

TOURISM SUSTAINABILITY IN AFRICA: CAN WE RELY ON TIP, ETHNIC TENSION AND SOCIAL SUPPORT?

Ernest Alang Wung
Roger Tsafack Nanfosso
Armand Mboutchouang Kountchou

<https://doi.org/10.20867/tosee.07.32>

Abstract

Purpose – The objective of this paper is to analyze the cultural values in Africa on tourism sustainability. This is due to the existence of minimal works in the African context on tourism.

Methodology – Adopting the instrumental variable two-stage least square (IV-2SLS) strategy on a panel of 41 African countries within the period 2006-2017, we accustom for potential endogeneity problems with the indicators to explore the theoretical contribution of the study.

Findings – Findings show that, African generosity, culture, and social support contribute to the sustainability of the tourism sector in Africa. Implying that, as Africans are more and more supportive, offering tips (time, financial and/or moral help) to strangers/organizations, and the diversity of the African continent in terms of language, nationality, and race strongly contribute to the sustainability of tourism in Africa through a massive annually inflow of tourist.

Contribution – Apart from contributing to the sustainable tourism literature, this paper is novel in its scope and methodology alongside its theoretical background. This paper as well indicates the importance of hospitality in the tourism sector of African countries.

Keywords: Generosity (tips), Ethnic Tension, Social Support, Tourism sustainability, IV-2SLS, Africa.

1. INTRODUCTION

Portraying a good image of the African touristic image and richness entails adequate attention from both practitioners and scholars. Though Africa is endowed with touristic potentials, giving a clarity to foreign investors, travelers and those seeking for touristic destinations for leisure about the African continent is non-negligible (Christie, Fernandes, Messerli, and Twining-Ward 2013; Dieke 2020; Tasci, Aktas, and Acikgoz 2021). The benefits of international tourism are elaborately documented and/or not limited to its contribution to, foreign exchange earnings, government revenue, creation of employment opportunities, income generation, stimulation of an inward investment and regional development, and strengthening of international relations between countries (Dieke, 2020).

Yet, the tourism sector in Africa is still at its development stage (Christie et al. 2013), and not at the forefront of major world policies regarding the tourism industry towards achieving a sustained tourism sector in Africa (Kaitano 2020). For instance, 2017 was asserted a year of sustainable tourism to promulgate a common global agenda that grabs the challenges faced by the tourism sector of the world and Africa as well by the World

Tourism Organization (WTO). But the Agenda 2030 for sustainable development goals (SDGs) does not address tourism at the forefront of these SDGs (Kaitano 2020). Though the tourism sector fits into the SDGs at almost all the pillars.

African countries, particularly those of SSA like Kenya, Côte d'Ivoire, Mauritius and Zimbabwe is well known to be the strongest areas of performance in terms of tourist destination with very slow growth rates in tourism arrivals, e.g. the case of South Africa in 2017 with slide differences with other African counties (Dieke 2020). This research, thus, highlights the fact that, for a continuity in growth and/or a sustainable tourism sector in Africa to be achieved, several factors are not to be considered minimal – tipping, culture, and social support are therefore rallied to explore the effect on tourism sustainability in Africa. Attracting tourists to Africa is attributed to factors such as; the conducive African climate, cultural diversity of Africa, socially supportive nature of Africans to both indigents and strangers, touristic sites, among other factors. These determinants, play a vital role in attracting tourists to Africa that in return contribute to the GDP of the country (e.g. through tourist receipts) and hence, a growth and/or a continuity in the tourism sector (Banga, Deka, Kilic, Ozturen, and Ozdeser 2022).

The African continent (context) remains an untapped area in terms of scholarly works on tourism studies, though with a growing touristic industry (Christie et al. 2013; Dieke 2020; Kaitano 2020). Scanty and minimal works exist in Africa on the subject of tourism sustainability (Dieke 2020; Kaitano 2020) with most of them highlighting the weaknesses of the tourism sector in Africa with a clear policy recommendations for policymakers (Christie et al. 2013; Dieke 2020).

Though hospitality, the internet, governance, and quality of infrastructures have been greatly explored (Filep, Macnaughton, and Glover 2017; Tasci et al. 2021; Xu 2010), other feasible strands remain untapped. For instance, the generous, welcoming, cultural differences and social support Africans give to both tourists and their fellow blacks remain spatially explored (Tasci et al. 2021). Thus, the objective of this research is to fill in this gap in the literature by exploring the impact of cultural differences in Africa, the socially supportive nature of Africans and African generosity¹ to attract and sustain the tourism sector of Africa. This is demonstrated with the use of the instrumental variable two-stage least square strategy on a panel of forty-one African countries.

