3-12-2019

A Study of Safari Tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Empirical Test of Tourism A-B-C (T-ABC) Model

Lalita A. Manrai

Dana-Nicoleta Lascu
University of Richmond, dlascu@richmond.edu

Ajay K. Manrai

Recommended Citation

Manrai, Lalita A., Dana-Nicoleta Lascu, and Ajay K. Manrai. "A Study of Safari Tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Empirical Test of Tourism A-B-C (T-ABC) Model." *Journal of Business Research* (Available onlne, March 12, 2019). doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.02.066.

A Comparative Study of Safari Tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Empirical Test of Tourism A-B-C (T-ABC) Model

Lalita A. Manrai, Dana-Nicoleta Lascu, and Ajay K. Manrai

Final copy published in the *Journal of Business Research*, forthcoming, in press

ABSTRACT

The competition among several sub-Saharan African countries is intense for attracting foreign tourists for safari tourism. Besides the inter-country competition, there is also intra-country competition among numerous game lodges and resorts within each country. In this context, it is important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each country for safari tourism. In this article, we provide an empirical test of the relationship between tourism performance and multiple tourism dimensions, namely tourism Attractions (A), Basics (B), and Context (C), considered by tourists. We empirically test the Tourism A-B-C model (Manrai & Manrai, 1993; Manrai et al. 2018) using secondary data from eight sub-Saharan African countries, namely, Botswana, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The findings of the empirical study suggest that tourism dimensions correlate highly with economic development, with the exception of situations where the government takes on a leadership role to develop the tourism infrastructure, as in the case of Kenya, or where it makes a strong push for education, as in Zimbabwe. We also discuss research implications and directions for future research.

Keywords: Sub-Saharan Africa, Safari Tourism, Tourism Performance, Regional Economic Development, Sustainable Tourism, Tourism A-B-C model

A Comparative Study of Safari Tourism in Sub-Saharan Africa:
An Empirical Test of Tourism A-B-C (T-ABC) Model

INTRODUCTION

Tourists from all over the world are attracted to Africa for the safari tourism opportunities that the continent offers. The sub-Saharan Africa region is particularly known for Safari tourism. There are 48 countries in the region, including Angola, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Republic of Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (World Bank, 2018a).

Further, a number of these countries offer unique game animals and safari experiences to tourists, and eight of them in particular stand out: Botswana, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The eight countries stand out both in terms of their occurrence in searches for "safari" and "Africa," accounting for the preponderance of the results, and in keyword searches (Keyword Search, 2017). To illustrate, Kenya, using "Kenya safari" as a search combination, has 390 occurrences, followed by Tanzania, at 384, South Africa, at 321, Botswana, at 257, Namibia, at 240, Uganda, at 160, Zambia, at 146, and Zimbabwe, at 126. They are followed at a distant 72 occurrences for Mozambique, Mauritius, at 67, Madagascar, at 57, Rwanda, at 52, Congo, at 51 occurrences, and so on (Keyword Search, 2017).

Of the selected eight countries, Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa are upper-middle-income countries, Kenya and Zambia are lower-middle-income countries, and the remaining

three, namely Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe, are low-income countries (World Bank, 2017.) Income levels and level of economic development alone provide some insights into the tourism infrastructure they can expect in a country. However, tourists also consider other factors in their destination decisions, such as the variety of game animals and safari experiences possible within the same trip. For example, a tourist visiting one of the eight African countries may also want to visit another country within close geographical proximity as long as there are no natural barriers (such as mountains, rivers etc.) that may make travel between the two countries difficult, or political barriers (such as stringent visa requirements, war, etc.), which may make entry to another country difficult or risky.

For safari tourism, the geographical proximity of countries plays a critical role in a tourist's decision to visit multiple countries in a single trip to Africa. Using the two criteria of unique safari attractions and geographical proximity of countries, Manrai, Manrai, & Lascu (2017) developed three clusters of the above eight countries. These three clusters are outlined in Figure 1, and the economic indicators, as well as safari attractions, are outlined in Table 1. Cluster 1 includes Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa. Cluster 2 includes Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, and Cluster 3 includes Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Countries in Cluster 1 are more developed, classified by the World Bank (2018a and 2018b) as upper-middle-income countries, based on GDP (PPP) per capita and GNI (PPP) per capita. The three countries in Cluster 1 share borders and are in close geographical proximity. Although the countries within Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 are also in close proximity, the two clusters are geographically separated by Lake Malawi and several other countries, such as the Republic of Burundi, Congo, Malawi, and Rwanda. The three countries in Cluster 2, namely, Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania, share borders with each other, and all three countries are located

around Lake Victoria. Both Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 consist of low-middle-income and low-income countries, with a relatively low GDP (PPP) per capita and GNI (PPP) per capita. It may also be noted that, although Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 countries are in geographic proximity, they are very different in terms of economic development.

The competition among countries is intense for attracting foreign tourists for safari tourism. Further, numerous game lodges and resorts within each country compete with each other as well. Under this scenario, it is important to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each country for safari tourism. Although it is true that tourists come looking for unique game animals and unique safari experiences, they also need a developed and reliable tourism infrastructure, such as accommodation, transportation etc. Likewise, the environment of the country needs to be safe and tourist-friendly. These three factors, namely, attractions, basics or necessities, and context or environment were identified by Manrai and Manrai (1993), and later introduced as Tourism ABC (or T-ABC) model in Manrai et al. 2018. In T-ABC model, A stands for "attractions" (game animals and safaris), B stands for "basics" (accommodation, transportation etc.) and C stands for "context" (crime, safety of country environment, etc.)

In this research study, we apply the T-ABC model to the study of safari tourism in the eight selected countries in sub-Saharan Africa. The goal of the paper is two folds. The first goal is to compare the eight countries on several relevant variables covering the attractions, basics, and context. The second goal is to empirically test the T-ABC model and determine the relative importance of these three dimensions in predicting tourism influx into the country. This required performing a principal components analysis using the data on the eight countries as a first step, to determine the underlying multidimensional structure in the data, computing dimensional scores for each country on the emergent multiple dimensions, and, finally, using the dimensional

scores as independent variables to run a regression analysis on tourist arrivals data, as dependent variable, to impute the relative importance of the dimensions in predicting tourists' arrivals.

This research paper is divided into eight sections. The next section is the literature review. In this section, qualitative information is reviewed, such as information on the safari parks, on A (attractions), B (basics), and C (context) of each of the eight countries. In section 3, comparative numerical data for the eight countries is tabulated and discussed, and conclusions are drawn about the strengths and weaknesses of the eight countries based on comparisons of a variety of statistics. The number of tourists' arrivals in each country is also compared. Section 4 advances hypotheses regarding the relationship between tourism attractions, basics, and context on one hand, and tourism performance. In section 5, a principal components analysis is conducted to identify underlying multidimensional structure in the data. Section 6 compares the dimensional structure found in section 4 with the Tourism-ABC model. The relative importance of each dimension in predicting tourism performance is then determined by running regression on the number of international tourist arrivals and total international tourist receipts for the eight countries, with the dimensional scores as independent variables. We also empirically test the proposed hypotheses in Section 6. Section 7 offers a discussion of the findings and implications of the research for the regional economic development of sub-Saharan Africa. Section 8 addresses study limitations and offers directions for future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Tourism ABC Model

In the process of assessing the A (attractions), B (basics), and C (context) of safari tourism in each of the eight countries, a review of the literature contributes important insights. In

this section, we review the literature on safari tourism attractions in the eight countries, such as parks, including national parks, and game reserves, activities offered, and accommodation. We also review information regarding tourism basics, related to accessibility and affordability, and tourism context, in terms of health and safety, and environmental sustainability, among others (Manrai et al., 2018). This section also offers insights into tourism performance, in terms of the total contribution of tourism to GDP and employment in each of the countries in the study, and in terms of international tourist arrivals and international tourism receipts, deemed as key measures for assessing tourism performance (Assaker et al., 2014).

Tourism Attractions

Tourism attractions include all that may draw a tourist to a destination; interest is sparked in a destination when there are unique attractions (Manrai et al., 2018), such as safari opportunities, in the case of this study. Once a competitive advantage is established, then destination management and sustainability become important factors in maintaining competitiveness (Manrai et al., 2018).

Game reserves and parks are the main tourism attractions in sub-Saharan Africa. They offer ecotourism experiences, involving "travelling to relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated areas with the specific objective of studying, admiring and enjoying the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestations (both past and present) found in these areas" (Orams, 1995, p. 4; Hultman, Kazeminia, & Ghasemi, 2015). Ecotourism is growing at a rate three times faster than general tourism (Han, Hsu, & Sheu, 2010), constituting more than 7% of the global tourism demand, accounting for approximately $100 billion annually (Center for Responsible Travel, 2011; Hultman, Kazeminia, & Ghasemi, 2015).

With the growing recognition of environmentalist movements, finite resources, and high environmental costs, tourism offerings can gain a competitive advantage by demonstrating environmental concerns and contributing to conservation causes (Kotler, 2011; Kazeminia, Hultman & Mostaghel, 2016). Tourism attractions in sub-Saharan Africa emphasize the preservation of unique animal life, specific to the region.

