ANTALYA RESIDENTS' ATTITUDES REGARDING THE IMPACTS OF ALL-INCLUSIVE RESORTS IN THE TURKISH COASTAL DESTINATION

A Thesis

by

EMRULLAH ERUL

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Chair of Committee,	Kyle M. Woosnam
Committee Members,	David Matarrita-Cascante
	Alex McIntosh
Head of Department,	Gary Ellis

August 2014

Major Subject: Recreation, Park, and Tourism Sciences

ABSTRACT

All-inclusive resorts (hereafter abbreviated AIR) have a long history of contributing to tourism revenue leakage from host economies. Antalya, with its high percentage of AIRs, is a prime tourist destination in Turkey that likely contributes to such leakage. In an effort to better understand AIR, the purpose of this study was to examine how residents perceive the impacts of AIR in Antalya, Turkey. In so doing, a further focus of the work was looking at the interrelationships between residents' attitudes about their attachment to the community, existing tourism and tourism development, future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options and attitudes about AIR impacts.

A survey was conducted in four key districts in Antalya (based on the concentration of AIRs in the areas): the Antalya city center, Kemer, Serik and Manavgat, yielding a robust sample (n = 660). A questionnaire was designed to examine residents' perceptions of AIR impacts on local communities, perceptions of existing tourism and tourism development, attitudes about future tourism development, attitudes about forms of potential tourism development, community attachment, and a host of demographic variables.

This study adopted social exchange theory and community attachment as conceptual frameworks to explain residents' perceptions and attitudes toward AIR, existing tourism development, future tourism development and potential tourism development options. The study's findings demonstrated that highly attached residents

tend to view tourism development more favorably than less community-attached residents and support for future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options. Additionally, highly attached residents tended to perceive negative impacts of AIR. Furthermore, residents who perceived positive impacts of tourism were supportive of future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options.

Findings indicated that each of four AIR factors (*AIR negative impacts, AIR positive impacts, AIR impacts on population, AIR impacts on quality)* and degree of community attachment had direct significant influence on residents' perceptions of existing tourism and tourism development, attitudes about future tourism development, and attitudes about forms of potential tourism development. Findings provide empirical support for social exchange theory and community attachment. Implications are described and directions for future research are discussed.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents who supported me throughout my studies. I am also grateful to my God for giving me the opportunity to complete this task successfully.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of a great number of individuals. I wish to express my gratitude to everyone who made a meaningful contribution to the completion of my thesis research.

Above all, I would like to thank Dr. Kyle M. Woosnam, chairman of my committee, for all his support, guidance, and encouragement. I have learned much from your sense of humor, generosity, and humanity. You have been my greatest adviser, colleague, and best elder brother.

Deepest gratitude is also due to the committee members, Dr. Alex McIntosh, and Dr. David Matarrita-Cascante, for their guidance and continuous encouragement throughout my graduate studies. Without your knowledge and guidance, this study would not have been successful. I thank all of you who took part in this study for generously sharing your time and contributing your insightful thoughts throughout the progress of my thesis.

I owe special thanks to the Republic of Turkey Ministry of National Education that is provided a fellowship throughout my graduate studies.

Also, I would like to thank all my friends at Texas A&M, in Turkey, and abroad for their support throughout my studies.

Last but not least, with the most sincere love, I would like to thank my mother, my father, and my brother. Nothing can be more valuable than their existence; without them, I would not be where I am today. I will always do my best to be worthy of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is becoming a vital aspect of economic development programs around the world (Harrill, 2004). The tourism industry can offer economic benefits, growth and opportunities for people and businesses in destinations, not to mention strength local economies. Unfortunately, tourism can also have negative social and environmental effects. Besides positive economic influences (e.g., diversifying the economy, and creating employment), in order to reduce negative impacts (e.g., eroding local natural and cultural amenities and contributing to increasing prices and crowding), proactive planning that encompasses research to assess residents' perception of tourism and tourism development is necessary (Sirakaya, Jamal, & Choi, 2001; Williams & Lawson, 2001).

Without appropriate planning, tourism development can bring about economic, social, cultural and environmental threats to local communities (Harrill, 2004; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Yoon, Chen, & Gursoy, 1999). Hall (2000) has argued that the involvement and participation of community residents is imperative for successful tourism planning. Other researchers have found that while policymakers and planners create tourism strategies, one of the highest priorities needs to be considering the perceptions, attitudes and opinions of local residents (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Hao, Long, & Kleckley, 2011; Harrill, Uysal, Cardon, Vong, & Dioko, 2011; Lawton, 2005; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Schlüter & Var, 1988; Teye, Sirakaya, & Sönmez, 2002;

Yu, Chancellor, & Cole, 2011; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2008). Furthermore, if residents' needs and demands are not considered in tourism development, residents will view tourism negatively and potentially act hostile toward tourists (Harrill, 2004; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

These thoughts not only provide a context for understanding the importance of community residents' attitudes in the tourism development process, but also indicate the need for appropriate tourism planning in many developed and developing communities (Choi & Murray, 2010; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Frauman & Banks, 2011; Yu et al., 2011). In addition, policymakers, planners, and government officials can increase residents' involvement in the tourism industry and achieve successful tourism development by considering local residents' perceptions (Wang, Pfister, & Morais, 2006).

Residents' attitudes toward tourism development and residents' perceptions of tourism's impacts on local communities have drawn the attention of academicians, policymakers, tourism managers and several researchers, resulting in numerous studies on the topic for many years (e.g., Allen, Hafer, Long, & Perdue, 1993; Bujosa Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2009; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994; Korca, 1996; Long, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Perdue, Long, & Kang, 1995; Pizam, 1978; Schlüter & Var, 1988; Um & Crompton, 1987; Uriely, Israeli, & Reichel, 2002; Yu et al., 2011; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2008). Given the extensive research on resident attitudes and impacts within the tourism literature, one can argue it is among the most researched topics in the field.

Tourism is now one of the largest and fast-growing industries in Turkey, and has experienced considerable growth since the 1980s (Erkuş-Öztürk & Terhorst, 2010; Köseoglu, Topaloglu, Parnelld, & Lester, 2013). According to the Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism reports, tourist arrivals and receipts grew from 1.3 million and $326 million in 1980 to 26.3 million international tourists and $16.7 billion tourism earnings in 2008 (Avci, Madanoglu, & Okumus, 2011). Turkey is among the top twelve most-visited countries in the world, attracting a total of 28.6 million visitors per year (Tumer, 2010). Furthermore, with its pervasive "all-inclusive resorts", Turkey has become a competitive international player in the resort hotel industry throughout the last two decades (Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011). The total arrivals to all-inclusive resorts have increased 26-fold, from 217,000 in 1981 to 5.6 million in 1997 (Karamustafa, 2000).

The beginning of the 2000s was marked by growing popularity of all-inclusive resorts in Turkish tourism (Duman & Tosun, 2010). The concept of all-inclusive resorts (hereafter abbreviated AIR) contains travel, transfers, accommodation, all foods, all beverages, activities and entertainment for guests. All-inclusive resorts can be defined as: "A trip planned and pre-paid with a single price, which covers a broad range of items from transport and accommodation to meals and sightseeing, sometimes accompanied with an escort or guide." (Heung & Chu, 2000; Morrison, 1989; Sheldon & Mak, 1987)

According to the Association of Turkish Travel Agencies in 2009, Turkey ranked third in selling all-inclusive packages in Europe, and has sold more package tours to international tourists in recent years (Ozdemir, Çizel & Bato Cizel, 2012). Moreover, a large percentage of international tourists to Turkey spend their vacation in Antalya (the

popular resort town in southwest Turkey located along the Mediterranean coast), which most recently welcomed 9.6 million visitors annually (Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism [TMCT], 2011). Antalya receives increasing numbers of tourists each subsequent season (Doganer, 2012). As a result, the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly, with a majority of them falling into the AIR categorization (Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011).

1.1 Problem Statement

Antalya has witnessed magnificent tourism growth for 20 years and has taken its place as the leading tourism destination in Turkey by offering AIR to tourists (Doganer, 2012). Thus, AIR is an important tourism strategy for tourism development in Antalya (Karamustafa, 2000). However, AIRs are not always profitable (Bahar, 2004). In fact, the involvement of these all-inclusive resorts in Antalya can result in high levels of leakage of tourism revenue from the host economy. According to Dwyer and Thomas (2012), each form of leakage results in money leaving or bypassing the host economy. In addition, AIRs can fail to promote local development and can decrease the livelihoods of the residents by diverting guests away from local businesses. In addition, local people can potentially have minimal exposure to foreign tourists, and as a result, the economic exchange between locals and tourists may be greatly diminished (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009; Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002).

All too often, tourists who visit Antalya prefer staying in AIR hotels, which can affect adversely the interaction between local people and foreign tourists (Doganer, 2012). Tourists may not spend extra money in the destination because of AIRs offers,

thus providing little economic benefits to local communities (Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002). In some instances, the resorts have even banned tourists from purchasing food outside the resort and tourists may not feel confident about travelling off-site to buy meals in countries whose language they might not understand (Freitag, 1994). Tourists can also fear that if they leave their hotel grounds, they will be attacked and robbed (Freitag, 1994). Although AIR provides both psychological and financial security for tourists, participation in and appreciation of the destination are compromised in the process. This lack of local participation often results in high external money leakages that hinder the economic development of host communities (Britton, 1982; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997).

Gürkan (2002) found that local business workers did not support AIR because they thought AIR negatively impacted tourism in Turkey and reduced tourism earnings, most notably in Antalya. Similarly, Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) have claimed that AIRs have affected local employees negatively. They found that local workers viewed AIR as a short-term marketing strategy, which results in discouraging high-middle class tourists from visiting and encouraging lower-middle class tourists to visit. AIR is increasing the number of tourists on one hand, but on the other hand has contributed to the reduction in local workers and tourism earnings (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). Barak (2006) supported this claim by indicating that without AIR, the exchange between tourists and local workers could increase in Turkey.

It is clear that policymakers, planners and government officials can fail in the decision making and planning process by not deliberately considering residents' perspectives and opinions about tourism (Teye et al., 2002). Consequently,

understanding residents and proper planning are significantly important for tourism development in Antalya. Policymakers, academicians and government officials can increase tourism benefits and prevent money leakage by building a bridge between locals and tourists.

1.2 Significance of the Research

While several researchers have focused on the popularity of AIR, tourists' satisfaction with AIR, destination image, and destination loyalty for many years in Turkey (Avci et al., 2011; Bahar, 2004; Doganer, 2012; Duman & Öztürk, 2005; Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011; Erkuş-Öztürk & Terhorst, 2010; Karamustafa, 2000; Köseoglu et al., 2013; Ozdemir et al., 2012; Tumer, 2010), little research has incorporated the voices and perceptions of residents concerning AIR in Antalya. Furthermore, it is unclear how residents view AIR or the impacts of AIR on local communities in Antalya. The present study will serve to bridge the literature gap as one of the first to examine local residents' perceptions about AIR and tourism in Antalya, Turkey. In addition, this study has practical implications for tourism planners in Antalya and other destinations with AIR in order to sustainably plan for tourism and tourism development.

1.3 Purpose of the Research

The following research questions will guide this study: 1) What are residents' attitudes regarding perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya?; 2) Are perceived impacts of AIRs different across numerous resident demographics?; 3) How does community attachment influence perceived impacts of AIRs?; 4) How do perceptions of AIRs relate to residents' perception of existing tourism impacts as well as future tourism

development and different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya?; 5) How do perceived impacts of existing tourism relate to attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya?; and 6) What types of potential tourism development are most desirable among Antalya residents? This study aims to (a) identify locals' perspectives about AIR and its impacts on the local communities, (b) examine residents' attitudes toward tourism and residents' perceptions of tourism's impact on local communities, and (c) investigate the importance of understanding residents and the importance of planning.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will initially discuss all-inclusive resorts in general and in Turkey. Previous literature about residents' attitudes toward tourism development and their perceptions of the impacts of tourism in their local communities will then be analyzed in general and in Turkey. Finally, residents' attitudes toward an all-inclusive resort and residents' perceptions of all-inclusive resorts' impacts on local communities will be discussed.

2.1 All-Inclusive Resort Concept

The all-inclusive resort (AIR) model has become a vital component in a growing number of tourism destinations due to the increasing demand for international tourism (Ozdemir et al., 2012). According to Poon (1998), AIRs are playing a significant role as an important approach in international tourism. The original all-inclusive concept can be traced back to the 1930s in Great Britain's holiday camps that offered a full day of free entertainment (Rayna & Striukova, 2009). However, the camps were not completely all-inclusive because they did not include expenses for such things as alcohol (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003). Others have considered the Club Mediterranean (Club Med) to have first introduced the AIR model in the Balearic Islands, one of the most popular Mediterranean destinations in Spain, beginning in the 1950s (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003). As a result of AIR in the Balearic Islands, total arrivals moved from 9.38% in

2002 to 16.32% in 2004, with approximately 10 million tourists visiting there every year (Alegre & Cladera, 2006).

The world's most popular AIR destinations can be found in the Mediterranean and Caribbean countries (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003), but AIRs have developed widely, and spread from Europe to operate worldwide (Inskeep, 1991). The package tours are classified into two types: a basic package tour and an all-inclusive package tour (Wong & Kwong, 2004). While a basic package tour only includes transportation and accommodation (Armstrong & Mok, 1995), an AIR usually contains almost everything such as travel, transfers, accommodation, all foods, all beverages, activities and entertainment (Ozdemir et al., 2012). After tourists make an initial payment, trip details are covered by travel intermediaries such as a travel agency or tour operators who play a significant role in offering AIRs (Wong & Kwong, 2004). Some of the common reasons for purchasing AIRs are: the price, friends' recommendations, entertainment, wide range of facilities, unfamiliarity with destinations, and the convenience of departure dates (Quiroga, 1990).

Some tourists select AIRs because they can be provided with a good experience and a high-quality product at a low cost (Karamustafa, 2000). Economic reasons and overall convenience are the most important reasons for choosing AIRs (Anderson, 2008). It is usually cheaper than an independent trip to the same destination (Wong & Kwong, 2004). AIRs can also eliminate unexpected costs (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003), allowing tourists to plan more accordingly knowing overall costs for all experiences and goods (Anderson, 2008). For example, tourists can know which hotel is the most

appropriate for them and what features are offered (Anderson, 2008). Besides economic reasons, personal safety is another important motive for purchasing AIRs (Wong & Kwong, 2004). Tourists can feel safer when they are in a group of people (Armstrong & Mok, 1995).

Overall, AIRs can save travelers time and money given their well-organized nature (Anderson, Juaneda, & Sastre, 2009). They can provide safe destinations, new social contacts, reliable transport, and a wide range of sports and entertainment (Anderson et al., 2009). AIRs can also reduce fear of encountering language and cultural differences, lowered hygiene standards and lack of security (Armstrong & Mok, 1995).

On the other hand, AIRs foster minimal interaction between tourists and locals with the former often being discouraged from leaving their accommodations (Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert, & Wanhill, 1998; Issa & Jayawardena, 2003), and can contribute to reduced spending outside of the resort (Anderson, 2008). Tourists do not have to leave their accommodations because so much is offered and provided by the accommodations (Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002). As mentioned previously, AIRs can contribute to high levels of leakage of tourism revenue from host communities (Bahar, 2004), especially if the AIRs are owned by foreign investors. For example, service workers in restaurants and taxi drivers can lose business due to the fact that AIRs capture most if not all services, such as transfers, foods, etc. (Anderson, 2008).

2.1.1 AIR Research in Turkey

Throughout the 1990s, Turkey experienced three main crises which adversely affected Turkish tourism. These crises were the Gulf War (occurring in the early part of

the decade), the PKK terrorist group directly targeting tourism destinations (in 1993-1994), and the major earthquake that impacted many regions throughout the country (in 1999) (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). These three major crises not only damaged Turkey economies, but also created a negative image for potential tourists. As a result, numerous hotels in Turkey began to offer AIRs in order to overcome these problems, compensate for their economic loss, change their negative image, and provide a competitive advantage (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009).

Presently, Turkey is among the top twelve most-visited countries in the world, attracting a total of 28.6 million visitors per year (Doganer, 2012; Tumer, 2010). In its well-planned report, the Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism forecasted that by 2023 the country would see 63 million tourists, $86 billion tourism earnings and $1350 on average spent by tourists (TMCT, 2007). Furthermore, with its pervasive "all inclusive resort", Turkey has become a competitive international player in the resort industry over the last two decades (Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011). Turkey, as the third-ranked all-inclusive package tour-seller in Europe in 2009, has sold more package tours to international tourists in recent years (Ozdemir et al., 2012).

The Marco Polo has been widely accepted as the first introducer of AIR in Turkey, dating back to the beginning of the 1990s. However, the popularity of all-inclusive resorts in Turkish tourism began in the 2000s due to the increasing demand for international tourism (Alaeddinoglu & Can, 2009). As a result of AIRs in Turkey, the total bed supply has increased rapidly, from 325,168 in 2000 to 532,262 in 2007. According to Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), Antalya had 44% of this supply in 2007.

Likewise, Oger Tour (2007) conducted a survey of 90,000 German tourists and 85% indicated they selected Turkey as a destination because of AIR (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). In addition, 7,291,356 tourists visited Antalya and 68% of tourists preferred AIR in 2007 (TMCT, 2008). AIR is arguably the most popular traveling mode for tourists visiting Antalya (Ozdemir et al., 2012). In 2008, tourist arrivals exceeded 9 million in Antalya (Antalya Tourism Information Office, 2009).

The Turkish tourism industry mainly depends on international tourists looking for sun and sea destinations, especially during the summer season (Koc, 2005). Within this form of tourism, Antalya has witnessed huge tourism growth over the last 20 years and has taken its place as the leading tourism destination in Turkey (Ozdemir et al., 2012). The majority of international tourists spend their vacation in Antalya, which most recently welcomed 9.6 million visitors annually (TMCT, 2011). The number of all-inclusive resort hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly and receives growing numbers of tourist flows every season (Cave & Kilic, 2010; Doganer, 2012). In addition, a majority of hotels in Antalya have adopted AIR so as to increase their occupancy rates (Demir, 2002). Antalya is Turkey's most popular tourist destination (Yilmaz, Yilmaz, Icigen, Ekin, & Utku, 2009) attracting visitors from Germany, Russia, Austria, Sweden, the UK, Netherlands, France, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, Poland and the Ukraine. Germany (27%) and Russia (26%) make up the 53% of market share for inbound tourism (Doganer, 2012).