In the tourism literature, words of gratitude are frequently mentioned, but few empirical research has focused on the salient factor of generosity, cultural diversity and social support to be measures good enough to influence tourism development and its sustainability in Africa and the world at large (Filep et al. 2017; Kumar, Calvo, Avendano, Sivaramakrishnan, and Berkman 2012). We contribute to the existing tourism literature by carrying out an empirical study that seeks to demonstrate the contribution of three main indicators to tourism sustainability in Africa – tipping, culture, and social support. After section 1, the rest of the paper is structured as follows; in section 2 extant literature

¹ Adult African Generosity is inter-changeably called tipping and generosity in this study due to the measurement criteria used by Gallup (2018) in capturing this indicator and authors' intuition base on extant works. Details at the variable description section.

is reviewed (2.1.) with a theoretical underpinning (2.2.), section 3 presents the analytical approach, while section 4 presents the findings and discussions and section 5 concludes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL INSIGHT

2.1. Review of Literature and Hypothesis Development

The Asian Pacific is noted to be the top world leading tourist destinations, with Africa (precisely Sub-Sahara Africa) proceeding Asia (Christie et al. 2013). It is no doubt that tourism is strongly influenced by African generosity, ethnic tension and social support (Christie et al. 2013). Nevertheless, even though tourism is the fastest growing sector in the world today (UNWTO 2020), its growth in Africa remains questionable as many factors still preclude its growth; the availability of land, students' enrollment into the field of hospitality and leisure, culture, the kindness and welcoming nature of the people (generous) among other factors.

Filep et al. (2017), documents three main motives for analyzing gratitude and gratuity/generosity in the tourism literature; (i) kinship and relationship enhancements is a key core tourist motive and certainly a driver of tourist satisfaction and how this satisfaction is met in a tourist-tourist and tourist-host context is important, but less documented especially in strangers' interactions. (ii) The topic of gratitude sheds light on the outcome of tourist experiences and well-being. (iii) Tourism is a unique and important context in which the examination of temporal social capital, trust, and interactions between strangers is carried out; since travellers regularly benefit from the kindness of strangers/host. In examining kindness in the tourism field, Filep et al. (2017) make clear a distinction between gratitude and gratuity-generosity but, however, focused their study on gratitude without a reason – gratitude and gratuity are never the same thing, beside a quantitative empirical study of generosity is required.

Gratitude to Filep et al. (2017) is defined as a desirable habit that connotes excellence in personal character - and, in positive psychological terms, an emotional response to life. In line with this, receiving kindness and feelings of love are considered as emotional responses to life, as people often feel grateful when they receive rewards from others (Emmons and Shelton, 2002). To Emmons and Shelton (2002), gratitude is seen as a wonder, thankfulness and appreciation for life expressed toward man and God (and even animals). While in the Oxford Dictionary, gratitude is the feeling of being grateful, meanwhile gratuity/generosity is money that an individual gives to somebody/organization; synonymous with a tip. Similar definitions provided by Kolyesnikova, Dodd, and Laverie (2007). Per these distinctions, Filep et al. (2017) only examined the thoughts/feelings of being kind and not the act of kindness (expressed in generosity/tipping).

Gratitude and gratuity though inter-woven, they are important in the life of the tourism sector, products and tourist satisfaction/experiences. In the context of wine tourism, Kolyesnikova et al. (2007), in finding out the role of gratitude and obligations along-side consumer characteristics, found that gratitude and obligation are strong predictors of

purchasing at wineries. Likewise, visitors/tourist who feel grateful to personal and/or obliged are likely to spend more money at wineries.

Tourism in its very nature has the potential of drawing complete strangers together, especially on temporal bases where kindness and gratuities are analyzed (Leeming 2016). Contrary to this viewpoint, tourism and hospitality to Derrida (2000) is the most risky encounter between persons as tourists may freeload on the generosity of their host. Nonetheless, the work of Bauman (1995) indicates the fear individuals have encountering strangers for dangers of entangling themselves with obligatory responsibilities in a society. In the literature relating to tourism, visitors restrict themselves from those who are unknown to them, hindering the host to express generosity by helping them (“*the tourist bubble*” notion). Developed and expounded by Cohen (1972), the tourist bubble notion indicates a confine context in which one mainly associate and expresses his/herself amidst those with similar characteristics.

