

Rafał Nagaj / Brigita Žuromskaitė

# CEE Millennial Travellers' Attitude Towards Security Measures Applied in Tourism Infrastructure

## Abstract

The aim of the paper is to assess the level of Millennial travellers' from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) safety estimated by the importance of the security measures implemented in tourism infrastructure (accommodation facilities and tourist attractions) as a way to provide a safer leisure environment. In addition, the paper examines whether tourists' gender and economic stimulus in the form of reduced travel costs are among the factors which influence the evaluation of the significance of safety measures and the perception of risk. The objective is accomplished through a critical analysis of literature and the survey conducted by the authors among Millennials from Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia. The findings indicate that security measures improve the safety and quality of the tourist experience in respondents from the countries focused on in the survey; however, there are differences in the type of security measures accepted by tourists from individual countries. To have lower travel expenses, they are more willing to accept a lower level of safety during an outbound trip. The research has also revealed that the assessment of security measures varies depending on tourists' gender.

**Keywords:** Millennial travellers, security measures, travel costs, travel risk, Central and Eastern Europe

## 1. Introduction

Events and the changing political situation in the 20th and early 21st centuries had a significant influence on the tourists' perception of security and safety all over the world (Tarlow, 2014; Jurado & Matovelle, 2019; Mataković, 2020). Although some tourists tend to ignore the risk at popular tourist destinations (Fuchs et al., 2012), many of them are willing to pay more for safety at tourist facilities (Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008). Regardless of their age, tourist motivations and incomes, all tourists use tourism infrastructure to a greater or lesser extent while travelling. That is why tourists start to evaluate tourism infrastructure from the point of view of the existence of security measures there (Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008; Ghazi, 2015). They influence the quality of services and thus the tourists' satisfaction (Ogunjinmi & Binuyo, 2018). As a result, investments in tourist security are constantly increasing. This, in turn, has a direct impact on the rising cost of travel. It is also worth noting that not all security measures are appreciated by tourists. Most of them are "visible" and some can violate people's privacy, make it impossible for them to relax, and affect their opinions about tourism infrastructure (Enz & Taylor, 2002; Hilliard and Baloglu, 2008; Ghazi, 2015). All this makes security one of the factors determining the choice of the accommodation facility (Chan & Lam, 2013; Jensen, 2004) or tourist attraction. The above arguments make the subject of the study is the security measures implemented in tourism infrastructure (an inherent element of travel) in the context of an increased travel risk.

Many researchers present and describe the security measures implemented in tourist infrastructure (Henderson, 2007; Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008; Singh, 2014; Monitoring & Compliance Unit Tourism Authority, 2014), but there are no comprehensive studies on the way they affect the quality of tourists' recreation. Besides there are only few studies showing how these measures are evaluated by tourists, or how they affect the quality

---

**Rafał Nagaj**, PhD, Corresponding author, Professor, Institute of Economics and Finance, University of Szczecin, Poland; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9410-7663>; e-mail: [rafal.nagaj@usz.edu.pl](mailto:rafal.nagaj@usz.edu.pl)

**Brigita Žuromskaitė**, PhD, Professor, Institute of Leadership and Strategic Management, Faculty of Public Governance, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6837-344X>; e-mail: [brigitaz@mruni.eu](mailto:brigitaz@mruni.eu)

and enjoyment of the tourists' stay (Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008; Ghazi, 2015). Moreover, they only apply to regions with a high level of political risk.

The aim of the paper is to assess the significance of the level of safety to Millennial travellers from Central and Eastern Europe (Poland, Lithuania, Slovakia), measured by the importance of the security measures used in tourism infrastructure (accommodation facilities and tourist attractions), which provide a safer leisure environment. The authors also discuss whether the tourists' gender and the economic stimulus (reduced travel costs) are factors which influence the evaluation of the significance of safety measures and have an effect on the perception of risk.

This paper contributes to the literature discussion in three aspects. Firstly, the authors focus on a specific social group, i.e. Millennial travellers, representing the, so-called, Millennial generation or Generation Y (18-34 years of age), who are playing an increasingly important role in the development of the tourism sector. According to some authors, in 2020, this generation will account for about half of the demand for tourism sector services (Moisă, 2010; Buffa, 2015; Morrison et al., 2016). They are quite different from the earlier generations, as regards sociological characteristics, tourist motivations and way of travelling (Mura, 2010; Machado, 2014; Nagaj & Žuromskaitė, 2018a). They are ready to accept higher risks, including those involved in tourist travel. As a result, their tourism preferences are different: they prefer international tourism and typically want to gain new cultural experience. Secondly, the authors evaluate the importance of security measures in tourism infrastructure (both at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions) for providing a safer leisure environment, as well as deliberate on how this affects tourism choices, depending on the country, as well on the role of the tourists' gender and the economic stimulus, in the form of reduced travel costs. Thirdly, the authors focus on the region of Central and Eastern Europe, which has not been the object of literature's interest in this research topic so far. Most often, the literature examines areas with a higher level of terrorist risk (Ghazi, 2015; Henderson et al., 2010; Singh, 2014), while this particular region is ignored. Therefore, the authors decided to fill in this significant research gap. So perhaps they underestimate the tourist risk and are not willing to invest in their security.

The remaining part of the article is structured in the following way: Section 2 presents relevant literature regarding the problem of safety and security in tourism infrastructure. Section 3 includes research methodology and a presentation of the subject of study. Section 4 provides empirical results and, finally, Section 5 presents the conclusions to this study and a discussion.

## 2. Literature review

The prerequisite for the development of the tourism sector is a good political and economic situation, which increases tourists' safety (Khazai et al., 2018; Lanouar & Goaid, 2019). The level of tourists' security, the protection of their lives, health and property, is just as important (Bernas & Pujer, 2015). According to Seabra et al. (2018, p. 413) "travel safety is a critical issue to most tourists". Its importance stems from the fact that it affects the perception of the tourist sector and tourist destinations by tourists. It is worth noting that the change of view on the importance of the level of safety during travel is noticed among tourists in recent years. The result is that some tourists choose safe tourist regions, i.e. places where all kinds of security measures are provided in the tourist infrastructure and where there is not a large number of victims among tourists (Survila et al., 2017). The above analysis of the literature indicates that the more threats there are in a given region, the more likely it is that it will lose popularity amongst tourists and the tourism sector's income in this region will decrease (Baral et al., 2004). This is because they treat high risk and their safety as one of the factors determining a tourist trip. Moreover, the opinion about a given destination often remains in the consciousness of tourists for longer. This is because tourists treat their own safety based on their own experience of travelling and cultural differences (Henderson, 2007). It should be added that the sources of information from which

tourists learn about these dangers also have an impact on their inclinations (Žuromskaitė et al., 2018). As Kim et al. (2017) emphasize tourism information quality can shape the destination image in social media and thus influence its attractiveness and the number of arriving tourists. It makes that people are willing to pay more for an accommodation facility with a safety certificate (Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008). This in turn is ensured by, among other things, security systems in tourism infrastructure facilities, which, as indicated by Enz and Taylor (2002), usually consist of two elements: physical safety attributes and organizational systems including plans to ensure safe operation. When security measures are applied, it should be remembered that they must be visible to make tourists feel safe (Henderson et al., 2010). However, bearing in mind that cognitive bias and emotions can affect consumer behaviour (Nagaj, 2018), are must be taken to ensure that safety measures do not adversely affect the comfort of the holiday during a tourist trip, because overly invasive ones can invade privacy and thwart the objective of tourist trip (Henderson et al., 2010; Singh, 2014). The owners of some tourist facilities think that security measures may have a negative impact on their business or that such investments are not needed (Pizam, 2010; Ghazi, 2015). At this point it should be remembered that a lot depends also on the sources of information used by people, which are different, and they often affect the inclinations of tourists (Žuromskaitė et al., 2018). The economic factor should also be taken into account when analysing the need to introduce security measures in tourism infrastructure, so that investments in these measures do not result in an excessive increase in the price of tourism services.

