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Abstract

In developing Tourism Satellite Accounts (TSAs) for Namibia, key gaps in data and knowledge regarding the domestic tourism sector became apparent. In order to fill these gaps, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Namibia Tourism Board (NTB) and other partners carried out a survey on domestic tourism demand in 2007. Over one thousand face to face interviews were conducted nationally, surveying individuals and households on their domestic tourism demand during the period December 2006 to December 2007. This paper presents and describes the results of that survey, with analysis on a national and regional level. Some of the key findings of the survey include:

The inequality in income distribution and concentration of economic activities between residents of urban and rural areas is reflected in differences in the number of trips and expenditure between the two groups. Rural areas have more tourist households in comparison to urban areas, but they only account for 29 per cent of the total tourism expenditure. Urban areas generated more tourism ‘trips’ (52%) when compared to rural areas. With rural travel the number of trips carried out for business and health purposes is much greater than that for urban dwellers.

Trips with the purpose of visiting friends and relatives recorded the highest overall expenditures, followed by those with the purpose of business. The average cost per trip however was highest for leisure trips, followed by business trips.

The highest overall expenditure on goods and services were recorded for transport (31%), food and drinks (24%) and shopping (22%). Together with this high transport expenditure, the fact that domestic tourists use public transport as their mode of movement underlies the importance of transport planning to the tourism economy. Some 88% of the total tourism trips are overnight visits, perhaps a reflection of Namibia’s geographical size.

About 80% of domestic tourists used the homes of friends and relatives for accommodation, with the rest using facilities such as lodges, guesthouses, bed & breakfasts and camping especially for the holiday or leisure visitor. This could reflect the high cost of many of tourism facilities, which at present tend to be geared towards the international market.

The main destinations for visiting friends and relatives are Windhoek and communal areas. The high proportion visiting friends and relatives in communal areas is associated with the origins of many of the city’s inhabitants, who originally came from there.

We hope that these findings and others will provide some insights with respect to the economic contribution of domestic tourism and policy making for tourism development in Namibia.
1. INTRODUCTION

Domestic tourism forms a very important part of any tourism economy. In addition to the economic benefits of a strong domestic market, it can also be the case that support of the local tourism industry can result in improved tourism service and product quality. In turn, this can lead to increasing levels of international tourism and the economic benefits associated with this. Also importantly, domestic tourism can help counter the tourism issues of seasonality and limited geographic spread, as well as mitigating the exposure of the industry to fluctuations in international demand, which can be very sensitive to global political and economic issues. Analysis of the domestic market is important to provide the Namibian Tourist Board (NTB) with necessary information to help develop a Domestic Tourism Growth Strategy. Currently, very limited information exists about the domestic tourist market in Namibia.

As emphasised by the World Trade Organisation (WTO), "broad based statistical information is an indispensable requirement at each step of rational planning" (WTO, 1999). Given the robust economic potential and the actual impacts tourism has, the sector is not receiving the attention it deserves from the public policy point of view, particularly in developing countries where major statistical gaps exist. Information gaps usually result from unavailability or unreliability of data. Although Namibia's Vision 2030 makes tourism one of the key sectors for economic growth, the sector will not be sustained if reliable information does not exist for effective and efficient planning and management.

In 2001 a preliminary TSA was established in the Sida-funded Environmental Economic Unit (EEU) within the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). However, this too had major data gaps that were to be filled once the TSA has been fully launched. In 2006, the MET and NTB initiated the national project to develop a TSA that was more practical to implement in capturing all of the economic phenomena associated with tourism. In order to achieve this, a TSA working group was established comprising of the NTB, MET, Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS), Bank of Namibia (BoN), and the Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit (NEPRU). The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), based in Oxford in the United Kingdom (UK), was contracted to carry out the TSA exercise, with the financial assistance from COMARK and the Embassy of Finland. This culminated in the establishment of economic models and training of economists and researchers from the working group institutions and organizations. Both the preliminary and WTTC TSAs (Suich 2001; WTTC 2006) identified major data gaps due to the unavailability of domestic and outbound tourism consumption expenditures and the associated tourism expenditure ratios. The WTTC TSA has been updated by (NTB 2008).