Each of the countries in the present study underscore conservation and the uniqueness of its offerings (see Appendix). For example, Botswana's Central Kalahari draws tourists as the home of the San Bushmen for 30,000 years, and with distinctive offerings, such as herds of springbok and gemsbok (Siyabona Africa, 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018; Mwakikagile, 2010). Namibia boasts the largest park, Namib-Naukluft, with its orange sand dunes and oryx herds, and the Hartmann's mountain zebra (Namib Naukluft National Park, 2018). South Africa's Kruger National Park features, in addition to the Big 5 – lion, leopard, elephant, buffalo and rhino, – antelope, cheetah, carnivorous dog, hyena, mongoose, and zebra, among others (Siyabona Africa 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018). Kenya's Masai Mara National Reserve, contiguous with Tanzania's Mara (Serengeti) Game Reserve, offers the Big 5, as well as buffalo, zebra, wildebeest, hyena, waterbuck and impala (Siyabona Africa, 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018). And Uganda's Murchison Falls National Park features, in addition to the Big 5, oribi, Jackson's hartebeest, and crocodiles, near the Victoria Falls (Murchinson Falls National Park 2018).

Tourism Basics, Context, and Performance

Tourists seeking new experiences do not want to relinquish familiar comforts and, especially, the security of their home environment (Ayikoru, 2015; Manrai et al., 2018). Tourism basics support the initial attraction of destinations: while tourism attractions establish a motivation for travel, tourism basics support that motivation (Manrai et al., 2018). Tourism

basics include accessibility and affordability, including the ability to reach the destination, and the infrastructure that must be in place to welcome tourists, including security, and luxuries such as the Internet and personal banking access (Manrai et al., 2018). Tourism context is comprised of factors that could create a favorable impression, making it more likely that tourists would travel to a destination. Alternatively, there are factors that make tourists wary of travelling to destinations, such as health risks, pollution, quality of life, medical care, or literacy (Manrai et al., 2018). Strong, enforced regulations promoting a high quality of life and a sustainable tourism industry that ensures quality services for tourists are particularly important (Manrai et al. 2018).

Importantly, tourism performance is a critical dimension of the T-ABC model. Tourism performance of destinations is assessed by determining the number of tourists and tourist expenditures (Manrai et al., 2018). International tourist arrivals and international tourism receipts are deemed key measures used to assess tourism performance (Assaker et al., 2014), but other dimensions, such as travel and tourism industry's total contribution to GDP and to employment, capture important information as well (Manrai et al., 2018). Next, follows a discussion of tourism basics, context, and performance in the eight countries selected for this study.

It is expected that tourism will contribute to sub-Saharan African countries' aspirations to progress into the high-income country category (Okelo & Novelli, 2014, p. 63). However, countries in this region are facing major challenges, ranging from "national image, narrow tourism products, poor marketing, limited investments, insufficient infrastructure, political and economic mismanagement, costs of tourism and conservation for local communities, and vested interests of critical actors" (c.f. Okelo & Novelli, 2014, p. 63). Among broader challenges they face are a lack of financial capital (Henrique & Herr, 2008), substandard managerial skills (Abor & Quartey, 2010), deficiencies in technology (Fafchamps,1994), insufficient support services

(Mead & Liedholm, 1998), ineffective property rights or license protection (Fowler, 2004), a lack of access to credit (Fafchamps, 1997), inadequate learning and knowledge development (Viswanathan, Sridharan, Gau, & Ritchie, 2009; Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., & Ritchie, R. (2010), and an inadequate infrastructure (DeBerry-Spence, 2010, 2012).

The safari is the primary tourism product for East Africa and Southern Africa (Christie et al., 2014), the region where all countries under investigation in this study are located. The large diversity of destinations and the high value associated with Big 5 game viewing give East and Southern Africa a competitive advantage over other areas of sub-Saharan Africa and the rest of the world in the delivery of safari products (Christie et al., 2014). It is important to note, however, that the infrastructure in the region places great limitations on tourism and increases overall costs – the highest cost for a safari package is inland transport for a weekend excursion (Christie et al., 2014). Airfare to sub-Saharan Africa is also more expensive, as are accommodations. For this reason, safari tours to sub-Saharan Africa are 38 percent more expensive than safaris to other destinations, such as Borneo, Galapagos, or India; to illustrate, a 10-day tiger-watching trip to India with British company Cox and Kings cost $3,703 in 2010, while a similar trip to Namibia cost $5,039 (Twining-Ward, 2010; Christie et al., 2014).

In the next section, comparative numerical data for the eight countries is presented, with a focus on tourism basics, context, and performance.

ASSESSING TOURISM ATTRACTIONS, BASICS, CONTEXT, AND PERFORMANCE

In this section, tourism attractions, tourism basics, tourism context, and tourism performance data is presented, and comparisons are provided in light of the country clusters introduced earlier in this article.

Tourism Attractions

For tourism attractions (see Table 2), the data demonstrates that there is a relationship between economic development, the surface area of the country, the geology, the political stability, and the number of parks and game reserves. South Africa, a high-middle-income country with a large surface area, and with an abundance and diversity of resources and animal life – including the Big 5, namely, lion, leopard, elephant, buffalo and rhino, – has the highest number of game reserves and parks (43), followed by Kenya (26), a lower-middle-income country which has devoted substantial attention and effort to leveraging its resources, especially the abundance and diversity of animal life, to create memorable tourist experiences. For example, Kenya's Masai Mara National Park is only one tenth of the size of Tanzania's Serengeti, and yet the Masai Mara attracts ten times more visitors than Serengeti (Okelo & Novelli 2014).

Next are Botswana, with 14, and Namibia, with 13 parks and game reserves. In terms of economic development, Botswana and Namibia are in the same cluster as South Africa, their key trade partner, as high middle-income countries, and both enjoy exceptional biodiversity – and, although the Namib coastal desert covers a large surface area, that itself is also an attraction. Low-middle-income Zambia has 14 parks, and low-income Tanzania has 13 parks and game reserves. Tanzania has a large surface area – larger than Kenya's – and possesses important biodiversity and resources, but a limited capacity to leverage them. Uganda, with 10 parks and game reserves, and Zimbabwe, with 8 parks, are both low-income countries, and share a recent history of political instability and upheaval that has greatly impeded their development. As these countries continue to progress, they will be able to more fruitfully showcase their plentiful attractions and biodiversity.

The number of game reserves alone is informative: game reserves, protected land areas inhabited by wild animals, are used primarily for conservation, and traffic is limited, compared to parks and national parks, which are not restricted, and where tourists might even experience traffic jams. Game reserves are less profitable, and it takes leadership and dedication on the part of the government to ensure the preserves' protected status. They also require the government's ability to shoulder the costs of maintaining such reserves, as well as the ability to fight off private-sector lobbying for broader tourist access to the reserves.

South Africa has the most game reserves of all comparison countries, 33, almost three times as many as Kenya, the country with the next highest number, 13, followed by Botswana, at 11, and Namibia, at 5. Tanzania only has 2 game reserves, Uganda 3, Zambia 1, and Zimbabwe 0. Thus, Cluster 1 countries, South Africa, Botswana and Namibia, have made conservation a priority and, as upper-middle-income countries, they are in a position where they can afford it. In Kenya, a lower-middle-income country in Cluster 2, the government has made conservation and tourism national priorities already since the post-colonial 1960s and 1970s, when they developed the tourism infrastructure and the marketing strategies aimed at shaping how Western consumers thought about Kenya; these factors then influenced the themes that Kenya promoted to the global tourism market (Smart, 2018). Conservation is one of those themes, which explains the larger number of game reserves in Kenya, when compared to other countries in Cluster 2.

The eight countries do not differ greatly with regard to sustainability of travel and tourism industry development, with rates ranging between 4 and 5.5 out of 7. Kenya has the highest score, 5.5; this is reflective of a government policy dedicated to developing a sustainable tourism industry. Following are Namibia, at 5.2, Botswana at 5.1, and Tanzania, at 5.0. All countries examined must not just build the tourism industry, but also ensure its sustainability.

With regard to forest area coverage, Zimbabwe and Kenya have the highest percentage, at almost 13 percent, followed by Tanzania, at almost 11 percent, and Botswana, at 9.5 percent. Remaining countries have under 6 percent coverage.

Tourism Basics

The tourism basics dimension assessed in the study includes the number of operating airlines, the quality of air transport, airport infrastructure, ground and port infrastructure, quality of roads, major car rental companies, tourist service infrastructure, quality of tourism infrastructure, price competitiveness, number of ATMs, information and communication technology (ICT) readiness, internet users, and quality of electricity supply (see Table 3).