Literature also points out that tourists' behaviour and their attitude to risk may be determined by their country of origin. As the Hofstede model of dimensions of national cultures indicates, there are differences between these cultures. One of the levels of aggregation of culture can be the nation, while one dimension of such differences is uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2009).

Generally, tourism infrastructure (accommodation and tourist attractions) features "soft" and "hard" security measures (Survila et al., 2017; Nagaj & Žuromskaitė, 2020). The former are considered less visible and less interfering with the comfort and leisure of the guests. The latter are more invasive, create a sense of "alarm", but are more effective. However, the main goal of both types of security measures is to reduce risk, ensure tourists' safety and minimize potential economic losses that could arise from it (Henderson, 2007).

One of the first types of tourism infrastructure facilities for which a list of necessary security measures was created were hotels. Enz and Taylor (2002) created a safety index and hotel security was improved with the following measures: sprinklers, smoke detectors, safety-instruction materials, in-room safety videos, security cameras, electronic locks and interior corridors. Nowadays, newly built facilities include these security measures from the very beginning (Enz, 2009).

As indicated by AlBattat and Mat Som (2013), there are various types of danger that a tourist may encounter at an accommodation facility. Thus, it is difficult to select the most appropriate security measures. The security measures most often applied in tourism infrastructure are following: 24-hour cameras, checking the transport arriving at the hotel premises, armed security guards, smoke detectors and sprinkler system, electronic key cards for guest rooms, written security plans, emergency telephone numbers, safe deposit boxes, clearly marked fire exits and extinguishers and others (Hilliard & Baloglu, 2008; Singh, 2014; Monitoring & Compliance Unit Tourism Authority, 2014; Henderson, 2007).

As noted by Ghazi (2015, p. 3), older accommodation facilities are often not designed to ensure safety. As a result, the potential investment outlays at such facilities, necessary to create an adequate level of security, may be much higher. For this reason, older accommodation facilities have fewer security measures. This is all the more important as the number of security measures in the accommodation facilities is one of the parameters of their quality and can be treated as a factor of their competitiveness (Nagaj & Žuromskaitė, 2020).

In the tourist infrastructure, a higher level of risk may affect not only accommodation facilities but also tourist attractions. Those which attract crowds because of their beauty (Siaw & Loosemore, 2006) and cultural and

historical value are most vulnerable. Unfortunately, the installation and use of security measures at tourist attractions is often more difficult than at accommodation facilities, due to the age of the former. In addition, they are often larger in size, which requires hiring and training additional personnel to protect the site, which is an expensive consideration. It should be remembered that even the most advanced security measures will not protect the tourists without properly trained human resources (Enz, 2009). The main security measures installed at tourist attractions include the following: access control, good housekeeping (it builds the image and reduces the chances of suspicious items or bags being planted, as well as helps to deal with false alarms and hoaxes), CCTV guidance, mail handling (to check for any chemical, biological or radioactive materials in the post), search planning, evacuation planning, personnel security, information security (cyber-attack, hacking), intruder alarms, etc. (Re:source, 2003; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2006; National Counter Terrorism Security Office [NaCTSO], 2017). Similar to accommodation facilities, tourists attractions should have security measures which are not invasive, do not spoil the peaceful enjoyment of the stay and do not disturb the tourists with their presence (NaCTSO, 2017).

### 3. Methodology

In tourism, the generation theory is seen as a popular method of explaining consumers' behaviours, because age seems to be a strong determinant affecting the preferences and activities connected with travelling (Huang & Petrick, 2010; Gong et al., 2018). The subject of study are Millennial travellers aged 18-36 from three countries in Central and Eastern Europe - Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia. It is chosen the Generation Y, who is the first wave of the digital generation, which was born in the world of technology (Bencsik et al., 2016; Garikapati et al., 2016), easily accepts changes (Bencsik et al., 2016), accepts cultural differences (Nagaj & Žuromskaitė, 2016), spends a lot of time at destinations which can be regarded as places at high risk (Hughes et al., 2008).

However, the object of the study are decisions of Millennial travellers regarding the security measures implemented at tourist destinations. The authors' aim is to assess the significance of the level of safety to Millennial travellers from Central and Eastern Europe, measured by the importance of the security measures in tourism infrastructure for improving the quality of leisure and making tourism choices in view of an increased risk. In addition, the authors will discuss the impact of the economic stimulus, by showing whether the tourists included in the survey were willing to accept the increased risk when reduced travel costs were offered to them.

Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia were selected for this study, because Lithuania represents the Baltic States, Poland is the largest country in Central Europe, and Slovakia represents the southern part of Central and Eastern Europe. They are countries which have similar experiences and started establishing their independence about 30 years ago. Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia are similar in economic terms. In 2018, GDP per capita (real expenditure per capita in PPS EU-27) was 21,500 in Poland, 24,500 in Lithuania and 23,600 in Slovakia (Eurostat, 2020). The most important reason is the fact that Central and Eastern Europe belongs to the regions with a low risk index.

The selection of the security measures for the study was determined by purpose of the article. They were chosen from among those identified by Henderson (2007) and by the authors of the article, guided by their own observation and literature analysis. At the turn of 2017 and 2018 pilot surveys were carried out, which among other things allowed to pre-identify the most important security measures. During them, all identified security measures were assessed, and then, using the principal component analysis (PCA) method, the number of variables describing the phenomena was reduced. Finally, eleven security measures were taken into consideration, to evaluate the level of safety at accommodation facilities: 24 hour security/armed security guards (SG); monitoring/camera (MO); gated accommodation area (GA); bullet-proof glass (BG); security forces on duty at the facility (SF); metal detectors at the entrances to the facility (MD); baggage scanning

(BS); checking the incoming and outgoing transport (CT); hotel transportation with adequate passenger protection (HT); information about additional security measures in the room (IN); a security button for calling hotel service (SB). In order to evaluate the level of safety at tourist attractions, 10 security measures were used: on-duty security (military) personnel (MP); additional CCTV cameras (AC); security forces on duty (SF); tourist police (TP); metal detectors at the entrances to the facility (MD); checking tourists' personal belongings at the entrances to the facility (CB); verification of documents (VD); guarded fenced tourist facility area (FF); information leaflets (IL) and messages about potential dangers (IM).