Therefore, it is against this background that a national survey on domestic tourism was carried out by the MET, NTB, and key partners such as NPC, BoN, the Federation of Namibian Tourism Association (FENATA) and NEPRU to bridge data gaps in tourism economic analyses.

What follows is a brief section on the definition of key terms, followed by a discussion of the methodology used and a section recognising potential shortcomings from the survey and learning for the future. The key findings from the survey will then be presented in figures and tables, together with a brief discussion relating to each. Finally there will be a short conclusion summing up the findings from the survey.
1.1 Definition of Key Terms

The Technical Manual on Collection of Domestic Tourism Statistics, 1995, from the WTO was consulted and the WTO definitions were applied in all cases where applicable.

Tourism
“Tourism comprises the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes. The usual environment of a person consists of a certain area around his/her place of residence plus all other places he/she frequently visits.”

Domestic tourism
“...[Domestic tourism] comprises of activities of residents of Namibia travelling and staying in places inside Namibia but outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes.”

Usual environment
The usual environment can be operationally defined in statistical terms by using various criteria. It is the area where your usual and routine activities take you.

The following fall outside the usual environment and were excluded from domestic tourism: (urban- municipal jurisdiction; rural- constituency)

- Residents travelling to another place within Namibia with the intention of setting up their usual residence in that place;
- Persons who travel to another place to work temporarily in institutions within that place;
- Commuters travelling to regular place of work and/or study;
- Persons travelling on a routine basis to take care or daily necessities;
- Persons who travel regularly or frequently between neighbouring localities to work or study;
- For domestic same-day visitors, in addition to the above, persons travelling within their municipal areas.

Place of residence
The place of residence consists of the place where the respondent has lived for most of the past 12 months.

Domestic expenditure
The WTO defined domestic expenditure ñas the expenditure incurred as a direct result of visitor travelling within their country of residence. It includes travel expenses and money spent at the places visited as well as advance outlays, necessary for the preparation and undertaking of the trip and travel-related outlays made in the place of residence after the trip.”

The following purchases are excluded from domestic tourism expenditure:
- Purchases for commercial purposes, i.e. resale made by any visitors and purchase made on behalf of their employer by visitors on business trips.
Cash given to relatives and friends during a holiday trip which does not represent payment of tourism goods or services, as well as donations made to institutions.

Capital investments or transaction engaged in by visitors, such as land, housing, real estate, even though they may be used in future for tourist travel purposes.

Tourism expenditure can be broken down into the following main categories:

- Package travel, package holidays and package tours
- Accommodation
- Food and drinks
- Transport
- Recreation, culture and sporting activities
- Shopping
- Others

Domestic visitor
Domestic Visitor is defined as: ‘A person residing within Namibia and travels to a place outside his/her usual environment within Namibia for a period not exceeding 12 months and whose main purpose of visit is other than the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place of visited.’

Same-day visitor
A same-day visitor is the same as a domestic visitor, but without an overnight stay.

Domestic tourist (or overnight tourist as mentioned in the report)
As above, but with an overnight stay.

Take note that the only difference between a domestic tourist and domestic same-day visitors is that a tourist stays at a collective or private accommodation unit for at least one night. WTO also concluded that the term ‘tourist’ should be strictly speaking reserved to overnight visitors, but at the same time they also concluded that the term ‘visitor’ - comprising both tourists (overnight visitors) and same-day visitors - representing the basic concept for the whole system of tourism statistics.

Outbound tourism
Outbound tourism comprises the activities of residents of Namibia travelling to and staying in places outside Namibia for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes.

Purpose of visit
The purpose of visit refers to the motivation of the trip, the reason in the absence of which the trip would not have taken place or the given destination would not have been visited.