For tourism basics, there is a clear correlation between the country scores and the level of development, with South Africa scoring highest on most measures. South Africa has the highest number of operating airlines, 55, followed by Tanzania, 35, Kenya, 32, and Uganda, 20. Botswana has the lowest number, with just 6 airlines. South Africa also has the highest quality of air transport, with a score of 6 out of 7, followed by Kenya and Namibia, at 4.8 and 4.6, respectively, Botswana with a score of 4, and the remaining countries with scores in the 3s. Similarly, South Africa scores highest in terms of airport infrastructure, at 3.41 out of 7, followed by Namibia, at 2.96, Kenya, at 2.53, Botswana and Tanzania at 2.23 and 2.03, respectively, with remaining countries scoring just under 2. South Africa also scores highest on ground and port infrastructure, at 3.4, followed by Kenya, at 3.13, Botswana, at 2.84, and the remaining countries scoring between 2.28 and 2.41. Namibia and South Africa score highest on quality of roads, at 5.2 and 5.0 out of 7, respectively, followed by Kenya at 4.2, and Botswana, at 4.1, with Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe scoring between 3.2 and 3.5. South Africa

has 6 major car rental companies, Namibia 5, Botswana, Kenya, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe have 4, whereas Uganda and Zambia have 2.

The data on infrastructure suggests that the countries in Cluster 1 score higher on most dimensions, with the exception of Kenya, in Cluster 2, which ranks highly on road, port, and airport infrastructure quality, suggesting that development of the infrastructure is a function of economic development, and, in the case of Kenya, clear government priority assigned to tourism development (Smart, 2018; Okelo & Novelli, 2014). With regard to the number of airlines serving the countries, South Africa leads again, but Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda are important players, as each country encourages competition between small local airlines.

On price competitiveness, Botswana scores highest, at 5.7, followed by Namibia and Tanzania, at 5.4, with South Africa at 5.2, Zimbabwe at 5.1, Uganda at 5, with Kenya and Zambia at 4.8, with the eight countries rating similarly.

On the number of ATMs per 1 million people, South Africa scores highest, at 69.28, followed by Namibia, at 54.73, Botswana, at 30.48, Zambia, at 10.97, and Kenya, at 10.16, followed by Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and Uganda, all below 6.25. On the tourist service infrastructure, South Africa scores highest, at 4.4 out of 7, followed by Namibia, at 3.94, Botswana, at 3.55, Kenya, at 3.55, Uganda, at 3.05, with Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe scoring between 2.62 and 2.85.

For the quality of tourism infrastructure, South Africa scores highest, 6.0, followed by Kenya, at 5.7, Namibia, at 5.5, Botswana, at 5.2, with the remaining countries scoring between 4.5 and 4.7. South Africa ranks highest on information and communication readiness (ICT), with a score of 4.4 out of 7, followed by Botswana, at 4.1, Namibia, at 3.9, Kenya, at 3.4, with the remaining countries scoring between 2.7 and 2.9 out of 7. South Africa has the highest

percentage of Internet users, 51.9, followed by Kenya, at 45.6 percent, Botswana, at 27.5 percent, Namibia, at 22.3 percent, Zambia, at 21 percent, Uganda, at 19.2 percent, Zimbabwe, at 16.4 percent, followed by Tanzania, far behind, at 5.4 percent.

Namibia ranks highest in terms of quality of electricity supply, with a score of 5.5, followed by Kenya, at 3.9, Uganda, at 3.4, Botswana, at 3.3, South Africa, at 3.0, Tanzania, at 2.9, Zambia, at 2.5, and Zimbabwe, at 2.3.

On most of the dimensions of tourism basics, there is a clear delineation between the Cluster 1 upper-middle-income countries, South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia, and the remaining Cluster 2 and 3 countries. Cluster 3 countries, Zambia and Zimbabwe, tend to score lowest on most dimensions, with Tanzania, in Cluster 2, joining them on a number of assessments, including electricity supply, ICT readiness, quality of tourism infrastructure, or even scoring far below for the number of internet users.

Tourism Context

The tourism context dimension assessed in the study includes reliability of police service, health and hygiene index, physician density, accessed to improved sanitation, sustainability of the travel and tourism industry development, stringency of environmental regulations, and adult literacy. Botswana scored highest on the reliability of police service, at 4.8 out of 7, followed by Namibia, at 4.4, Tanzania, at 4.3, Uganda, at 4, Kenya, at 3.9, Zimbabwe, at 3.5, Zambia, at 3.4, with South Africa last, at 3.3.

On the health and hygiene index, South Africa scored highest, at 3.77 out of 7, followed by Namibia and Botswana, at 3.52 and 3.51, respectively, Kenya, at 3.17, Tanzania, at 2.93, Zimbabwe, at 2.88, Uganda, at 2.75, and Zambia, at 2.7. On physician density, South Africa ranks highest, with .8 doctors per 1,000 people, followed by Botswana and Namibia, with .4

doctors, Kenya and Zambia, with .2 doctors, Zimbabwe, with .1, and Tanzania with 0. South Africa scored highest on access to improved sanitation, scoring 66.4 on a scale from 0 to 100, followed by Botswana, at 63.4, Zambia, at 43.9, Zimbabwe, at 36.8, Namibia, at 34.4, Kenya, at 30.1, Uganda, at 19.1, and Tanzania, at 15.6. On most health- and hygiene-related dimensions, Cluster 1 countries score highest, with South Africa having the highest scores of the eight countries.

In terms of sustainability of travel and tourism industry development, Namibia scored highest at 5.5 out of 10, followed by Kenya, at 5.2, Botswana, at 5.1, South Africa, at 5, Tanzania, at 4.6, Zambia, at 4.5, Uganda, at 4.3, and Zimbabwe at 4, with the eight countries rating similarly.

Namibia has the highest score on the stringency of environmental regulations, at 4.8 out of 10, followed by South Africa, at 4.7, Botswana, at 4.5, Tanzania, at 4.3, Kenya, at 4.2, Zimbabwe, at 4.1, Zambia, at 4.0, and Uganda, at 3.1. Namibia scored highest on the enforcement of environmental regulations, at 4.7 out of 10, followed by Botswana, at 4.6, Kenya and Tanzania, at 4.2, South Africa and Zambia, at 4.1, Zimbabwe, at 4.0, and Uganda, at 3.1. On environmental regulations, Cluster 1 countries exhibit the highest performance, which also correlates with their conservation efforts, as evidenced by the large number of game reserves. Cluster 3 countries, Zambia and Zimbabwe, are joined by Uganda, all placing less importance, comparatively, on environmental regulations and conservation.

The percentage of adult literacy is highest in South Africa, at 94.3 percent, followed by Botswana, at 88.5, Zimbabwe, at 86.5, Namibia, at 81.9, Tanzania, at 80.3, Kenya, at 78.0, Uganda, at 73.9, and Zambia, at 63.4 percent. These findings again confirm the leading position of Cluster 1 countries; it is, however, noteworthy that Zimbabwe, in Cluster 3, due to large

investments in education after independence, is among the highest-literacy countries on the continent (World Bank Data, 2018b).

Tourism Performance

Tourism performance assessed in the study includes international tourist arrivals; international tourism inbound receipts; travel and tourism industry total contribution to GDP and percentage of GDP, directly, as well as directly and indirectly; and travel and tourism industry employment in terms of numbers and as percent of total employment, directly, as well as directly and indirectly, as described later.

For international tourist arrivals, South Africa receives the lion's share, close to 9 million annually, followed by Zimbabwe, at 2.03 million, Botswana, at 1.53 million, Namibia, at 1.39 million, Uganda, at 1.30 million, Kenya, at 1.11 million, Tanzania, at 1.10 million, and Zambia, at .92 million. With regard to international tourism inbound receipts, South Africa leads by far, with $8,234.7 million, followed by Tanzania, at $2,230.6 million, Uganda, at $1,149 million, Botswana, at $948.3 million, Zimbabwe, at $886 million, Kenya, at $723 million, Zambia, at $660.1 million, and Namibia, at $378 million. The tourism performance data on international tourist arrivals and international tourism inbound receipts does not readily parallel the findings on tourism attractions, basics, and context, as it does not clearly elevate Cluster 1 countries to a leadership position. While South Africa is unequivocally in a leadership position on both dimensions, Cluster 3 Zimbabwe has the second highest number of international tourist arrivals, whereas Cluster 2 Tanzania and Uganda occupy the second and third place, respectively, on international tourism inbound receipts. It is likely that a more in-depth examination of the data on the three dimensions, tourism attractions, basics, and context in the next sections will offer

further insights into these findings, which do not parallel the Cluster 1 countries' dominance just observed in the assessment of tourism attractions, basics, and context.

The direct and indirect contribution of tourism to GDP and employment also offer evidence of tourism performance. These measures assess not just the direct influence of tourism and travel on the economy, but also capture their indirect influences, as they enhance the performance and profitability of other industries that benefit from tourism. Such industries include foodservice, transportation, banking, communication, and retailing, among others. Tourism is among the top contributors to the selected countries' GDP and employment, and tourism's contributions to GDP and employment are rapidly rising for the countries under examination (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017a,b,c,d,e,f). Tourism is, thus, essential in the sustainable economic development of sub-Saharan Africa.