In order to examine the opinions of Millennial travellers from Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia about the security measures taken in tourism infrastructure, a survey was carried out, in which the respondents had to answer the questions (the first for accommodation facilities and the second for tourist attractions): What security measures installed in tourism infrastructure made them feel more secure? All the variables were measured using the Likert scale with 5 response options: 1=not important/totally unnecessary; 2=rather unnecessary; 3=neutral; 4=rather important/ necessary; 5=very important/very necessary. The reliability of the scale was verified by applying the internal consistency method and calculating Cronbach's Alpha indicator. The high values of the coefficient confirm that the consistency of the scale elements in measurement is highly acceptable (in the case of the security measures in accommodation facilities value for Poland is 0.88, for Lithuania is 0.86 and for Slovakia is 0.81, and in the case of the security measures at tourist attractions, Cronbach's Alpha value is respectively 0.86, 0.86 and 0.77). It should also be added that the variance of responses for each of the studied countries is at an acceptable level and, depending on the studied security measure in accommodation facilities, ranges from 0.94 to 1.29 for Poland, for Lithuania 1.22-1.58, and for Slovakia 0.79-1.41, and for security measures in tourist facilities is respectively: 1.02-1.44 (Poland), 1.06-1.50 (Lithuania) and 0.70-1.31 (Slovakia). It means that the respondents' answers are not highly dispersed and relatively concentrated.

**Table 1**  
*The description of the research sample*

Itemization		Poland (PL)	Lithuania (LT)	Slovakia (SK)
<b>Sample size</b>		849	652	528
<b>Gender (%)</b>	Women	72.9	76.5	79.9
	Men	27.1	23.5	20.1
<b>Age (%)</b>	Up to 20	17.4	12.5	11.1
	21-25	42.6	32.5	66.2
	26-30	26.7	30.8	12.7
	Over 30	13.3	24.2	10.0
<b>Total budget for a trip per person (%)</b>	Up to 200 eur	38.4	11.8	37.5
	201-400 eur	33.7	27.6	37.9
	401-800 eur	21.4	33.1	20.5
	801-1,200 eur	4.0	17.3	3.4
	Over 1,200 eur	2.5	10.2	0.7
<b>Price reduction of the total cost of tourist trip that would have persuaded of respondent to choose a trip to a country with a lower level of security (% of respondents)</b>	Not responding to travel costs reduction	57.7	46.9	39.8
	20%	2.0	1.5	1.5
	30%	4.0	5.5	3.8
	40%	5.5	9.5	7.6
	50%	14.4	15.8	23.5
	70%	16.4	20.7	23.9

The article presents the results of a survey<sup>1</sup> which was conducted in Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia among young people aged 18-36. In Poland, the survey was conducted in April-May 2018, in Lithuania - in April-May 2018, and in Slovakia - in March 2018. Participation in the study was voluntary, and only those people took part in it, who were willing to complete the survey. So this didn't influence research findings. The survey included only tourists, i.e. people who claimed that they travelled at least once a year and responded to the age criterion. A tourist trip with 1 night or over was treated as a trip. Persons declaring that they do not travel or have done it less than once a year (in the last 2 years) were not included in the results of the analysis. Most of the respondents declared that they travel abroad (in Poland 54.9%, in Lithuania 86.0%, in Slovakia 78.4%). The demographic and economic characteristics of the respondents are provided in Table 1.

For the purpose of the empirical data analysis, the Statistica 13.3 statistical package was used, and for the statistical data analysis - descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. For descriptive statistics, such as frequency expressed as a percentage, mean rank, mode, and median rank were used. Due to the independent samples, the hypotheses resulting from this research were verified by applying nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test (for 2 samples) and Kruskal-Wallis test criteria (for a few samples), at the statistical level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ ,  $p$  value (Asymp. Sig.)  $\leq 0.05$ . Non-parametric tests were used because the variables are expressed on the ordinal scale and the studied population data does not have a normal distribution.

The goal of the hypothesis testing using these statistical tests was to find out whether the evaluation of the security measures in tourism infrastructure (accommodation facilities and tourist attractions) depends statistically significant on the following variables: the country (Poland, Lithuania and Slovakia), gender, travel costs reduction, i.e. the attitude to the decision to go on a trip to a country with a lower level of security but at a reduced price.

With the abovementioned variables in mind, there are three hypotheses:

- in Central and Eastern Europe, the country of origin has no influence on how Millennial travellers assess the security measures in the tourist infrastructure, i.e. their validity and type. Therefore, the hypothesis that will be tested: there is no statistically significant difference between the research samples, i.e. security measures in every country of Central and Eastern Europe are assessed in the same way,
- evaluation of the security measures depends on gender,
- evaluation of the security measures depends on economic incentive in the form of travel costs reduction. Therefore, the authors assume that there is a statistically significant difference between the research samples of Millennial travellers according to a willingness to forgo up security in exchange for a price bonus.

## 4. Results

The authors attempted to assess the importance of the level of safety to Millennial travellers from Central and Eastern Europe, measured by young tourists' evaluation of the security measures in tourism infrastructure (accommodation facilities and tourist attractions). It was investigated whether security measures improve or worsen the tourists' comfort of leisure and whether they are taken into consideration when making tourism choices in the situation of an increased risk. To achieve this objective, the respondents specified whether they would feel safer with them or not. Descriptive statistics methods were used.

First, it was examined how Millennials evaluated the security measures at accommodation facilities, using descriptive statistics methods (Table 2 and Table 3).

**Table 2**  
*The evaluation of security measures at accommodation facilities, by countries: Descriptive statistics\**

Specification	Mean rank			Mode			Number of modes			Median		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
24h armed security guards (SG)	3.93	3.55	3.32	5	4	4	317	188	184	4	4	4
Monitoring / Camera (MO)	4.14	4.04	3.97	5	5	4	380	308	256	4	4	4
Gated accommodation area (GA)	4.00	3.65	3.60	5	4	4	326	209	212	4	4	4
Bulletproof glass (BG)	3.23	3.23	3.02	3	3	3	287	198	180	3	3	3
Security forces in the facility (SF)	3.37	3.48	4.00	3	4	4	289	181	228	3	4	4
Metal detectors (MD)	2.88	3.17	2.74	3	3	3	303	204	168	3	3	3
Baggage scanning (BS)	3.17	3.57	3.22	3	4	4	288	220	184	3	4	3
Control of transport (CT)	3.28	3.49	3.33	3	4	4	280	212	178	3	4	3
Hotel transportation with passenger protection (HT)	3.33	3.80	3.44	4	4/5	4	270	212	198	3	4	4
Information about additional security measures in the room (IN)	3.71	3.52	3.79	4	4	4	292	195	196	4	4	4
Security button calling for hotel service (SB)	3.86	3.81	3.86	4	5	4	296	235	202	4	4	4

\* Scale for evaluation of the importance of security measure ranging from 1=not important to 5=very important.