Only the following categories of purpose of visit were included:

- Leisure, recreation and holiday
- Visiting friends and relatives
- Business and professional
- Health treatment
Tourist trip
A tourist trip describes tourism from the standpoint of the generating place and covers the whole period that a person travels away from home.

Tourist household
A tourist household is one in which at least one member of the household is engaged in tourism activity during the reference period.

Head of household
The head of a household usually conform to the traditional concept of head of family. As a rule, this person is also the main provider, being the one who contributes most of the household budgets.

Tourism economy
Tourism Economy refers to the gross national income that is directly or indirectly generated from the tourism industry.

Tourism satellite account (TSA)
TSA is an economic accounting method that estimates the total contribution of tourism industry to the national economy through consumption, investments, government revenue or the balance of payments (imports/exports).

Tourist expenditure
Tourist expenditure includes all related expenditures on goods and services incurred before, during and after a tourism trip.

1.2 Methodology

Face to face structured interviews were carried out in all the 13 political regions in Namibia by MET and NTB. The reference period of the survey was the 12 months from December 2006 to December 2007. A total sample was drawn countrywide based on Primary Sample Units (PSUs) from all the political regions as stipulated by the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS). Sixty Sample PSUs were interviewed countrywide (in both rural and urban areas), with the number of PSUs per region differing depending on the population size. In each PSU, 20 households were selected for an interview by way of a systematic random sampling method; in this way, 1200 questionnaires were administered. The sample data was weighted according to the total number of households per rural and urban areas and region, based on information provided by the CBS. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) was used to enter and analyse the data.
Table 1. Domestic Tourism Survey 2006/2007 sample statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Households</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaires</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Tourist Households</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Households</td>
<td>155,442</td>
<td>209,944</td>
<td>365,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Tourist Households</td>
<td>125,502</td>
<td>134,358</td>
<td>259,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Shortcomings

Although the survey sample was carefully chosen to be as representative as possible, the majority of the PSUs were drawn from very low-income households, predominantly in rural areas with high levels of unemployment. Although this scenario does broadly reflect the make-up of the Namibian nation i.e. a high population lives in rural areas and most households both in rural and urban areas are poor, it may be to the detriment of the study. Previous tourism studies across the globe have revealed that there is a positive correlation between income and propensity to engage in tourism related activities (see, for example, Crouch, 1995). Higher income groups or households therefore tend to engage in more pure tourism activities than the lower income groups. As such, due to the higher sampled population of low-income household than high-income households in the survey, the estimates on the contribution of domestic tourism to the Namibian economy may be somewhat underestimated.

A further issue concerns the 12-month reference period, which was potentially too long for respondents to recall travel patterns and expenditures. In response to this issue, some country studies have prescribed shorter reference periods: see, for example, the quarterly tourism statistical data collection by the Czech and Turkish Ministries of Tourism. Due to critical budget constraints and the fact that this survey is the first of its kind in Namibia, we were satisfied that the results would be valuable with the 12-month reference period nonetheless. A related issue concerns the reference period and the exclusion of December 2007 in the survey. As some respondents may not have been able to remember their travel patterns from 12 months previously, the travel patterns as described may have underestimated travel intensity in the month of December.

These lessons learnt through completion of the study will serve as a clear guideline for future surveys of this nature. In addition, in future we suggest that a bigger sample be utilised. This will enable a fuller reflection of the diversity of households and capture the greater propensity of middle and high income households to travel as expected. Since bigger samples come with higher costs, it is suggested that data for domestic tourism consumption expenditures be captured through income and expenditure surveys in future.

---

1 We assume that domestic tourism is likewise a “normal”, rather than “inferior” good in Namibia’s case.
2. FINDINGS

2.1 Tourist Households and Tourist Individuals

2.1.1 Rural and Urban

This survey established that 259,861 households or 71 per cent of all households, engaged in tourism related travel during 2007. Furthermore, approximately 134,358 rural households (64 per cent of rural households) and 125,502 urban households (81 per cent of urban households) took part in travel activities.