Meanwhile, social support and cultural diversity have been suggested to be strong measures that are linked to tourism development and sustainability in an economy. Kumar et al. (2012), argue that social support is positively linked to the healthiness of people living happy and good lives while for others social support adheres to patience quick recovering (DiMatteo 2004). In a quantitative review of 182 primary studies published between 1984 and 2001 by (2003), showed that social support positively influences health status of people, role function and behaviors, coping behavior, health beliefs, health promotion behavior, quality of life, well-being, and self-actualization (Kumar et al. 2012). Thus, this study assumes that;

H1: Helping strangers, sacrificing time and money (generosity-tipping) strongly affects tourism sustainability in Africa

H 2: Social support influences the tourism sector of Africa by attracting tourists to continually visit the continent that intend to sustain tourism activities

H 3: Cultural diversity, language differences, and racial differences (ethnic tension) act as pull factors that sustain the tourism sector in Africa through a continuous inflow of tourist

The preceding paragraphs expose the shortcomings of extant literature on the tourism sustainability and pertinent cultural values in Africa like generosity-tipping, cultural diversity and socially supportive habits Africans have. This study adheres that, these indicators are capable of influencing tourists in their selection of a touristic destination (tourism arrival), and that in return boost the tourism sector through tourist expenditures and demand for more varieties of products. Likewise, some misspecifications made with descriptive works on tourism in the field of psychology, sociology using weak methodologies may be misleading. Hence, an empirically supportive study of this nature shades light on an econometric input in view of aptly directing and making suggestions to practitioners and scholars.

2.2. Theoretical Underpinning of Tipping and Tourism Sustainability in Africa

Generosity worldwide has witness a drastic reduction since decades behind. People don't sacrifice time, money, nor do they help strangers or those in need. According to Gallup (2018)'s report about the world's most generous country showed that, worldwide, 43% of people help strangers in need, 27% offered money to charity and 18% offered their time to work in organizations that carter for the needs of others. Interestingly, Gallup (2018) recount that, unless leaders learn how to unlock the energy behind people's generosity toward others, only then will they be able to share the problems facing their communities. This only gives credit to studying in Africa to ameliorate its tourism sector.

This research therefore draws on a variety of theoretical underpinnings; sociology, anthropology, psychology, and economics. Among the theoretical writings establishing the causal relationship between social factors such as generosity, culture, aid and tourism is the social exchange theory (Cook, Cheshire, Rice, and Nakagawa 2003; Fennell 2006). The basic point of social exchange after forming a society with different structures and individuals is through an establishment of an interactive world which is based exclusively on the logic of reciprocity and rationality. Emerson (1976), illustrates social exchange makes individual contingency when they receive rewards from others through a communal cohesion that intend leads to a social obligation. Also, the theory of reciprocal altruism aligns with the fact that, being supportive (reciprocating each other) grows a community and the tourism sector is not exempted. The established theory of altruism has been employed by the contemporary literature to explain the causal relationship between generosity, aid and tourism (Fennell 2006; González 2018). These two theories have been widely used as the theoretical basis for establishing a relationship between different social factors, which is in this effect that we are inspired to establish the linkages between generosity, culture, tourism and social support.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data

Data used in this study is mainly secondary and sourced from Gallup (2018), WDI (2020) and ICRG (2019). The main motive behind several sources of data is the absence of data across African countries in a singular base. We used a panel data of ranging from 2006-2017, sourced from these databases conditioned according to data availabilities in countries. The dependent variable; tourism indicator (inferred as tourism sustainability) is sourced from the World Development Indicator (WDI 2020). Per variables of interest, the first, *generosity (tips)* is sourced from Gallup World Poll database that records annual data across 156 countries in the world with the aim of finding out which country in the world is the most generous (Gallup 2018). The methodology used by Gallup (2018) in measuring this indicator is by allowing adult Africans response to a three strand question about; the time, money/donations and help they have given to organizations. This is similar to the ancient method of tipping where a Roman lord will toss a coin on the way to others, put money in a vessel when entering a public gathering either to insure promptitude or gain a safe passage (Azar 2004) in that, sacrificing time, money and helping strangers are all

extraordinary activities carry on by persons to others for varied motives. Reason this study inter-woven inferred to them as the same on a global scale.