**Table 3**  
*Share of responded tourists who assess security measures at tourism infrastructure positive (they are important or very important for tourists) or negative (rather unnecessary or totally unnecessary for tourists) (in %)*

Accommodation facilities	Positive impact			Negative impact			Tourist attractions	Positive impact			Negative impact		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK		PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
SG	68.3	54.1	50.4	10.4	19.0	25.0	MP	39.1	55.8	37.9	29.2	16.3	24.6
MO	77.0	71.9	76.9	6.6	10.7	6.1	AC	67.7	72.7	68.6	11.5	9.5	11.0
GA	72.1	57.8	58.0	8.8	14.3	12.1	SF	58.5	54.1	76.1	12.5	15.8	5.3
BG	40.8	44.3	34.8	25.4	25.3	31.1	TP	54.8	62.1	64.8	14.8	11.3	10.6
SF	46.5	53.2	76.5	19.4	21.0	7.6	MD	42.0	51.7	41.7	24.4	17.3	25.8
MD	28.2	40.5	27.7	36.2	28.2	40.5	CB	40.8	61.3	50.4	28.4	14.7	22.3
BS	39.3	58.3	47.3	26.7	17.8	6.9	VD	69.8	58.3	64.0	10.6	17.5	13.3
CT	43.6	54.9	47.3	23.4	19.3	21.2	FF	69.0	61.0	51.9	10.2	12.6	22.7
HT	47.0	65.0	51.5	21.8	11.7	15.9	IL	44.9	50.8	45.8	25.7	23.6	26.1
IN	61.2	54.8	64.8	13.1	17.3	12.1	IM	64.8	56.9	63.3	13.0	18.4	13.3
SB	68.2	63.0	70.1	11.7	14.0	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

The study results indicate that most security measures at accommodation facilities are positively evaluated and considered necessary by the respondents in each country included in the study. The security measures which were rated highly or very highly in all three countries included CCTV camera monitoring (approved by ca. ¾ of respondents, with a mean rank of 3.97-4.14, median of 4, and mode of 4 in Slovakia and 5 in Poland and Lithuania) and the panic button (mean rank of 63.0%-70.1%; median of 4 and mode of 4-5). There is not a single security feature evaluated negatively by more than half of the respondents. The one that is rated the lowest is metal detectors (negative evaluation by 28.2%-40.5% of respondents, with the mean rank below 3, and mode and median of 3, in each country). It is worth noting, however, that the security measures (apart from the ones mentioned above) are assessed differently in individual countries. In Poland, "soft" security measures are preferred: camera monitoring, 24h security guards, gated accommodation area and information about additional security measures in the rooms (mean rank of above 3.7, mode of 4 - 5 and median rate of 4). On the other hand, the security measures which involve checking tourists' personal belongings (e.g. metal detectors, baggage scanners, transport check), as well as the "hard" security measures (e.g. bullet-proof glass, security forces at the facility) may give the impression that the tourist facility is in danger, and are rated neutrally (with mode and median rank of 3, and the mean rank below 3.4). Millennial travellers from Lithuania evaluate security measures at an accommodation facility a bit differently than those from Poland. They rate all security measures, apart from metal detectors and bullet-proof glass, at a similar level, as important. Lithuanian respondents rate "soft" security measures less enthusiastically than the

Millennials from Poland, but "hard" security measures were rated much higher by them (as important) than in Poland (median rate and mode of 4, mean rank above 3.5). The respondents from Slovakia can hardly be described as enthusiasts of any particular type of security measures ("soft" or "hard"). Compared to Polish and Lithuanian Millennial travellers, they evaluate security forces at a facility much better (76.5% gave positive opinions), and security measures like bullet-proof glass and 24h armed security guards - much worse (only 34.8% gave positive opinions, with the median and mode rank of 3 and the mean rank of 3.02), and are almost neutral (the mean rank of 3.32, compared to the mean rank of 3.92 and mode of 5 in Poland).

Next, the authors investigated how Millennials evaluated the security measures at tourist attractions, using measures of descriptive statistics (Table 4) and frequency expressed as a percentage (Table 3).

**Table 4**  
*The evaluation of the security measures at tourist attractions, by countries: Descriptive statistics\**

Specification	Mean rank			Mode			Number of modes			Median		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
On duty security personnel/ military personnel (MP)	3.11	3.60	3.11	3	4	3	269	191	198	3	4	3
Additional cameras (AC)	3.81	4.01	3.78	4	5	4	335	273	234	4	4	4
Security forces in the facility (SF)	3.62	3.56	3.98	4	4	4	331	198	254	4	4	4
Tourist Police (TP)	3.53	3.73	3.70	4	4	4	311	238	242	4	4	4
Metal detectors (MD)	3.23	3.53	3.23	3	3	3	285	202	172	3	4	3
Checking the personal belongings of tourists (CB)	3.15	3.70	3.37	3	4	4	262	211	186	3	4	4
Verification of documents (VD)	3.89	3.63	3.72	4	4	4	311	193	202	4	4	4
Fenced tourist facility area and its protection (FF)	3.85	3.71	3.41	4	4	4	337	218	184	4	4	4
Information leaflets about the potential risks (IL)	3.23	3.37	3.23	4	4	4	257	201	178	3	4	3
Informational messages about the dangers (IM)	3.73	3.56	3.69	4	4	4	334	205	212	4	4	4

\* Scale for evaluation of the importance of security measure ranging from 1=of no importance to 5=very important.

The research results show (Table 4) that security measures at tourist attractions are more frequently evaluated positively (the mean rank of over 3 for all) than the security measures at accommodation facilities (the mean rank below 3 for 2 of them). Compared to the accommodation facilities, where some security measures are rated as very important and others as neutral, those at tourist attractions are rated relatively equally as important. The analysis for individual countries shows that the Millennials from Lithuania evaluate the importance of the security measures at tourist attractions the highest, as having a positive impact on the comfort/leisure (more than half of the respondents assessed them as important or very important). What is more, for all of them, the median of responses is at least 4. For the majority of Millennial travellers from Lithuania (72.7%), security measures have a positive effect on the quality of rest (mode 5). Moreover, they opt for the "hard" security measures, i.e. the Tourist Police, fenced tourist facility area and its protection, checking tourists' personal belongings by military personnel on duty. On the other hand, 23.6% of the respondents view information leaflets concerning potential risks as having a negative impact on the quality of leisure. It is different for Millennial travellers from Poland and Slovakia. Here, at least half of the respondents do not approve of some security measures at tourist attractions. The second difference concerns the type of preferred security measures. In Poland, the "soft" security measures are rated higher than the "hard" ones, while in Slovakia it is difficult to indicate the preference. The following security measures are rated the highest in Poland: verification of documents, fenced tourist facility areas and their protection, additional surveillance equipment and information about possible dangers. However, security measures such as on-duty military personnel or checking tourists' personal belongings, have few supporters and a large number of opponents. The following are rated the highest in Slovakia: security forces at the facility (evaluated as important or very important by 76.1% of respondents, with the mean rank of 3.98), additional cameras and the Tourist Police



(the percentage of respondents positively assessing these particular security measures is the highest among the studied countries). On the other hand, the following security measures are rated the lowest: fenced and guarded tourist facility areas (10 percentage points fewer respondents in Slovakia than in other studied countries assess it positively and over 10 percentage points more respondents assess it negatively) and information leaflets about the potential risks (opposed by many in all three countries).