2.1.2 Urban and Rural Tourist Individuals

This survey established that 259,861 households or 71 per cent of all households, engaged in tourism related travel during 2007. Furthermore, approximately 134,358 rural households (64 per cent of rural households) and 125,502 urban households (81 per cent of urban households) took part in travel activities.
It is estimated that 419,992 Namibians took tourism related trips during the reference period, of which 54 per cent were from the urban areas and 46 per cent from rural areas (see Figure 2 above).

2.2 Characteristics of Tourist Households

2.2.1 Tourist Households by Region

**Figure 3: Distribution of Tourist households by Region (%), 2007**

![Figure 3: Distribution of Tourist households by Region (%), 2007](image)

Figure 3 shows that the Khomas region contained by far the highest number of all tourist households in Namibia (20%). This is followed by the Erongo and Oshana regions, with 11% and 9% respectively, and then subsequently by the Ohangwena, Kavango, Otjozondjupa and Omusati regions with almost the same percentages. The two southern regions of Karas and Hardap share similar percentages of around 5-6%. The Caprivi region reported the lowest number of tourist households, with only 2% of the overall total.

2.2.2 Tourist Individuals by Occupation

As shown in Figure 4 below, the category "unemployed" contained the largest number of all tourist individuals (25%). The student category contained the second largest proportion (18%), followed by the "other" category, comprising those in formal business activities not categorised, those involved in informal business activities and pensioners (17%). The least travelling occupations are those employed in the craft industries and skilled workers, shop and market sales workers.
2.2.3 Distribution of Tourist Individuals by Income

Figure 5 shows that most of the domestic tourists’ income falls below 25,000 per annum. This total includes unemployed and students who rated high in terms of domestic tourists. The lower-middle income group (N$ 50,000-100,000) recorded a significant percentage of 25% followed by Middle-higher income group (N$ 100,000-200,000) who scored 20% of tourist households. Only a few domestic tourists earn incomes above N$500,000 per year. This does not necessarily mean that those with high income travel less but, as indicated in the limitations of this study, may be due to few high income households in the country and hence the sample.
2.2.4 Tourist Household Expenditure

Figure 6: Breakdown of Household Expenditure per Urban/Rural Areas (%), 2007

Figure 6 shows the breakdown of household expenditure by urban/rural areas. Although there are more rural than urban households, 71% of the total expenditure on tourism trips accrued to urban households.

Table 2: Average Household Expenditure per Urban/Rural Areas (N$), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3,626</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2 above, tourist households spent a mean of N$ 2,511 per household on tourism related activities. However, 50 percent of the tourist households spent N$ 860 and less. The mean spend by urban households was N$3,626 while the mean for rural household was much lower with N$1,440. Half of the urban households only spent N$1,600 on domestic tourism and half of rural households spent less than N$600 during the reference period. For both cases, where the mean is more than double the median, this implies some urban and rural households spent much greater than the mean on tourist trips domestically.
2.2.5 Distribution of Household Expenditure per Region

Figure 7: Distribution of total Household Expenditure per Region (%), 2007

The Khomas region generated 34 per cent of the total tourist households expenditure on tourism related activities, followed by the Erongo region with 25 per cent (see Figure 7). Omaheke, Caprivi and Hardap reported very low expenditures.

Table 3: Average Household Expenditure per Region (N$), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharas</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>1,903</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khomas</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohangwena</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshana</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshikoto</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,511</strong></td>
<td><strong>860</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3 above, the Erongo region reported the highest mean (N$5,915) per household spent on tourism related activities. The Khomas region followed closely with a mean spend of N$ 4,104. The Ohangwena region recorded the lowest mean of only N$766 spent per tourist household.
2.3 Characteristics of Tourism Related Trips

2.3.1 Rural and Urban Generated Trips

Figure 8: Trips (%) Generated by Urban/Rural Households, 2007

Table 4: Number of Trips Generated by Urban/Rural Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>193,144</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>177,306</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370,450</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey revealed that 370,575 tourism related trips were generated by residents in 2007, of which 52% came from urban areas and 48% from rural areas (see Figure 8 and Table 4). This means that those in urban areas have a greater propensity to travel frequently than their rural counterparts.