Tourist satisfaction is greatly impacted by choice of accommodation, location, food and beverage services, and hospitality (Yilmaz et al., 2009). In their study

concerning customer satisfaction, Duman and Öztürk (2005) not only emphasized the importance of these factors in tourist satisfaction, but also claimed that the majority of tourists prefer Antalya as a destination because such factors are included in AIRs. Furthermore, according to Tumer (2010), so as to keep its position as the twelfth most-visited country in the world, Turkey should use AIR as a tourism strategy to remain competitive. Similarly, Demir (2002), in her study concerning AIR cost and profitability, found that the biggest reason AIRs are used in Antalya was due to its livelihood of increasing profitability and occupancy rates while decreasing costs. She claimed that hotels achieved their aims by using AIR. On the other hand, Orucu, Aydilek, and Bulut (2004) in their research, which examined the contribution of AIR in Marmaris, found that although AIR increased the number of tourists and became a big package tour-seller in Europe, they have affected Turkish tourism negatively due to the associated low-cost image of such resorts.

Yarcan and Ertuna (2002) in their study, regarding Turkish inbound international tourism, found that most of the European tourists visit Turkey with sun and sea motivations. Furthermore, the authors posited that tourists generally prefer AIR, but cite that AIRs result in tourists being confined to the resorts and contributing minimally to the local economy. The study also indicated that despite an increase in the supply of beds through Turkey, the per capita expenditure of foreign tourists has fallen because all inclusive holiday packages have been sold for very low prices. As a result, the authors suggested that policymakers, government officials and planners should seek to increase per capita expenditures rather than increase the absolute number of foreign tourists.

Moreover, Yarcan and Ertuna (2002) have found that even though AIR is common and popular in Turkey, local tourism has not yet developed very well. To improve tourism earnings and develop local tourism, the authors suggested that cultural and historical resources should be promoted.

Likewise, Bircan, Ulker, Gunes, and Karakoc (2010) have found that AIR tourists tend to remain in their accommodations and thus may not be aware of the historical background and social structure of the region. Furthermore, the researchers have posited that AIRs in Antalya are attracting many more lower-middle class tourists than before. In addition, AIR can decrease the quality of tourism services so as to increase profitability. Üner, Sökmen, and Birkan (2006) have supported this claim by indicating that AIRs are increasing the number of tourist, on the other hand decreasing the quality of tourism services.

Furthermore, several studies report that many hotels have started offering AIR in order to reduce their costs and increase tourism earnings (Köseoglu et al., 2013). However, these studies have also found that AIRs have drawn the attention of lower-middle class tourists and created the cheapest tourism destination image. According to Erkuş-Öztürk & Terhorst (2010), AIR can provide rapid growth in tourism; on the other hand, they can create a cheapened tourist image. The authors also report that lower-middle class tourists, who are generally price-sensitive, prefer Turkey because AIRs can offer them the cheapest travel. In addition, AIRs may discourage higher-middle classes from visiting who may want to distinguish themselves from lower-middle class travelers.

In his dissertation, Doganli (2006) determined that Antalya has a very low brand value which in turn can adversely affect tourism income. He emphasized that the positive contribution of tourism in Turkish economies can increase as the brand value increases. Furthermore, he has claimed that providing tourists with low price experiences in the destination, high quality resorts and wonderful beaches may not be enough to be a competitor in the international tourism market. Albeni and Ongun (2005) echoed these findings revealing that Antalya has the image of a cheap destination which results in a reduced tourism product, ultimately affecting tourism earnings.

2.2 Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development

To develop sustainable tourism, community support and inclusion of locals in planning is crucial (Andereck & Vogt, 2000). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development and their perceptions of the impact of tourism in their local communities are essential determinants of successful tourism (Yu et al., 2011). This is largely due to the fact that residents are affected directly by the tourism industry (Ap, 1992; Murphy, 1985). Moreover, residents not only have a significant influence in shaping tourists' experiences and the decision-making process, but also have an important voice regarding development and marketing of existing and future tourism programs (Gjerald, 2005).

Residents' attitudes toward tourism development and their perceptions of the impacts of tourism in their local communities have been researched for more than four decades (Tosun, 2002). In examining the impacts of tourism on local residents, previous studies have discovered numerous positive and negative tourism impacts (Tatoglu, Erdal, Ozgur, & Azakli, 2002). These impacts can be categorized as economic, social

and environmental (Chuang, 2010). In the 1960s, studies tended to focus primarily on positive economic impacts of tourism (Pizam, 1978). It was in the 1970s that anthropologists and sociologists began to research the negative social cultural impacts of tourism (De Kadt, 1979). Since the 1980s, academic research on such impacts has encompassed both positive and negative consequences of tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Ap & Crompton, 1998).

Destination residents can usually perceive positive economic impacts of tourism (Tatoglu et al., 2002) as such impacts can be seen as the most valuable factors for host communities (Long, 2012; Schluter & Var, 1998). First of all, tourism can diversify local economies (Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Yu et al., 2011), contribute to income generation and standard of living such as improvements in health services, airport, water and sewage systems; enhance community infrastructure and general facilities (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Schlüter & Var, 1988; Yu et al., 2011), bring in new businesses, and create investment opportunities (Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2008). Tourism can decrease unemployment rates by creating new job opportunities (Gilbert & Clark, 1997; Sheldon & Var, 1984). For example, residents can work in hotels, restaurants, and other service sector positions related to tourism (Tatoglu et al., 2002; Uriely et al., 2002).

Besides the positive economic influences of tourism, residents are also keenly aware of the negative economic impacts (Tatoglu et al., 2002). As destinations attract tourists, prices of goods and services can increase (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Liu & Var, 1986). In addition, tourism can adversely affect the price of land and housing (Pizam, 1978). Residents can suffer from increasing land and housing prices due to increased

migration to a destination (Kwon & Vogt, 2010). Rent in some locations has even increased as a result (Var, Kendall, & Tarakcioglu, 1985).

Tourism can also affect life in general for destination residents' cultures (Gjerald, 2005), such as quality of life factors (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Perdue et al., 1995). For example, the transportation systems, shopping centers, recreational opportunities and the quality of fire protection can increase (Pizam, 1978). Tourism can provide valuable educational experiences such as learning a new language (Korca, 1996). Tourism may also contribute to greater understanding of people from different cultural backgrounds as numerous opportunities are afforded for resident-tourist interaction (Korca 1996; Schlüter & Var, 1988). It can also increase understanding of the image surrounding a community and its various cultures (McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

Some previous studies report that residents can perceive social and cultural impacts of tourism negatively (Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994; Pizam, 1978). Tourism can lead to the reduced importance of moral values within society in general and in cultures specifically (Tatoglu et al., 2002). For example, residents may desire to use drugs and drink more alcohol as a result of increased tourism in a destination (Pizam, 1978). In addition, prostitution, gambling, smuggling, and crime rate can all increase in a community that has experienced an increased number of tourists (Liu & Var, 1986; Long, 2012; Pizam, 1978). Furthermore, an increase in the number of individuals in a destination (especially in summer seasons) can lead to greater noise and traffic congestion (Kwon & Vogt, 2010; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

Residents tend to change their lifestyle (e.g., dressing, eating, entertainment and so on) by observing tourists (Tatoglu et al., 2002). Some residents can identify with cultural values of tourists and desire to have the same luxuries (e.g., expensive phones, cameras and bags) (Tatoglu et al., 2002). This kind of social and cultural influences of tourism can be viewed positively, but it can also be evaluated negatively as an indicator of assimilation, conflict and loss of cultural identity (Mok, Slater, & Cheung, 1991; Pizam, 1978). For instance, adopting cultural values of tourists can provide residents with valuable educational experiences such as speaking a different language (Tatoglu et al., 2002), but adopting a new culture can also damage family structure and values, and lead to an increase in divorce rates and prostitution (Gee, Makens, & Choy, 1997).

The impacts of tourism on the environment have drawn the attention of tourism researchers within the framework of sustainable development of tourism (Tatoglu et al., 2002). In order to attract more tourists, historical buildings and structures can be preserved and restored (Liu & Var, 1986; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). However, if policymakers, planners, and government officials do not establish sustainable plans, tourism can damage the beauty of the attractions (Schlüter & Var, 1988), cause air and water pollution (Long, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004), and lead to overcrowding (Pizam, 1978).

To sum up, when residents perceive the positive impacts of tourism, they are willing to support additional tourism development (McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Wang et al., 2006), but residents who perceive more costs than benefits will likely oppose tourism development (Long, 2012). Consequently, residents are key actors in planning

for tourism development (Gunn, 1994) and without them, negative economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences for local communities would likely be greater (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). These negative influences on residents can reduce the attractiveness of a destination which can adversely affect the income potential and employment opportunities for the local tourism industry (Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

2.2.1 Theories and Frameworks

In order to clarify the relationship between impacts of tourism and residents' attitudes toward tourism on a community level, several theories and conceptual frameworks have been developed by tourism researchers. Most notable of these include the historical frameworks such as Doxey's (1975) Irridex and Butler's (1980) life-cycle of a destination. While both have paved the way for resident attitudes and impacts research, neither has provided much empirical support.

One of the most influential theories is the social exchange theory (Ap, 1992) which claims that people who perceive exchange benefits would have positive attitudes towards tourism, but people who recognize exchange costs would have negative attitudes toward tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Long, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). This theory also states that residents who are economically dependent on tourism tend to support tourism development (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Lawton, 2005; Pizam, 1978). The majority of studies have shown that the potential benefit from an exchange can create positive perceptions of tourism and tolerance of negative impacts of tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Chuang, 2010; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

Látková and Vogt (2012) most recently used the social exchange theory to examine the impacts of tourism development on residents' attitudes. Similarly, the researchers found that residents who perceived benefits from tourism viewed tourism more positively and supported further tourism development; on the other hand, residents who felt tourism had negative consequences were less optimistic about their community's future. In addition, Látková and Vogt (2012) investigated a relationship between residents' characteristics and the impacts of tourism while controlling personal benefits of tourism. The authors claimed that when controlling personal benefits from tourism, residents' characteristics predicted perceived impacts of tourism. Consistent with the findings of McGehee and Andereck (2004), older residents perceived positive impacts of tourism more than younger residents.

Chen and Raab (2012) found that residents' attitudes toward tourism development played a significant role in predicting support for tourism. The authors determined that perceived benefits from tourism had a larger impact on residents' attitudes toward tourism compared with perceived costs from tourism. According to the social exchange theory, if the potential benefits from tourism development are greater than its costs, residents will view tourism positively; otherwise, they will perceive it negatively (Chen & Raab, 2012; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

Community attachment is another framework that has been used to explain the relationship between resident attitudes and impacts of tourism. It is defined as the "extent and pattern of social participation and integration into community life, and affect toward the community" (McCool & Martin 1994, p. 30). Generally, tourism researchers

claim that the relationships between community attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism can be negative. According to the researchers, as the attachment level in a community increases, residents' positive perception about tourism decreases (Harrill, 2004). For example, Um and Crompton (1987) found that residents who were strongly attached to their community perceived tourism development negatively. However, contrary to Um and Crompton, McCool and Martin (1994) found that residents who were strongly attached to their community viewed tourism development positively.

It is possible that residents who are strongly attached to their community have positive attitudes toward tourism development. The important factor in the community attachment theory is that community attachment indirectly influences residents' attitudes toward participation, which affects their attitude toward tourism development (Doh, 2006). For instance, if a resident is strongly attached to his/her community and is aware of the importance of natural resources, he/she will be more likely to participate in community affairs or organizations to make his/her opinions heard and protect nature. This affects his/her attitude toward tourism impacts (Doh, 2006).

According to community attachment theory, when residents perceive the impacts of tourism negatively, they will have a negative attitude towards tourism development and oppose any future tourism development. On the other hand, residents who perceive the impacts of tourism positively will support future tourism development and have positive attitudes toward potential tourism development (Doh, 2006). This can also be explained through the social exchange theory.

Both the social exchange theory and community attachment framework have informed the current research. Furthermore, findings will be explained considering the two frameworks. Both frameworks explain why and under what situations local residents would have positive attitudes toward tourism and would support future tourism development. These theories claim that residents who perceive positive impacts of tourism, especially from an economic perspective, would support tourism development and would have positive attitudes toward tourism. One of the purposes of this study is to understand host communities' attitudes toward tourism impacts and identify various factors affecting residents' attitudes that have implications for future tourism development by using both the social exchange theory and community attachment framework. Both the social exchange theory and community attachment framework have indirect influence on residents' attitudes toward tourism development and intention to support tourism (Chen & Raab, 2012).

2.2.2 Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism in Turkey

Gümüş and Özüpekçe (2009) found that residents' attitudes toward tourism development in Foca were positive and the majority of people surveyed were interested in the economic contribution made by tourism. The researchers found that well-educated participants were less enthusiastic about tourism development because they were more interested in the cultural change and environmental degradation in Foca than the economic contribution made by tourism. However, they did not find any correlation between residents' attitudes toward tourism development and other socioeconomic factors such as age, gender, income, and length of residency. Tatoglu et al. (2002)

published a study of resident attitudes toward tourism development in Kusadasi, but contrary to Gümüş and Özüpekçe, they found a relationship between high levels of education and increased support for tourism.

Korca (1996) examined the relationship between physical proximity to tourism and residents' attitudes about tourism in Antalya. She found that as the distance between individuals' homes and the tourism zone increases, residents were more supportive. She argued that when tourism facilities are located close to residents' homes, residents have less favorable attitudes toward tourism due to negative consequences of tourism such as noise, litter and trash.

In considering the interaction between Turkish residents and tourists in two areas (Urgup and Acigol) of Nevsehir, Tayfun (2002) found that residents in the tourism-centered area (Urgup) perceived the social impacts of tourism more positively, while Acigol residents perceived the social impacts of tourism more negatively. For example, while locals in the non-tourism area (Acigol) thought that tourism could lead to an erosion of moral values, Urgup residents thought that tourism could contribute to the adoption of a more modern lifestyle. Similarly, Tayfun and Kiliclar (2004) examined the social implications of tourism and residents' perception of tourism in Antalya by comparing the tourism-centered area of Alanya and non-tourism centered area of Gazipasa. The authors found few differences between the two areas with community infrastructures and general facilities being better in Alanya.

In Afyonkarahisar, Özdemir and Kervankiran (2011) found that even though residents perceived the positive economic and social influences of tourism, they were

also aware of the negative economic effects of the industry. The authors suggested that policymakers, government officials, managers and planners should consider residents' opinions and perceptions about tourism so as to reduce the negative impacts of tourism. Alaeddinoglu (2009) supported this claim by indicating that the opportunity should be given to residents to contribute to tourism plans and projects. Furthermore, he has emphasized that residents' involvement in the tourism industry and participation in tourism planning are essential components to achieve successful tourism. Without appropriate planning, tourism development can bring about economic, social, cultural and environmental threats to local communities (Alaeddinoglu, 2009).

In another Turkish town (Safranbolu), Gürbüz (2002) found that residents perceived the negative social impacts of tourism. He has suggested that residents should be trained about tourism development so as to decrease its negative social impacts. Gürbüz (2002) claimed that residents should also be aware of the positive social impacts of tourism and that tourism should not solely be considered for its positive economic contributions. Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2003) have supported this idea by claiming that policymakers, government officials, and planners should pay more attention to the problems of locals and should try to train locals about costs and benefits of tourism. In addition, residents should not be ignored in tourism planning. Otherwise, negative perceptions can increase to a point that residents can harbor negative attitudes about tourism development, which can ultimately damage tourism (Akova, 2006).

As a consequence, these thoughts not only emphasize that understanding residents' attitudes toward tourism development and appropriate planning is necessary

for successful tourism development (Murphy, 1985), but also indicate that residents' attitudes toward tourism development and its impacts are correlated with several key factors. These include socioeconomic factors such as age, income, gender, length of residency, ethnicity and educational level (Chuang, 2010; Huh & Vogt, 2008) and spatial factors such as distance from tourism sites to residential neighborhoods (Korca, 1996; Pizam, 1978). Researcher can classify residents as supporters or opponents of tourism development by considering these variables (Harrill, 2004).

2.2.3 Residents' Attitudes toward AIR in Turkey

Several studies have revealed that local business employees have negative attitudes towards AIR in Antalya (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009; Demir, 2002; Gülbahar, 2002; Gürkan, 2002; Üner et al., 2006). Gülbahar (2002) found local employees can face issues of losing their jobs and may not gain adequate money from tourists due to AIR. Üner et al. (2006) have supported this idea by claiming that AIR can provide most if not all services to tourists, which results in individuals not spending money outside of the hotel, and not recognizing the attractions and culture of the destination. Likewise, Erdinc (2011) conducted a survey of 13,446 tourists in Antalya and 76.4% of tourists preferred AIR during that year. She found that 63.8% of tourist remained at resorts instead of visiting the city center.

Furthermore, Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) found that local employees view AIR as a short-term marketing strategy, which results in discouraging high-middle class tourists from visiting and encouraging lower-middle class tourists to visit. Demir (2002) supported this notion claiming that the quality of tourism can decrease because of AIR

and the presence of lower-middle class tourists. She also added that AIRs can reduce the number of customers and increase unemployment rates. Similarly, Gürkan (2002) emphasized that local workers did not support AIR because they thought AIR negatively impacted tourism in Turkey and reduced tourism earnings.

Menekşe (2005) found that while local workers had negative perception about AIR in Marmaris, the suppliers had positive attitudes toward AIR. With regard to Alanya Chambers of Commerce and Industry report (2007), AIR is increasing the number of tourists, on the other hand decreasing the number of local workers and tourism earnings (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). Barak (2006) supported this claim by indicating that without AIR, the exchange between tourists and local workers could increase in Bodrum. Barak (2006) has also found that AIR may not provide any economic benefits for local workers.

In light of the above-mentioned findings, the present study claims that AIRs have succeeded in drawing tourists to Antalya, likely increasing tourism earnings, occupancy rates, and profitability at first. However, AIRs are largely responsible for a lack of tourist interaction with locals. Residents such as local workers are afforded minimal exposure to foreign tourists and their needs, which results in limited economic exchange between locals and tourists. In addition, AIRs can fail to promote local development and can decrease the livelihoods of the residents. It can also prevent participation and appreciation of the destination. This lack of local interaction can result in high external money leakages that hinder economic development of host communities. As a result of these consequences, residents will likely have negative attitudes towards AIR and

tourism development. As shown above, involvement and participation of local residents is imperative for successful tourism development. The main aim of successful tourism should involve the inclusion of residents and tourism earnings that are spread throughout the destination instead of increasing tourist numbers as AIR has done.