Second, *Social support* measuring the extent to which Africans have access to finance from relatives, family members, friends either for financial health, business, daily life and/or personal growth. This variable is capable of influencing the sustainability of the tourism sector in Africa in that, it creates a friendly and reliable environment that tourist choice of the African continent will be assured and thus, its sustainability. It was sourced from Gallup (2018). Third, *Ethnic Tension* was derived from international country risk guide (ICRG 2019), and measures the rate of ethnic tension (due to language, race, and cultural differences) in African countries that daunt/stimulates tourist travels to Africa. Regarding controls, the happiness indicator – Life Ladder and life expectancy were gotten from the source with generosity. While religious tension (measuring religion) and the investment profile of countries (IPC) were from the source with ethnic tension. Table 1 can be consulted for descriptive statistics, while Table 6 at the appendix can be seen for list of countries used.

Table 1: **Descriptive Statistics**

| Variables | N | Mean | SD | Min | Max |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| Tourism Arrival (TS) | 304 | 13.558 | 1.456 | 10.343 | 16.524 |
| Generosity (GEN) | 349 | -0.025 | 0.108 | -0.262 | 0.315 |
| Life Ladder (LL) | 353 | 4.299 | 0.613 | 2.693 | 6.355 |
| Social Support (SS) | 350 | 0.717 | 0.119 | 0.290 | 0.917 |
| Healthy Life Expectancy (HLE) | 353 | 51.527 | 5.934 | 37.766 | 65.881 |
| Perception of Corruption (PC) | 345 | 0.799 | 0.129 | 0.078 | 0.963 |
| Ethnic Tension (ET) | 297 | 3.938 | 1.249 | 1.5 | 6 |
| Investment Profile of Country (IPC) | 297 | 7.271 | 1.609 | 1 | 10.5 |
| Religious Tension (RT) | 297 | 3.938 | 1.249 | 1.5 | 6 |

Note: N, is the observations, SD, and standard deviation

Source: Authors computation.

3.2. Empirical Strategy

This study adopts the instrumental variable two-stage least square (IV-2SLS) strategy to estimate the effects of tipping, social support and ethnic tensions on tourism sustainability in Africa. This strategy is good for identifying the causal effects of simultaneity or reverse causality, which are tackled with an instrumentation strategy. Also, it is useful when there are feedback loops in the model. In the two-stage least square strategy, we employed all the dependent variables of interest as endogenous variables with all the control variables as instruments, following the works of C.-J. Wang (2015) and Liu and Lee (2013). The employment of these instruments is to avoid the biases of the results and to ensure a better precision of the estimated model due to the problem of potential endogeneity (Liu and Lee 2013; Ngouhouo, Njoya, and Asongu 2022). In the IV-2SLS strategy, all independent variables are suspected to be endogenous whereas time-invariant variables are expected to be strictly exogenous (Achuo, Nchofoung, Asongu, and Dinga 2021). Considering that simultaneity or reverse causality has to be tackled with an instrumentation to account for the unobserved heterogeneity, the validity

of this instrumentation process will be confirmed by the Hansen probability test and the Kleibergen-Paap statistical probability test. The Hansen probability values have to be insignificant (P-values>10%) while the Kleibergen-Paap P-value has to be significant to validate the instrumentation process of the IV-2SLS strategy. The instrumental equation is specified in equation 1:

$$TS_{it} = \delta_0 + \delta_{1t}VI_{it} + \sum_{h=1}^k \delta_h Q_{hi(t-\tau)} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

Where TS represents tourism sustainability, VI represents independent variables of interest (generosity, social support and ethnic tensions), Q signifies the vector of control variables employed as instruments in the 2SLS instrumentation process. We regress the outcome variables on year fixed effects (δ_t) country fixed effects (δ_i) with changes in the lags of control variables represented by. τ

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Baseline results

Section 4 begins with the presentation of the baseline results. As earlier pinpointed, the OLS results are not reliable and also present some shortcomings since the estimations do not control for certain econometric biases such as endogeneity, cross-sectional dependence, unobserved heterogeneity and double causality. In this regard, these problems have been addressed by the instrumentation techniques of instrumental variable two-stage least square (IV-2SLS) estimations specifically for addressing endogeneity (as in Table 2), with the main results presented on the Lewbel (2012)'s estimates in Table 3.