**Table 5**  
**The evaluation of the security measures at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions by country:**  
**Kruskal-Wallis test and post-hoc testing statistics\***

Accommodation facilities	Kruskal-Wallis test (1-3)**		p-value for post-hoc testing			Tourist attractions	Kruskal-Wallis test (1-3)		p-value for post-hoc testing		
	H	p	1/2	1/3	2/3		H	p	1/2	1/3	2/3
<b>SG</b>	96.50	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.01*	<b>MP</b>	80.71	0.00*	0.00*	1.00	0.00*
<b>MO</b>	17.91	0.00*	1.00	0.00*	0.01*	<b>AC</b>	28.08	0.00*	0.00*	1.00	0.00*
<b>GA</b>	69.97	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.66	<b>SF</b>	53.36	0.00*	1.00	0.00*	0.00*
<b>BG</b>	12.86	0.00*	1.00	0.01*	0.00*	<b>TP</b>	16.48	0.00*	0.00*	0.02*	1.00
<b>SF</b>	118.16	0.00*	0.02*	0.00*	0.00*	<b>MD</b>	30.99	0.00*	0.00*	1.00	0.00*
<b>MD</b>	39.09	0.00*	0.00*	0.25	0.00*	<b>CB</b>	86.87	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
<b>BS</b>	53.44	0.00*	0.00*	0.70	0.00*	<b>VD</b>	19.14	0.00*	0.00*	0.01*	1.00
<b>CT</b>	17.49	0.00*	0.00*	1.00	0.02*	<b>FF</b>	54.09	0.00*	0.06	0.00*	0.00*
<b>HT</b>	71.80	0.00*	0.00*	0.39	0.00*	<b>IL</b>	7.48	0.02*	0.05	1.00	0.08
<b>IN</b>	10.90	0.00*	0.06	0.88	0.01*	<b>IM</b>	5.94	0.05	0.06	1.00	0.53
<b>SB</b>	0.16	0.92	1.00	1.00	1.00						

\* Asterisks mean that there is a statistically significant difference between the tested samples.

\*\* 1 - Poland; 2 - Lithuania; 3 - Slovakia.

The differences between countries as regards assessing security measures by Millennial travellers were confirmed by non-parametric *Kruskal-Wallis test*, the results of which are presented in Table 5 (bold print means statistical significance of the differences between the tested samples). The statistical verification shows that between the three studied countries, there is a statistically significant difference in the assessment of the suitability of most security measures at accommodation facilities. Only for the panic button, there is no statistically significant difference. Post-hoc testing (*Dunn's test*) has been used to identify between which groups (pairs of countries) there are differences in the assessment of security measures. The analysis indicated that differences occur mainly between respondents from Lithuania and Poland, as well as between those from Lithuania and Slovakia. With regard to the assessment of security measures in accommodation facilities the largest differences can be observed between the Millennial travellers from Slovakia and Lithuania, where the differences in assessment relate to 9 out of 11 security measures. Equally strong differences concern Poland and Lithuania, where security measures are assessed differently, with the exception of 4 security measures (monitoring/camera (MO), bulletproof glass (BG), information about additional security measures in the room (IN) and security button calling for hotel service (SB)). Millennials from Poland and Slovakia differ only slightly - statistically significant differences concern only five of 11 security measures, mostly "hard" ones.

Slightly smaller differences between the studied countries in assessing the suitability of security measures relate to tourist attractions. It should be noted, however, that they concern the same pairs of countries. They also occur mainly between Polish and Lithuanian Millennial travellers and relate mainly to "hard" security measures. In this case, with the exception of 4 security measures, ie. security forces at the facility (SF), fenced tourist facility area (FF), information leaflets (IL) and informational messages (IM) about the potential risks and the dangers, respective respondents differ in their assessment of the importance of security measures. Similar strong differences (6 of 10) concern tourists from Slovakia and Lithuania, but here the differences are only in relation to hard security measures. However, as regards the respondents from Slovakia and Poland, statistically significant differences occurred only in the case of 5 security measures (SF, TP, CB, VD and FF),

ie. "hard" security measures, but those of them that are related to the nationality such as verification of documents or checking the personal belongings of tourists.

**Table 6**  
*The evaluation of security measures at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions according to gender: Mann-Whitney U test statistics\**

Security measures	Z			p-value		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
<b>Accommodation facilities</b>						
SG	4.46	1.60	2.62	0.00*	0.11	0.01*
MO	5.29	1.34	-1.50	0.00*	0.18	0.13
GA	5.05	2.16	0.15	0.00*	0.03*	0.88
BG	3.34	3.53	-2.13	0.00*	0.00*	0.03*
SF	3.85	2.41	-2.43	0.00*	0.02*	0.02*
MD	2.08	0.20	-1.17	0.04*	0.84	0.24
BS	2.96	2.15	-1.31	0.00*	0.03*	0.19
CT	2.89	2.37	0.12	0.00*	0.02*	0.91
HT	3.39	1.84	-1.56	0.00*	0.07	0.12
IN	4.74	2.26	-1.27	0.00*	0.02*	0.21
SB	5.56	3.28	-2.28	0.00*	0.00*	0.02*
<b>Tourist attractions</b>						
MP	1.91	-0.12	-0.92	0.06	0.90	0.36
AC	5.73	1.07	-3.64	0.00*	0.28	0.00*
SF	3.10	-0.03	-4.63	0.00*	0.98	0.00*
TP	4.72	1.48	-3.86	0.00*	0.14	0.00*
MD	2.84	1.02	-3.64	0.00*	0.31	0.00*
CB	4.81	2.78	-2.72	0.00*	0.00*	0.01*
VD	5.53	1.47	-3.21	0.00*	0.14	0.00*
FF	4.57	3.21	-2.41	0.00*	0.00*	0.02*
IL	5.11	3.66	-1.20	0.00*	0.00*	0.05
IM	6.00	3.09	-3.63	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*

\* Asterisks mean statistically significant differences between the tested samples.

The results of the study using *Mann-Whitney U test* show that gender is an important factor that makes Millennial travellers different in their evaluation of the importance of security measures (Table 6). In Poland, the gender-evaluation relationship occurs for all the analyzed security measures at accommodation facilities and for most at tourist attractions. Rank-sum analysis shows that women rank the importance of security measures higher than men in all three countries (the average ranks and their sum are higher among women). The *Mann-Whitney U test* for Lithuania confirmed that for most security measures at accommodation facilities, there are statistically significant differences between women and men, and that for most security measures applied at tourist attractions, statistical significance occurs only for "soft" safety measures. The results of the statistical analysis of Millennials in Slovakia shows a different relationship than in Lithuania: gender is an important factor among the respondents who evaluate the importance of security measures at tourist attractions (for 9 out of 10), and there are no such differences as regards accommodation facilities (for 7 out of 11 security measures. no statistically significant differences were identified with the gender variable involved).

Finally, it was examined whether Millennial travellers would be willing to trade higher security for economic benefits, i.e. sacrifice a higher safety level in exchange for an appropriate economic motivation. The respondents were asked at what reduction in the cost of a tourist trip, they would be willing to go to a country with a reduced security level (economic incentives of 0%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 70%). The results, based on *Kruskal-Wallis test*, are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7**  
**The evaluation of the security measures at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions according to travel costs reduction: Kruskal-Wallis test statistics\***

Security measures	H			p-value		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
<b>Accommodation facilities</b>						
SG	39.66	13.62	15.15	0.00*	0.02*	0.01*
MO	28.46	21.03	37.61	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
GA	43.35	30.42	45.06	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
BG	30.58	26.89	23.06	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
SF	23.35	41.32	35.84	0.00*	0.00*	0.00*
MD	14.22	15.79	21.51	0.01*	0.01*	0.00*
BS	24.53	4.95	16.86	0.00*	0.42	0.00*
CT	19.66	29.44	13.77	0.00*	0.00*	0.02*
HT	33.74	10.20	25.05	0.00*	0.07	0.00*
IN	29.97	8.81	13.07	0.00*	0.12	0.02*
SB	32.35	15.35	15.36	0.00*	0.01*	0.01*
<b>Tourist attractions</b>						
MP	15.91	19.93	17.20	0.01*	0.00*	0.00*
AC	29.79	12.77	20.27	0.00*	0.03*	0.00*
SF	19.61	3.83	22.84	0.00*	0.57	0.00*
TP	40.15	7.61	7.05	0.00*	0.18	0.22
MD	27.80	15.65	11.47	0.00*	0.01*	0.04*
CB	22.13	5.90	24.85	0.00*	0.32	0.00*
VD	29.28	9.10	12.94	0.00*	0.11	0.02*
FF	50.79	15.07	12.31	0.00*	0.01*	0.03*
IL	20.32	11.68	2.63	0.00*	0.04*	0.76
IM	38.20	12.48	5.59	0.00*	0.03*	0.35

\* Asterisks mean statistically significant differences between the tested samples.