2.3 Research Hypotheses

Using Antalya as the study site, this research proposes the following 11 hypotheses:

H1: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will be significantly different across numerous demographic variables (i.e., gender, income, age, and education) in Antalya.

H2: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya.

H3: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya.

H4: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya.

H5: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya.

H6: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya.

H7: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya.

H8: Local residents' attitudes about future tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya.

H9: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya.

H10: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya.

H11: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

This study utilized a survey method to gain accurate and detailed information about Antalya residents' attitudes toward tourism development and all-inclusive resorts (i.e., AIRs). A questionnaire was designed to examine residents' perceptions of AIR impacts on local communities, perceptions of existing tourism and tourism development, attitudes about future tourism development, attitudes about forms of potential tourism development, community attachment, and a host of demographic variables.

This chapter describes the study's research methods, which is divided into four sections. In the first section, brief information on the study area is presented. The second section describes the sample selection procedure and how data were collected. The development of the instrument used to collect survey data is described in the third section. The final section includes a brief summary of how data were analyzed.

3.1 Antalya as a Study Site

Tourism has been one of the most significant and dynamic industries in Turkey (Erkuş-Öztürk & Terhorst, 2010; Köseoglu et al., 2013; Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002), generating $52.6 billion (approximately 10.2% of Turkey's GDP) and employing approximately 1.7 million people (7.2% of total employment) in 2009 alone (The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report, World Economic Forum, 2009). Furthermore, it generated 509,500 jobs directly in 2011 (2.1% of total employment), and this is forecasted to grow by 4.4% in 2012 to 532,000 (2.2% of total employment). These

figures include employment by hotels, travel agents, airlines and other passenger transportation services (excluding commuter services). It also includes the activities of the restaurant and leisure industries directly supported by tourists. By 2022, the tourism industry in Turkey will account for approximately 689,000 jobs directly, an increase of 2.6% over the next ten years (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2012).

International tourist arrivals and tourism receipts have been growing rapidly over recent decades (Avci et al., 2011; Turkish Statistical Institute [TSI], 2009). According to the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism reports in 2010, the share of Turkish tourist arrivals in the world has increased from 1.1% in 1990 to 2.7% in 2008. The share of tourism receipts in the global tourism GDP, likewise, has increased from 1.2% in 1990 to 2.3% in 2008. Turkey has become one of the world's most popular tourism destinations due to its natural attractions, unique historical and archaeological sites, and improving touristic infrastructure all of which have helped Turkey attract 28.6 million visitors per year (Tumer, 2010).

Turkey is located in southeastern Europe and southwestern Asia, with 97% of its area comprising Anatolia or Asia Minor. Turkey is 814,578 square kilometers, sharing borders with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Iran, Iraq, and Syria. Turkey is also bordered by the Black Sea on the northern coast of the country; the Aegean Sea to the west and the Mediterranean Sea to the south. Throughout history, Turkey has been of geostrategic importance owing to its central location in Eurasia. It is in the juncture of cultural, intellectual, and political manifestations of both the East and West. According to Turkish Statistical Institute reports, the population of Turkey slightly

exceeds 75.6 million individuals (TSI, 2012). The capital city, Ankara, is located in the northwest center of Anatolia. The official language is Turkish; however English is widely spoken in major cities. The unique Mediterranean climate and beautiful nature of Turkey allows almost six months of summertime in southern parts, especially in Antalya, which is the most popular resort or "sun and sea" tourist destination (Doganer, 2012; TMCT, 2011; Yilmaz et al., 2009).

Antalya is known as the capital of Turkish tourism because of the archaeological and natural resources of the area (Yilmaz et al., 2009). It is located on the Mediterranean coast of southwest Turkey and covers approximately 20,815 km² (Figure 1). According to Turkish Statistical Institute reports, the population of Antalya is slightly above 2 million individuals (TSI, 2012). Ancient history and architecture, desirable climatic conditions and natural beauty are distinctive features of the area. In addition to the wide selection of hotels, restaurants, bars, nightclubs and shops, the city also plays host to a number of sporting events throughout the year, such as international beach volleyball, triathlons, golf tournaments, archery, tennis and canoeing competitions. Antalya has a Mediterranean climate with hot and dry summers and mild and rainy winters. Approximately 300 days of the year are sunny, with over 3000 hours of sunlight per year. The sea temperature ranges between 15 °C (59 °F) in the winter and 28 °C (82 °F) in the summer.

With its beautiful weather, history, sea, cultural assets and high quality tourism facilities, Antalya is the leading destination of Turkey (Yilmaz, et al., 2009). With Belek,

Kemer, Side-Manavgat, Alanya, and Kaş tourism centers, Antalya hosts more than 9 million foreign visitors every year (Antalya tourism information office, 2009).

According to the Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism reports in 2007, the total bed supply was 532,262 in Turkey, with Antalya owning 44% of the market. Turkey was the third ranked all-inclusive package tour-seller in Europe in 2009 (Ozdemir et al., 2012). Hence, Antalya has witnessed magnificent tourism growth for 20 years and has taken its place as the leading tourism destination in Turkey (Doganer, 2012). In addition, the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly and a majority of them have adopted an AIR model (Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011).

3.2 Sampling and Data Collection

The current study was carried out in Antalya, with a sample population comprised of local residents living in Antalya, including both full-time and seasonal residents. Furthermore, data for this study were collected through on-site self-administered questionnaires distributed to Antalya residents. The study was carried out during four weeks between the months of February, March and April of 2014, during weekdays between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. and between 11:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on the weekends. The questionnaire was translated into Turkish (Appendix C) for communities with large Turkish-speaking populations. The translated questionnaires were examined by experts who are familiar with Turkish and English languages. The survey was conducted in four key districts in Antalya (based on the concentration of AIRs in the areas): the Antalya city center, Kemer, Serik and Manavgat.

Questionnaires were randomly distributed door-to-door using a cluster sampling strategy in order to save money, time and effort. Cluster sampling began by dividing Antalya into geographic areas based on local government designation. The Antalya area was reduced to 15 districts as determined by the Turkish Statistical Institute classifications. From the list of districts, Kemer, Antalya city center, Serik and Manavgat were selected given their proximity to tourism areas. Based on the number of AIRs in each district (i.e., Kemer 98%, Manavgat 94%, Serik 98% and Antalya city center 79%), a target number of completed questionnaires were developed and streets in each of the districts were randomly selected by using city maps. Within each of the randomly selected areas, every 4th home or business on the street were visited, with the head of household or business owner contacted and asked to participate.

Questionnaires were distributed by the author to residents' at their homes or businesses. The resultant sample included all types of business owners, whether they were tourism-related or not, including both shop and restaurant owners. When the residents (whom were at least 18 years of age) agreed to participate, an 8-page questionnaire (Appendix B) was left at the home or business and picked up by the author later that day. Financial and human resource limitations did not allow the researcher to conduct personal interviews with each respondent. In a few cases, the survey was done using a face-to-face interview approach. Respondents were approached and informed about the purpose of survey and were asked whether they would participate in the survey. The respondents participated voluntarily, and the survey was designed to do no

harm to respondents who volunteered to cooperate with the study. The respondents were also ensured that their individual responses would be confidential.

Ultimately 1003 households and businesses were visited by the author, with approximately 5% (n = 53) yielding "no answer" responses. At the remaining 950 homes and businesses, heads of households or business owners (or spouse) were contacted and asked to participate, of whom 223 declined (an acceptance rate of 76.5%). Of the 727 surveys that were distributed, 660 were completed by residents (a completion rate of 90%). The overall response rate (i.e., 660 completed and usable survey instruments from 950 individuals that were contacted) was 69%. The response rate specifically for each district was indicated below (i.e., Kemer and Manavgat were 71%, Antalya city center and Serik were 68%). These results can be found in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Response Rates for Each Antalya District

	No Answer	Decline	Accept	Completed	Response Rate %
Kemer	10	63	169	165	71%
Center	16	64	173	160	68%
Serik	16	38	203	165	68%
Manavgat	11	58	182	170	71%
Total	53	223	727	660	69%

3.3 Questionnaire Measures

The questionnaire consisted of seven sections (see Appendix B), with at least one scale found in each section. Such scales and corresponding items can be found verbatim on the questionnaire. The first section pertained to community life and included questions asking about length of residence, residents' community attachment (Matarrita-Cascante, Luloff, & Krannich, 2006), and residents' sense of community (Peterson, Speer, & McMillan, 2008). Both the *Community Attachment Scale* (hereafter abbreviated CA) and *Brief Sense of Community Scale* included multiple items on 5-point Likert scales (where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree).

The second section of the questionnaire pertained to tourism impacts and included the modified *Tourism Impact Attitude Scale* or TIAS (originally formulated by Lankford & Howard, 1994) most recently utilized by Wang and Pfister (2008) and Woosnam (2012). Items were presented on the same 5-point Likert scale of agreement.

The third section presented respondents with items on what feelings they have about Antalya visitors. The items were modified from the *Emotional Solidarity Scale* or ESS developed by Woosnam, Norman, and Ying (2009). Once more, the 5-point Likert scale of agreement was used.

The fourth section asked respondents about their attitudes toward future tourism development (hereafter abbreviated FTD). Items determined whether they were generally in favor of or opposed to tourism development in the area. This scale was formulated by Doh (2006), using a 5-point Likert scale of agreement.

The fifth section presented respondents with items on what types of potential tourism development (hereafter abbreviated PTD) might be desirable if tourism development was to occur in their community in the future. The items were modified from the scale previously used by Doh (2006). The author adopted 12 items from the original scale and added one new item, where residents indicated their level of desirability (on a 5-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = strongly undesirable and 5 = strongly desirable) with each item. "Development of businesses for bird-watching," "Increased places to hunt wildlife," "Development of more places to camp," and "Providing facilities which would educate visitors about nature," were not included given the lack of application to Turkish culture in Antalya and to make the scale as parsimonious as possible for respondents. In addition, "Development of more all-inclusive resorts (AIRs)", was added to the scale to learn about residents' level of desirability of AIR.

The sixth section of the questionnaire included items measuring AIR impacts on the community. A scale was used that measured residents' perceptions of AIR based on the work of previous research (Barak, 2006; Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009; Gürkan, 2002; Menekşe, 2005), with three items removed so as to be as parsimonious as possible. The items were presented to residents on a 5-point Likert scale of agreement.

The last section of the questionnaire was designed to gather information about demographic characteristics of residents. Basic demographics included age, gender, income, education level, marital status, cultural nationality, employment status and

dependency on tourism. These questions were placed at the close of the questionnaire so as to increase response rates.

3.4 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in several stages employing different descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. All analyses in this study were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 21. Prior to assessing each of the 11 hypotheses formulated in the previous chapter, univariate data screening occurred following Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) by examining *z* scores for standardized data to identify potential outliers from the data distribution. Once univariate data screening was completed, descriptive analysis for each variable in the dataset would occur whereby frequency distributions were requested. Respondents' demographic profile including average age, gender, income, educational level and other characteristics were analyzed during this step.

The next step involved general analysis to report a summary of the pattern of the data. This includes descriptive summaries for individual items as well as variables set for hypotheses testing. After some of the items were reverse-coded to account for negative wording in some of the statements, the responses were summed to create composite scores for each variable. Following this, factor analysis for each scale was conducted to assess dimensionality of each scale used in the questionnaire. At that point, reliabilities for each scale were assessed to examine internal consistency for each factor. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was considered appropriate (Woosnam et al., 2009) using principal component analysis with varimax rotation. To examine whether resulting AIR factors

could explain perceived impacts of existing tourism, future tourism and different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya, multiple regression analyses were then conducted.

Finally each hypothesis was assessed. MANOVA was used to address Hypothesis 1. Simple linear regression analysis was used to assess Hypotheses 2 and 8-11. Multiple regression analysis was then utilized to examine Hypotheses 3-7. These steps can be found in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Steps for Data Analysis

step 1	Screening Data
step 2	Descriptive Analysis
step 3	Demographic Profile
step 4	Factor Analysis
step 5	EFA Results
step 6	Multiple Regression
step 7	MANOVA
step 8	Hypothesis Testing

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This research focuses on residents' attitudes regarding perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya. A total of 660 Antalya residents— 165 (25%) from Kemer, 160 (24%) from Antalya city center, 165 (25%) from Serik, and 170 (26%) from Manavgat —completed the questionnaire. Sixty-seven uncompleted responses were excluded from the data analysis. This chapter provides a description of the demographic characteristics of the Antalya residents in the sample and a summary of the statistical results for the 11 hypotheses formulated in the second chapter.

4.1 Demographic Profile

A descriptive summary of Antalya Resident survey participants can be found in Table 4.1. Of the 660 respondents, 38% were female and 62% were male. The median age range of participants was 30-39 years. Over half (51%) of residents reported their employment status was tourism-related. Respondents' were primarily either married (56%) or single (42%). A majority (92%) were Turkish, while only 6% of the respondents considered themselves Kurdish. Over half (52%) of residents had at least an undergraduate degree. Median income range of the respondents was under $1,500 (i.e., 3,000 Turkish Lira). However, 28% earned between $1,500-$3,000 (i.e., 3,000TL-6,000TL), and 16% made more than $3,000 (i.e., 6,000TL) per month.

Table 4.1 Sample Characteristics

Socio-demographic Variable	*n*	%
Gender (*n* = 660)		
Female	252	38.2
Male	408	61.8
Employment (*n* = 660)		
Not tourism-related	191	28.9
Tourism-related	337	51.1
Student	104	15.8
Homemaker	19	2.9
Retired or unemployed	9	1.4
Monthly Household Income[a] (*n* = 660)		
Under $1,500	435	65.9
$1,500-3,000	184	27.9
Over $3,000	41	6.2
Age[b] (*n* = 660)		
18-29	271	41.1
30-39	176	26.7
40-49	164	24.8
50-59	46	7.0
≥ 60	3	0.5
Education[c] (*n* = 660)		
Less than high school	46	7.0
High school	177	26.8
Technical or vocational school	71	10.8
Undergraduate degree	343	52.0
Graduate degree	23	3.5
Marital Status (*n* = 660)		
Single	277	42.0
Married	367	55.6
Divorced or separated	10	1.5
Widowed	6	0.9
Race/ethnicity (*n* = 660)		
Turkish	610	92.4
Kurdish	37	5.6
American	2	0.3
European	7	1.1
Others	4	0.6

[a] *Median* = Under $1,500
[b] *Median* = 30-39 years of age, *SD* = 0.990
[c] *Median* = Undergraduate degree, *SD* = 1.804

4.2 Data Preparation

As mentioned above, 67 respondents did not complete at least 50% of the questionnaire and therefore their responses were not included in analysis. In order to examine data for potential outliers, frequency tables for each variable were requested from SPSS. In addition to this, univariate outliers were detected by computing *z*-scores in the distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), which served as a cross-check to ensure all outliers were identified. Upon inspection, no cases were identified as problematic and therefore, the total dataset included responses from all 660 individuals comprising the population sample.

4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

To assess the factor structure of the scales used in analysis and potentially reduce number of items in each scale, exploratory factor analysis (principal components analysis) with varimax rotation was performed. Factors were retained based on two criteria: scree plot examination and eigenvalues exceeding a value of 1.0 (Woosnam et al., 2009). Only items with loadings of at least .50 were retained (Costello & Osborne, 2005). However, items that cross-loaded onto multiple factors (i.e., those whose values exceeded .32) were removed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

4.3.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis for *Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts* (AIR) *Scale*

Short of three items from the Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) *Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts* (AIR) *Scale,* EFA was performed on the remaining 20 items. In the initial analysis, five factors were identified; however four items had to be removed (two

as low-loaders and two as cross-loaders). The items eliminated from this analysis were "AIR attracts more lower- middle class tourists," "AIR should be abolished," "AIR reduces the sale prices of the local businesses," and "Tourists are unaware of the beauty of the region due to AIR." A second EFA was run and Cronbach alphas were examined for the factors. From the results, two items (i.e., "AIR contributes positively to suppliers" and "AIR leads tourists to consume excessive food and alcohol") were then removed so as not to compromise internal consistencies of factors.

The third and final EFA yielded satisfactory loadings, however modest reliabilities in two of the four resulting factors. The four factors accounted for 68% of the total variance in the construct and yielded factor loadings between .62 and .90 with Cronbach's alphas ranging from .56 to .91. The four factors were named: *AIR negative economic impacts on local businesses* (five items); *AIR positive impacts* (four items); *AIR impacts on quality* (three items); and *AIR impacts on population* (two items). These results can be found in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis of *Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts* (AIR) *Scale*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean[a]	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach α Reliability
Factor 1. *Negative Impacts on Local Businesses*[b]		4.22	3.83	27.35	.91
AIR causes a decrease in the sales of local business owners	.90	4.28			
AIR reduces the profitability of the local businesses	.90	4.26			
AIR lessens the competitive power of the local business owners	.82	4.16			
AIR affects adversely the local business owners	.81	4.31			
AIR reduces the number of customers in the local businesses	.74	4.08			
Factor 2. *Positive Impacts*[b]		3.02	2.12	15.11	.71
AIR should be applied in unattractive tourism regions as an alternative strategy	.72	3.49			
All-inclusive resort system (AIR) contributes positively to tourism in Turkey	.70	2.52			
AIR should be applied everywhere tourism exists	.68	2.35			
AIR increases occupancy rates of hotels and businesses	.67	3.71			
Factor 3. *AIR Impacts on Quality*[b]		3.66	2.06	14.70	.66
AIR impairs the quality of tourist and service	.79	3.72			
AIR discourages higher- middle classes from visiting	.74	3.86			
AIR is a short term marketing strategy in the industry	.62	3.39			
Factor 4. *AIR Impacts on Population*[b]		3.51	1.47	10.48	.56
AIR has lessened the number of staff members in the local businesses	.76	3.64			
The number of tourists will increase once the all-inclusive resort system is abolished	.75	3.38			
Total variance explained				67.64	

[a] items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] KMO was 0.86, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

4.3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis for *Community Attachment* (CA) *Scale*

The *Community Attachment* (CA) *Scale* from Matarrita-Cascante et al. (2006), with its five items, was also examined for dimensionality through an EFA. The scale was found to be unidimensional, explaining 61% of the variance in the construct. Factor loadings were fairly high, ranging between .71 and .86. Cronbach alpha for the scale was also high (i.e., .84). These results can be found in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis of *Community Attachment* (CA) *Scale*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean[a]	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach α Reliability
Community Attachment		3.21	3.07	61.40	.84
I feel this community is a real home to me	.86	3.41			
I feel I am fully accepted as a member of this community	.82	3.58			
The longer I live in this community, the more I feel I belong here.	.79	3.66			
If I was in trouble, most people in this community would go out of their way to help me	.73	2.65			
Most of the people in this community can be trusted	.71	2.75			

[a] items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] KMO was 0.78, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

4.3.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis for *Tourism Impact Attitude Scale*

An initial EFA procedure on the 17-item *Tourism Impact Attitude Scale* (TIAS) (Woosnam, 2012) resulted in the generation of a two-factor underlying structure. However, one item (i.e., "One of the most important benefits of tourism is how it can improve the local standard of living") had to be dropped as it exceeded .32 critical-value for cross-loading.