Table 2: Nature of tourism sustainability if we rely on OLS estimations

| Variables | Dependent variable: Tourism Sustainability | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | Generosity | Ethnic Tension | Social Support |
| Generosity | -2.028*** (0.700) | ---- | ---- |
| Ethnic Tension | ---- | 0.328*** (0.0792) | ---- |
| Social support | ---- | ---- | 3.427*** (0.697) |
| Life Ladder | 0.832*** (0.127) | 0.835*** (0.124) | 0.716*** (0.128) |
| Healthy Life Expectancy | 0.0931*** (0.0133) | 0.0909*** (0.0128) | 0.113*** (0.0125) |
| Perception of Corruption | 5.224*** (0.866) | 5.057*** (0.850) | 4.783*** (0.855) |
| Investment Profile of Country | -0.0351 (0.0440) | -0.0293 (0.0433) | -0.0479 (0.0429) |
| Religion Tension | -0.0388 (0.0569) | -0.108* (0.0600) | -0.0126 (0.0547) |
| Constant | 1.352 (1.120) | 0.745 (1.067) | -1.268 (1.137) |
| Observations | 255 | 255 | 252 |
| R-squared | 0.419 | 0.439 | 0.444 |
| r2_a | 0.405 | 0.425 | 0.430 |

Source: Author computation

Globally, the results of the baseline estimation show a statistically strong relationship between generosity, ethnic tension (cultural differences) and social support. This means that, first, as adult Africans are less willing and able to sacrifice time, money and offer a helping hand to organizations, this will lead to a fall in tourism inflow into Africa and subsequently a nonsustained tourism sector (this is seen in Table 2). Second, due to the diverse cultures, language differences and socially supportive nature of Africans, tourists continually select the continent for a destination. This in return keeps the tourism sector growing and hence a sustained tourism sector in Africa. These results align with those of (Banga et al. 2022) on the subject of renewable energy and pollution in 38 OECD. However, these results are subject to endogeneity and causal relation issues that Table 3 accounts for

4.2. Main Results

We applied the instrumental estimates of the 2SLS, precisely the Lewbel (2012)'s estimates. The Lewbel (2012)'s estimates results after accounting for potential endogeneity on the OLS results of Table 2 indicate novel findings. Contrary to the OLS results that generosity impairs a sustainability in tourism arrivals into Africa, the main results show a strong statistically significant relationship between generosity and tourism arrival in Africa. That is, a percentile increase in the rate of adult African generosity leads to a certain inflow number of tourists into Africa. Intuitively, an increase in the number of tourists into Africa means a continuation and development, hence, attaining a sustainability (Banga et al. 2022; Christie et al. 2013; Kaitano 2020; Tasci et al. 2021).

Likewise, social support, differences in culture, languages and endowed values (ethnic tension) in Africa remain strong indicators that accrue tourism arrivals into Africa. Signifying that, because of the differences in Africa in terms of cultures, languages and the socially supportive nature of Africans to each other and strangers, tourists are capable of selecting Africa as a tourist destination. Thus, a continuity (development) and sustainability in the tourism sector of Africa. These results remain affirmative with those of Banga et al. (2022) on the subject of renewable energy and tourism sustainability, Tasci et al. (2021) on cultural differences, Lee, Chen, and Peng (2021) on the strong statistical influence of happiness and generosity in tourism travels, Kaitano (2020) on SDGs and tourism in Africa, Dieke (2020) on issues and the perception of tourism in Africa, and Christie et al. (2013) on a variety of challenges and forecast of tourism in Africa. This validates the assumptions of this that there is a positive relationship between generosity, cultural diversity and social support in Africa on the sustainability of the tourism sector of Africa (see H1, H 2, and H 3) as revealed in Table 3 and Table 4 with robust estimations in Table 5.