In Botswana, safari-based tourism, tightly controlled and typically upmarket, is a key source of income (Euromonitor – Botswana Country Report, 2018). Botswana is heavily reliant on its neighbors on tourism, particularly on South Africa (Botswana Tourism Report, 2018). Tourism employs, directly and indirectly, 7.1 percent of Botswana's workforce, and accounts, directly and indirectly, for 10.9 percent of GDP (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017a). In Namibia, tourism is a leading sector, accounting, directly and indirectly, for 14.9 percent of GDP and 14.9 percent of employment (Namibia Tourism Board, 2015; World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017b). In South Africa, tourism accounts, directly and indirectly, for 9.3 percent of GDP and 6.3 percent of employment (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017c).

In Kenya, tourism, the leading service sector, employs 11 percent of the workforce, directly and indirectly (Euromonitor – Kenya Country Report, 2018). Tourism contributes, directly and indirectly, over 10 percent to Kenya's GDP, as the third largest contributor to the

economy, after agriculture and manufacturing; it is also the third largest foreign exchange earner, after tea and horticulture (Okelo & Novelli 2014; Euromonitor – Kenya Country Report, 2018). Compared to Kenya, however, tourism in Tanzania appears to underperform: although Kenya's Mara National Park in only a tenth of the size of Tanzania's Serengeti, the Mara attracts ten times more visitors than Serengeti (Okelo & Novelli 2014). Nevertheless, tourism in Tanzania accounts, directly and indirectly, for 13.3 percent of GDP and 11.6 percent of employment (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017d). For Uganda, tourism accounts, directly and indirectly, for 6.6 percent of GDP and 5.8 percent of total employment (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017e). Tourism in Uganda is an important generator of foreign exchange – tourism is the country's fourth leading foreign exchange earner – and investment (Okelo and Novelli 2014). In the low-income countries of this study, tourism is playing an increasingly important role, accounting, directly and indirectly, for 7.0 percent of GDP and 5.0 percent of employment for Zambia (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017f), and 6.1 percent of GDP and 5.2 percent of employment for Zimbabwe (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017g).

An analysis of travel and tourism direct and indirect proportion contribution to GDP finds that Cluster 1 countries, with the exception of Botswana, perform about the same as Cluster 2 countries, with the exception of Uganda, accounting for between 9.3 and 14.9 percent of the GDP. For the remaining countries, travel and tourism direct and indirect proportion contribution to GDP ranges between 6.1 and 7.2 percent. Similarly, an analysis of travel and tourism direct and indirect proportion contribution to employment finds that Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 countries, with the exception of South Africa and Uganda, account for between 10.9 and 14.9 percent of the employment. For the remaining countries, travel and tourism direct and indirect proportion contribution to employment ranges between 5.0 and 6.4 percent. These results suggest that

Cluster 2 countries are equally determined to increase their share of worldwide tourism dollars as Cluster 1 countries, having diligently prepared the ground for extensive tourism investment. Cluster 3 countries, while lagging behind, have already a dedicated tourism industry and, given the expansive areas of biodiversity they possess, it is likely that, economic development and tourism development will work in tandem to create a dynamic tourism industry.

TOURISM-ABC MODEL OF SAFARI TOURISM: HYPOTHESES

In the previous section, tourism attractions, basics, context, and performance were assessed in the context of the sub-Saharan Africa safari experience. The current section presents hypotheses regarding the relationship between tourism attractions, basics, and context on one hand, and tourism performance.

Tourism attractions – all that may draw a tourist to a destination (Manrai et al., 2018), – especially unique attractions such as safari opportunities, create a motivation for travel and provide destinations with a competitive advantage (Manrai et al., 2018). As the main tourism attractions, game reserves offer distinctive ecotourism experiences. Ecotourism is growing at a rate three times faster than general tourism (Han, Hsu, & Sheu, 2010), and constitutes a large proportion of the global tourism demand (Center for Responsible Travel, 2011; Hultman, Kazeminia, & Ghasemi, 2015). Thus, as ecotourism experiences, safari tourism is likely to bring in more tourists to destinations.

Tourism offerings gain a competitive advantage and draw more tourists if they demonstrate environmental concerns and if they contribute to conservation causes (Kotler, 2011; Kazeminia, Hultman & Mostaghel, 2016). By emphasizing the preservation of unique animal life specific to the region where they are located, such as the Big 5 in the region, or springbok and

gemsbok in Botswana, oryx herds and the Hartmann's mountain zebra in Namibia, or waterbuck and impala in Tanzania, for example, these tourist destinations are more likely to draw tourists. This is the case especially for the countries with multiple safari opportunities, such as the Cluster 1 countries, South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia, and Kenya, in Cluster 2. As a result, countries with greater safari tourism attractions are more likely to have more tourists, and thus a stronger tourism performance. We thus hypothesize that:

H1: Safari tourism attractions are positively related to tourism performance in sub-Saharan Africa.

Tourism basics support tourists' initial motivation for travel (Manrai et al., 2018). The quality of air transport, airport infrastructure, ground and port infrastructure, quality of roads, as well as price competitiveness, number of ATMs, internet users, among others, offer support the motivation to travel.

On the most part, in this study, tourism basics correlate with the countries' level of economic development. As such, those countries that are more developed are more likely to provide tourism basics that offer a greater assurance of comfort and safety to tourists, and prices that are more competitive. Thus, it is likely that, with assurances of tourism basics, more tourists are likely to travel to a destination. We thus hypothesize that:

H2: Safari tourism basics are positively related to tourism performance in sub-Saharan Africa.

Tourism context, comprised of factors, such as adequate medical care and hygiene, strong enforced regulations promoting a high quality of life, and a sustainable tourism industry that

ensures quality services for tourists, makes it more likely that tourists would travel to a destination (Manrai et al. 2018).

Leadership on tourism context factors, especially on health and environmental regulations, was also found in this study to be in line with the countries' conservation efforts. Specifically, those countries with strong health and environmental regulations also have a larger number of game reserves, which emphasize conservation offer protection to the country's unique biodiversity. Along with tourist services, such policies are more likely to attract tourists to a destination. We thus advance the following hypothesis:

H3: Safari tourism context is positively related to tourism performance in sub-Saharan Africa.

ASSESSMENT OF THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL STRUCTURE IN THE DATA

A principal components analysis (PCA) was used to identify the underlying multi-dimensional structure in the data. A total of 25 measures – 4 for tourism attractions, 13 for tourism basics, and 8 for tourism context – were used in the analysis. A principal component analysis was employed to determine the underlying dimensions (Nunnally, 1978). The items were then further assessed for loadings (the cutoff was .5) and for face validity. Forest area, access to improved sanitation, major car rental companies, ICT readiness, and adult literacy were eliminated from the analyses because they loaded poorly, and/or lacked face validity. For example, tourists are less likely to rent automobiles in many countries in Africa due to safety concerns (automobiles not up to standards, lack of sufficient gas stations, lack of knowledge of roads and road conditions, and personal safety concerns); hence, the car-rental companies item was eliminated.

Three principal components (dimensions or factors) with an eigenvalue greater than 1 were extracted, accounting for 88.64 of the variance. The results are presented in Table 6. The dimensions exhibited reasonable reliabilities. Dimension 1, representing tourism context (Cronbach's alpha=.75; standardized=.96), has an eigenvalue of 11.65, and accounts for 61.33 percent of variance. Dimension 2, representing tourism attractions (Cronbach's alpha=.76; standardized=.75), has an eigenvalue of 3.97, and accounts for 20.88 percent of the variance. Dimension 3, representing tourism basics (Cronbach's alpha=.16; standardized=.86), has an eigenvalue of 1.22, and accounts for 6.43 percent of the variance (see Table 6).

The multi-dimensional structure offers important insights into the make-up of the T-ABC model components. The tourism attractions dimension (Dimension 2) comprises the attractions themselves, total number of parks and reserves and game reserves, but it also has an accessibility aspect, capturing the number of airlines and quality of roads and port infrastructure, and a safety aspect, reliability of police. This means that parks and game reserves alone are not sufficient to bring in the tourists; the parks and game reserves must be accessible and safe. The definition of tourism attractions, thus, must be expanded to: "all that may draw a tourist to a destination" (c.f. Manrai et al., 2018) easily, meaning that the attractions are readily accessible, and safely.

The tourism 'basics' dimension (Dimension 3) has two major components, security and affordability. For security, the captured dimensions are police service reliability, enforcement of environmental regulations and environmental regulations stringency. For affordability, the captured dimensions are price competitiveness and ticket taxes and airport charges. Tourism basics have been previously described as supporting the initial attraction of destinations. In line with the definition, tourism basics in this study readily capture destination affordability, security, and strong regulations that promote a high quality of life (Manrai et al., 2018). The initial

definition also suggests that tourism basics should include the infrastructure that must be in place to welcome tourists, and luxuries such as internet and personal banking (Manrai et al., 2018). In this study, it is suggested that those other dimensions belong under the broader, tourism-context umbrella, and that tourism basics refer strictly to affordability and security.