Running a second EFA revealed an identical factor structure, with all items exceeding .50 and no items cross-loading. The EFA of the 16 items yielded the two factor solution that explained 57% of the total variance in the scale. As indicated in table 4.4, the first factor (comprised of nine items), *support for tourism development* (M = 4.42) explained about 34% of the variance. Factor loadings ranged from .58 to .85. The second factor (comprised of seven items), *contributions to community* (M = 3.63), explained roughly 23% of the variance, and had factor loadings that ranged from .61 to .74. The Cronbach's alphas for the two factors were .91 and .84, respectively, indicating a high degree of internal consistency for each factor (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis of *Tourism Impact Attitude Scale* (TIAS)

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean[a]	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach α Reliability
Factor 1. *Support for Tourism Development*[b]		4.42	5.44	33.99	.91
I support new tourism facilities that will attract new visitors to Antalya	.85	4.54			
I support tourism and want to see it remain important to Antalya	.84	4.52			
Antalya should support the promotion of tourism	.82	4.42			
I believe that tourism should be actively encouraged in Antalya	.81	4.41			
Antalya should remain a tourism destination	.80	4.48			
It is important to develop plans to manage growth of tourism	.74	4.53			
The tourism sector plays a major role in the Antalya economy	.70	4.57			
Long-term planning by the city can control negative environmental impacts	.60	4.34			
In general, the positive benefits of tourism outweigh negative impacts	.58	3.96			
Factor 2. *Contributions to Community*[b]		3.63	3.68	22.99	.84
The quality of public services has improved due to more tourism in Antalya	.74	3.38			
Quality of life in Antalya has improved because of tourism development in the area	.73	3.82			
Antalya has better roads due to tourism	.72	3.63			
My household standard of living is higher because of money tourists spend here	.70	3.25			
The tourism sector provides many desirable employment opportunities for residents	.68	4.07			
I have more recreational opportunities (place to go and thing to do) because of tourism in Antalya	.66	3.74			
Shopping opportunities are better in Antalya as a result of tourism	.61	3.49			
Total variance explained				56.97	

[a] items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

[b] KMO was 0.93, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

4.3.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis for *Future Tourism Development* (FTD) *Scale*

Doh's (2006) eight-item *Future Tourism Development* (FTD) *Scale* was also assessed for factor structure. One of the items was reverse-coded (i.e., "Increased tourism would hurt my community's quality of life") due negative wording relative to other items. From the initial EFA, the same item that was reverse-coded was dropped given it was a low-loader. The remaining seven items were submitted for a second EFA, yielding one dimension that explained 57% of the variance in the construct. Loadings for the factor were .66 to .81 with a high Cronbach alpha (i.e., .87) for the factor (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 Exploratory Factor Analysis of *Future Tourism Development* (FTD) *Scale*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean[a]	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach α Reliability
Future Tourism Development[b]		3.96	3.97	56.73	.87
I support new tourism development in my community	.81	4.26			
In general, new tourism development should be actively encouraged in my community	.80	4.04			
Tourism should play a vital role in the future of Antalya	.79	4.05			
Tourism development in my community will benefit me or some member of my family	.76	3.82			
Tourism looks like the best way to help my community's economy in the future	.73	3.82			
Overall, the benefits of tourism development in Antalya will outweigh its costs	.71	3.84			
My community can handle more tourism development	.66	3.85			

[a] items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] KMO was 0.89, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

4.3.5 Exploratory Factor Analysis for *Potential Tourism Development* (PTD) *Options Scale*

A final scale that was assessed for dimensionality was the *Potential Tourism Development* (PTD) *Options Scale* put forth by Doh (2006). Twelve of the original 16 items were retained while an additional item concerning development in the way of more AIRs was added. In the initial EFA that was run, three factors were identified. One of the items (i.e., "Prohibiting all new development") was reverse-coded to account for negative wording. Five items (i.e., "Businesses that attract tourists to the community," "Development of more resorts," "Hosting events such as festivals, etc.," "Development of amusement park-type facilities," and "Development of more golf courses") were removed as they were either low-loaders or cross-loaders.

Upon running the second EFA, one item (i.e., "Prohibiting all new development") was removed as it was deemed a low-loader. The third and final EFA involving the remaining seven items yielded a two-factor solution. The two factors, *services development* (four items) and *sustainable development* (three items), accounted for 60% of the variance in the scale, with the former yielding factor loadings ranging from .63 to .84 as the latter revealed loadings from .58 to .85. Cronbach alphas were adequate for each factor (i.e., .70 for *services development* and .66 for *sustainable development*). These results can be found in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 Exploratory Factor Analysis of *Potential Tourism Development* (PTD) *Options Scale*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean[a]	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach α Reliability
Factor 1. *Services Development*[b]		3.16	2.13	30.48	.70
Development of more hotels	.84	3.13			
Development of more restaurants	.75	3.59			
Development of franchise businesses	.65	3.58			
Development of more all-inclusive resorts (AIR)	.63	2.34			
Factor 2. *Sustainable Development*[b]		4.30	2.08	29.65	.66
Development of historic sites	.85	4.56			
Developing new trails for walking or biking	.85	4.46			
More small independent businesses (gift shops, bookstore, etc.)	.58	3.86			
Total variance explained			60.13		

[a] items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly undesirable* and 5 = *strongly desirable*.
[b] KMO was 0.69, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

4.4 Model and Hypothesis Testing

As shown within the second chapter, 11 hypotheses were formulated based on the literature. Hypothesis 1 (H_1) involved running a series of MANOVAs with Wilks' Λ to determine if significant differences in perceptions of AIRs across various demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, income level, and educational level). Hypotheses 2-11 (H_2-H_{11}) involved running either simple linear or multiple linear regression analyses to examine the relationships between the five scaled measures (i.e., CA, AIR, TIAS, FTD, and PTD) from the EFA results. Such abbreviated nomenclature is used in referring to each scale name from this point forward. Prior to beginning any of the regression analyses, composite factor means were calculated by adding means for each item within a particular factor and then dividing by the number of items within said factor (Woosnam et al., 2009).

4.5 AIR across Socio-demographic Variables (H_1)

To address Hypothesis 1 and determine if significant differences in perceived AIR impacts exist across numerous socio-demographic variables, a series of MANOVAs with Wilks's Λ (i.e., one for gender, age, education level, and monthly household income) were run. Composite mean scores for each of the EFA resulting AIR factors (i.e., *AIR negative economic impacts on local businesses*, *AIR positive impacts*, *AIR impacts on services nature and quality*, and *AIR impacts on population*) were calculated prior to running MANOVAs. For the sake of practicality, each predictor variable was transformed from a continuous-level variable into a categorical variable by splitting raw

data close to the mean while accounting for a normal distribution (Woosnam, Van Winkle, & An, 2013).

4.5.1 Attitudes about AIR across Gender

One of the independent variable that yielded significant differences in AIR perceptions was gender—significant differences were found across gender for all four AIR factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.97$, $F(4, 655) = 4.86$, $p < 0.001$ (Table 4.7.1). Gender, being dichotomous is only measured at two levels, so post hoc tests were not necessary (O'Donoghue, 2012).

For three of the four factors (i.e., *AIR negative impacts*, *AIR impacts on quality*, and *AIR impacts on population*), male residents indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with items comprising the factors than did females. In other words, female residents indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR positive impact factor*. From this, one can deduce that female residents tended to perceive positive impacts of AIR more than male residents in Antalya.

Table 4.7.1 Attitudes about AIR across Gender[a]

	Means[b] (*SD*)		ANOVA Results	
AIR Factor	Female	Male	*F*	*p*
Negative Impacts	4.10 (*0.88*)	4.29 (*0.85*)	6.91	0.009
Positive Impacts	3.14 (*0.96*)	2.94 (*0.93*)	7.49	0.006
Impacts on Quality	3.51 (*0.98*)	3.75 (*0.99*)	8.57	0.004
Impacts on Population	3.34 (*0.91*)	3.62 (*1.00*)	13.39	0.000

[a] MANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.97$, $F(4,655) = 4.86$, $p < 0.01$.
[b] AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*

4.5.2 Attitudes about AIR across Age

Significant differences in perceptions of AIR (based on factor means) were found across age categories, Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(16, 1993) = 2.66$, $p < 0.001$ (Table 4.7.2). Analyses of variances (ANOVAs) on each factor (as the dependent variable) were then conducted as post-hoc tests to the MANOVA. Using the Bonferroni method (to control for Type I errors), each ANOVA was tested at the 0.0125 level (i.e., 0.05 divided by the number of dependent variables) per Tabachnick and Fidell's (2013) suggestion.

While the ANOVA on *AIR negative impacts* was not significant, $F = 0.89$, $p = 0.47$, the ANOVA on *AIR positive impacts* was significant, $F = 8.57$, $p < 0.001$. Those with an age between 18-29 years old indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with the *AIR positive impacts* items than those aged 30-39 and 40-49 year old. In addition, the ANOVA on *AIR impacts on quality* was not significant, $F = 1.32$, $p = 0.26$.

Finally, the ANOVA on *AIR impacts on population* was also significant, $F = 4.16$, $p = 0.002$. Those residents 60 and older indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with the *AIR impacts on population* items than those with an age between 18-29 and 30-39 year old. Additionally, those between 30-39 years old indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with the *AIR impacts on population* than those aged 18-29 years old. In other words, result showed that younger residents especially between 18-29 ages perceived the positive impacts of AIR more than older residents in Antalya. On the other hand, older residents especially over 60 perceived AIR impacts on population more than younger residents in Antalya.

Table 4.7.2 Attitudes about AIR across Age[a]

	Means[b] (*SD*)					ANOVA Results[c]	
AIR Factor	18-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	≥ 60	*F*	*p*
Negative Impacts	4.16 (*0.84*)	4.29 (*0.85*)	4.24 (*0.90*)	4.17 (*0.98*)	4.67 (*0.58*)	0.89	0.468
Positive Impacts	3.27 (*0.89*)[de]	2.80 (*0.98*)[d]	2.90 (*0.93*)[e]	2.81 (*0.85*)	2.75 (*0.66*)	8.57	0.000
Impacts on Quality	3.56 (*1.00*)	3.71 (*1.00*)	3.76 (*0.97*)	3.62 (*1.02*)	4.00 (*0.33*)	1.32	0.260
Impacts on Population	3.34 (*0.94*)[f]	3.66 (*0.98*)[f]	3.61 (*0.99*)	3.60 (*0.96*)	4.17 (*0.76*)[l]	4.16	0.002

[a] MANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(16,1993) = 2.66$, $p < 0.001$.
[b] AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree.*
[c] Significance determined at 0.0125 level
[d-f] Same letter indicates significant mean difference at the 0.0125 level

4.5.3 Attitudes about AIR across Monthly Household Income Level

A third MANOVA was run for monthly household income. No significant differences in perceptions of AIR were found across income levels from the overall model, Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.98$, $F(8, 308) = 1.48$, $p = 0.16$ (Table 4.7.3). As a result, no post-hoc ANOVAs were necessary.

Table 4.7.3 Attitudes about AIR across Monthly Household Income Level[a]

	Means[b] (*SD*)			ANOVA Results	
AIR Factor	Under $1,500 (3,000TL)[c]	$1,500- $3,000 (3,000-6,000TL)[c]	Over $3,000(6,000TL)[c]	*F*	*p*
Negative Impacts	4.19 (*0.87*)	4.26 (*0.86*)	4.32 (*0.88*)	0.71	0.491
Positive Impacts	3.03 (*0.97*)	3.05 (*0.91*)	2.73 (*0.76*)	2.14	0.119
Impacts on Quality	3.64 (*1.03*)	3.68 (*0.92*)	3.74 (*0.99*)	0.25	0.782
Impacts on Population	3.54 (*0.99*)	3.39 (*0.91*)	3.79 (*1.07*)	3.20	0.041

[a] MANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.98$, $F(8,1308) = 1.48$, $p = 0.16$.
[b] AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree.*
[c] The Turkish Lira (TL) is the currency of Turkey. In 2014 – 1 U.S. dollar = 2.00 Turkish lira (average)

4.5.4 Attitudes about AIR across Educational Level

A final MANOVA was run to examine whether perceptions of AIR impacts were different across residents' level of education. Significant differences were indeed found from the overall model, Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(16, 993) = 2.41$, $p < 0.01$ (Table 4.7.4). Following the same process as above in assessing ANOVAs with the Bonferroni method, post-hoc ANOVAs for two of the four AIR factors were significant (i.e., *AIR positive impacts* and *AIR impacts on population*). The ANOVA on *AIR negative impacts* was not significant, $F = 0.64$, $p = 0.63$. In addition, the ANOVA on *AIR impacts on quality* also was not significant, $F = 1.68$, $p = 0.15$.

The ANOVA for *AIR impacts on population* was significant, $F = 4.77$, $p < 0.01$. Those having less than a high school degree indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with the *AIR impacts on population* items than either those with a high school degree or a technical/vocational school degree. While the ANOVA for *AIR positive impacts* was significant ($F(1,660) = 4.30$, $p < 0.01$), none of the post-hoc comparisons were significant (given the alpha level was .0125). Significant differences in AIR factors were found in all predictor variables considered, except monthly household income. As a result, Hypothesis 1 overall was supported.

Table 4.7.4 Attitudes about AIR across Education Level[a]

AIR Factor	Means[b] (*SD*)					ANOVA Results[c]	
	< High School	High School	Tech/Voc School	Under-Grad	Grad	*F*	*p*
Negative Impacts	4.15 (*1.10*)	4.29 (*0.81*)	4.11 (*0.66*)	4.21 (*0.88*)	4.25 (*1.16*)	0.64	0.632
Positive Impacts	2.70 (*1.05*)	2.87 (*0.97*)	3.23 (*0.83*)	3.10 (*0.94*)	2.84 (*0.68*)	4.30	0.002
Impacts on Quality	3.82 (*1.08*)	3.70 (*1.03*)	3.58 (0.95)	3.60 (*0.98*)	4.06 (*0.77*)	1.68	0.153
Impacts on Population	3.88 (*1.15*)[d]	3.64 (*1.01*)[e]	3.18 (*0.92*)[de]	3.47 (*0.92*)	3.41 (*0.89*)	4.77	0.001

[a] MANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(16,1993) = 2.41$, $p < 0.01$.
[b] AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[c] Significance determined at 0.0125 level
[d-e] Same letter indicates significant mean difference at the 0.0125 level

4.6 Relationship between CA and AIR (H_2)

To examine whether local residents' degree of community attachment significantly predicted their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya, four separate simple linear regression models were requested, one for each of the AIR factors. In each model, one AIR factor served as the dependent variable predicted by the unidimensional CA construct.

As can be seen in Table 4.8, three of the four models were significant ($p < 0.05$); indicating that CA factor significantly predicted all but the *AIR positive impacts* factor. In Model 1, CA ($F = 5.084$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.008$) significantly predicted perceived *AIR negative impacts*, and it ($t = 2.26$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.09$) was a significant predictor in the model. The results showed that when the residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *community attachment* factor increased, residents indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising AIR *negative impacts* factor.

In Model 2, CA ($F = 1.986$, $p = 0.159$, $R^2 = 0.003$) did not significantly predict perceived *AIR positive impacts*. In Model 3, CA ($F = 5.453$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.008$) however did significantly predict perceived *AIR impacts on quality*, and it ($t = 2.34$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.09$) was a significant predictor in the model. Likewise in Model 4, CA ($F = 6.472$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.01$) significantly predicted perceived *AIR impacts on population*, and it ($t = 2.54$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.10$) was a significant predictor in the model.

These results show that as the residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *community attachment* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising *AIR impacts on quality* and *AIR impacts on population* factors. In this respect, all told, Hypotheses 2 was supported by results from Models 1, 3, and 4.

Table 4.8 Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between CA and AIR

AIR Models with CA[a] Factor	B	Beta (β)	*t*
Model 1: AIR *Negative Impacts* ($F = 5.084$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.008$, $M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.87$)			
Community Attachment[b]	0.09	0.09	2.26*
Model 2: AIR *Positive Impacts* ($F = 1.986$, $p = 0.159$, $R^2 = 0.003$, $M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.94$)			
Community Attachment	0.06	0.06	1.41
Model 3: AIR *Impacts on Quality* ($F = 5.453$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.008$ $M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.99$)			
Community Attachment	0.10	0.09	2.34*
Model 4: AIR *Impacts on Population* ($F = 6.472$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.01$, $M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.97$)			
Community Attachment	0.11	0.10	2.54*

[a] Each of the CA and AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] $M = 3.21$ $SD = 0.88$
*$p < 0.05$

4.7 Relationship between AIR and TIAS (H_3)

To examine whether local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs significantly predicted their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya, two multiple regression models were run. In each model, one TIAS factor served as the dependent variable predicted by each of the four AIR factors, as independent variables.

As can be seen in Table 4.9 both of two models were significant ($p < 0.001$); indicating that AIR factors significantly predicted each TIAS factors. Model summary statistics, predictor coefficients, and multi-collinearity diagnostics (i.e., tolerance and VIF values) are presented in the table. Tolerance values of the four independent variables are all above .20 and their VIFs are below .50, suggesting that multi-collinearity is not an issue with the data (O'Brien, 2007).