Table 3: The Lewbel’s results of sustainable tourism in Africa

| Variables | Dependent variable: Tourism Arrival | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | Generosity | Ethnic TensionsJ | Social support |
| Generosity | 3.496 (7.795) | | |
| Ethnic Tension | | 5.698 (3.913) | |
| Social support | | | 15.50*** (3.213) |
| Life Ladder | 0.946** (0.385) | 0.707 (0.750) | 0.673*** (0.225) |
| Healthy life expectancy | 0.161*** (0.0570) | -0.245 (0.275) | 0.212*** (0.0285) |
| Perception of corruption | 4.898** (2.023) | 9.094 (5.599) | 3.727** (1.565) |
| Investment Profile | -0.100 (0.0774) | 0.406 (0.421) | -0.117 (0.0772) |
| Religious Tension | 0.00103 (0.138) | -1.407 (0.991) | -0.108 (0.100) |
| Constant | -2.033 (3.280) | -0.917 (6.352) | -13.64*** (3.278) |
| Observations | 148 | 148 | 148 |
| chi2 | 97.58 | 7.761 | 86.27 |

Source: Author computation

Table 4: Two-Stage Least Square estimates (2SLS)

| Variables | Dependent Variable: Tourism Arrival | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Generosity | Ethnic Tension | Social support |
| Generosity | 17.09* (8.651) | | |
| Ethnic Tension | | 0.310*** (0.107) | |
| Social support | | | 15.17*** (3.023) |
| Life Ladder | 1.474*** (0.451) | 2.195*** (0.632) | 0.688*** (0.233) |
| Healthy life expectancy | 0.265*** (0.0626) | 0.124*** (0.0230) | 0.206*** (0.0282) |
| Perceptions corruption | 2.981 (2.055) | 4.569*** (1.274) | 3.713** (1.543) |
| Investment Profile | -0.328*** (0.0889) | -0.0368 (0.0732) | -0.110* (0.0614) |
| Religious Tension | -0.00284 (0.149) | -0.193** (0.0963) | -0.108 (0.108) |
| Constant | -6.386* (3.561) | -6.032** (2.906) | -13.21*** (3.077) |
| Observations | 148 | 151 | 148 |
| r2 | -1.512 | 0.208 | 0.0956 |
| r2_a | -1.619 | 0.175 | 0.0571 |
| F | 21.52 | 16.31 | 16.74 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author computation

4.3. Robustness Checks

As robustness checks, we proceeded by making use of the instrumental variable Tobit (IV-Tobit) estimation to find out the consistency of results in Table 3. The IV-Tobit results show exact and consistent results. Thus, robust with the findings of the study that generosity, ethnic tension and social support are strong indicators susceptible of causing a continuity in the African context as seen in Table 5.

Table 5: Tobit Estimations

| Variables | Dependent variable: Tourism Arrival | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | Generosity | Ethnic Tensions | Social support |
| Generosity | 3.496 (7.795) | | |
| Ethnic Tensions | | 5.698 (3.913) | |
| Social support | | | 15.50*** (3.213) |
| Life Ladder | 0.946** (0.385) | 0.707 (0.750) | 0.673*** (0.225) |
| Healthy life expectancy | 0.161*** (0.0570) | -0.245 (0.275) | 0.212*** (0.0285) |
| Perception of corruption | 4.898** (2.023) | 9.094 (5.599) | 3.727** (1.565) |
| Investment Profile | -0.100 (0.0774) | 0.406 (0.421) | -0.117 (0.0772) |
| Religious Tensions | 0.00103 (0.138) | -1.407 (0.991) | -0.108 (0.100) |
| Constant | -2.033 (3.280) | -0.917 (6.352) | -13.64*** (3.278) |
| Observations | 148 | 148 | 148 |
| chi2_exog | 0.610 | 45.94 | 27.79 |
| chi2 | 97.58 | 7.761 | 86.27 |

Note: Standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author computation.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Indeed, Africa remains an untapped arena in tourism and with a growing touristic sector (Dieke 2020; Kaitano 2020; Tasci et al. 2021). Aiming at filling in the gap in extant works in Africa about the determinants and sustainability of the tourism sector, we explore the effect of generosity, ethnic tension and social support and show that there is a strong causality between these variables with tourism arrivals in Africa that intend leads to development and sustainability. Theoretically expounding the social exchange theory (Cohen 1972) and theoretical works on human relations, this study adheres to the three indicators used on tourism arrival in Africa (Banga et al. 2022; Dieke 2020).

The results adhere to the theoretical connotation that in Africa has numerous factors that are capable of building, developing and sustaining the tourism sector. One of which is to build a distinctive local image and recognizing donors' capacity in assisting the tourism

sector (Christie et al. 2013, 29). Likewise, the results elaborate on the tourist bubble notion of Cohen (1972) and the fear tourist and people in general has interacting with others who are not of the same group, race, culture and ethnicity. This is done by establishing an empirical relationship between African cultural factors (generosity-tip, ethnic tension and social support) and the inflow of strangers into Africa (tourism arrival). These results therefore align with the previously stated hypothesis that ethnic tension (H 2) and social support (H 3) attracts tourist into Africa while negating the contribution of generosity (H1) in positively influencing tourism arrival in Africa.