The research results show that the economic factor plays a role in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (asterisks in Table 7 indicates statistically significant differences in the assessment when the grouping variable is the travel costs reduction). In Poland, the assessment of all the security measures applied at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions, shows statistically significant differences, depending on the reduction in travel costs, offered to tourists in exchange for a lower level of safety. In Slovakia, the differences in assessment refer to all the security measures used at accommodation facilities and most of the security measures at tourist attractions (7 out of 10). In Lithuania, similar differences in assessment occurred only as regarded 8 out of 11 security measures at accommodation facilities and 7 out of 10 security measures at tourist attractions (the smallest numbers among all three countries in question). Millennial travellers from Poland are least willing to sacrifice the level of security in return for an economic advantage (regardless of the level of reduction in travel costs, 57.7% would not travel to a country with a lower level of security). In Lithuania and Slovakia, more than half of the respondents would accept such an offer (53.1% and 60.2% respectively).

The above analysis indicated that the economic factor, ie. travel cost reduction, causes a differentiation of the assessment of security measures by tourists. However, is there any relationship? To answer this question, the mean ranks of security measures depending on travel cost reduction was calculated (Table 8) and *the Chi-square independence test* was used (at p-value ≤ 0.05).

**Table 8**

*The evaluation of the security measures at accommodation facilities and tourist attractions, using descriptive statistics (mean rank) when the grouping variable is the scale of travel costs reduction*

Mea- sure	20%			30%			40%			50%			70%			100%**		
	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK	PL	LT	SK
<b>Accommodation facilities</b>																		
SG	3.2	3.2	3.8	3.2	3.6	2.9	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.0	4.1	3.5	3.6	4.0	3.7	3.4
MO	3.6	3.6	4.5	3.6	4.1	3.2	4.0	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
GA	3.3	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.1	3.1	4.0	3.7	3.3	4.2	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.8	3.9
BG	2.5	3.6	2.5	2.9	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.6	3.4	3.3	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.3	2.5	3.4	3.1
SF	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.1	3.9	4.5	3.3	2.5	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.6	4.2	2.8	3.6	4.1
MD	2.3	3.2	3.8	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.9	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.8
BS	2.5	3.0	3.5	2.4	3.4	2.8	3.1	3.4	2.8	3.1	3.6	3.0	3.2	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4
CT	2.7	2.0	3.3	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.3
HT	2.4	3.3	3.5	2.6	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.8	3.2	3.4	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.9	3.4
IN	3.2	2.7	4.0	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.1	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.9
SB	3.3	3.0	4.3	3.0	4.7	4.4	3.6	3.1	3.7	3.7	4.3	3.7	3.8	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.8
<b>Tourist attractions</b>																		
MP	2.4	3.4	2.3	2.6	3.7	3.3	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.6	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.1
AC	3.2	3.6	3.8	3.3	3.8	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.8
SF	3.4	3.8	4.0	3.1	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	4.2	3.7	3.6	4.0
TP	3.1	2.6	3.8	2.8	3.9	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.8
MD	2.8	3.2	3.0	2.4	3.7	2.7	2.9	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.7	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.3
CB	2.4	3.2	3.5	2.6	3.6	2.7	2.9	3.6	3.8	3.1	3.7	3.1	3.1	3.7	3.6	3.3	3.8	3.4
VD	3.2	2.8	4.0	3.4	3.3	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.8
FF	3.1	2.6	3.3	3.2	3.8	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.3	3.8	3.6	3.4	4.0	3.8	3.6
IL	2.5	2.4	3.3	2.9	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.2
IM	2.9	3.0	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.8

\*Values below 3 indicate a negative impact of the security measure on the well-being of tourists, values equal 3 are neutral, and values over 3 (up to 5) indicate a positive impact on the well-being of tourists.

\*\* Not responding to the reduction in travel costs.

The analysis of Mean Ranks of the importance of security measures in tourism infrastructure by tourists when the grouping variable is the scale of travel costs reduction generally indicates that when the Millennials are less sensitive to the price (there is a lower willingness for exchange for reduced travel costs, ie. they demand a greater price reduction), they assess the importance of security measures lower. This was not confirmed by the statistical verification of these mean ranks using *the Chi-square independence test*. The results indicate that among Millennial travellers from Poland and Lithuania, there is no statistically significant relationship between the assessment of the importance of a safety measure and the scale of the travel costs reduction. Therefore, it cannot be said that when the cost reduction increases, more Millennials from Poland and Lithuania will agree to go to a tourist destination where there is a lower level of security at tourism infrastructure. This relationship only concerns the Millennials from Slovakia, with respect to the following security measures: MO (Chi square=13.98; p=0.016), SF(Chi square=11.55; p=0.042); IN (Chi square= 13.02; p=0.023) and SB (Chi square=14.63; p=0.012). In the case of tourist attractions, such a relationship exists for SF (Chi square=12.13; p=0.033) and VD (Chi square=12.29; p=0.031). In addition, the importance of the security measures in tourism infrastructure is ranked the highest by Millennial travellers who are either not concerned about the travel costs or are willing to give up security in return for a very high discount (70%).

## 5. Conclusions and discussion

The 21<sup>st</sup> century poses new challenges for tourism. As tourists' tastes and preferences change, we confront the problem of their effective protection against potential threats (Tarlow, 2014), which, unfortunately, are a part of the contemporary world and they will not disappear overnight (Seabra , 2014; Seabra et al., 2013). Since

tourists often become the victims of different types of risks, administrators of tourism infrastructure (accommodation facilities and tourist attractions) must do their best to minimize potential risks faced by tourists. Therefore, they have to meet the emerging challenges and answer the following questions: what security measures should be used in tourism infrastructure and how to use them effectively taking into consideration the fact that tourists' peace and comfort leisure should be prevented from any disturbance. The analysis of literary sources has indicated that "hard" security measures can create an atmosphere of trepidation. Thus, instead of effectively providing tourists with safety, they mainly discourage tourists from choosing certain destinations. Yet the use of "soft" security measures alone may increase the number of victims and affect the image of tourist destinations.

The research subject in this article were Millennials, who due to their characteristic tourist preferences and social features differ from previous generations. They are more curious about the world, look for new interesting and undiscovered places rarely frequented by mass tourism participants. This particular group of tourists finds it more important to visit interesting places than to enjoy high standard accommodation, which may also make them more vulnerable to potential threats.