In each model, two AIR factors significantly predicted both of the two TIAS factors. In Model 1, AIR ($F = 18.18$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.10$) significantly predicted perceived *support for tourism development* (STD). Of the four AIR factors, both *AIR negative impacts* ($t = 5.99$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.26$) and *AIR positive impacts* ($t = 4.62$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.18$) were significant predictors in the model. In Model 2, AIR ($F = 10.96$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.06$) significantly predicted perceived *contributions to community* (CTC). Two of the four AIR factors were significant in the model; *AIR positive impacts* ($t = 5.98$, $p < 0.001$, $\beta = 0.24$) and *AIR impacts on population* ($t = 2.63$, $p < 0.01$, $\beta = 0.11$) were those motivation factors. Based on regression coefficients, results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR positive impacts* factor

increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *support for tourism* and *contributions to community* factors. On the other hand, results also indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR negative impacts* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *support for tourism* factor. Hence, Hypothesis 3 overall was supported.

Table 4.9 Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship between AIR and TIAS

TIAS Models with AIR[a] Factors	B	Beta (β)	*t*	tol[b]	VIF[c]
Model 1: TIAS *Support for Tourism Development* ($F = 18.175$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.103$)					
AIR *Negative Impacts*[e]	0.20	0.26	5.99***	0.74[d]	1.35[d]
AIR *Positive Impacts*[f]	0.13	0.18	4.62***	0.86	1.16
AIR *Impacts on Quality*[g]	0.05	0.07	1.72	0.81	1.24
AIR *Impacts on Population*[h]	0.05	0.07	1.59	0.77	1.31
Model 2: TIAS *Contributions to Community* ($F = 10.957$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.063$)					
AIR *Negative Impacts*	0.06	0.06	1.42		
AIR *Positive Impacts*	0.21	0.24	5.98***		
AIR *Impacts on Quality*	0.06	0.08	1.82		
AIR *Impacts on Population*	0.10	0.11	2.63**		

[a] Each of the TIAS and AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] Tolerance is a measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. It is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of the variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation.
[c] VIF or variance inflation factor is another measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. VIF is defined as 1/tolerance; and is always greater than 1.
[d] Same tolerance and VIF across each of the two models given the same four AIR factors were considered predictors in each model.
[e] $M = 4.22$ $SD = 0.87$
[f] $M = 3.02$ $SD = 0.94$
[g] $M = 3.66$ $SD = 0.99$
[h] $M = 3.51$ $SD = 0.97$
**$p < 0.01$
***$p < 0.001$

4.8 Relationship between AIR and FTD (H_4)

Hypothesis 4 involved exploring whether local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs significantly predicted their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya. For this, a multiple regression model was performed (once again using the enter function). In this model, FTD factor served as the dependent variable predicted by the four AIR factors.

As can be seen in Table 4.10 from the model summary statistics, the model was significant ($p < 0.001$); indicating that AIR significantly predicted FTD. Multi-collinearity was not an issue based on tolerance and VIF. Each of the four AIR factors significantly predicted the unidimensional FTD. In the model, AIR ($F = 18.54$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.10$) significantly predicted attitudes about future tourism development (FTD). Model statistics for each predicting AIR factor were as follows: *AIR negative impacts* ($t = 4.70$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.20$), *AIR positive impacts* ($t = 4.78$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.19$), *AIR impacts on quality* ($t = 3.01$, $p < 0.01$, $\beta = 0.12$), and *AIR impacts on population* ($t = 2.19$, $p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.09$) were significant predictors.

The results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising any of the four AIR factors increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising future tourism development factor. According to these results, although residents perceived the negative impacts of AIR increased, they still agreed to support future tourism development. Hence, Hypothesis 4 was also supported.

Table 4.10 Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship between AIR and FTD

FTD Model with AIR[a] Factors	B	Beta (β)	*t*	tol[b]	VIF[c]
Model: *Future Tourism Development* ($F = 18.540$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.102$)					
AIR *Negative Impacts*[d]	0.18	0.20	4.70^{***}	0.74	1.35
AIR *Positive Impacts*[e]	0.15	0.19	4.78^{***}	0.86	1.16
AIR *Impacts on Quality*[f]	0.09	0.12	3.01^{**}	0.81	1.24
AIR *Impacts on Population*[g]	0.07	0.09	2.19^{*}	0.77	1.31

[a] Each of the FTD and AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] Tolerance is a measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. It is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of the variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation.
[c] VIF or variance inflation factor is another measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. VIF is defined as 1/tolerance; and is always greater than 1.
[d] $M = 4.22$ $SD = 0.87$
[e] $M = 3.02$ $SD = 0.94$
[f] $M = 3.66$ $SD = 0.99$
[g] $M = 3.51$ $SD = 0.97$
$^{*}p < 0.05$
$^{**}p < 0.01$
$^{***}p < 0.001$

4.9 Relationship between AIR and PTD (H_5)

A fifth hypothesis (H_5) was put forth to determine if residents' perceived impacts of AIRs significantly predicted their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya. In so doing, two multiple regression models were considered. As with the previous hypotheses, AIR factors are considered the independent variables predicting the dependent variable, the two PTD factors (i.e., *services development* and *sustainable development*).

Both of models were significant ($p < 0.001$) (see Table 4.11); as before, multi-collinearity was not an issue. At least one AIR factor was significant in each of the two models. For Model 1, AIR ($F = 46.64$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.22$) significantly predicted

attitudes about *services development*. Of the four AIR factors, both *AIR positive impacts* ($t = 11.72$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.44$) and *AIR impacts on quality* ($t = -2.92$, $p < 0.01$; $\beta = -0.11$) were significant predictors in the model. In Model 2, AIR ($F = 8.87$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.05$) significantly predicted attitudes about *sustainable development*. Of the four AIR factors, only *AIR negative impacts* ($t = 4.10$, $p < 0.001$, $\beta = 0.18$) was a significant predictor in the model.

The results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the AIR *positive impacts* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of desirability with items comprising the *services development* factor. On the other hand, as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR impacts on quality* factor increases, residents indicate a modest level of desirability with items comprising the *services development* factor. Furthermore, when residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR negative impacts* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of desirability with items comprising the *sustainable development* factor.

According to these results, when residents' perspective about the positive impacts of AIR increases, they may desire more potential services development. In addition, as the local residents' perception about *AIR* negative impacts on services and quality increases, the desirability of potential services development may decrease. On the other hand, when residents' perspective about the negative impacts of AIR increases, they may desire more potential sustainable tourism development. Hence, Hypothesis 5 was supported.

Table 4.11 Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship between AIR and PTD

PTD[a] Models with AIR[b] Factors	B	Beta (β)	*t*	tol[c]	VIF[d]
Model 1: PTD *Services Development* ($F = 46.644$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.222$)					
AIR *Negative Impacts*[f]	-0.07	-0.06	-1.58	0.74[e]	1.35[e]
AIR *Positive Impacts*[g]	0.43	0.44	11.72***	0.86	1.16
AIR *Impacts on Quality*[h]	-0.11	-0.11	-2.92**	0.81	1.24
AIR *Impacts on Population*[i]	0.07	0.07	1.77	0.77	1.31
Model 2: PTD *Sustainable Development* ($F = 8.873$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.051$)					
AIR *Negative Impacts*	0.14	0.18	4.10***		
AIR *Positive Impacts*	0.06	0.08	1.94		
AIR *Impacts on Quality*	0.04	0.06	1.46		
AIR *Impacts on Population*	0.04	0.05	1.16		

[a] Each of the PTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly undesirable* and 5 = *strongly desirable*
[b] Each of the AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[c] Tolerance is a measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. It is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of the variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation.
[d] VIF or variance inflation factor is another measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. VIF is defined as 1/tolerance; and is always greater than 1.
[e] Same tolerance and VIF across each of the two models given the same four AIR factors were considered predictors in each model.
[f] $M = 4.22$ $SD = 0.87$
[g] $M = 3.02$ $SD = 0.94$
[h] $M = 3.66$ $SD = 0.99$
[i] $M = 3.51$ $SD = 0.97$
**$p < 0.01$
***$p < 0.001$

4.10 Relationship between TIAS and FTD (H_6)

For Hypothesis 6, a multiple regression model was conducted that examined the degree to which residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development potentially predicted their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya. As can be seen from Table 4.12 and the resulting summary statistics, the model was significant ($p < 0.001$); indicating that TIAS factors significantly predicted the FTD factor. As in all prior hypothesis analyses, multi-collinearity was not a concern.

In the model, each of the TIAS factors ($F = 371.29$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.53$) significantly predicted the FTD factor. The first TIAS factor, *support for tourism development* ($t = 17.10$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.52$) as well as the second TIAS factor, *contributions to community* ($t = 10.47$, $p < 0.001$, $\beta = 0.32$) were significant.

Results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising both of the two TIAS factors increase, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising future tourism development factor in Antalya. These results show that when residents have positive attitudes about existing tourism impacts, they would also have positive attitudes toward future tourism development. Hence, Hypothesis 6 also was supported.

Table 4.12 Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship between TIAS and FTD

FTD Model with TIAS[a] Factors	B	Beta (β)	*t*	tol[b]	VIF[c]
Model: *Future Tourism Development* ($F = 371.290$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.531$)					
TIAS *Support for Tourism Development*[d]	0.59	0.52	17.10***	0.77	1.30
TIAS *Contributions to Community*[e]	0.29	0.32	10.47**	0.77	1.30

[a] Each of the FTD and TIAS items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] Tolerance is a measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. It is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of the variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation.
[c] VIF or variance inflation factor is another measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. VIF is defined as 1/tolerance; and is always greater than 1.
[d] $M = 4.42$ $SD = 0.66$
[e] $M = 3.63$ $SD = 0.81$
**$p < 0.01$
***$p < 0.001$

4.11 Relationship between TIAS and PTD (H_7)

Hypothesis 7 also involved multiple regression analysis whereby residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development were examined to determine if they significantly predicted residents' attitudes concerning different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya. Two multiple regression models were examined.

As can be seen in Table 4.13, both of models were significant ($p < 0.001$); indicating that TIAS factors significantly predicted the PTD factors. Model summary statistics, predictor coefficients, and multi-collinearity diagnostics (i.e., tolerance and VIF values) are presented in the table. Tolerance values of the two independent variables are all above .20 and their VIFs are below .50, suggesting that multi-collinearity is not an issue with the data (O'Brien, 2007).

At least one TIAS factors significantly predicted both of the two PTD factors. In Model 1, TIAS ($F = 23.64$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.07$) significantly predicted attitudes about *services development*. Both TIAS factors were significant in the model; *support for tourism development* ($t = 2.27$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.10$), and *contributions to community* ($t = 4.62$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.20$) were those TIAS factors. In Model 2, TIAS ($F = 43.68$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.12$) significantly predicted attitudes about *sustainable development*. Of the two TIAS factors, only *support for tourism development* ($t = 7.81$, $p < 0.001$, $\beta = 0.33$) was a significant predictor in the model.

The results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising *support for tourism development*, and *contributions to community* factors increase, residents indicate a significantly higher level of desirability with items comprising *services development* factor in Antalya. In addition, as residents' level of agreement with items comprising *support for tourism development* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of desirability with items comprising *sustainable development* factor. In other words, as they have positive attitudes toward existing tourism impacts and tourism development, they are likely to desire different degrees of tourism development options. Hence, Hypothesis 7 overall was supported.

Table 4.13 Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationship between TIAS and PTD

PTD[a] Models with TIAS[b] Factors	B	Beta (β)	*t*	tol[c]	VIF[d]
Model 1: PTD *Services Development* ($F = 23.643$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.067$)					
TIAS *Support for Tourism Development*[f]	0.14	0.10	2.27*	0.77[e]	1.30[e]
TIAS *Contributions to Community*[g]	0.23	0.20	4.62***	0.77	1.30
Model 2: PTD *Sustainable Development* ($F = 43.687$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.117$)					
TIAS *Support for Tourism Development*	0.34	0.33	7.81***		
TIAS *Contributions to Community*	0.03	0.03	0.79		

[a] Each of the PTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly undesirable* and 5 = *strongly desirable*
[b] Each of the TIAS items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[c] Tolerance is a measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. It is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of the variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation.
[d] VIF or variance inflation factor is another measure that assesses the degree of multi-collinearity in the model. VIF is defined as 1/tolerance; and is always greater than 1.
[e] Same tolerance and VIF across each of the two models given the same two TIAS factors were considered predictors in each model.
[f] $M = 4.42$ $SD = 0.66$
[g] $M = 3.63$ $SD = 0.81$
*$p < 0.05$
***$p < 0.001$

4.12 Relationship between FTD and PTD (H_8)

To examine whether residents' attitudes about future tourism development significantly predicted their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya (H_8), two separate simple linear regression models were conducted. As can be seen from Table 4.14, both of two models were significant ($p < 0.001$); indicating that FTD factors significantly predicted each PTD factor. In Model 1, FTD ($F = 20.881$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.031$) significantly predicted attitudes about *services development*, and it ($t = 4.57$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.18$) was a significant predictor in the model. In Model 2, FTD ($F = 64.775$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.09$) significantly predicted attitudes about *sustainable development*, and it ($t = 8.05$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.30$) was also a significant predictor in the model.

These results show that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *future tourism development* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of desirability with items comprising the *services* and *sustainable development* factors. Hypothesis 8 was supported through Model 1 and Model 2. When residents have positive attitudes toward future tourism development, they may also desire certain types of tourism development options in different degrees.

Table 4.14 Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between FTD and PTD

PTD[a] Models with FTD[b] Factor	B	Beta (β)	*t*
Model 1: PTD *Services Development* (F = 20.881, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.031, M = 3.16, SD = 0.94)			
Future Tourism Development[c]	0.22	0.18	4.57***
Model 2: PTD *Sustainable Development* (F = 64.775, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.09, M = 4.30, SD = 0.69)			
Future Tourism Development	0.27	0.30	8.05***

[a] PTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly undesirable* and 5 = *strongly desirable*
[b] FTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[c] M = 3.96 SD = 0.75
***p < 0.001

4.13 Relationship between CA and TIAS (H_9)

To examine whether local residents' degree of community attachment significantly predicted their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya, two separate simple linear regression models were performed for each of the TIAS factors. In each model, one TIAS factor served as the dependent variable predicted by the CA factor.

As can be seen in Table 4.15 both of the two models were significant (p < 0.001). In Model 1, CA (F = 40.998, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.06) significantly predicted perceived *support for tourism development*, and it (t = 6.40, p < 0.001; β = 0.24) was a significant predictor in the model. In Model 2, CA (F = 59.202, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.08) significantly predicted perceived *contributions to community*, and it (t = 7.69, p < 0.001; β = 0.29) was also a significant predictor in the model.

These results show that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *community attachment* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *support for tourism* and *contributions to*

community factors. Hypothesis 9 was supported. In other words, results indicate that when a resident is highly attached to his/her community, he or she has more positive attitudes toward existing tourism and tourism development.

Table 4.15 Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between CA and TIAS

TIAS Models with CA[a] Factor	B	Beta (β)	*t*
Model 1: TIAS *Support for Tourism Development* ($F = 40.998$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.06$, $M = 4.42$, $SD = 0.66$)			
Community Attachment [b]	0.18	0.24	6.40***
Model 2: TIAS *Contributions to Community* ($F = 59.202$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.083$, $M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.81$)			
Community Attachment	0.27	0.29	7.69***

[a] Each of the CA and TIAS items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] $M = 3.21$ $SD = 0.88$
***$p < 0.001$

4.14 Relationship between CA and FTD (H_{10})

Hypothesis 10 was examined to determine whether residents' degree of community attachment significantly predicted their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya. One simple linear regression analysis was performed. As can be seen in Table 4.16, CA ($F = 48.368$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.07$) significantly predicted attitudes about future tourism development, and it ($t = 6.96$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta = 0.26$) was a significant predictor in the model. Approximately 7% of the total variation in future tourism development was explained by the community attachment factor.

These results show that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *community attachment* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level

of agreement with items comprising the *future development* factor. In this respect, Hypotheses 10 also was also supported.

Table 4.16 Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between CA and FTD

FTD Model with CA[a] Factor	B	Beta (β)	*t*
Model: *Future Tourism Development* ($F = 48.368$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.068$, $M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.75$)			
Community Attachment [b]	0.22	0.26	6.96^{***}

[a] Each of the CA and FTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[b] $M = 3.21$ $SD = 0.88$
$^{***}p < 0.001$

4.15 Relationship between CA and PTD (H_{11})

The last of the 11 hypotheses involved two separate simple linear regression analyses to determine whether residents' degree of community attachment significantly predicted their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya. As can be seen in Table 4.17, both of two models were significant ($p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$); indicating that CA significantly predicted each of the PTD factors. In Model 1, CA ($F = 4.583$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.007$) significantly predicted attitudes about *services development*, and it ($t = 2.14$, $p < 0.05$; $\beta = 0.08$) was a significant predictor in the model. In Model 2, CA ($F = 9.014$, $p < 0.01$, $R^2 = 0.014$) significantly predicted attitudes about *sustainable development*, and it ($t = 3.00$, $p < 0.01$; $\beta = 0.12$) was a significant predictor in the model.

The results indicate that as residents' level of agreement with items comprising the *community attachment* factor increases, residents indicate a significantly higher level

of desirability with items comprising the *services* and *sustainable development* factors. Hypothesis 11 was supported by Model 1 and Model 2.

Table 4.17 Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between CA and PTD

PTD[a] Models with CA[b] Factor	B	Beta (β)	*t*
Model 1: PTD *Services Development* ($F = 4.583$, $p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.007$, $M = 3.16$, $SD = 0.94$)			
Community Attachment[c]	0.09	0.08	2.14*
Model 2: PTD *Sustainable Development* ($F = 9.014$, $p < 0.01$, $R^2 = 0.014$, $M = 4.30$, $SD = 0.69$)			
Community Attachment	0.09	0.12	3.00**

[a] PTD items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly undesirable* and 5 = *strongly desirable*
[b] CA items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.
[c] $M = 3.21$ $SD = 0.88$
*$p < 0.05$
**$p < 0.01$

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The all-inclusive resort (AIR) model has, for some time, been a focus for tourism destinations and tourism researchers (Ozdemir et al., 2012). In an effort to better understand AIR, the purpose of this study was to examine how residents perceive impacts of AIR in Antalya, Turkey. In so doing, a further focus of the work was looking at the interrelationships between residents' attitudes about their attachment to the community, existing tourism and tourism development, future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options and attitudes about AIR impacts. This chapter contains a summary of study findings and discussion of the results in the context of extant literature focusing on AIR. Limitations of the study and future research recommendations comprise the last section of the chapter.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the factors that influence residents' attitudes toward tourism development and AIRs, and how these attributes influenced residents' attitudes toward existing tourism impacts, FTD and PTD in Antalya. To answer this question, relationships among AIR, residents' attachment to the community, TIAS, and attitude towards FTD and PTD, were tested using a series of hypotheses. To achieve this purpose, a self-administered survey sampling design was used. Data collected through this process revealed several findings about attitudes toward AIR, PTD, FTD, and existing tourism development.