2.3.2 Trips by Region

Figure 9: Distribution of Tourism Related Trips by Region (generated trips) (%), 2007

Residents of the Khomas region generated the highest number of tourism related trips by far (24%), of which 96 per cent were from the urban population (see Figure 9). The
Erongo and Oshana regions followed with 11% and 10% respectively. The Caprivi region generated the least tourism trips with only 2% of total tourism related trips.

**Figure 10: Breakdown of Region generated trips by Urban/Rural Area (%), 2007**

As shown above, the vast majority of trips generated to the Khomas and Erongo region were to urban areas, which perhaps reflects the importance of Windhoek and Swakopmund as hub cities for tourism. On the other hand, Ohangwena and Omusati generate almost only rural trips.

2.3.3 Trips by Purpose of Visit

**Figure 11: Breakdown of Tourism Related Trips by Purpose of Visit, 2007**

As shown in Figure 11, about 59% of all tourism-related trips were mainly for the purpose of visiting relatives and friends (VFR); followed by business trips (16%) and
leisure (holiday) (13%). Health and Religion represent the least purposes of visits by domestic tourist from both rural and urban areas.

2.3.4 Urban/Rural (generated trips) by the Purpose of the Trip

Figure 12: Breakdown of Urban/Rural (generated trips) by the Purpose of the Trip, 2007

Although VRF remains relatively equal for both rural and urban settings and across the regions, the rest of purposes of trips varied across urban and rural areas (Figure 12). Those in rural areas showed a higher propensity to undertake business related trips than their urban counterparts. Moreover, urban areas recorded a higher portion of those who travel for leisure than rural areas.

2.3.5 Trips by Mode of Transport

Figure 13: Distribution of Tourism Related Trips by Mode of Travel, 2007
The survey reported that the majority (55%) of the domestic tourists used public transport as their means of transport, followed by the use of own cars (23%). 17 percent used unspecified mode of transport for their tourist-related travel, presumably hitchhiking to their destinations. Air transport is the least used mode of transport by domestic tourists.

2.3.6 Trips by Destination

Figure 14: Distribution of Tourism Related Trips by Destination (top 10) (%), 2007

Although Windhoek is the main destination for domestic tourism trips in aggregate (see Figure 14), this picture is not the same when destinations are classified by purpose of travel. As shown in Figure 15, Swakopmund is the most popular destination for leisure trips, followed by Etosha National Park, which is the largest national park in Namibia. Walvis Bay, Oshakati, Windhoek and the communal areas also received a significant proportion of leisure trips.

Figure 15: Distribution of Leisure (Holiday) Trips by Destination (top 10) (%), 2007
Both Figures 16 and 17 show that Windhoek is most frequently visited by business as well as VFR visitors. This reflects the centralised nature of the political and business systems in Namibia’s capital city. It is worth noting the high proportion of trips to communal areas for VFR.

2.3.7 Trips by Month of Travel

It is apparent from the information below in Figure 18 that seasonality patterns of this survey are different from other data sources such as the Tourist Arrival and Accommodation statistics. Although December peaks in terms of domestic tourism, as indicated by Accommodation statistics, this reflects the reference period of the survey; most people tended to travel in mid-December by which this survey had already came to completion (see section 1.3 Shortcomings).
2.3.8 Trips by Marital Status

The survey results reported that most (54%) of the tourism related trips were undertaken by single persons followed by married category (32%) (see Figure 19).

2.3.9 Trips by Age Group

The age group, ṅ25-44ñ years made up most (37%) of all domestic trips, followed by the ṅ45-64ñ age group as well as ṅ15-24ñ. The elderly made up the lowest proportion of domestic trips.
2.3.10 Length and Type of Trip

Figure 21: Average Length of Overnight Trips (# of nights) by Purpose of Visit, 2006

Business tourists reported the highest mean number of overnights (14 nights) per trip, followed by VFR with 13 nights, while leisure/holiday trips recorded a mean of 6 nights per trip. 50 percent of tourism related trips reported duration of 6 overnights, or in other works, a week's visit.
As shown in Figure 22 above, about 88% of all trips were over nights (and thus only 12% day trips). This means most of the domestic tourists prefer a night over than simply spending part of a day, which perhaps in part reflects the size of the country.

