Reprinted from the *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), D.W. Harper, Jr., "Comparing tourists crime victimization,"1053-1056, ©2001, with permission from Elsevier. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/01607383

RESEARCH NOTES AND REPORTS

This Department publishes research notes, conference reports, reports on the work of public agencies and associations, field (industry) reports, and other related topics and timely issues. Contributions to this department are submitted to its two Associate Editors: Research Notes to Juergen Gnoth (Department of Marketing, University oi Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Email <jgnoth@commerce.otago.ac.nx> and Conference Reports to Russell Smith (llospiialii\ and louusin. Namang I ethnological Unneisity, Singapore 639798/Rep. of Singapore. Email <arasmith@ntu,edu.sg>). Unsolicited conference and agency reports will not be accepted.

Research Notes



Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 1053-1056, 2001 © 2001 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved Printed in Great Britain 0160-7383/01/\$20.00

Comparing Tourists Crime Victimization

Dee Wood Harper Jr. Loyola University New Orleans, USA

This research note focuses on comparisons of tourist and resident populations' crime experience in five international locations. Since many staridard data resources do not report separately the crime experience of tourists, some researchers have relied on interviewing them as they leave a destination (Strangeland 1998). Other researchers have looked to police reports that identify victims as tourists and using an average daily census of this population, developed equivalent measures of this crime experience to the resident population (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986; de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999).

In most instances, the rate of tourists' crime experience, particularly larceny, theft, and robbery, is higher than that experienced by the local population. A useful first step in developing a comparative criminology of tourism would be to determine if the magnitude of difference between the experience of crime between tourists and non-tourists is significant and to what degree the rate of victimization for tourists correlates with the local crime rate. In other words, is any difference between tourist and non-tourist crime rates just a chance variation? The high rates of tourists' victimization occur at destinations that also experience high rates of crime generally. These observations would provide some further preliminary support that tourist crime is a separate type where the victim, because of the tourist role, is singled out and targeted for victimization (Harper 2000).

Table 1 includes comparative data from five studies of tourists' criminal victimization, in six locations worldwide. It includes data for years from 1978

Table 1. Comparing Tourist Crime Victimization^a

Research Studies	Years	Daily Crime Rate (per 100,000)	
		Tourists	Non-Tourists
New Orleans, USA:b			
	78	30.1	22.2
	79	42.5	25.0
	80	42.0	25.0
	81	41.3	26.4
	theft	74.8	58.1
	robbery	12.7	8.6
Hawaii, USA: ^C	•		
Honolulu	81-82	20.2	15.6
	robbery	.7	.43
	larceny	14.3	10.0
Kauai	78-80	15.6	15.4
	robbery	.3	.06
	larceny	12.2	9.5
Malaga, Spain:d	-		
	93	3.9s	2.5 ^h
	robbery	.40	.003
	theft ⁱ	1.4	.712
Barbados: ^e			
	89	16.5	4.1
	robbery	.86	.16
	theft	7.9	.66
	91	17.8	4.9
	robbery	3.6	.57
	theft	8.8	.77
	93	14.2	5.8
	robbery	2.6	.58
	theft	7.7	.62
Miami, USA: ^f	93 ⁱ	23.9	36.4

^a One-tailed paired samples Rest of means between tourist and non-tourist crime experience, t Stat=2.919, P<.007. Correlation (Pearson's R) of tourists, non-tourists crime experience. r=.73. Correlation (Pearson's R) of tourists, non-tourists robbery experience. r=.97. Correlation (Pearson's R) of tourists, non-tourists larceny, theft experience. r=.99. ^b Harper (1983).

Chesney-Lind and Lind (1986).

Strangeland (1998).

^e de Albuquerque and McElroy (1999).

f Scheibler, Crotts and Hollinger (1996).

g N=3424; median stay=2 weeks.

h N=876.

i Excludes auto theft and theft from autos.

j Visitor est.=5,813,000.

to 1993. Also included is comparative data on robbery, larceny, and theft. The criteria for selecting these studies is that comparative data for the crime experience of the tourist population and the resident population are both reported. This report is based on information extracted from tables contained in the respective articles. Crime rates, which are conventionally reported as the number of crimes per 100,000 population, have, in the studies cited in Table 1, been converted to daily crime rates (annual rate per 100,000/365). This procedure allows for a valid comparison of the crime experience of residents and tourists.

As the tests briefly described in the footnotes of Table 1 show, the crime experience of tourists and non-tourists is significantly different and this tends to hold true for all the locations reported in the studies cited. Only in the Miami study is the crime experience of the host population greater than tourists. However, as the crime experience increases for the host population it also tends to be higher for the guest population. This is particularly true for larceny, theft, and robbery, the crimes tourists are most likely to experience (theft and robbery accounted for 87.5% of the crime experience of tourists to New Orleans with thefts outnumbering robberies by a ratio of 6 to 1). Conversely, in those locations with low rates of crime, such as the coastal area near Malaga, Spain, the crime experience of tourists is correspondingly low. Nevertheless, theft accounts for most of the crime experience at this location. These observations tend to hold true for all the locations in this analysis.

These findings support the notion that tourists' locations can be "hot spots" for certain crime types (Sherman, Gartin and Buerger 1989). Where there is a high concentration of adult entertainment venues, such as bars and nightclubs, tourists will tend to congregate. To the extent that they are viewed by the criminal element as easy targets of victimization, tourists will tend to be disproportionately targeted. As Ryan (1993) has so aptly observed, tourism is often the provider of victims. Moreover, to the extent that the crime experience of tourists and resident populations is different, both qualitatively and quantitatively, the development of a criminology of tourism that focuses on the situational context of tourism seems appropriate at this time. In a recent article, Pizam (1999) has similarly identified a need for a comprehensive theoretical approach directed at understanding the effects of crime and violence on destinations. Further, from a practical and business perspective, managers of tourism enterprises should take cognizance of the local crime situation and warn their guests accordingly.

Dee Wood Harper: Loyola University New Orleans, Box 14, Loyola Station, New Orleans LA 70118, USA. Email harper@bata.loyno.edu.

REFERENCES

Chesney-Lind, M., and I. Y. Lind

1986 Visitors as Victims: Crimes against Tourists in Hawaii. Annals of Tourism Research 13:167-191

de Albuquerque, K., and J. McElroy

1999 Tourism and Crime in the Caribbean. Annals of Tourism Research 26:968-984.

Harper, D. 1983 The Tourist as Crime Victim. Paper read at the Academy of Criminal Justice Science meetings, San Antonio Texas.

2000 Planning in Tourist Robbery. Annals of Tourism Research 27:517-520.

1999 A Comprehensive Approach to Classifying Acts of Crime and Violence at Tourism Destinations. Journal of Travel Research 38:5-12.

Ryan, C.
1993 Crime, Violence, Terrorism and Tourism: An Accidental or Intrinsic Relationship? Tourism Management 14:173-183.
Scheibler, S. A., J. C. Crotts, and R. C. Hollinger
1996 Florida Tourists' Vulnerability to Crime. *In* Tourism, Crime and International Security Issues, A. Pizam and Y. Mansfeld, eds., pp. 37-50. Chicheston Wiley. ter: Wiley.

Sherman, L. W., P. R. Gartin, and M. E. Buerger

1989 Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of

Place. Criminology 27:27-55.

Strangeland, P.
1998 Odier Targets or Other Locations? British Journal of Criminology 38:61-77.

Submitted 28 June 2000. Resubmitted 9 July 2000. Accepted 8 September 2000. Final version 10 October 2000.

PII: S0160-7383(01)00016-0