The research was carried out in three CEE countries. The authors agree with the conclusions by Desivilya et al. (2015) that the approach of tourists to their safety may differ depending on the country they come from and on the types of danger (AlBattat & Mat Som, 2013). Thus, the assumptions of cultural differences indicated in the model by Hofstede (2009) are also reflected in the analysed issue concerning the region of Central and Eastern Europe. Tourists from the so-called "safe" countries pay less attention to security matters and are willing to downplay potential threats. The aim of the paper was to examine the attitude of Millennial travellers to the security measures used in tourism infrastructure. The results indicate that while analysing this category of tourists, the fact that "adventurous" tourists are dealt with must be taken into consideration. Most of the surveyed Millennial travellers from Slovakia and Lithuania were willing to risk their own safety and travel to dangerous tourist destinations, if they had the opportunity to travel cheaper. The situation is slightly different with tourists from Poland. The latter are more cautious when it comes to choosing a tourist destination – they give their safety a higher priority. The respondents displayed significant differences in the assessment of security measures applied in tourism infrastructure. Millennial travellers from all the countries in question agree that such measures are needed. However, Millennials from Lithuania prefer "hard" security measures, the Slovaks do not have one clear position, and the Poles prefer "soft" security measures. Interestingly, tourists from Poland and some tourists from Slovakia said they would like to have "soft" security measures installed both in accommodation facilities and in tourist attractions. It is difficult to say why such differences occur among these countries and why certain security measures are preferred, while others not. Perhaps one should agree with Desivilya et al. (2015) that coming from a safe country with a low level threat has a direct impact on risk perception. Research on this issue is limited and there is a need for broader studies in the future in order to understand the reason for individual choices. According to the authors, the fact that Lithuanians are in favour of "hard" security measures may be related to their historical past (this is a country that has regained its independence quite recently and operated in an environment of "hard" security control for a long period) as well as to the geographical location of their country. The research results have also indicated that the evaluation of security measures depends on the respondents' gender. Women in each of the studied countries are concerned about their own safety more than men are. The results of the research have shown that this applies to all security measures used in accommodation facilities and tourist attractions. It was also found that tourists' views change when economic benefits are proposed to them. The importance of security measures in tourism infrastructure is rated the highest by Millennials who are either not concerned about travel cost reduction or are willing to give up security only when offered a very high – 70 % – price reduction. The findings have also indicated that young tourists from Central and Eastern Europe were quite willing to sacrifice security in exchange for an economic advantage (42.3% in Poland, 53.1% in Lithuania, and 60.2% in Slovakia). This finding partly reiterates the study conducted by Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty (2009) who claim that although people say that safety is important to them, some tourists continue to travel despite

the possible risk. Our study confirms the conclusions presented by Barton et al. (2013) and Garg (2015) who state that Millennial travellers are impacted by economic factors when taking travel decisions.

The article has practical and theoretical implications. The authors' main contribution is their research conducted among tourists coming from countries with low risk like the CEE region. In this way, they fill in the existing gap in the scientific literature. So far, the focus has been on investigating the countries with high or heightened level of threats. The literature focused mainly on examining tourists from regions of Southern Europe or the Middle East where there are political risks, and the studies were conducted on tourists from these countries or travelling to these countries. The authors also filled in another research gap in the literature on tourism safety and security issues. They did it by studying the way the Millennials perceive security measures and the significance of safety with respect to the country of origin, gender and attitude to price reduction. Whereas a practical implication is information for the sector representatives about which security measures are preferred in the studied countries. The article provides information on which types of security measures, "soft" or "hard", are worth implementing in order to encourage the Millennials, who will soon generate most of the revenue for the tourism sector, to travel. The research conducted in this article is particularly relevant now in the COVID-19 era, when the attitude of tourists to their own health and life, including the Millennials, is changing significantly. The current need to care for the safety and health of tourists has affected all tourist destinations worldwide. The results obtained during our study may give valuable clues in restoring confidence in the tourism sector after it has been frozen for several months. The results presented in this article may be particularly applicable to the region of Central and Eastern Europe, which was one of the first in Europe and the world to unfreeze tourism after it was locked by a pandemic (among others, the Baltic "travel bubble").

The study presented in the article has also several shortcomings and, consequently, some research limitations. The results cannot be generalized for the whole population of the countries in question, but only to the generation of Millennials. Moreover, the study included mostly unmarried people. The married ones might have shown a smaller inclination to take risks. Another research shortcoming is the method used, i.e. the questionnaire survey, which measures only the subjective, conscious attitudes of the respondents. In surveys, respondents sometimes manipulate their answers (Ma et al., 2014). This particular problem could be avoided by using some behavioural methods, for instance, those applied in neuro-tourism (Nagaj & Žuromskaitė, 2018b). Hence, the authors believe that future studies should include subconscious attitudes, which will enable researchers to carry out a more in-depth analysis.

---

#### Note:

<sup>1</sup> Survey research in Poland and Slovakia was conducted by first of the authors, and in Lithuania by the second of them.

## References

- AlBattat, A.R., & Mat Som A. (2013). Emergency preparedness for disasters and crises in the hotel industry. *SAGE Open Journals*, July–September, 1-10.
- Baral, A., Baral, S., & Morgan, N. (2004). Marketing Nepal in an uncertain climate: Confronting perceptions of risk and insecurity. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10, 186-192.
- Barton, C., Haywood, J., Jhunjhunwala, P., & Bhatia, V. (2013). *Travelling with Millennials*. The Boston Consulting Group. <http://www.bcg.com/documents/file129974.pdf>
- Bencsik, A., Horváth-Csikós, G., & Juhász, T. (2016). Y and Z generations at workplaces. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), 90-106.
- Bernaś, B., & Pujer, K. (2015). Bezpieczeństwo i zagrożenia w turystyce [Safety and risks in tourism]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Bankowej we Wrocławiu*, 2, 223-243.
- Buffa, F. (2015). Young tourists and sustainability. Profiles, attitudes, and implications for destination strategies. *Sustainability*, 7(10), 14042-14062.