2.3.11 Number of people on Trip

Those travelling for leisure and religion have recorded a slightly higher than average number of people per trip than the rest of the categories (see Figure 23). The low mean number of people per trip reflects the high number of single persons travelling.
2.3.12 Accommodation Facilities Used during Trips

Figure 23: Distribution of Accommodation Facilities used on Tourism Trips (%), 2007

It is apparent from the survey results that most domestic visitors (80%) made use of accommodation of friends and relatives (Figure 23).

2.4 Domestic Tourism Expenditure

2.4.1 Trip Expenditure by Purpose of Visit

Figure 25: Distribution of Trip Expenditure by Purpose of Visit, 2007

Figure 25 shows the distribution of trip expenditure by purpose of visit. The largest portion (41%) of tourism related expenditure was generated by VFR tourists. The
holiday/leisure trips accounted for a significant 26 per cent of total spent on domestic travel despite accounting only 13 per cent of the volume of tourism related trips.

Table 6: Average Expenditure by Purpose of Visit (N$), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Purpose of Visit</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Holiday</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6, a mean of N$1,703 was spent per tourism related trip in Namibia by residence. However, 50 per cent of all tourism related trips, reported expenditure of N$700 and less per trip.

Average expenditure on holiday trips was the highest with a mean of N$ 3,458 per trip, followed by business and VFR trips with means of N$ 2,853 and N$ 1,176 per trip respectively. Health related trips recorded the lowest mean of N$ 609 per trip.

2.4.2 Trip Expenditure by Region

Figure 26: Distribution of Trip Expenditure by Region (%), 2007

Figure 26 shows that 60 per cent of the total expenditure were generated by residents of the Khomas and Erongo regions; Khomas generated the largest portion (35%) of total tourism related trip expenditures while Erongo region generated 25 per cent.
Table 7: Average Trip Expenditure by Region (N$), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caprivi</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erongo</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardap</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavango</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khomas</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunene</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohangwena</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omusati</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshana</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshikoto</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Khomas region generated the largest portion of total tourism related trip expenditure, the Erongo region recorded the highest mean spent per trip (N$3,743). The lowest mean was reported by the Ohangwena region. This is illustrated by the table below.

2.4.3 Trip Expenditure by Urban/Rural

**Figure 27: Trips Expenditures by urban and rural, 2007**

Tourism related trips generated by the urban population contributed 72 per cent to the total domestic tourism expenditure in the country (see Figure 27). Urban generated trips also had the highest mean spent (N$2,315).

It should be noted that, as shown in Table 8 below, 50 per cent of the urban generated trips recorded spent of N$1000 or less.
Table 8: Mean Trip Expenditure by Urban/Rural Generated Trips $N, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4 Trip Expenditure by Urban/Rural and Purpose of Visit

Figure 28: Mean Trip Expenditure by Urban/Rural and Purpose of Visit, 2007

The highest mean spend per trip was recorded by urban business tourists, while rural business tourists' expenditures were comparatively very low (Figure 28). Rural expenditure remained very low for all purposes of visit, being highest on leisure and recreation amongst the other rural expenditures.

Table 9: Mean Trip Expenditure by Urban/Rural Generated Trips and Purpose of Visit (NS), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Purpose of Visit</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5,056</td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Recreation</td>
<td>3,793</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure/Recreation</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Category</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Drinks</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure on transport recorded the largest mean of N$ 443 per trip, followed by food & drinks (N$ 343) and shopping (N$315) (see Table 10). A low mean of N$ 99 per trip was spent on accommodation, although as before, this reflects the high propensity of urban resident trips than rural resident trips. This was mostly the case for median expenditure also, with the exception of the Religion and Others categories (see Table 9).
domestic tourists to stay in VFR residences. For those that did not stay at VFR (and assuming those that did spent nothing on accommodation), the mean expenditure on accommodation was N$495.