"*H_2: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya."*

The results of this study indicated that *community attachment* factor significantly predicted all but the *AIR positive impacts* factor. In other words, *community attachment* was a significant predictor in the three of the four AIR models (i.e., *AIR negative impact, AIR impacts on quality,* and *AIR impacts on population*). The results showed that when the local residents were highly attached to their community of residence, their values were negatively oriented toward AIR in Antalya, Turkey. Hence, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

"*H_3: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya*."

In each model, two AIR factors significantly predicted both of the two TIAS factors. Of the four AIR factors, both *AIR negative impacts* and *AIR positive impacts* were significant predictors in the model 1 (i.e., *support for tourism development*), and *AIR positive impacts* and *AIR impacts on population* were significant predictors in the model 2 (i.e., *contributions to community*). Although the respondents perceived negative impacts of AIR, they had positive attitudes toward existing tourism development in general, and were supportive of its impacts in Antalya. Hence, Hypothesis 3 was partially supported.

"*H_4: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya."*

Model statistics for each predicting AIR factor were as follows: *AIR negative impacts*, *AIR positive impacts*, *AIR impacts on quality*, and *AIR impacts on population* were significant predictors. Even though residents tended to perceive negative impacts of AIR, they still expect to see future tourism development in Antalya. Hence, Hypothesis 4 also was partially supported.

"*H_5: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Anta*lya."

At least one AIR factor was significant in each of the two PTD models. Of the four AIR factors, both *AIR positive impacts* and *AIR impacts on quality* were significant predictor in the model 1(i.e., *services development*), but only *AIR negative impacts* was a significant predictor in the model 2 (i.e., *sustainable development*).

In other words, when residents perceived AIR negative impacts on quality, the *services development* were less desirable. Additionally, when residents perceive AIR negative impacts, they tend to desire only *sustainable development*. Hypothesis 5 overall was supported.

"*H_6: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya*."

"*H_7: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya*."

In the FTD model, each of the TIAS factors significantly predicted the FTD factor. The first TIAS factor, *support for tourism development* as well as the second TIAS factor, *contributions to community* were significant. Moreover, in the PTD models, at least one TIAS factors significantly predicted both of the two PTD factors. Both TIAS factors were significant in the model1 (i.e., *services development)*; however, only *support for tourism development* was a significant predictor in the model 2 (i.e., *sustainable development*).

In other words, when people are aware of the importance of existing tourism and tourism development, they are likely to perceive positive impacts of existing tourism (i.e., *support for tourism development* and *contributions to community* factors), which is likely to affect positively their attitude toward future tourism development. This may also influence their attitudes toward what types of potential tourism development are desirable in Antalya. Results indicate that when the local residents perceive positive impacts of existing tourism and tourism development, they support future tourism development, and expect that both *services development* and *sustainable development* options will be desirable for their communities. Hence, Hypothesis 6 and Hypothesis 7 were supported.

"*H_8: Local residents' attitudes about future tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya*."

The results of this study found that *future tourism development* was a significant predictor in the both of two PTD models (i.e., *services development* and *sustainable*

development). In this respect, the more residents predict to feel that negative impacts of future tourism, the less they would desire any type of tourism development. However, the more they expect to feel positive impacts of future tourism, the more they would desire *services development* and *sustainable development*. Hence, Hypothesis 8 was supported.

"*H_9: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya*."

"H_{10}: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya."

"H_{11}: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya."

The results of this study found that *community attachment* was a significant predictor in the both of two TIAS models (i.e., *support for tourism development* and *contributions to community*). In addition, the results showed that *community attachment* was a significant predictor in the FTD model as well as in the both of two PTD models (i.e., *services development* and *sustainable development*).

In other words, when a resident was highly attached to his/her community, he or she had more positive attitudes toward existing tourism development, future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options in Antalya. Hence, Hypotheses 9, 10, 11 were supported. These results can be found in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Results of Research Hypothesis Testing

Hypotheses	Results
H_1: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will be significantly different across numerous demographic variables (i.e., gender, income, age, and education) in Antalya	Supported
H_2: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya	Supported
H_3: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya	Partially Supported
H_4: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya	Partially Supported
H_5: Local residents' perceived impacts of AIRs will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_6: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_7: Local residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_8: Local residents' attitudes about future tourism development will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_9: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of existing tourism and tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_{10}: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about future tourism development in Antalya	Supported
H_{11}: Local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their attitudes about different forms of potential tourism development in Antalya	Supported

5.2 Discussion

5.2.1 Discussion of Demographic Variables (H_1)

The results of this study found female residents indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *AIR positive impact factor*. From this, one can deduce that female residents tended to agree more positive impacts of AIR than male residents in Antalya. Consistent with a study conducted by Huh & Vogt (2008) and McCool & Martin (1994), female were more favorable towards the positive impacts of tourism. Similarly, Heung and Chu (2000) found significant mean differences between males and females in three out of the six all-inclusive resorts factors. The authors indicated that woman rate information and buyer's value as more important than do men. In contrast to the current study's finding, previous studies have found that women in some cases have more negative views of tourism development than men (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987).

The results of this study indicated that older residents, especially over 60, tended to agree more with the items comprising the factor *AIR impacts on population* than younger residents in Antalya. This finding is in keeping with Cavus & Tanrisevdi (2003), and Huh & Vogt (2008) findings, which showed a significant relationship between age and attitude toward tourism development. The authors found that older residents perceived tourism development more negatively than did the younger residents. However, contrary to this study, McGehee & Andereck (2004), and Látková & Vogt (2012) found that older residents perceived positive impacts of tourism more than younger residents.

Finally, residents with less than a high school diploma indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with *AIR impacts on population* items than either those with a high school or a technical/vocational school diploma. This result is in accordance with many previous studies in the sense that level of education has been shown to be a significant indicator (Gumus & Ozupekce, 2009; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Tatoglu et al., 2002). These results are consistent with the social exchange theory that when controlling for personal benefits from tourism, residents' characteristics can predict perceived impacts of tourism. Similarly, the results of this study showed that residents who were male, older, and less educated felt AIR had negative consequences and were less optimistic about their community's future. In other words, residents' perceived impacts of AIRs were significantly different across numerous demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, and education) in Antalya.

5.2.2 Discussion of Relationship between CA and AIR (H_2)

In reviewing the literature, no studies were found concerning the association between community attachment and AIR. However, prior studies emphasize the importance of the relationship between CA and resident attitudes toward tourism. Hence, this study may speculate about the relationship between CA with AIR based on utilizing this perspective.

As mentioned in the literature review, generally, tourism researchers claim that the relationships between community attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism can be negative. Similarly, the results of this study indicated that when a respondent was highly attached to his/her community, he/she was also likely to have a more negative

attitude toward AIR. The findings of the current study are also consistent with those of Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer (2009), Um & Crompton (1987), and Yoon, Gursoy, & Chen (1999), who found that residents who were strongly attached to their community perceived tourism development negatively. These results provide support for Hypothesis 2, that local residents' degree of attachment predicted their perceived impacts of AIR in Antalya.

The results are supported by the community attachment theory, which claims that highly attached residents tended to perceive negative impacts of AIR. By exploring the influence of community attachment on residents' attitudes toward tourism development, this study is able to add to the existing body of knowledge of AIR with community attachment.

5.2.3 Discussion of Relationship between AIR and TIAS (H_3)

This study is the first use to both TIAS and AIR in assessing residents' attitudes toward tourism and AIR in Antalya. The results indicate Antalya residents perceived positive impacts of AIR, and were likely to have more positive attitudes toward tourism development and perceive positive impacts of existing tourism.

This finding corroborates the ideas of Chen and Raab (2012), who suggested that perceived benefits from tourism development had a larger impact on residents' attitudes toward tourism compared with perceived costs from tourism. The present findings seem to be consistent with other research, which found that people who perceive exchange benefits would have positive attitudes towards tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Kwon & Vogt, 2009; Long, 2012).

On the other hand, another result is consistent with the findings of Doh (2006), that although residents perceived negative impacts of AIR, they still had positive attitudes toward tourism development in general, and were supportive of its development in their area. This may be due to the fact that 51% of the respondents are dependent on the tourism industry. Another explanation might be that tourism in Antalya is well established, and residents recognize that the positive benefits of existing tourism can outweigh negative impacts of AIR. Another possible explanation for this is that AIR may not represent or symbolize tourism in general (Barak, 2006; Doganer, 2012). These findings confirmed the social exchange theory, which claim that residents who are economically dependent on tourism tend to support tourism development and tend to tolerate negative impacts of tourism (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Lawton, 2005; Pizam, 1978).

5.2.4 Discussion of Relationship between AIR and FTD (H_4)

In reviewing the literature, no studies were found examining the relationship between future tourism development and AIR. However, prior studies emphasize the importance of relationship between FTD and residents' attitudes toward tourism development. According to researchers, when residents perceive the impacts of tourism as positive, they are willing to embrace additional tourism development (Doh, 2006; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). Similarly, the results indicate when residents' level of agreement with items comprising *AIR positive impacts* factors increased, residents indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising *future tourism development* factor. The findings of this study reinforce social exchange theory, which

indicates that the potential benefit from an exchange can create positive perceptions of tourism and residents are more inclined to support future tourism development.

However, one unanticipated finding was that regardless of negative impacts of AIR, residents tended to support additional or future tourism development. It is difficult to explain this result, but it might be because economic activities may not be distributed equally across these districts. This finding consistent with the social exchange theory, which claims that residents who are economically dependent on tourism tend to ignore the negative impacts of tourism and support future tourism development (Lawton, 2005).

5.2.5 Discussion of Relationship between AIR and PTD (H_5)

This study is the first use to both PTD and AIR in assessing residents' attitudes toward tourism and AIR in Antalya. Consistent with the study conducted by Doh (2006), and Gursoy et al. (2009), residents who agreed that AIR would have negative impacts on services nature and quality, felt that *services development* options were less desirable. On the other hand, when residents perceived that AIR would bring positive impacts, they considered that only *services development* options were desirable for them. According to the social exchange theory, if the potential benefits from tourism development are greater than its costs, residents will view tourism positively; otherwise, they will perceive it negatively (Chen & Raab, 2012; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

Furthermore, when local residents' perceived that AIR would bring negative economic impacts, they felt that only *sustainable development* options were desirable for them. This relationship between AIR and PTD was supported by social exchange theory, which shows that when residents perceive negative impacts of tourism, they are less

optimistic about their community's future and further tourism development (Látková and Vogt, 2012; McGehee and Andereck, 2004).

5.2.6 Discussion of Relationship between TIAS, FTD and PTD (H_{6-7})

The regression results confirmed the results of previous studies examining the relationship between impacts of existing tourism and support for future tourism development (Chen & Raab, 2012; Doh, 2006; Liu & Var, 1986; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Perdue et al., 1995; Pizam, 1978; Yoon et al., 1999). The study concluded that the positive perception of existing tourism and tourism development had a strong impact on support for further tourism development. This result consistent with social exchange theory, residents who saw tourism as a positive activity are more likely to support additional or future development.

In addition to this, residents' perceived impacts of existing tourism may also predict their attitudes toward what types of potential tourism development are desirable in Antalya. Consistent with the findings of Gursoy et al. (2009), residents who see tourism as creating positive economic impacts were found to support both mass tourism and alternative tourism development. It is also encouraging to compare this figure with that found by Yoon et al. (1999) and Doh (2006), who indicated that positive economic impact is one of the main reasons for wanting new tourism development and desirable types of tourism development options in local communities. The findings is in agreement with social exchange theory, which claims that residents who perceive positive impacts of tourism, especially from an economic perspective, would support and would have positive attitudes toward future and additional tourism development.

5.2.7 Discussion of Relationship between FTD and PTD (H_8)

This finding corroborates the ideas of Doh (2006), who found a positive relationship between residents' attitudes toward future tourism development and their opinions on desirable types of tourism development options. Consistent with a study utilizing social exchange theory- when residents are likely to perceive positive impacts caused by future tourism, they were more likely to be in favor of *services development* and *sustainable development* options.

5.2.8 Discussion of Relationship between CA, TIAS, FTD and PTD ($H_{9\text{-}11}$)

Finally, this study examined the concept of community attachment ($H_{9\text{-}11}$). Previous studies have indicated that highly community-attached residents tend to view tourism development more favorably than less community-attached residents (Chen & Raab, 2012; Choi & Murray, 2010; Doh, 2006; Látková & Vogt, 2012; McCool & Martin, 1994), whereas other authors reported that there was a negative relationship between community attachment and residents' attitudes toward tourism development (Gursoy et al., 2009; Um & Crompton, 1987; Yoon et al., 1999).

It is possible that residents who are strongly attached to their community have positive attitudes toward existing tourism and tourism development (Choi & Murray, 2010; Doh, 2006). This affects residents' attitudes toward future tourism development and possible forms of potential tourism development (Chen & Raab, 2012; Doh, 2006). The result of this study showed that when a resident was highly attached to his/her community, he or she was more likely to perceive the positive impacts of existing tourism and tourism development, and more positive attitudes toward future tourism

development as well as potential tourism development options. This result confirms those in previous studies (Chen & Raab, 2012; Choi & Murray, 2010; Doh, 2006).

The current study's findings are in a line with results found in Chen and Raab (2012) and Doh (2006), where community attachment had a significant but moderate relationship with the perceived benefits created by existing tourism development. The study finding also is in agreement with McCool & Martin (1994) and Látková & Vogt (2012) findings which showed residents who were strongly attached to their community viewed tourism development positively. Similarly, Choi & Murray (2010) found that highly attached residents appear to evaluate additional tourism development positively.

Harrill (2004) noted that community attachment and social exchange theory, have served as groundwork for explaining how residents' attitudes toward the impacts of tourism development are formed. The results concluded that residents' degree of community attachment was a significant predictor of their perceptions of impacts of tourism and support for future potential tourism development. Hence, this study confirmed community attachment theory, which indicates that highly community-attached residents tend to view tourism development more favorably than less community-attached residents and are more likely to have positive attitudes towards additional tourism developments then residents who are less attached to their community.

5.3 Implications

The current study makes several contributions to understanding resident attitudes toward support for tourism development. The first contribution is the support for social

exchange theory logic. This study's result found that perceived positive impacts of tourism are critical influences of support for future tourism. The second contribution of this research is that this study extended social exchange theory and community attachment by including the construct of AIR, yielding a significant relationships with resident attitudes toward tourism, support for future tourism, and desire for potential tourism development options.

Another noteworthy contribution of this study is that two factors had a direct significant influence on residents' perceptions of existing tourism and tourism development, attitudes about future tourism development, attitudes about forms of potential tourism development: *AIR impacts* and *community attachment*. Theoretically, the results provided support for the findings of previous studies and present more in-depth information, that residents' perceived impacts of AIR and their community attachment level are important determinants and predictors of their attitude toward tourism (Chen & Raab, 2012; Choi & Murray, 2010; Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009; Doh, 2006; Látková & Vogt, 2012; McCool & Martin, 1994; Menekşe, 2005).

This study also has several practical implications for policymakers, government officials, managers and planners in Antalya and other destinations with AIR in order to sustainably plan for tourism and tourism development. First, policymakers, government officials, managers and planners should consider residents' opinions and perceptions about AIR so as to reduce the negative impacts of AIR. Residents must be involved in each stage of the AIR development process: planning, implementing and monitoring. Residents should be allowed to participate actively in the decision making process and

give a voice in issues affecting their lives by listening residents' concerns about AIR. Furthermore, policymakers, government officials and planners should seek to increase per capita expenditures rather than increase the absolute number of foreign tourists.

Finally, as a form of corporate social responsibility, AIR managers in Antalya need to consider financially supporting local parks, schools, civic centers, etc. as an act of showing they do indeed care about local communities and their residents. Such an approach can be viewed as a win-win situation or mutualism, where AIRs benefit from positive marketing publicity and residents gain from having better parks, schools, etc. If issues persist, the Turkish Ministry of Tourism may need to be involved to determine if regulations or laws need to be established that address such social responsibility.

Findings also demonstrated that highly attached residents tend to view tourism development more favorably than less community-attached residents and support for future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options. Additionally, highly attached residents tended to perceive negative impacts of AIR. Policymakers, government officials, managers and planners should educate or at least inform less attached individuals about the negative impacts of AIR, and positive impacts of tourism development (Harrill, 2004).

The results also indicated that residents' perceived positive impacts of tourism influenced their attitudes toward future tourism development as well as potential tourism development options. To gain residents' support and achieve successful tourism development, policymakers, government officials, managers and planners should focus on activities that can increase the perceived positive impacts of existing tourism among

Antalya residents, such as increasing economic and cultural exchanges between visitors and residents. Policymakers, government officials should give priority for employment to host residents to generate local employment opportunities and realize the perceived benefits from tourism development.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

The major limitation of this study is the representativeness of the sample. Only four districts were included in the sample of Antalya residents (based on the concentration of AIRs in the area). It is recommended that work linking all-inclusive resorts and residents' attitudes should be done in more than four districts, so as to replicate findings. Additionally, the sample included a very large percentage of business owners or those who derive income from tourists. Such an oversampling may have implications for findings. Future studies may consider focusing intentionally on collecting from business owners and non-business owners as a means to compare attitudes regarding AIR and tourism development.

Despite the fact that the TIAS exhibited sound reliability results, the scale as a measurement tool is not without its shortcomings. First of all, validity of the scale as well as other scales used in this study were not assessed. This should be a focus (e.g., construct and predictive validity) for future studies. It is apparent that the TIAS captures support for tourism development and the impacts tourism can have on the community; however, cultural impacts and additional negative social impacts (i.e., crowding, congestion, etc.) are not included. Ultimately, it may prove beneficial to include additional items to the existing TIAS to capture a more robust assessment of residents'

attitudes about tourism and tourism development (while perhaps allowing greater use of the scale in more diverse contexts) and also help determine if such additions can potentially improve reliabilities and explain a greater degree of variance in the construct and its accompanying dimensions (Woosnam, 2012).