Tourism context has been described as comprised of factors that could create a favorable impression on tourists, and ensuring quality services, making it more likely that tourists would travel to a certain destination (Manrai et al., 2018). The tourism context dimension (Dimension 1) is, as expected, the most comprehensive, capturing infrastructure dimensions, such as airport infrastructure, ground and port infrastructure, quality of roads and air transport, tourist service infrastructure, quality of tourism infrastructure, and sustainable travel and tourism development. It also captures important services that would make it more likely that tourists would travel to a destination, such as the number of ATMs, internet access (determined by the number of internet users), and health-related services (determined by the health and hygiene index and physician density).

To summarize, the study found that tourism attractions should be redefined as all that may draw a tourist to a destination easily, meaning that the attractions are readily accessible, and safely. It also found that tourism basics encompass security and affordability as the basic concerns that tourists have when it comes to deciding on the destination. Finally, the study found that tourism context is a broader concept, encompassing infrastructure considerations, and services that would make it more likely that tourists would travel to a destination, such as number of ATMs, internet access, and health services.

In the next section, the T-ABC model is tested in an attempt to determine the relative importance of each dimension in predicting tourism performance.

T-ABC MODEL TESTING

The T-ABC model proposes that there is a positive relationship between the T-ABC dimensions, namely, tourism attractions (A), tourism basics (B), and tourism context (C), and tourism performance. To determine the impact of tourism attractions, tourism basics, and tourism context on tourism performance, a series of linear regression analyses were used, with tourism attractions, tourism basics, and tourism context dimensional scores as independent variables, and with international tourist arrivals, and, respectively, with international tourism inbound receipts, in the role of dependent variables. International tourist arrivals and international tourism receipts were used for the analyses because they are considered to be the most accurate measures for assessing tourism performance (Assaker et al., 2014).

Tourism Performance: International Tourist Arrival Results

The R-square, demonstrating the overall explanatory power of the model, reveals that the independent variables – the three factor scores – explained about 90.3 percent of the systematic variation of the dependent variable international tourist arrivals. The overall fitness of the model is high, with an F statistic of 12.48 (p=.017). The regression analysis results support Hypothesis H3, that the tourism context is positively associated with tourism performance, as measured by international tourist arrivals (β = .54, p < .05), and, similarly supports Hypothesis H2 that tourism basics are positively associated with tourism performance (β = .79, p < .01). It did not offer support for Hypothesis H1, positing that tourism attractions are positively associated with tourism performance (β = .04, p >.10). See Table 7.

The correlation matrix also suggests that international tourism arrivals correlates highly with the tourism basics dimension (r=.79, p<.01) and with tourism context (r=.54, p<.05). However, it does not correlate with tourism attractions (r=.04, p>.10). None of the dimensions

correlate to each other, as expected (because these dimensions are extracted from a principal components analysis). See Table 8.

Tourism Performance: International Tourist Inbound Receipts Results

The R-square, demonstrating the overall explanatory power of the model, reveals that the independent variables – the three dimensional scores – explained about 91.6 percent of the systematic variation of the dependent variable international tourist inbound receipts. The overall fitness of the model is high, with an F statistic of 14.57 (p=.013). The regression analysis results support Hypothesis H3, that the tourism context is positively associated with tourism performance as measured by international tourist inbound receipts (β = .43, p < .05), and, similarly support Hypothesis H2, that tourism basics are positively associated with tourism performance (β = .75, p < .01). It did not offer support to Hypothesis H1, positing that tourism attractions are positively associated with tourism performance (β = .09, p >.10). See Table 9. In line with the international tourist arrivals findings, the correlation matrix suggests that international tourism inbound receipts correlates highly with the tourism basics dimension (r=.86, p<.01). It does not correlate with the tourism context – although it approaches significance (r=.43, p>.10), – nor with tourism attractions (r=.09, p>.10). None of the dimensions correlate to each other (as expected) – see Table 10.

DISCUSSION AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Safari tourism is a leading contributor to GDP, employment, and sustainable economic development in sub-Saharan Africa. This study examines safari tourism from the perspective of the Tourism-ABC model and suggests that there is a strong relationship between economic

development and the Tourism-ABC model in terms of tourism attractions, basics, context, and performance.

For attractions, there is a positive relationship between economic development, the surface area of the country, the geology, the political stability, and the number of game of parks and game reserves the countries offer, with South Africa leading on all measures, and with the remaining Cluster 1 countries, Botswana and Namibia – all high-middle-income countries, – following. In terms of attractions, Kenya, a Cluster 2, lower-middle-income country, joins Cluster 1. Kenya has devoted substantial attention and effort to leveraging its resources, especially the abundance and diversity of animal life to create a memorable tourist experiences (Smart, 2018), more efficiently and competently than Tanzania, another Cluster 2 country, with an even greater abundance of animal life. These findings support previous research (Okelo & Novelli 2014; Smart, 2018), demonstrating that government leadership in developing and promoting safari tourism is essential in creating a strong, sustainable industry. In comparison, low-income countries with a recent history of political instability, such as Uganda and Zimbabwe, have had more limited success in creating a strong tourism industry, despite plentiful attractions and biodiversity.

For tourism basics, Cluster 1 upper-middle-income countries South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia, perform better than Cluster 2 and 3 countries. Cluster 3 countries, Zambia and Zimbabwe, tend to score lowest on most dimensions, with Tanzania, in Cluster 2, joining them on a number of dimensions, including electricity supply, ICT readiness, quality of tourism infrastructure – in fact, Tanzania scores far below the other seven countries on the number of internet users.

Similarly-predictable findings place Cluster 1 countries in a leading position for all tourism context factors related to health and environmental regulations, and in line with their conservation efforts. At the low end, Cluster 3 countries, Zambia and Zimbabwe are joined by Cluster 2 Uganda, which suggests that a better position for Uganda – at least for now – might be in Cluster 3. Surprising findings are that South Africa's performance on the reliability of the police service is the lowest of all examined countries, which is likely to be problematic for the success of tourism. Another surprising finding is that Zimbabwe joins Cluster 1 countries with a high percentage of adult literacy, due to large investments in education after independence (World Bank, 2018a).

The findings of this study suggest that tourism dimensions correlate highly with economic development, with the exception of situations where the government takes on a leadership role to develop the tourism infrastructure, as is the case of Kenya (Smart, 2018; Okelo & Novelli, 2014), or where it makes a strong push for education, as in Zimbabwe (World Bank, 2018a).

On tourism performance, Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 countries appear to be equally determined to invest in and promote tourism, increasing yearly the contribution of tourism to GDP and employment. Performance numbers for Cluster 3 countries, while not as high, are steadily increasing. When it comes to key measures of performance, international tourist arrivals and international tourism inbound receipts, unlike in the case of tourism attractions, basics, and context, the findings are not as clearly differentiated by cluster – that is, with Cluster 1 leading, followed by Cluster 2 and 3, respectively. While South Africa leads by far on both measures, Cluster 3 Zimbabwe has the second highest number of international tourist arrivals, whereas

Cluster 2 Tanzania and Uganda occupy the second and third place, respectively, on international tourism inbound receipts. These findings were further elucidated by subsequent analyses.

A principal components analysis, used to determine the underlying multi-dimensional structure in the tourism attractions, basics, and context data, suggests that tourism attractions should be redefined as all that may draw a tourist to a destination easily and safely. It also found that tourism basics encompasses both affordability and security, whereas, tourism context is a broader concept, encompassing all infrastructure and services that would make it more likely that tourists would travel to a destination. In an attempt to further determine the impact of tourism attractions, tourism basics, and tourism context on tourism performance and empirically test the T-ABC model, regression analyses found support for the premise that the tourism context and tourism basics are positively associated with tourism performance, as measured by international tourist arrivals and international tourism inbound receipts. The analyses did not find support for a positive association between tourism attractions and tourism performance.

Upon further examination of the principal components analyses results, which suggest redefining attractions as all that may draw a tourist to a destination easily and safely, we posit that tourism attractions are no longer on par with tourism basics and tourism context as determinants of tourism performance. Rather, they are a precondition that would lead tourism basics and tourism context to influence tourism performance. More precisely, assuming that there is an attractive safari destination that is easily accessible and safe, then a high score on tourism basics and tourism context will lead to a high tourism performance in terms of international tourist arrivals and international tourism inbound receipts.