**Figure 30: Average (mean) Expenditure per Category by Purpose of Visit, 2007**

As shown in Figure 30, Leisure/holiday trips generated the highest means per trip for all expenditure categories. This is followed by the business-related trips. The unspecified category others recorded a high mean expenditure on transport of about N$400, which broadly compares to that spend on travelling under the VFR category of about N$350. Domestic travellers and tourists, especially those VFR, on business and on leisure trips had high mean expenditure on shopping of about N$300 and N$420 respectively.

**2.4.7 Expenditure per Category by Urban/Rural Generated trips**

**Table 11: Mean Trip Expenditure per Category by Urban/Rural Generated trips (NS), 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the mean trip expenditure per category of trip by urban rural residence. The highest mean was spent on transport for both rural and urban generated trips; the lowest expenditure was on Recreational trips for both urban and rural generated trips. The mean values of all expenditure categories were higher for urban than rural generated trips, seven times greater in the case of Recreation.
2.4.8 Expenditure by Type of Visit

Table 12: Mean Trip Expenditure by Type of Visit (N\$), 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of visit</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Day</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>1,863</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above confirms that by far, the more than a two third majority (81\%) of the tourist trips were overnight when compared to the same-day trips (19\%). It has been also revealed earlier that the expenditure for overnight visits far outstrips that of the same-day. This signifies how important overnight tourism is to the local and national economic status.

3. Conclusion

Comprehensive information on travel behaviour helps policy makers arrive at better strategic policy-decisions. With this in mind, survey data has yielded a number results that are likely to be useful for future planning.

In many cases, the results observed here are broader reflections of the Namibian economy in general. For example, the high number of tourist individuals that are unemployed, in part simply reflects the high employment rate within Namibia, estimated to be approximately 37\% (Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, 2006). Likewise, the high number of tourist individuals that earn less than N\$25,000, is at least in part reflective of the unequal nature of Namibian society at present, which is estimated to have a Gini-Coefficient of about 74.3 (World Bank, 2009). This inequality is further reflected elsewhere in the survey data, where for example the mean expenditure on many types of trips is more than double the median value. In these instances the adjustment of economic conditions would be expected to influence these statistics and others significantly.

The inequality in income distribution and concentration of economic activities between residents of urban and rural areas is reflected in differences in the number of trips and expenditure between the two groups. Whilst rural areas have more tourist households in comparison to urban areas, they only account for 29 per cent of the total tourism expenditure, against 71 percent for urban areas. Moreover, urban areas generated more tourism trips (52\%) when compared to rural areas. This rural/urban inequality is also perhaps further reflected in the structure of rural travel, where proportionately the number of trips carried out for business and health purposes is much greater than that for urban dwellers. As policy focuses more on increasing rural income through rural development initiatives, we would expect a commensurate increase in spending on tourism related activities in rural areas and improvements in the access of rural residents to services. This would also likely reduce the frequently observed rural-urban migrations for employment, as revealed by survey data on the age flow of tourists in this study.
Those individuals whose purpose of trips is visiting friends and relatives recorded the highest overall expenditures, followed by those whose purpose is business trips. The average cost per trip however was highest for leisure trips, followed by business trips. This implies that as the economy grows and incomes increase, the demand for increased leisure trips may grow, meaning that overall expenditures on leisure trips overtake those other trip purposes.

The highest overall expenditure on goods and services were recorded for transport (31%), food and drinks (24%) and shopping (22%). Together with this high transport expenditure, the fact that domestic tourists use public transport as their mode of movement underlies the importance of transport planning to the tourism economy. The role of oil prices in determining the level of domestic tourism may also be significant, depending on how those prices are transmitted to public transport costs. The finding that most Namibians don’t use rail transport requires more thorough analysis to identify potential constraints. This will help the government and those in the tourism industry to prioritise tourists’ needs with respect to passenger transportation services.