Additionally, many of the effect sizes (R^2) statistics for the regression analyses were modest, indicating a low degree of variance was explained in the dependent variables in the models. At the same time, no covariates were considered to account for relationships between independent and dependent variables. Future work should take into account the moderating effect of such covariates (i.e., some of the constructs used in the hypothesis testing as well as demographic variables) to potentially explain greater variance in similar models.

While the current research was conducted to utilize the existing measure of AIR and not modify it (so as to examine the existing factor structure), this study suggests a potential modification of the AIR. Those items which have low standardized factor loadings may be considered for exclusion (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). The rationale for this is that such items are unclear and likely do not contribute significantly to the variance explained in construct factors. Of course, assessing reliability of the factor with such items removed will be of importance as well. A reduction in the size of scale will make the measure more parsimonious and reduce the potential for confusion and cognitive overload experienced by participants, ultimately improving response rates in subsequent research (Doh, 2006; Woosnam et al., 2009; Woosnam, 2012).

Furthermore, the wording of items within the AIR impacts scale may have potentially impacted reliability of factors. Most noticeably is that the word "local" only appears in negatively-worded items. In order to increase reliability of factors, future research should modify these wording issues by making sure all items are written in a general context, removing the word "local" from each item.

Additionally, the current study potentially shows (as previous studies have) that tourism dependency may not only play a significant role in shaping residents' attitudes toward tourism, but also have an important affect on changing residents' perceptions about impacts of tourism and AIR impacts. Future studies should consider the impact tourism dependency (i.e., as a business owner) may potentially have on reported perceptions of tourism and AIR impacts, especially in considering measures of dependency as a covariate in future models of similar work.

Any time you engage in resident attitudes research, one must be aware that perceptions amongst the members are not homogenous (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Látková & Vogt, 2012), which was indicated through findings. In addition to this, attitudes are not static; they can change often and for many reasons (Chen & Raab, 2012). With that being said, future research focusing on AIR in Antalya (and other places similar in nature) should involve data collected at different points in time to gain a longitudinal perspective of how attitudes may change. In such research, the time of year or even year may serve as a variable that can explain a magnitude of change in attitudes.

REFERENCES

Akova, O. (2006). Yerel halkın turizmin etkilerini algılamalarına ve tutumlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi, 1*(2), 1-17.

Alaeddinoglu, F., & Can, A. S. (2009). Developing international market entry strategy for cultural tourism of Turkey. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, *6*(1), 509-527.

Albeni, M., & Ongun, U. (2005). Antalya turizminin turk turizmi icerisindeki yeri ve krizlerin Antalya turizmi uzerindeki etkileri [The significance of Antalya's tourism in Turkish tourism and the effects of crisis on tourism in Antalya]. *Suleyman Demirel Universitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Fakultesi Dergisi*, *10*(2), 93-112.

Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2006). Repeat visitation in mature sun and sand holiday destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 44*(3), 288–297.

Allen, L. R., Hafer, H. R., Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 31*(4), 27-33.

Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(1), 27-36.

Anderson, W. (2008). *Analysis of all-inclusive travel mode: Demand and supply perspectives in the Balearic Islands*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Balearic Islands, Palma de Mallorca, Spain.

Anderson, W., Juaneda, C., & Sastre, F. (2009). Influences of pro- all-inclusive travel decisions. *Tourism Review*, *64*(2), 4-18.

Antalya Tourism Information Office. (2009). Foreign Travelers' Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.antalyakultur.gov.tr/belge/1-70672/2008-yili.html.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 19*(4), 665-90.

Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, *37*(2), 120-131.

Armstrong, R. W., & Mok, C. (1995). Leisure travel destination choice criteria of Hong Kong residents. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *4*(1), 99-104

Avci, U., Madanoglu, M., & Okumus, F. (2011). Strategic orientation and performance of tourism firms: Evidence from a developing country. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 147-157.

Bahar, O. (2004). *Turkiyedeki turizim sektorunun rekabet gucune etkisi uzerine bir arastima:Mugla ornegi* [An empirical investigation of the competitive position of the tourism sector in Turkey: a study in Mugla]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Mugla, Mugla, Turkey.

Barak, H. (2006). *Turizm sektorunde uygulanan her sey dahil tatil sisteminin bolgedeki isletmeler uzerindeki etkisi: Bodrum ornegi* [The effect of all-inclusive resort system on the local businesses: a case study of Bodrum]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Dokuz Eylul, Izmir, Turkey.

Bircan, I., Ulker, H. I., Gunes, G., & Karakoc, G. (2010). Tourism destination sustainability and non-governmental organizations: A case study of Beypazari, Turkey. *Journal of Educational Travel, 1*(1), 17-32.

Britton, S. G. (1982). The political economy of tourism in the third world. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(3), 331-358.

Bujosa Bestard, A., & Nadal, J. R. (2007). Modeling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management, 28*(3), 688-695.

Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area life cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *The Canadian Geographer /Le Géographe canadien, 24*(1), 5-12.

Cave, P., & Kilic, S. (2010). The role of women in tourism employment with special reference to Antalya, Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 19*(3), 280-292.

Cavus, S., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2003). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study in Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis, 7*(3-4), 259-269.

Chen, S., & Raab, C. (2012). Predicting resident intentions to support community tourism: Toward an integration of two theories. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 21*(3), 270-294.

Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(4), 575-594.

Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*(4), 380-394.

Chuang, S. -T. (2010). Rural tourism: Perspectives from social exchange theory. *Social Behavior and Personality, 38*(10), 1313-1322.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10* (7), 1-7.

Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Gilbert, D., & Wanhill, S. (1998). *Tourism principles and practice*. London: Longman.

Çevirgen, A., & Üngüren, E. (2009). Yöre esnafinin her şey dahil sistemine yönelik tutumlari. *Ege Academic Review*, *9*(2), 637-658.

De Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism: Passport to development?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Demir, F. O. (2002). *Turizm isletmelerinde her sey dahil sisteminin maliyet ve karlılık uzerine etkisinin analizi* [The effects of all inclusive concepts to cost and probability]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Antalya, Antalya, Turkey.

Doganer, S. (2012). Resort hotel transition: Antalya, Turkey. In *The Proceedings of 5th International Conference on Sustainable Tourism*, 161, 331-342.

Doganli, B. (2006). *Turizimde destinasyon markalasmasi ve Antalya ornegi* [Determine the level of Turkish tourisms industry in the process of being a brand: A case study in Antalya]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Suleyman Demirel, Isparta, Turkey.

Doh, M. (2006). *Change through tourism: Resident perceptions of tourism development*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. In *Travel and Tourism Research Associations Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings* (pp.195-198). San Diego: TTRA.

Duman, T., & Öztürk, A. B. (2005). Yerli Turistlerin Mersin Kızkalesi Destinasyonu ve Tekrar Ziyaret Niyetleri ile İlgili Algılamaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Anatolia, 16*(1), 9-23.

Duman, T., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2011). Profiling of English tourists visiting Turkey based on attitudes toward Internet use in vacation decision making. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *20*(5), 525-550.

Duman, T., & Tosun, C. (2010). Current developments in Turkish tourism. *Anatolia, 21*(1), 5-9.

Dwyer, L., & Thomas, F. (2012). Tourism yield measures for Cambodia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *15*(4), 303-328.

Erkuş-Öztürk, H., & Terhorst, P. (2010). Variety of modes of governance of a global value chain: the case of tourism from Holland to Turkey. *Tourism Geographies, 12*(2), 217-245.

Frauman, E., & Banks, S. (2011). Gateway community resident perceptions of tourism development: Incorporating importance-performance analysis into a limit of acceptable change framework. *Tourism Management, 32*(1), 128-140.

Freitag, T. G. (1994). Enclave tourism development for whom the benefits roll? *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(3), 538-554.

Gee, C. Y., Makens, J. C., & Choy, D. J. L. (1997). *The Travel Industry. 3rd edition*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Gilbert, D., & Clark, M. (1997). An exploratory examination of urban tourism impact, with reference to residents' attitudes in the cities of Canterbury and Guildford. *Cities, 14*(6), 343-352.

Gjerald, O. (2005). Sociocultural impacts of tourism: A case study from Norway. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 3*(1), 36-58.

Gunn, C. A. (1994). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases (3rd ed.)*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2009). An examination of locals' attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36*(4), 723-726.

Gülbahar, M. (2002). *Turizmde Her Şey Dahil (all inclusive) Tur Satış Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: İstanbul, Turkey.

Gümüş, N., & Özüpekçe, S. (2009). The opinions of residents towards economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of tourism in Foça. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 6*(2), 398-417.

Gürbüz, A. (2002). Turizimin sosyal cevreye etkisi uzerine bir arastirma: Safranbolu ornegi [The effects of tourism on social environment: the case study of Safranbolu]. *Teknoloji, 1*(2), 49-59.

Gürkan, T. (2002). *Her Şey Dahil (all inclusive) Sisteminin Türk Turizmi Açısından İncelenmesi: Antalya-Kemer Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: Sakarya,Turkey.

Hall, C. M. (2000). *Tourism planning: Policies, processes, and relationships*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Hao, H., Long, P., & Kleckley, J. (2011). Factors predicting homeowners' attitudes toward tourism: A case of a coastal resort community. *Journal of Travel Research, 50*(6), 627-640.

Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature, 18*(3), 251-266.

Harrill, R., Uysal, M., Cardon, P. W., Vong, F., & Dioko, L. (2011). Resident attitudes towards gaming and tourism development in Macao: Growth machine theory as a context for identifying supporters and opponents. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 13*(1), 41-53.

Heung, V. C., & Chu, R. (2000). Important factors affecting Hong Kong consumers' choice of a travel agency for all-inclusive package tours. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(1), 52-59.

Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(4), 446-455.

Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Issa, J. J., & Jayawardena, C. (2003). The "all-inclusive" concept in the Caribbean. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15*(3), 167-171.

Karamustafa, K. (2000). Marketing-channel relationships: Turkey's resort purveyors' interactions with international tour operators. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 41*(4), 21-31.

Kavallinis, I., & Pizam, A. (1994). The environmental impacts of tourism-Whose responsibility is it anyway? The case study of Mykonos. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*(2), 26-32.

Koc, E. (2005). New product development in the Turkish tourism market: The case of football tourism. *Journal of Sport Tourism, 10*(3), 165-173.

Korca, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(3), 695-697.

Köseoglu, M. A., Topaloglu, C., Parnelld, J. A., & Lester, D. L. (2013). Linkages among business strategy, uncertainty and performance in the hospitality industry: Evidence from an emerging economy. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*, 81-91.

Kwon, J., & Vogt, C. A. (2010). Identifying the role of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components in understanding residents' attitudes toward place marketing. *Journal of Travel Research, 49*(4), 423-435.

Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(1), 121-39.

Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research, 51*(1), 50- 67.

Lawton, L. J. (2005). Resident perceptions of tourist attractions on the Gold Coast of Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, *44*(2), 188-200.

Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). The economic values of tourism's social impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *24*(1), 90-116.

Liu, J.C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *13*(2), 193-214.

Long, P. H. (2012). Tourism impacts and support for tourism development in Ha Long Bay, Vietnam: An examination of residents' perceptions. *Asian Social Science*, *8*(8), 28-39.

Matarrita-Cascante, D., Luloff, A. E., & Krannich, R. S. (2006). Community participation in rapidly growing communities in Southern Utah. *Journal of Community Development Society*, *37*(4), 71-87.

McCool, S. F., & Martin S. R., (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, *32*(3), 29-34.

McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*(2), 131-140.

Menekşe, R. (2005). Her şey dâhil sisteminin ve sistemden faydalananlar açısından etkilerinin otel yöneticilerinin gözünden değerlendirilmesi (Marmaris örneği). *AİBÜ-İİBF Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *1*, 97-124.

Mok, C., Slater, B., & Cheung, V. (1991). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Hong Kong. *Journal of Hospitality Management*, *10*(3), 289-293.

Morrison, M. A. (1989). *Hospitality and travel marketing*. Albany, NY: Delmar Publishers.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. New York, NY: Methuen.

O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality and Quantity*, *41*(5), 673-690.

O'Donoghue, P. (2012). *Statistics for sport and exercise studies: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routhledge.

Orucu, E., Aydilek, H. & Bulut, Z. A. (2004). Her sey dahil sisteminin ulke Turizmine ve isletme karlılıgına katkısı konusunda gorusler: Marmaris ve Icmeler Ornegi [The contribution of all inclusive system to profitability of facilities and national tourism: A case study in Marmaris]. *Ataturk Universitesi I.I.B.F Dergisi*, 18(2), 223-245.

Ozdemir, B., Çizel, B., & Bato Cizel, R. (2012). Satisfaction with all-inclusive tourism resorts: The effects of satisfaction with destination and destination loyalty. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *13*(2), 109-130.

Özdemir, M., & Kervankıran, D. (2011). Turizm ve turizmin etkileri konusunda yerel halkın yaklaşımlarının belirlenmesi: Afyonkarahisar örneği. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*, *24*, 1-25.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Kang, Y. S. (1995). Resident support for gambling as a tourism development strategy. *Journal of Travel Research, 34*(2), 3-11.

Peterson, N. A., Speer, W. P., & McMillan, D. W. (2008). Validation of a brief sense of community scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *36*(1), 61-73.

Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, *16*(4), 8-12.

Poon, A. (1998). All-inclusive resorts. *Travel & Tourism Analyst* (6), 62-77.

Quiroga, I. (1990). Characteristics of package tours in Europe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *17*(1), 185-207.

Rayna, T., & Striukova, L. (2009). Luxury without guilt: service innovation in the all-inclusive hotel industry. *Service Business*, *3*(4), 359-372.

Schlüter, R., & Var, T. (1988). Resident attitudes toward tourism in Argentina. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *15*(3), 442-445.

Sheldon, P. J., & Abenoja, T. (2001). Resident attitudes in a mature destination: the case of Waikiki. *Tourism Management*, *22*(5), 435-443.

Sheldon, P. J., & Mak, J. (1987). The demand for package tours: A mode choice model. *Journal of Travel Research, 25*(3), 13-17.

Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, *5*(1), 40-47.

Sirakaya, E., Jamal, T. B., & Choi, H.-S. (2001). Developing indicators for destination sustainability. *The encyclopedia of ecotourism*, 411-432.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics, 6th edition*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tatoglu, E., Erdal, F., Ozgur, H., & Azakli, S. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts: The case of Kusadasi, Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, *3*(3), 79-100.

Tayfun, A. (2002). Turist yerli halk etkilesimi uzerine bir arastima [A study on the interaction between tourist and residents]. *Gazi Universitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *1*, 1-12.

Tayfun, A., & Kiliclar, A. (2004). Turizmin sosyal etkileri ve yerli halkin turiste bakisi. *Gazi Universitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, *1*, 1-17.

Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *29*(3), 668-688.

Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *29*(1), 231–253.

Tumer, N. (2010). Measuring hotel performance using data envelopment analysis. *Anatolia*, *21*(2), 271-287.

Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2013). Tourism Statistics, Foreign Travelers' in 2007, 2008, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,36568/number-of-arriving-departing-visitors-foreigners-and-ci-.html

Turkish Statistical Institute. (2012). Population statistics. Retrieved from http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist

The Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry Investment Support and Promotion Agency. (2013). Tourism Revenue. Retrieved from http://www.invest.gov.tr/en-US/infocenter/news/Pages/310113-turkey-2012-tourism-revenue-up.aspx

Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, *26*(1), 27-29.

Uriely, N., Israeli, A. A., & Reichel, A. (2002). Heritage proximity and resident attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *29*(3), 859-862.

Üner, M. M., Sökmen, A., & Birkan, İ. (2006). Türkiye'de Her Şey Dahil Uygulamasının Konaklama İşletmeleri Üzerindeki Etkisi: Antalya Örneği. *Anatolia*, *17*(1). 35-50.

Var, T., Kendall, K. W., & Tarakcioglu, E. (1985). Resident attitudes towards tourists in a Turkish resort town. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *12*(4), 652-658.

Wang, Y., & Pfister, R. E. (2008). Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community. *Journal of Travel Research*, *47*(1), 84-93.

Wang, Y., Pfister, R. E., & Morais, D. B. (2006). *Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a case study of Washington, NC*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.

Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *28*(2), 269–290.

Wong, C.-k, S., & Kwong, W. –Y. Y. (2004). Outbound tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours. *Tourism Management*, *25*(5), 581–592.

Woosnam, K. M. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, *51*(3), 315-327.

Woosnam, K. M., Norman, W. C., & Ying, T. (2009). Exploring the theoretical framework of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, *48*(2), 245-258.

Woosnam, K. M., Van Winkle, C. M., & An, S. (2013). Confirming the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale in the context of a rural Texas cultural festival. *Even Management*, *17*(3), 257-270.

World Travel & Tourism Council. (2013). Employment and job opportunities. Retrieved from http://www.wttc.org/site_media/uploads/downloads/turkey2012.pdf

Yarcan, S., & Ertuna, B. (2002). What you encourage is what you get: The case of Turkish inbound international tourism. *Anatolia*, *13*(2), 159-183.

Yilmaz, Y., Yilmaz, Y., Icigen, E. T., Ekin, Y., & Utku, B. D. (2009). Destination image: A comparative study on pre and post trip image variations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *18*(5), 461-479.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities' characteristics. *Anatolia*, *10*(1), 29-44.

Yu, C. -P. S., Chancellor H. C., & Cole, S. T. (2011). Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: A reexamination of the sustainable tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(1), 57-63.

Zamani-Farahani, H., & Musa, G. (2008). Residents' attitudes and perception towards tourism development: A case study of Masooleh, Iran. *Tourism Management*, *29*(6), 1233-1236.