The study findings, thus, would benefit safari tourism marketers and national governments keen on leveraging national wildlife reserves to create a sustainable tourism

industry. Creating easily accessible and safe attractions must be a first priority. Next, the focus should be on tourism basics, namely, affordability and security, and improving all aspects of the tourism context, including infrastructure, health and hygiene, and access to ATMs, among others.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings of this study have certain limitations. While the study is based on secondary data vetted by the tourism industry, it limits the investigation to eight countries. Future studies might examine safari tourism in other countries that have ample offerings, such as Madagascar, Mozambique, Rwanda, and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

In the case of the first three countries, Madagascar, Mozambique, and Rwanda, the opportunities are more limited. Although Madagascar has wildlife that is not found anywhere else in the world, such as tomato frogs, bamboo lemurs, and satanic leaf-tailed Gecko, its attractions are only accessible on arduous walking safaris. Rwanda has both a wildlife park, the Akagera National Park, and the Virunga National Park, the home of the mountain gorilla – but the latter is, again, only accessible to those able to undertake grueling hikes that can last half a day before one can interact with a gorilla family. Rwanda is also recovering from a painful history of ethnic division and a genocide that decimated the Tutsi minority. Rwanda is today much safer and more stable, focused on resurrecting its travel industry, marketing its two main safari attractions, again embracing its decades-long claims to being the country of a thousand hills (marketed as *Pays de Mille Collines*, in French), and the Switzerland of Africa. Mozambique has been similarly plagued by political instability until 2014, and cyclones, but it, too, is devoting substantial efforts to leverage its impressive biodiversity.

In the case of the Democratic Republic of Congo, the second largest country in Africa, wildlife opportunities are numerous: it boasted phenomenal safari opportunities in the past, with exceptional parks and an impressive collection of unique wildlife, such as the mountain gorilla, the Eastern Lowland gorilla, and the Big 5. However, the Democratic Republic of Congo is currently experiencing perpetual civil unrest, crime, and armed conflict. Some of the best safari parks in Congo are now only accessible in the company of heavily armed guards.

Future studies might approach this research from tourists' perspectives, assessing all dimensions of the T-ABC model at destination level, and at country level simultaneously, comparing between destinations and countries. Future studies might also explore the T-ABC model by examining tourists' assessments regarding the importance of the model's constituent components, and, instead of measuring tourism performance using the measures used in these studies, researchers could measure tourists' intention to revisit the respective attractions, or the likelihood of exploring other similar attractions. Researchers could also collect information regarding tourists' satisfaction with the safari experience.

References

Abor, J., & Quartey, P. (2010). Issues in SME development in Ghana and South Africa. International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 39, 218–228.

Assaker, G., Hallak, R., Vinzi, V.E., & O'connor, P. (2014). An empirical operationalization of countries' destination competitiveness using partial least squares modeling. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53 (1), 26-43.

Ayikoru, M. (2015). Destination competitiveness challenges: A Ugandan perspective. *Tourism Management*, 50, 142-158.

BMI Research – Botswana (2018), "Botswana Tourism Report," accessed at www.bmiresearch.com on June 28, 2018.

Center for Responsible Travel (2011). Responsible travel: Global trends & statistics. Market trends series. Washington, DC: Center for Responsible Travel.

Christie, Iain, Eneida Fernandes, Hannah Messerli & Louise Twining-Ward (2014), *Tourism in Africa*, Africa Development Forum, Washington, D.C: The World Bank.

DeBerry-Spence, B. (2010). Making theory and practice in subsistence markets: An analytic auto-ethnography of MASAZI in Accra, Ghana. Journal of Business Research, 63(6), 608–616.

------ and Eliott, E.A. (2012). African microentrepreneurship: The reality of everyday challenges. Journal of Business Research 65 (2012) 1665-1673.

Euromonitor – Botswana Country Report (2018), "Botswana: Country Profile, May 9, 2018, accessed through PassportGMID database on June 28, 2018.

Euromonitor – Kenya Country Report (2018), "Kenya: Country Profile, May 18, 2018, accessed through PassportGMID database on June 28, 2018.

Fafchamps, M. (1994). Industrial structure and micro-enterprises in Africa. Journal of Developing Areas, 29(1), l–30.

Fafchamps, M. (1997). Trade credit in Zimbabwean manufacturing. World Development, 25(3), 795–815.

Fowler, B. (2004). Preventing counterfeit crafts designs. In M. Finger, & P. Schuler (Eds.), Poor people's knowledge: Promoting intellectual property in developing countries (pp. 16–19). Oxford: World Bank and Oxford University Press.

Han, H., Hsu, L. T., & Sheu, C. (2010). Application of the theory of planned behavior to green hotel choice: Testing the effect of environmental friendly activities. Tourism Management, 31, 325–334.

Henrique, M., & Herr, M. (2008). The informal economy and microfranchising. In S. W. Gibson, & W. G. Dyer (Eds.), Microfranchising: Creating wealth at the bottom of the pyramid (pp. 43–77). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hultman, M., Kazeminia, A. & Ghasemi, V. (2015). Intention to visit and willingness to pay premium for ecotourism: The impact of attitude, materialism, and motivation. Journal of Business Research 68, 1854–1861.

Kazeminia, A., Hultman, M. & Mostaghel, R. (2016). Why pay more for sustainable services? The case of ecotourism. Journal of Business Research 69, 4992–4997.

Keyword Search (2017), Google, accessed at https://keywordtool.io/search/keywords/google/7591564?category=web&keyword=kenya%20safari&country=GLB&language=en#suggestions on August 6, 2017.

Kotler, P. (2011). Reinventing marketing to manage the environmental imperative. Journal of Marketing, 75(4), 132–135.

Mead, D. M., & Liedholm, C. (1998). The dynamics of micro and small enterprises in developing countries. World Development, 26(1), 61–74.

Manrai, L.A. & Manrai, A.K. (1993). Positioning European countries as brands in a perceptual map. *Journal of Euromarketing*, 2 (3), 101-129.

Manrai, L., Manrai, A., and D. Lascu (2018), "A Comparative Study of Safari Tourism in Africa," in L. Adams, D. Lascu, G. Frankwick, C. Lagat, and Z. Ahmed eds., *Business and Entrepreneurship Development in a Globalized Era*, Eldoret, K*enya.* November, p. 133.

Manrai, L.A., A.K. Manrai, and S. Friedeborn (2018), "Environmental Determinants of Destination Competitiveness and its Tourism Attractions-Basics-Context, A-B-C, Indicators: A Review and Conceptual Model," *Journal of Economics, Finance, and Administrative Science.*

Mwakikagile, Godfrey (2010), *Botswana: Profile of a Nation*, Continental Press: Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Murchinson Falls National Park (2018), accessed at http://www.murchisonfallsnationalpark.com on May 22, 2018.

Namib Naukluft National Park (2018), accessed at www. rhinoafrica.com on May 22, 2018.

Namibia Tourism Board (2015), *Namibia Tourism Satellite Account*, 5th Edition, accessed at file:///C:/Users/dlascu/Desktop/JBR/Safari/Country%20data/Namibia%20toursism%20board.pdf on June 27, 2018.

Nunnaly, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Okello, Moses M. & Marina Novelli, "Tourism in the East African Community (EAC): Challenges, opportunities, and ways forward, *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 2014, Vol. 14(1–2) 53–66.

Orams, M. B. (1995). Towards a more desirable form of ecotourism. Tourism Management, 16, 3–8.

Safari Bookings (2018), *Botswana Safari Tours and Packages*, accessed at https://www.safaribookings.com/tours on March 30, 2018.

Selous Game Reserve (2018), accessed at http://www.selousgamereserve.info on May 22, 2018.

Siyabona Africa (2018), *Kalahari Game Reserve Safari in Botswana*, accessed at www.itravelto.com/kalahari-safari-and-lodging.html on March 30, 2018.

Smart, Devin (2018). Safariland: Tourism, development, and the marketing of Kenya in the post-colonial world. African Studies Review. Vol. 61, No. 2, 134-157.

Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., Gau, R., & Ritchie, R. (2009). Designing marketplace literacy education in resource-constrained contexts: Implications for public policy an d marketing. Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 28(Spring), 85–94.

Viswanathan, M., Sridharan, S., & Ritchie, R. (2010). Understanding consumption and entrepreneurship in subsistence marketplaces. Journal of Business Research, 63(6), 570–581.

World Bank (2018a), Data: Sub-Saharan Africa, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/region/sub-saharan-africa on April 10, 2018.

World Bank (2018b), Data: Sub-Saharan Africa Literacy Rate, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.ADT.LITR.ZS on April 10, 2018.

World Bank (2017), "World Development Indicators," accessed at http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&country=SSF on May 12, 2018.

World Bank (2017a), GDP Per Capita, PPP, International Comparison Database, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD on May 12, 2018.

World Bank (2017b), GNI Per Capita, PPP, International Comparison Database, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.PP.CD on May 12, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017a), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Botswana*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/botswana2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017b), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Namibia*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/namibia2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017c), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 South Africa*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/southafrica2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017d), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Tanzania*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/tanzania2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017e), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Uganda*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/uganda2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017f), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Zambia*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/zambia2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

World Travel and Tourism Council (2017g), *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2017 Zimbabwe*, accessed at https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/countries-2017/zimbabwe2017.pdf on June 26, 2018.

Zambia Tourism (2018), *Safaris and Tours*, accessed at https://www.zambiatourism.com/safaris-tours on May 22, 2018.

Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (2018), accessed at http://zimparks.org on May 22, 2018.