- Chan, E.S.W., & Lam, D. (2013). Hotel safety and security systems: Bridging the gap between managers and guests. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 202-216.
- Desivilya, H., Teitler-Regev, S., & Shahrabani, S. (2015). The effects of conflict on risk perception and travelling intention of young tourists. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 10(1), 118-130.
- Enz, C.A. (2009). The physical safety and security features of U.S. hotels. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 50(4), 553-560.
- Enz, C.A., & Taylor, M.S. (2002). The safety and security of U.S. hotels: A post-September-11 report. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 19-136.
- Eurostat. (2020). [https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/sdg\\_10\\_10/default/table?lang=en](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/databrowser/view/sdg_10_10/default/table?lang=en)
- Fuchs, G., Uriely, N., Arie, R., & Maoz, D. (2012). Vacationing in a terror-stricken destination: Tourists' risk perceptions and rationalizations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(2), 182-191.
- Garg, A. (2015). Travel risks vs tourist decision making: A tourist perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems*, 8(1), 1-9.
- Garikapati, V.M., Pendyala, R.M., Morris, E.A., Mokhtarian, P.L., & McDonald, N. (2016). Activity patterns, time use, and travel of millennials: A generation in transition? *Transport Reviews*, 36(5), 558-584.
- Ghazi, K.M. (2015). Safety and security measures in Egyptian hotels. *Hotel & Business Management*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Gong, B., Ramkissoon, A., Greenwood, R.A. & Hoyte, D.S. (2018). The generation for change: Millennial, their career orientation, and role innovation. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 30(1), 82-96.
- Henderson, J.C. (2007). *Tourism crises: Causes, consequences and management*. Elsevier.
- Hilliard, T.W., & Baloglu, S. (2008). Safety and security as part of the hotel servicescape for meeting planners. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 9(1), 15-34.
- Hofstede, G. (2009). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), Article 8. <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8>
- Huang, Y.C., & Petrick, J.F. (2010). Generation Y's travel behaviours: A comparison with Baby Boomers and Generation X. In P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo, & D. Pendergast (Eds.), *Tourism and Generation Y* (pp. 7-37). CAB International.
- Hughes, K., Bellis, M.A., Calafat, A., Juan, M., Schnitzer, S., & Anderson, Z. (2008). Predictors of violence in young tourists: A comparative study of British, German and Spanish holidaymakers. *European Journal of Public Health*, 18(6), 569-574.
- Jensen, D. (2004). Playing it safe. *Sales and Marketing Management*, 156(3), 53.
- Jurado, K.C., & Matovelle, P.T. (2019). Assessment of tourist security in Quito city through importance - performance analysis. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 67(1), 73-86.
- Khazai, B., Mahdavian, F., & Platt, S. (2018). Tourism Recovery Scorecard (TOURS) – Benchmarking and monitoring progress on disaster recovery in tourism destinations. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 27, 75-84.
- Kim, S.-E., Leeb, K., Shinc, S., & Yangd, S.B. (2017). Effects of tourism information quality in social media on destination image formation: The case of Sina Weibo. *Information & Management*, 54(6), 687–702.
- Lanouar, C., & Goaid M. (2019). Tourism, terrorism and political violence in Tunisia: Evidence from Markovswitching models. *Tourism Management*, 70, 404–418.
- Ma, Q. G., Hu, L. F., Pei, G. X., Ren, P. Y., & Ge, P. (2014). Applying neuroscience to tourism management: A primary exploration of neurotourism. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 670-671, 1637-1640.
- Machado, A. (2014, June 18). How Millennials are changing travel. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/06/how-millennials-are-changing-international-travel/373007/>
- Mataković, H. (2020). Seasonality of crime in Croatia: A relationship with tourism. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 68(2), 195-206.
- Moisă, C.O. (2010). Aspects of the youth travel demand. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, 12(2), 575-582.
- Monitoring & Compliance Unit Tourism Authority. (2014). *Safety and security measures – Tourist accommodation*. [http://www.tourismauthority.mu/userfiles/Annex%2013-SAFETY%20AND%20SECURITY%20MEASURES%20FOR%20ACCOMODATION\(1\).pdf](http://www.tourismauthority.mu/userfiles/Annex%2013-SAFETY%20AND%20SECURITY%20MEASURES%20FOR%20ACCOMODATION(1).pdf)
- Morrison, G., Fernandes, L., & Hayashi, C. (2016). *Millennial traveller report: Why Millennials will shape the next 20 years of travel*. Factory, & Expedia. <https://www.foresightfactory.co/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Expedia-Millennial-Traveller-Report-Final.pdf>

- Mura, P. (2010). 'Scary...but i like it!' Young tourists' perceptions of fear on holiday. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 8(1-2), 30-49.
- National Counter Terrorism Security Office. (2017). *Counter terrorism protective security advice for visitor attractions*. [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/375180/VisitorAttractions\\_Reviewed.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375180/VisitorAttractions_Reviewed.pdf)
- Nagaj, R. (2018). Metody behawioralne w ocenie zachowań konsumentów na rynku energii elektrycznej [Behavioral methods used to study consumer behaviour on the electricity market]. *Rynek Energii*, 3(136), 3-8.
- Nagaj, R., & Žuromskaitė, B. (2016). Incomes and the willingness of students in Poland and Lithuania to participate in charitable activities. *Journal of International Studies*, 9(2), 127-138.
- Nagaj, R., & Žuromskaitė, B. (2018a). Millennium travellers tourism choices in an era of global threats of terrorist attacks – A case study of Poland and Lithuania. In *NORDSCI Proceedings of the NordSci Conference on Social Sciences* (pp. 287-297). SAIMA CONSULT LTD.
- Nagaj, R., & Žuromskaitė, B. (2018b). The role of behavioral methods used in research tourism development. In K. Nermend, & M. Łatuszyńska (Eds.), *Problems, methods and tools in experimental and behavioral economics. Springer proceedings in business and economics* (pp. 331-342). Springer International Publishing.
- Nagaj, R., & Žuromskaitė, B. (2020). Security measures as a factor in the competitiveness of accommodation facilities. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 13(5), 99.
- Ogunjinmi, A.A., & Binuyo, I.Y. (2018). Relationship between destination service quality and tourists' satisfaction in Ikogosi Warm Spring Resort, Nigeria. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 66(4), 362-378.
- Pizam, A. (2010). Hotels as tempting targets for terrorism attacks. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 1.
- Re:source (2003). *Security in museums, archives and libraries a practical guide*. MLA. <https://326gtd123dbk1xdkdm489u1q-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Security-in-Museums-Archives-and-Libraries-A-Practical-Guide.pdf>
- Rittichainuwat, B.N., & Chakraborty, G. (2009). Perceived travel risks regarding terrorism and disease: The case of Thailand. *Tourism Management*, 30, 410-418.
- Seabra, C., Abrantes, J.L., & Kastenholz, E. (2014). The influence of terrorism risk perception on involvement and safety importance to international tourists. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(9-10), 874-903.
- Seabra, C., Dolnicar, S., Abrantes, J.L., & Kastenholz, E. (2013). Heterogeneity in risk and safety perceptions of international tourists. *Tourism Management*, 36, 502-510.
- Seabra, C., Kastenholz, E., Abrantes, J. L., & Reis, M. (2018). Peacefulness at home: Impacts on international travel. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 4(4), 413-428.
- Siaw, K.T., & Loosemore, M. (2006). Terrorism prevention, preparedness, and response in built facilities. *Facilities*, 24(5/6), 157-176.
- Singh, J. (2014). Safety & security concerns in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 2(2), 1-5.
- Survila, A., Mikėnas, E., & Žuromskaitė, B. (2017). The impact of terrorism on the tourism sector of Lithuania. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 13(3), 101-118.
- Tarlow, P. (2014). Reflective epilogue: Concerns in tourism safety. *International Journal of Religious Tourism and Pilgrimage*, 2(1), 68-70.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2006). *Cultural heritage protection handbook No 1. Security at museums*. [http://www.unesco.org/new/en/tashkent/about-this-office/single-view/news/security\\_at\\_museums\\_cultural\\_heritage\\_protection\\_handbook/](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/tashkent/about-this-office/single-view/news/security_at_museums_cultural_heritage_protection_handbook/)
- Žuromskaitė, B., Nagaj, R., & Dačiulytė, R. (2018). Source of information on the perceived risk and safety in the tourism industry. In N. Grünwald & M. Zakrzewska (Eds.), *Series of the Robert-Schmidt-Institut: Proceedings of the 5th International Scientific Conference on "Modern Economics"* (pp. 266-273). University of Wismar.

Received: February 11, 2020

Revised: June 26, 2020

Revised: August 24, 2020

Accepted: August 28, 2020

Refereed Anonymously