. D., Jaycox, L. H., Collins, R. L., Marshall, G., Elliott, M. et al. (2001). A national survey of stress reactions after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 345(20), 1507-1512.
40. Sonmez, S., Apostolopoulos, Y., & Tarlow, P. (1999). Tourism in crisis: Managing the effects of terrorism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(1), 13-18.
41. Tavitiyaman, P., & Qu, H. (2013). Destination image and behavior intention of travelers to Thailand: The moderating effect of perceived risk. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 30(3), 169–185.
42. Young, W., Morris, A., Cameron, N., & Haslett, S. (1997). *New Zealand national survey of crime victims 1996*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victimization Survey Committee.

43. Yvette Reisinger & Felix Mavondo (2006) Cultural Differences in Travel Risk Perception, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 20:1, 13-31, DOI: 10.1300/J073v20n01\_02.