Practically, the rate at which adult Africans donate money to charity, spend time in organizations and help strangers is not a strong indicator to attract tourism inflow into Africa. Meanwhile, results are encouraging the fact that, the socially supportive nature Africans have by offering assistance to family members, friends and strangers should be strongly upheld. Same, the African cultural diversity is a better indicator to be used in building and sustaining the tourism sector of Africa. Thus, in order to pave a way forward for the tourism sector in Africa, these indicators should be promulgated especially encouraging adult Africans to donate, spend time in charitable organizations and help strangers (generosity) in view of enticing tourist to Africa.

Our work provides the first step toward analyzing the effect of adult African generosity (termed tipping as per se), ethnic tension and social support in Africa with tourism inflow into Africa and develops a nuance in the literature by empirically testing these factors with a tourism indicator to clearly make policy suggestions. The nuance of this paper is especially clear as we do not only present factors that are capable of building and sustaining the tourism sector of Africa (Banga et al. 2022; Christie et al. 2013; Dieke 2020) but align with Tasci et al. (2021) that cultural differences and hospitableness has a great role to play in the tourism sector.

Nonetheless, the study is not void of limitations that may as well pave way for future research; first, the choice of a tourist destination is not limited and/or constraint to these three indices as tourist are equally influenced by the level of infrastructural development in the country, tourist endowments, the openness of the country to the rest of the world (accessibility), rate and quality of information distribution, climatic condition (level of greenhouse gas emission) and environmental quality, the management system of the tourism sector by policymakers and the list is in exhaustive. Second, we make use of generosity, ethnic tension and social support indicators that are complex and measured with several measures; the different cultures in Africa just as the factual dimension of adult African generosity (donation of money to charity, time or helping strangers) could give better results rather those of the proxies used. Third, the strand of the panel is limited to 2017 and seemingly old enough to be used in such empirical study. Thus, future works could enlarge the panel in Africa and with more recent world issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors acknowledge and sincerely thank two anonymous reviewers for their constructive and scholarly suggestions.