The fact that 88% of the total tourism trips are overnight visits is perhaps a reflection of Namibia’s geographical size. About 80% of domestic tourists used the homes of friends and relatives for accommodation, with the rest using facilities such as lodges, guesthouses, bed & breakfasts and camping especially for the holiday or leisure visitors. This could reflect the high cost of many of tourism facilities, which at present tend to be geared towards the international market.

The main destinations for visiting friends and relatives are Windhoek and communal areas. The high proportion of VFR in communal areas is associated with the origins of many of the city’s inhabitants, who originally came for education and work purposes. Rural development would lead to an adjustment in this type of travel. Swakopmund, Etosha, Walvis Bay, communal areas and Oshakati were the prime destinations for leisure related trips at present.
The Key Findings are further summarised in the table below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Households</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaires</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>1,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Tourist Households</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Households</td>
<td>155,442</td>
<td>209,944</td>
<td>365,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Tourist Households</td>
<td>125,502</td>
<td>134,358</td>
<td>259,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Number of Trips (Domestic)</td>
<td>193,144</td>
<td>177,306</td>
<td>370,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Number of Tourists (Domestic)</td>
<td>227,298</td>
<td>192,694</td>
<td>419,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Trips per Household</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of People per Trip</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average tourism expenditure per Household (Domestic)</td>
<td>N$ 3,626</td>
<td>N$ 1,440</td>
<td>N$ 2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean expenditure per trip (Domestic)</td>
<td>N$ 2,315</td>
<td>N$ 1,021</td>
<td>N$ 1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean expenditure per same-day trip (Domestic)</td>
<td>N$ 660</td>
<td>N$ 314</td>
<td>N$ 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean expenditure per overnight trip (Domestic)</td>
<td>N$ 2,462</td>
<td>N$ 1,149</td>
<td>N$ 1,863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of Trips by Purpose of Visit (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Visit</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Trip Expenditure by Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Visit</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VFR</td>
<td>N$ 1,355</td>
<td>N$ 975</td>
<td>N$ 1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>N$ 5,056</td>
<td>N$ 1,069</td>
<td>N$ 2,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>N$ 3,793</td>
<td>N$ 2,208</td>
<td>N$ 3,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>N$ 1,409</td>
<td>N$ 492</td>
<td>N$ 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>N$ 926</td>
<td>N$ 724</td>
<td>N$ 863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N$ 1,443</td>
<td>N$ 853</td>
<td>N$ 1,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Trip Expenditure by Expenditure Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Category</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>N$ 148</td>
<td>N$ 45</td>
<td>N$ 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>N$ 443</td>
<td>N$ 235</td>
<td>N$ 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>N$ 569</td>
<td>N$ 305</td>
<td>N$ 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>N$ 115</td>
<td>N$ 15</td>
<td>N$ 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>N$ 370</td>
<td>N$ 255</td>
<td>N$ 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N$ 182</td>
<td>N$ 124</td>
<td>N$ 154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. References


Vol. 22, Issue 1, pp.103-118.

Namibia: Windhoek.

Board, Namibia: Windhoek.

Research Discussion Paper No. 44, Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of  
Environment and Tourism, Namibia: Windhoek.


WTO. 1999. Tourism satellite account (TSA): the conceptual framework. World Tourism  
Organisation, Spain: Madrid.

WTTC. 2006. Namibia: the impact of travel and tourism on jobs and the economy.  
Namibia Tourism Board and Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Namibia: Windhoek.
DIRECTORATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

Research Discussion Papers available in this series


   b. Communal and commercial areas of southern Namibia. 42 pp.


Continued overleaf ...
Other Research Discussion Papers in this series (continued)


Continued overleaf ...
Other Research Discussion Papers in this series (continued)


Continued overleaf ...


*Continued overleaf ...*
Other Research Discussion Papers in this series (continued)


Continued overleaf ...
Other Research Discussion Papers in this series (continued)