Figure 1

Safari Tourism Clusters, Map of Africa

Cluster 1: Botswana, Namibia, & South Africa

Cluster 2: Kenya, Uganda, & Tanzania

Cluster 3: Zambia & Zimbabwe

Table 1

Location, GDP (PPP) per Capita & Unique Attractions of Eight African Countries

Clusters and Countries & Location: [Latitude, Longitude]	**GDP (PPP) per capita [1] & GNI (PPP) per capita [2]**	**Unique Game Animals and Safari Experiences Available in a Country**
CLUSTER 1		
1. Botswana [24° S and 25° E]	Upper-middle-income GDP/capita: $ 17,918 GNI/capita: $ 16,380	Botswana features unspoiled wilderness and has fewer but extremely large safari resorts.
2. Namibia [22° S and 17° E]	Upper-middle-income GDP/capita: $ 11,838 GNI/capita: $ 10,550	Namibia is known for its scenic beauty and wildlife specialties like tracking black-rhinos and desert adapted elephants.
3. South Africa [26° S and 28° E]	Upper-middle-income GDP/capita: $ 13, 321 GNI/capita: $ 12,860	The private game reserves adjacent to the Kruger National Park are the best to see the Big 5 game animals (lion, leopard, elephant, buffalo and rhino).
CLUSTER 2		
4. Kenya [1° S and 36° E]	Lower-middle-income GDP/capita: $ 3,516 GNI/capita: $ 3,130	The Masai Mara Game Reserve is the ideal place for big cat viewing. Likipia is known for viewing rare species of African wild dogs and Grevy's zebras.
5. Tanzania [6° S and 35° E]	Low-income GDP/capita: $ 3,296 GNI/capita: $ 2,740	Tanzania is home to Mount Kilimanjaro, Serengeti, and Zanzibar. It has an estimated 4 million wild animals, including Africa's largest populations of lions. Tanzania is known for an estimated 2 million migration of wildebeest, zebra and gazelle.
6. Uganda [1° N and 32° E]	Low-income GDP/capita: $ 2,155 GNI/capita: $ 1,820	Uganda offers excellent opportunities for viewing and trekking gorillas and chimpanzees.

CLUSTER 3		
7. Zambia [15° S and 28° E]	Lower-middle-income GDP/capita: $ 3,982 GNI/capita: $ 3,790	South Luangwa National Park in Zambia is well known for walking safaris. Night game drives are excellent in the Zambian parks as well.
8. Zimbabwe [17° S and 31° E]	Low-income GDP/capita: $ 2,002 GNI/capita: $ 1,920	Zimbabwe offers attraction of finding wildlife on foot through tracking in Mana Pools National Park. Another park is Hwange, where water holes in a dry environment attract a great many number of large animal species like elephants and buffalos.

[1] World Bank (2017a), GDP Per Capita, PPP, International Comparison Database, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD

[2] World Bank (2017b), GNI Per Capita, PPP, International Comparison Database, World Bank Group, accessed at https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GNP.PCAP.PP.CD

Table 2

Tourism Attractions

Indicator	Measure	Country							
		Botswana	Kenya	Namibia	South Africa	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
Game Reserves	Number	11	13	5	33	2	3	1	0
Total Number, Parks & Reserves	Number	14	26	13	43	13	10	14	8
Forest Area	Percent	9.48	12.81	5.8	2.9	10.94	2.26	4.95	12.96
Sustainability of travel and tourism industry development	*Score (1-7)	5.1	5.5	5.2	4.3	5	4.6	4.5	4

Sources: The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report, 2017; African Economic Outlook 2017, accessed at www.theglobaleconomy.com/indicators_list.php; SafariBookings, accessed at www.safaribookings.com.
* Scores are on a 1-to-7 scale unless indicated otherwise. These are sourced from relative competitive ratings of 141 countries. For detailed definitions, sources, and periods, consult the interactive Country/Economy Profiles and Rankings at http://wef.ch/ttcr

Table 3

Tourism Basics

Indicator	Measure	Country							
		Botswana	Kenya	Namibia	South Africa	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
Number of operating airlines	Number	6	32	9	55	35	20	17	15
Quality of air transport	*Score (1-7)	4	4.8	4.6	6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.6
Airport infrastructure	Score (1-7)	2.23	2.53	2.96	3.41	2.03	1.78	1.86	1.87
Ground and port infrastructure	Score (1-7)	2.84	3.13	2.57	3.4	2.57	2.28	2.35	2.41
Price competitiveness	Score (1-7)	5.7	4.8	5.4	5.2	5.4	5	4.8	5.1
Quality of roads	Score (1-7)	4.1	4.2	5.2	5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.2
Major car rental companies	Score (1-7)	4	4	5	6	4	2	2	4
Number of ATMS	/1000000 pp	30.48	10.16	54.73	69.28	6.04	4.55	10.97	6.23
Tourist service infrastructure	Score (1-7)	3.55	3.18	3.96	4.4	2.85	3.05	2.63	2.79
Quality tourism infrastructure	Score (1-7)	5.2	5.7	5.5	6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.5
ICT readiness	Score (1-7)	4.1	3.4	3.9	4.4	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.9
Internet users	% pop	27.5	45.6	22.3	51.9	5.4	19.2	21	16.4
Quality of electricity supply	Score (1-7)	3.3	3.9	5.5	3	2.9	3.4	2.5	2.3

Sources: The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report, 2017; World Port Source, accessed at www.worldportsource.com; African Economic Outlook 2017, accessed at www.theglobaleconomy.com; SafariBookings, accessed at www.safaribookings.com.

* Scores are on a 1-to-7 scale unless indicated otherwise. These are sourced from relative competitive ratings of 141 countries. For detailed definitions, sources, and periods, consult the interactive Country/Economy Profiles and Rankings at http://wef.ch/ttc

Table 4

Tourism Context

Indicator	Measure	Country							
		Botswana	Kenya	Namibia	South Africa	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
Reliability of police service	*Score (1-7)	4.8	3.9	4.4	3.3	4.3	4	3.4	3.5
Health and hygiene index	Score (1-7)	3.51	3.17	3.52	3.77	2.93	2.75	2.7	2.88
Physician density	/1000 people	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.8	0	0.1	0.2	0.1
Access to improved sanitation	Score (0-100)	63.4	30.1	34.4	66.4	15.6	19.1	43.9	36.8
Sustainability of travel and tourism industry development	Score (1-7)	5.1	5.2	5.5	5	4.6	4.3	4.5	4
Stringency of environmental regulations	Score (1-7)	4.5	4.2	4.8	4.7	4.3	3.2	4	4.1
Enforcement of environmental regulations	Score (1-7)	4.6	4.2	4.7	4.1	4.2	3.1	4.1	4
Adult literacy	%	88.5	78	81.9	94.3	80.3	73.9	63.4	86.5

Sources: The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report, 2017; GDP (2016) Africa Stat Flash
World Port Source, accessed at www.worldportsource.com; African Economic Outlook 2017, accessed at www.theglobaleconomy.com/indicators_list.php.
* Scores are on a 1-to-7 scale unless indicated otherwise. These are sourced from relative competitive ratings of 141 countries. For detailed definitions, sources, and periods, consult the interactive Country/Economy Profiles and Rankings at http://wef.ch/ttcr

Table 5

Tourism Performance

Indicator	Measure	Country							
		Botswana	Kenya	Namibia	South Africa	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia	Zimbabwe
International tourist arrivals	people	1,528,000	1,114,100	1,388,000	8,903,773	1,104,000	1,303,000	932,000	2,056,588
International tourism inbound receipts	$ mil.	948.3	723	378	8234.7	2230.6	1149	660.1	886
Travel & tourism GDP	$ mil.	619.1	2296	373.9	9339.9	1906.1	920	627.3	703
Travel & tourism GDP	% of total	4.1%	3.8%	3.0%	3.0%	4.1%	3.7%	3.0%	5.2%
Travel & tourism GDP (direct and indirect contribution)	% of total	7.1%	10.1%	14.9%	9.3%	13.3%	6.6%	7.0%	6.1%
Travel & tourism employment	people	28,399	592,300	28,792	702,824	386,427	464,305	94,213	180,028
Travel & tourism employment	% of total	3.0%	3.5%	3.6%	4.5%	3.4%	3.1%	1.7%	3.1%
Travel & tourism employment (direct & indirect contribution)	% of total	10.9%	11.0%	14.9%	6.3%	11.6%	5.8%	5.0%	5.2%

Sources: The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report, 2017; World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017a, 2017b, 2017c, 2017d, 2017e, 2017f, 2017g; Euromonitor – Kenya Country Report, 2018.