REFERENCES

- Achuo, E. D., Nchofoung, T. N., Asongu, S., and Dinga, G. D. (2021). Unravelling the mysteries of underdevelopment in Africa: AGDI Working Paper.
- Azar, O. H. (2004). The history of tipping—from sixteenth-century England to United States in the 1910s. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 33(6), 745-764. doi: 10.1016/j.socec.2004.09.043.
- Banga, C., Deka, A., Kilic, H., Ozturen, A., and Ozdeser, H. (2022). The role of clean energy in the development of sustainable tourism: does renewable energy use help mitigate environmental pollution? A panel data analysis. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 29(39), 59363-59373.
- Bauman, Z. (1995). *Life and Fragments. Essays in Postmodern Morality*: Blackwell. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA.
- Christie, I., Fernandes, E., Messerli, H., and Twining-Ward, L. (2013). Tourism in Africa: Harnessing tourism for growth and improved livelihoods. *The World Bank*.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*(39), 164–189.
- Cook, K. S., Cheshire, C., Rice, E. R., and Nakagawa, S. (2003). Social exchange theory *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 61-88): Springer.
- Derrida, J. (2000). Of hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond (trans. R. Bowlby). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dieke, P. U. (2020). Tourism in Africa: Issues and prospects. *Sustainable Human Resource Management in Tourism: African Perspectives*, 9-27.
- DiMatteo, M. R. (2004). Social support and patient adherence to medical treatment: a meta-analysis. *Health psychology*, 23(2), 207.
- Emerson, T. I. (1976). Legal foundations of the right to know. *Wash. ULQ*, 1.
- Emmons, R. A., and Shelton, C. M. (2002). Gratitude and the science of positive psychology. *Handbook of positive psychology*, 18, 459-471.
- Fennell, D. A. (2006). Evolution in tourism: The theory of reciprocal altruism and tourist–host interactions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(2), 105-124.
- Filep, S., Macnaughton, J., and Glover, T. (2017). Tourism and gratitude: Valuing acts of kindness. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 26-36.
- Gallup. (2018, 2021). The 2018 World's Most Generous Countries Report. Retrieved 10 January, 2022, from <https://www.gallup.com/analytics/245165/worlds-most-generous-countries-2018.aspx>
- González, J. L. L. (2018). Ethics and tourism: in dialogue with Dean macCannell. *Recerca. Revista de pensament i anàlisi*(23), 239-248.
- ICRG. (2019). International Country Risk Guide (ICRG) Researchers Dataset. Retrieved 10 January, 2022, from <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=doi:10.7910/DVN/4YHTPU>
- Kaitano, D. (2020). Tourism and sustainable development goals in the African context. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies*, 12(1), 88-102.
- Kolyesnikova, N., Dodd, T. H., and Laverie, D. A. (2007). Gratuity purchasing at wineries: An investigation of the determining factors. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*.
- Kumar, S., Calvo, R., Avendano, M., Sivaramakrishnan, K., and Berkman, L. F. (2012). Social support, volunteering and health around the world: Cross-national evidence from 139 countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(5), 696-706.
- Lee, C.-C., Chen, M.-P., and Peng, Y.-T. (2021). Tourism development and happiness: International evidence. *Tourism Economics*, 27(5), 1101-1136.
- Leeming, J. (2016). *Addressing Cultural Vulnerabilities in Arctic Tourism: Kindness as 'Third Space'*. University of Waterloo.
- Lewbel, A. (2012). Using heteroscedasticity to identify and estimate mismeasured and endogenous regressor models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 30(1), 67-80.
- Liu, X. and Lee, L.-F. (2013). Two-stage least squares estimation of spatial autoregressive models with endogenous regressors and many instruments. *Econometric Reviews*, 32(5-6), 734-753.
- Ngouhou, I., Njoya, L., and Asongu, S. (2022). Corruption, economic growth and the informal sector: Empirical evidence from developing countries: AGDI Working Paper.
- Tasci, A. D., Aktas, G., and Acikgoz, F. (2021). Cultural differences in hospitableness: a study in Turkish culture. *Tourism and hospitality management*, 27(2), 339-361.
- UNWTO. (2020). Supporting jobs and economies through travel & tourism—a call for action to mitigate the socio-economic impact of COVID-19 and accelerate recovery.
- Wang, C.-J. (2015). Instrumental variables approach to correct for endogeneity in finance. *Handbook of financial econometrics and statistics*, 2577-2600.

Wang, H. H., Wu, S. Z., and Liu, Y. Y. (2003). Association between social support and health outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Kaohsiung Journal of Medical Science*, (19.), 345-351. doi: 10.1016/S1607-551X(09)70436-X

WDI. (2020). The World Bank Development Indicator. Retrieved 10 January, 2022, from <https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators>

Xu, J. B. (2010). Perceptions of tourism products. *Tourism Management*, 31(5), 607-610.

Appendix

Table 6: African Countries sourced from the panel

| African Countries (N=41) | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Algeria | Madagascar | Botswana | Zambia |
| Angola | Mauritania | Burkina Faso | Zimbabwe |
| Benin | Mauritius | Burundi | |
| Cameroon | Morocco | Central African Republic | |
| Congo (Brazzaville) | Mozambique | Chad | |
| Congo (Kinshasa) | Namibia | Ethiopia | |
| Egypt | Nigeria | Lesotho | |
| Gabon | Senegal | Malawi | |
| Ghana | Sierra Leone | Mali | |
| Guinea | South Africa | Niger | |
| Ivory Coast | Tanzania | Rwanda | |
| Kenya | Togo | Sudan | |
| Liberia | Tunisia | Uganda | |

Source: Authors extraction from World Bank dataset

Ernest Alang Wung, Mr., PhD Candidate
 University of Dschang,
 Department of Economic policy analysis
 PO Box 96, Dschang, Cameroon
 +237 676 412 959
 ernest.alang@univ-dschang.org

Roger Tsafack Nanfosso, Full Professor
 University of Dschang
 Department of Economic policy analysis
 PO Box 96, Dschang, Cameroon
 +237 677 580 278
 roger.tsafack-nanfosso@univ-dschang.org

Armand Mboutchouang Kountchou, Senior Lecturer
 University of Dschang
 Department of Public Economics
 PO Box 96, Dschang, Cameroon
 +237 675 133 309
 armand.mboutchouang@univ-dschang.org