APPENDIX A

NOMENCLATURE

AIR	All-Inclusive Resorts
TMCT	Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism
TSI	Turkish Statistical Institute
GDP	Gross Domestic Products
TIAS	Tourism Impact Attitude Scale
CA	Community Attachment
EFA	Exploratory Factor Analysis
ESS	Emotional Solidarity Scale
STD	Support for Tourism Development
CTC	Contributions to Community
FTD	Future Tourism Development
PTD	Potential Tourism Development

APPENDIX B

Antalya residents' attitudes about the impacts of all-inclusive resorts

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION, PARK AND TOURISM SCIENCES

College of Agriculture and Life Sciences

2261 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2261 979.845.8781 512.758.9737

2014

103

ANTALYA RESIDENT SURVEY

SECTION 1: Community life in Antalya

1. How long have you lived in Antalya? (Please write in number)
_____ Years

2. The following items concern **YOUR COMMUNITY**. Please indicate your level of agreement with each item on a scale of 1-5, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree.* (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I can get what I need in this community.	1	2	3	4	5
This community helps me fulfill my needs.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel like a member of this community.	1	2	3	4	5
I belong in this community.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a say about what goes on in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
People in this community are good at influencing each other.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel connected to this community.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a good bond with others in this community.	1	2	3	4	5

3. How much do you agree with the following statements about living in **YOUR COMMUNITY**? The scale ranges from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree.* (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The longer I live in this community, the more I feel I belong here.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel I am fully accepted as a member of this community.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel this community is a real home to me.	1	2	3	4	5
Most of the people in this community can be trusted.	1	2	3	4	5
If I was in trouble, most people in this community would go out of their way to help me.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 2: Attitudes about tourism and tourism development

4. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding your attitudes about tourism development in Antalya? The scale ranges from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree.* (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I believe that tourism should be actively encouraged in Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
I support tourism and want to see it remain important to Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
I support new tourism facilities that will attract new visitors to Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya should support the promotion of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
In general, the positive benefits of tourism outweigh negative impacts.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya should remain a tourism destination.	1	2	3	4	5
Long-term planning by the city can control negative environmental impacts (e.g. problems with waste, water contamination).	1	2	3	4	5
It is important to develop plans to manage growth of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
The tourism sector plays a major role in the Antalya economy.	1	2	3	4	5
One of the most important benefits of tourism is how it can improve the local standard of living.	1	2	3	4	5
Shopping opportunities are better in Antalya as a result of tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya has better roads due to tourism.	1	2	3	4	5
The tourism sector provides many desirable employment opportunities for residents.	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of life in Antalya has improved because of tourism development in the area.	1	2	3	4	5
I have more recreational opportunities (places to go and things to do) because of tourism in Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
The quality of public services has improved due to more tourism in Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
My household standard of living is higher because of money tourists spend here.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 3: Feelings you have about Antalya visitors

5. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding **your feelings** toward Antalya visitors you encounter MOST OFTEN? The scale ranges from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree.* (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I appreciate visitors for the contribution they make to the local economy.	1	2	3	4	5
I have made friends with some Antalya visitors.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel close to some visitors I have met in Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
I understand Antalya visitors.	1	2	3	4	5
I treat Antalya visitors fairly.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel affection towards Antalya visitors.	1	2	3	4	5
I identify with Antalya visitors.	1	2	3	4	5
I am proud to have visitors come to Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
I have a lot in common with Antalya visitors.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel the community benefits from having visitors in Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 4: The future of tourism development in Antalya

6. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding the future of tourism in Antalya? The scale ranges from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree.* (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall, the benefits of tourism development in Antalya will outweigh its costs.	1	2	3	4	5
In general, new tourism development should be actively encouraged in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
My community can handle more tourism development.	1	2	3	4	5
Increased tourism would hurt my community's quality of life.	1	2	3	4	5
Tourism looks like the best way to help my community's economy in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
Tourism should play a vital role in the future of Antalya.	1	2	3	4	5
I support new tourism development in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
Tourism development in my community will benefit me or some member of my family.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 5: Potential forms of tourism development in Antalya

7. How desirable are the following forms of tourism development in your community? The scale ranges from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Undesirable	Undesirable	Neither Undesirable Nor Desirable	Desirable	Strongly Desirable
Prohibiting all new development	1	2	3	4	5
Businesses that attract tourists to the community.	1	2	3	4	5
More small independent businesses (gift shops, bookstore, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
Developing new trails for walking or biking.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of historic sites.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of more resorts.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of amusement park type facilities.	1	2	3	4	5
Hosting events such as festivals, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of more hotels.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of more restaurants.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of franchise businesses.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of more golf courses.	1	2	3	4	5
Development of more all-inclusive resorts (AIR).	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 6: Perceptions of all-inclusive resorts in Antalya

8. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding all-inclusive resorts (AIR) in Antalya? The scale ranges from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. (Please circle one number per statement).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
All-inclusive resort system (AIR) contributes positively to tourism in Turkey.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR should be applied everywhere tourism exists.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR should be applied in unattractive tourism regions as an alternative strategy.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR increases occupancy rates of hotels and businesses.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR impairs the quality of tourist and service.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR is a short term marketing strategy in the industry.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR discourages higher- middle classes from visiting.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR attracts more lower- middle class tourists.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR affects adversely the local business owners.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR reduces the profitability of the local businesses.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR causes a decrease in the sales of local business owners.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR lessens the competitive power of the local business owners.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR reduces the number of customers in the local businesses.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR has lessened the number of staff members in the local businesses.	1	2	3	4	5
All-inclusive resort system should be abolished.	1	2	3	4	5
The number of tourists will increase once the all-inclusive resort system is abolished.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR reduces the sale prices of the local businesses	1	2	3	4	5
AIR contributes positively to the suppliers.	1	2	3	4	5
AIR leads tourists to consume excessive food and alcohol in the resort.	1	2	3	4	5
Tourists are unaware of the beauty of the region due to AIR.	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 7: Background information: This information is completely confidential and will be used to determine if we have satisfactorily represented Antalya residents.

9. What is your gender? (Please check one)
   - □ Female
   - □ Male

10. What is your current employment status? (Please check one)
   - □ Not tourism-related
   - □ Tourism-related
   - □ Student
   - □ Homemaker
   - □ Retired or Unemployed

11. What is your monthly household income? (Please check one)
   - □ Under 1.5 thousand Dollar
   - □ 1.5–3 thousand Dollar
   - □ Over 3 thousand Dollar

12. What is your age? (Please check one)
   - □ 18-29
   - □ 30-39
   - □ 40-49
   - □ 50-59
   - □ 60+

13. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please check one)
   - □ Less than high school
   - □ High school
   - □ Technical/vocational school
   - □ Undergrad degree
   - □ Graduate degree

14. What is your current marital status? (Please check one)
   - □ Single
   - □ Married
   - □ Divorced or Separated
   - □ Widowed

15. What is your race/ethnicity? (Please check one)
   - □ Turkish
   - □ Kurdish
   - □ Russian
   - □ American
   - □ European
   - □ Others

16. What percent of your household income would you say is derived either directly or indirectly from Antalya tourist spending?

_____ % (Please write in number)

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!
PLEASE <u>PLACE THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE</u> AND <u>LEAVE OUTSIDE</u>—
A RESEARCHER WILL BE BY LATER TODAY TO COLLECT IT.

____DAT_____LOC_____IDNR_____ADMINR

APPENDIX C

Antalya halkının her şey dahil sistemi(tam paket tur) hakkındaki görüşleri

REKREASYON, PARK VE TURİZM BİLİMLERİ BÖLÜMÜ

Tarım ve Yaşam Bilimleri Fakültesi

2261 TAMU College Station, TX 77843-2261 979.845.8781 546.487.1940

2014

ANTALYA HALKI ANKET SORULARI

BÖLÜM 1: Antalya'da toplum hayatı

1. Kaç yıldır Antalya'da yaşamaktasınız? (Lütfen rakam olarak belirtiniz)
   _____ Yıldır

2. Aşağıda belirtilen maddeler **SİZİN TOPLUMUNUZ** ile ilgilidir. Lütfen her bir maddeye ne ölçüde katıldığınızı (1'in *kesinlikle katılmıyorum* ve 5'in *kesinlikle katılıyorum* anlamına geldiği) 1'den 5'e kadar olan ölçekte belirtiniz. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve rakamlardan **sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	**Katılmıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Katılıyorum**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**
İhtiyacım olan her şeyi burada bulunduğum toplumdan elde edebilirim.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Buradaki toplum ihtiyaçlarımı karşılamamda bana yardımcı olur.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Kendimi bu toplumun bir üyesi olarak görüyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Ben bu topluma aitim.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumda olup bitenler hakkında söz sahibiyim.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumun içindeki insanlar birbirleri ile iyi bir etkileşim içerisindeler.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Kendimi bu toplumun bir parçası olarak hissediyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumdaki diğer fertlerle aramda iyi bir bağ var.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

3. **TOPLUMDAKİ YAŞAM BİÇİMİNİZ** hakkında aşağıda belirtilen maddelere ne ölçüde katılmaktasınız? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle katılmıyorum'* dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle katılıyorum'* a kadardır.(Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve rakamlardan **sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	**Katılmıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Katılıyorum**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**
Bu toplum içinde yaşadıkça kendimi daha çok buraya ait hissediyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumda tam bir üye olarak kabul gördüğümü hissediyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumun bana gerçek bir yuva olduğunu hissediyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bu toplumdaki insanların çoğu güvenilirdir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Eğer sorun yaşayacak olursam, bu toplumdaki insanların çoğu bana yardım etmek için çaba sarfederler (işini gücünü bırakırlar).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

BÖLÜM 2: Turizm ve turizm gelişmeleri ile ilgili görüşler

4. Antalya'da turizm gelişmeleri hakkındaki görüşlerinize yönelik aşağıda belirtilen maddelere ne ölçüde katılmaktasınız? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle katılmıyorum'* dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle katılıyorum'* a kadardır. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve rakamlardan **sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	**Katılmıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Katılıyorum**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**
Turizmin Antalya'da aktif olarak teşvik edilmesi gerektiğine inanıyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizmi destekliyor ve Antalya'daki öneminin devam etmesini istiyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya'ya yeni ziyaretçiler çekmeyi sağlayacak yeni turizm faaliyetlerini destekliyorum.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya halkı turizme katkı sağlayacak tanıtımları(reklam vb.) desteklemelidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Genel olarak turizmin olumlu katkısı olumsuz etkilerinden daha ağır basar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya turizm bölgesi olarak kalmaya devam etmelidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizmin olumsuz çevresel etkisi uzun dönemli planlarla kontrol altına alınabilir(örneğin atık sorunu ve su kirliliği).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizmde büyümeyi (ilerlemeyi) yönetmek için planlar geliştirmek önemlidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizm sektörü Antalya ekonomisi için büyük bir rol oynar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizmin en önemli katkılarından birisi de yerel yaşam standartlarını nasıl geliştireceğidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya'daki alışveriş fırsatları turizm nedeniyle daha iyidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizm sayesinde Antalya daha iyi yollara sahiptir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizm sektörü Antalya halkı için birçok cazip iş imkanı sağlar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turizm gelişmeleri sayesinde Antalya'daki yaşam kalitesi yükselmiştir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya'daki turizm sayesinde daha çok eğlence olanaklarına(gidilecek yerler ve yapılacak şeyler) sahibim.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Antalya'da turizmin artmasıyla kamu hizmetlerinin kalitesi yükselmiştir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turistlerin burada harcadıkları para evdeki yaşam standartlarımı yükseltmiştir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

BÖLÜM 3: Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçiler hakkındaki duygu ve düşünceleriniz.

5. Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçilerden EN SIK karşılaştıklarınıza yönelik **duygu ve düşüncelerinizle** ilgili aşağıdaki maddelere ne ölçüde katılmaktasınız? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle katılmıyorum*' dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle katılıyorum'* a kadardır. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve **sadece bir rakamı** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
Yerel ekonomiye katkılarından dolayı ziyaretçileri takdir ediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen bazı ziyaretçilerle arkadaşlık kurdum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'da karşılaştığım bazı ziyaterçileri kendime yakın hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçileri anlıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçilere adil davranıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçilere karşı duygusal bir yakınlık hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçilerle kendimi özdeşleştiriyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya ziyaretçilerin gelmesinden dolayı gurur duyuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya gelen ziyaretçilerle birçok ortak noktamız var.	1	2	3	4	5
Antalya'ya ziyaretçilerin gelmesinin topluma yarar sağladığını düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5

BÖLÜM 4: Antalya'da turizm gelişmelerinin geleceği.

6. Antalya turizminin geleceği ile ilgili olarak aşağıda belirtilen maddelere ne ölçüde katılmaktasınız? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle katılmıyorum*' dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle katılıyorum'* a kadardır. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve rakamlardan **sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
Genel olarak, Antalya'da gerçekleşen turizm gelişmelerinin sağlayacağı faydalar sebep olacağı maliyetten daha fazla olacaktır.	1	2	3	4	5
Genellikle, yeni turizm gelişmeleri içinde bulunduğum toplum tarafından aktif bir şekilde teşvik edilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
İçinde bulunduğum toplum birden fazla turizm gelişmesiyle başa çıkabilir.	1	2	3	4	5
Gelişen turizm içinde bulunduğum toplumun yaşam kalitesine zarar verebilir.	1	2	3	4	5
Gelecekte içinde bulunduğum toplumun ekonomisine katkı sağlayacak en iyi yol turizm gibi görünmektedir.	1	2	3	4	5
Turizm Antalya'nın geleceği için hayati bir rol oynamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
İçinde bulunduğum toplumdaki turizm ile ilgili yeni gelişmeleri desteklerim.	1	2	3	4	5
İçinde bulunduğum toplumdaki turizm ile ilgili gelişmeler bana veya aile fertlerime yarar sağlayacaktır.	1	2	3	4	5

BÖLÜM 5: Antalya'daki turizm gelişiminin olası biçimleri/türleri

7. Aşağıda belirtilen turizm gelişim türleri toplumunuz tarafından nasıl arzulanmaktadır? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle arzulamıyorum*' dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle arzuluyorum'* a kadardır. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve **rakamlardan sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Arzulamıyorum	**Arzulamıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Arzuluyorum**	**Kesinlikle Arzuluyorum**
Turizm ile ilgili tüm yeni gelişmelerin yasaklanmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turisti topluma çekecek her türlü işletmeleri.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha küçük bağımsız işletmeleri(hediye dükkanları,kırtasiyeler, kitapçılar, vb.).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Yürüyüş yapmak ve bisiklete binmek için yeni yolların hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Tarihi alanların geliştirilmesini.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha fazla dinlenme ve tatil yerlerinin hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Eğlence ve lunapark türü tesislerin hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Festival benzeri etkinliklerin geliştirilmesini.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha çok otelin hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha çok restoranın(lokantanın) hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Bayilik veren işletmelerin geliştirilmesini.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha çok golf sahasının hizmete sunulmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Daha çok her şey dahil sisteminin(tam paket turlarının) uygulanmasını.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

BÖLÜM 6: Antalya'da her şey dahil sistemi (tam paket tur) algısı

8. Antalya'daki her şey dahil tatil sistemine(tam paket tur) yönelik belirtilen maddelere ne ölçüde katılmaktasınız? Ölçek aralığı 1= *kesinlikle katılmıyorum*' dan başlayıp 5 = *kesinlikle katılıyorum'* a kadardır. (Lütfen her bir maddeyi **doldurunuz** ve rakamlardan **sadece birini** yuvarlak içine alınız).

	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	**Katılmıyorum**	**Kararsızım**	**Katılıyorum**	**Kesinlikle Katılıyorum**
Her şey dahil sisteminin(tam paket tur) ülke turizmine olumlu katkısı vardır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi turizmin olduğu her yerde uygulanmalıdır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Turistik çekiciliği olmayan bölgelerde her şey dahil sistemi alternatif olarak uygulanmalıdır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi otel ve işletmelerin doluluk oranlarını arttırmaktadır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi turist ve hizmet kalitesini düşürmektedir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi sektörde geçici bir pazarlama stratejisidir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi zengin turisti ülkemizden uzaklaştırmaktadır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi gelir seviyesi düşük turistlerin gelmesine neden olur.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi turisti otele hapsettiği için yöre esnafını olumsuz etkiler.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi yöre esnafının karlılık oranını azaltmıştır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi yöre esnafının satışlarını düşürmektedir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi yöre esnafının rekabet gücünü azaltmıştır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi yöre esnafının müşteri sayısını düşürmektedir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sisteminden dolayi işletmede çalışan personel sayısı azalmıştır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil uygulaması yürürlükten kaldırılmalıdır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil uygulaması kaldırılırsa işletmenize gelen turist sayısı artacaktır.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi yöre esnafının satiş fiyatlarını düşürür.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi tedarikçileri(toptancıları) olumlu yönde etkilemektedir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi turistleri tesislerde aşırı tüketime sürüklemektedir.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Her şey dahil sistemi nedeniyle, gelen turistler otel dışına çıkamadıkları için ülke güzelliklerinden habersiz kalmaktadırlar.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

BÖLÜM 7: Gerekli Bilgiler: Bu bilgi tamamen gizlidir ve Antalya halkını yeterince iyi temsil edip edemediğimizi belirlemek için kullanılacaktır.

9. Cinsiyetiniz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ Kadın
   - □ Erkek

10. Mevcut çalışma durumunuz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ Turizimle ilgili değil
   - □ Turizimle ilgili
   - □ Öğrenci
   - □ Ev hanımı
   - □ Emekli veya İşsiz

11. Aylık hane halkı geliriniz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ 3 bin TL altı
   - □ 3-6 bin TL
   - □ 6 bin TL üstü

12. Kaç yaşındasınız? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ 18-29
   - □ 30-39
   - □ 40-49
   - □ 50-59
   - □ 60 ve üstü

13. Eğitim düzeyiniz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ Lise öncesi
   - □ Lise
   - □ Teknik okul/Meslek okulu
   - □ Üniversite
   - □ Lisansüstü

14. Medeni durumunuz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ Bekar
   - □ Evli
   - □ Bosanmış ya da Ayrılmış
   - □ Dul

15. Irkınız veya etnik kökeniniz nedir? (Lütfen birini işaretleyiniz)
   - □ Türk
   - □ Kürt
   - □ Rus
   - □ Amerikan
   - □ Avrupalı
   - □ Diğer

16. Tüm hane halkı düşünüldüğünde, evinizdeki gelir seviyesinin yüzde kaçı doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak Antalya'daki turistlerin yaptığı harcamaya bağlıdır?

_____ % (Lütfen yüzdelik olarak belirtiniz)

ZAMAN AYIRDIĞINIZ VE BİLGİ SAĞLADIĞINIZ İÇİN ÇOK TEŞEKKÜR EDERİZ!
LÜTFEN <u>TAMAMLADIĞINIZ ANKETİ ZARFIN İÇİNE YERLEŞTİRİNİZ</u> VE <u>DIŞARIYA BIRAKINIZ</u> BİR ANKETÖR GÜN İÇERİSİNDE GELİP ZARFI ALACAKTIR.

____GÜN_____ADRES_____ANKETNO_____ANKETÖR