Table 6
Factor Structure: Principal Component Analysis

Items	Dimension 1 Eigenvalue=11.65 Variance=61.33% Alpha=.75 Standardized Alpha=.96 *Tourism Context*	Dimension 2 Eigenvalue=3.97 Variance=20.88% Alpha=.76 Standardized Alpha=.75 *Tourism Attractions*	Dimension 3 Eigenvalue=1.22 Variance=6.43 Alpha=.16 Standardized Alpha=.86 *Tourism Basics*
Total # parks/reserves	.593	.781	
Number of airlines		.884	
Airport infrastructure	.894		
Ground & port infrastructure	.649	.663	
Quality of roads	.981		
Tourist service infrastructure	.893		
Quality of tourism infrastructure	.915		
Internet users	.705		
Reliability of police service		-.595	.587
Sustainable travel/tourism development	.876		
Environmental regulations stringency	.634		.632
Enforcement environmental regulations			.700
Price competitiveness			.874
Quality of air transport	.845		
Game Reserves	.661	.715	
Ticket taxes/airport charges			.944
Number of ATMs	.854		
Health and hygiene index	.862		
Physician density	.799		

Table 7

Tourism Attractions, Basics, and Context Influence on Tourism Performance: International Tourism Arrivals

Variables	Standard Regression Coefficient	t-Statistic	p-value	Model-Testing Outcome
Tourism Context	.54	3.44	.026	Supported
Tourism Attractions	.04	.26	.81	Not supported
Tourism Basics	.79	5.79	.00	Supported
$R^{2 =}$ .903; F=12.48 (p=.017)				

Table 8

International Tourist Arrivals: Inter-Construct Correlations

	International Tourist Arrivals	Tourism Context	Tourism Attractions	Tourism Basics
International Tourist Arrivals	1.0			
Tourism Context	.54**	1.0		
Tourism Attractions	.04	0.0	1.0	
Tourism Basics	.79***	0.0	0.0	1.0

Note. Significance reported as indicated below:
* $p < .10$.
** $p < .05$.
*** $p < .01$.

Table 9

Tourism Attractions, Basics, and Context Influence on Tourism Performance: International Tourism Inbound Receipts

Variables	Standard Regression Coefficient	t-Statistic	p-value	Model-Testing Outcome
Tourism Context	.43	2.97	.04	Supported
Tourism Attractions	.09	.63	.56	Not supported
Tourism Basics	.75	5.87	.00	Supported
$R^{2 =}$ .916; F=14.57 (p=.013)				

Table 10

International Tourism Inbound Receipts: Inter-Construct Correlations and Reliabilities

	International Tourism Inbound Receipts	Tourism Context	Tourism Attractions	Tourism Basics
International Tourism Inbound Receipts	1.0			
Tourism Context	.43	1.0		
Tourism Attractions	.09	0.0	1.0	
Tourism Basics	.86***	0.0	0.0	1.0

Note. Significance reported as indicated below:
* $p < .10$.
** $p < .05$.
*** $p < .01$.

APPENDIX: PARKS AND GAME RESERVES

Botswana

- 14 parks, including 11 game reserves, and 3 national parks, Chobe, Makgadikgadi Pans, and Nxai Pan. Game reserves include Central Kalahari, Kgalagadi, Khutse, Kwando, Linyanti, Mashatu, Mokolodi, Moremi, Northern Tuli, Okavango Delta, and Selinda.
- Central Kalahari has been the home of the San Bushmen for 30,000 years; it covers 5.2 million hectares, with herds of springbok and gemsbok in the best grazing area, as well as wildebeest, hartebeest, eland, giraffe. It also offers unique game drives, Bushmen interaction, birding, nature walks, night drives outside the park, and stargazing. Offers wide variety of accommodation from tents to bungalows, to luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa, 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018; Mwakikagile, 2010.

Kenya

- 26 parks, of which 13 are game reserves, including Arabuko Sokoke Forest, Buffalo Springs, Kakamega Forest, Laikipia Plateau, Lake Bogoria, Lake Turkana, Lewa Wildlife, Masai Mara, Ol Pejeta, Samburu, Shaba, Shimba Hills, and Solio Ranch. The 13 national parks include Aberdare, Amboseli, Chyulu Hills, Hell's Gate, Kora, Lake Nakuru, Marsabit, Meru, Nairobi, Ruma, Saiwa Swamp, Tsavo East, and Tsavo West
- The Masai Mara National Reserve, Kenya's largest (170 thousand hectares), offers views of big cats, including leopard, and elephant, buffalo, giraffe, hippopotamus, zebra, wildebeest, black rhino, lion, cheetah, and hyena. Masai Mara offers game drives, hot air ballooning, picnics, visits to a Masai Village, and a variety of accommodation, from tents to bungalows, to luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa, 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018.

Namibia

- 13 parks of which 5 are game reserves: Ai-Ais Richtersveld, Damaraland, Kaokoland, Waterberg Plateau, and Zambezi Region. National parks include Bwabwata, Etosha, Khaudum, Mudumu, Namib-Naukluft, Nkasa Rupara, Skeleton Coast, and Tsau //Khaeb The remaining 5 game reserves and parks include Namib-Naukluft Park, the largest (5 million hectares). Orange sand dunes are unique features. Namib-Nankluft Park offers animals such as oryx herds, and the Hartmann's mountain zebra. It offers game drives, hot air ballooning, guided hiking, and stargazing, and a variety of accommodation, ranging from tents to bungalows and luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018; Namib Naukluft National Park 2018.

South Africa

- 43 parks of which 33 are game reserves, and 10 national parks, Addo Elephant, Augrabies Falls, Camdeboo, Golden Gate Highlands, Karoo, Kruger, Mapungubwe, Marakele, Mokala, and Mountain Zebra. Game reserves and parks include |Ai-|Ais Richtersveld Transfrontier, Amakhala, Balule, Djuma, Dulini, Hluhluwe-Imfolozi, Idube, Inyati, Ithala, Kapama Private, Kgalagadi Transfontier, Kwandwe, Lion Sands, Londolozi, Madikwe, Makalali, Mala Mala, Manyeleti, Mkhuze, Phinda, Pilanesberg, Sabi Sabi, Sabi Sand, Shamwari, Singita, Spioenkop, Tembe Elephant, Thornybush, Timbavati, Ulusaba, Waterberg Biosphere, Weenen, and Zulu Nyala.

- Kruger National Park (largest, at 2 million hectares), features the Big 5, and antelope, cheetah, carnivorous dog, hyena, mongoose, zebra, and others, and birds (eagle, heron, stork, vulture, etc.). Kruger offers horse trail and walking safari, elephant-interaction and dawn-to-dusk safari, and a variety of accommodations – tents, bungalows, luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018.

Tanzania

- 13 parks, of which 2 are game reserves. Parks include Arusha, Gombe, Katavi, Lake Manyara, Mahale Mountains, Mikumi, Mkomazi, Ruaha, Saadani, Serengeti, Tarangire, and Bangweulu Wetlands. Selous Game Reserve spans over 5.5 million hectares, with large groups of giraffe among species such as buffalo, waterbuck, impala and zebra, and lions. The Mara (Serengeti) Game Reserve offers boat safaris, fishing, game drives, and walking safaris, and accommodations range from tents to bungalows and luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa 2018; Safari Bookings, 2018; Selous Game Reserve, 2018).

Uganda

- 10 parks, with 3 game reserves and 7 national parks: Bwindi, Kibale, Kidepo Valley, Lake Mburo, Mgahinga Gorilla, Murchison Falls, and Queen Elizabeth. Game reserves and parks include Budongo Forest, Katonga Wildlife, and Toro-Semliki Wildlife.
- Murchison Falls National Park (400,000 hectares) features the Big 5, and oribi, Jackson's hartebeest, grey duiker, bushbuck, and hyena. The Victoria Nile brings crocodile and hippo. Park offers game drives, fishing, natural walks, cultural encounters, and hot air balloons, and accommodations from tents to bungalows, to luxury lodges.

Sources: Siyabona Africa 2018; Safari Bookings 2018; Murchinson Falls National Park 2018

Zambia

- 14 parks (one is game reserve). Parks include Blue Lagoon, Kafue, Kasanka, Liuwa Plain, Lochinvar, Lower Zambezi, Luambe, Lukusuzi, Mosi-oa-Tunya, North Luangwa, Nsumbu, Sioma Ngwezi, South Luangwa, and Bangweulu Wetlands.
- Kafue National Park (2.2 million hectares) offers the Big 5 (except rhinos), and hippo, zebra, cheetah, and hyena, and unique safaris, guided walks, drives, and watching 494 bird species. It offers accommodations from tents to bungalows, and luxury lodges.

Source: Zambia Tourism, 2018.

Zimbabwe

- 8 national parks: Chizarira, Gonarezhou, Hwange, Mana Pools, Matobo, Matusadona, Nyanga, and Zambezi. Hwange National Park spans 1.5 million hectares between Bulawayo and Victoria Falls. Tourists can see the Big 5 (except rhinos), and over 100 animal species, such as African wildcat, serval, honey badger, civet and hyena, and 400 hundred bird species. Hwange offers unique safaris, such as drives, hunting, sightseeing, walks, and a variety of accommodations, from tents, to bungalows, to luxury lodges.

Source: Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, 2018.