



**TURİZM ENDÜSTRİSİNİN TURİST KABUL EDEN TOPLUMLARA ETKİSİ:
ANTALYA VE ÇANAKKALE ÖRNEKLERİ**

Mustafa BOZ¹ Ezgi KARAKAŞ²

Özet

Turizm endüstrisi ekonomik, sosyal, kültürel ve çevresel bir olgudur. Bu makale başlıca iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. İlk bölümde; turizm endüstrisinin turist kabul eden toplumlar üzerindeki ekonomik, sosyo-kültürel ve çevresel etkileri, alanyazın taranarak incelenmiştir. İkinci bölümde; Antalya ve Çanakkale illerinde yaşayanlar ile yüz yüze alan araştırması yapılarak, turizmin yerel topluluk üzerindeki etkileri konusundaki görüşleri ve algıları ortaya çıkartılmaya çalışılmıştır. Antalya, Türkiye’de en fazla turist ağırlayan ve herşey dahil sistemin yoğun olarak uygulandığı ildir. Çanakkale’de turizm yeni gelişmeye başlayan bir endüstridir ve hedef sektörlerden birisi olarak belirlenmiştir. Farklı özelliklerinden dolayı bu iller arasında karşılaştırma yapmak mümkündür. Çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Evrenin tam sayımı mümkün olmadığı ve evrende herkese ulaşma imkanı bulunmadığı için, örneklemede, ihtimalsiz örnekleme yöntemlerinden kolayda örnekleme tekniği tercih edilmiştir. Antalya ve Canakkale illerinde yaşayan halk ile 2013 yılında yüzyüze anket yapılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda, Antalya ve Çanakkale’de yaşayan halkın algıları ve görüşleri arasında belirgin farklılıklar olduğu ortaya çıkartılmıştır. Bazı bulgular şu şekildedir: Turizmin gelişmesi insanların yabancı bir dil öğrenme ve yabancı kültürlerle aşina olma isteğini arttırmaktadır. Turizm yerel toplulukların sosyal yaşamını geliştirmekte ve kadınların işgücüne katılımına katkı sağlamaktadır. Turizm endüstrisi işsizlik probleminin çözümüne pozitif katkı sağlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Turizm Endüstrisi
Turist Kabul Eden Toplular
Turizmin Ekonomik Etkileri
Turizmin Sosyo-kültürel Etkileri
Turizmin Çevresel Etkileri

¹ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Tourism, m.b.istanbul@gmail.com

² Doctorate Student, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Tourism, ezgisucu@hotmail.com

IMPACT OF TOURISM INDUSTRY ON HOST COMMUNITIES: ANTALYA AND CANAKKALE CASES

Abstract

Tourism industry is an economic, social, cultural, and environmental phenomenon. This article consists of mainly two parts: In the first part, economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts of tourism industry on host communities were examined in the light of literature. In the second part, a face to face survey was conducted with residents of Antalya and Canakkale provinces to reveal perceptions and attitudes of host communities about the impacts of tourism on the local community. Antalya is the most tourist receiving city in Turkey and all- inclusive system is implemented heavily. In Canakkale, tourism is a newly developing industry, and identified as one of the target sectors. It is possible to make comparison between these provinces due to their different characteristics. Quantitative research method was used. In sampling convenience sample technic from non-probability sample types was applied because of difficulties to count and reach the whole population. A face to face survey was conducted with residents of Antalya and Canakkale provinces in 2013. At the end of the survey, it was revealed that there are significant differences between perception and attitudes of local people who live in Antalya and Canakkale. Some findings are as below: The development of tourism increases the desire of people to learn a foreign language and to become acquainted with foreign cultures. Tourism improves social life of host communities, and contributes women in participating to labor force. The tourism industry provides a positive contribution to the solution of unemployment problem.

Keywords

Tourism Industry
Host Communities
Economic Impacts of Tourism
Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism
Environmental Impacts of Tourism

INTRODUCTION

After fifties, due to changes in economic, sociocultural, and political life such as shorter working weeks, increase in revenues, liberalization of economies and politics, development in infrastructure, and superstructure like new transportation, communication, and accommodation facilities, the middle and lower income level public were able to afford holidays. The number of international tourist arrivals rose from 25 million in 1950, to 435 million in 1990, 675 million in 2000, 942 million in 2010, 1.1 billion in 2013, and 1.14 billion in

2014 (UNWTO, 2012; UNWTO, 2013; Scowsill, 2015). Cheap package tours are an important driving force in this increase. Today, tourism industry is one of the largest industry in the world and continues to grow regularly.

For many countries, especially for underdeveloped and developing ones, tourism industry is seen as an important income, foreign currency, employment source and an easy way of development. Besides positive impacts of tourism industry, there may be many unforeseeable and hidden economic, social, cultural and environmental costs of tourism development for host communities. It is necessary to carefully study impacts of a rapidly developed tourism industry, because it is possible to make many mistakes in investments and tourism policies in trying to attract tourists (Aydın and Boz, 2006). This paper investigates economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts of tourism industry on host communities through literature review and perceptions of local residents through a survey.

1. Literature Review

Tourism industry is not only an economic phenomenon. Because of its nature, it has close relationship with social life, culture, natural and man-made environment. Tourism consist of three main elements; destination, host community and tourists. It brings people together from different cultural, social, and economic backgrounds. Tourism is a process which obviously affects various aspects of society, environment and culture (Acharya, 2005; UNEP, 2016).

Table – 1: Economic Impacts of Tourism Industry

Positive	Negative
1. Foreign exchange earnings Flow of foreign currency	Leakage Import leakage Export leakage
2. Contribution to government revenues Increase in tax revenues Direct fees, museum tickets etc.	Increase in prices Local shops overcharge Increase in real estate prices
3. Stimulation of infrastructure investment Improved infrastructure (power, water, transportation, telecommunications etc.)	Infrastructure cost
4. Contribution to local economies Creates regional and local investment Provides local people with trade opportunities Supports other economic sectors within a destination zone	Economic dependence of the local community on tourism
5. Economic diversification Multiplier effect of the tourism Changes of profession A wide range of services and goods	Seasonal character of jobs
6. Employment generation Creates employment opportunities in new economic activities Increases participation of women into economic activities	Increased economic inequality
7. Increase in standard of living	Enclave tourism

Table – 2: Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism Industry

Positive	Negative
1. Cultural Diversity	Change or loss of indigenous identity and values
Learning other cultures, intercultural interactions	Loss of authenticity and staged authenticity
Decrease of prejudices disappearance of stereotypes, increase in tolerance	Adaptation to tourist demands, commercialization of culture
	Losing cultural identity
	Disappearance of local habits, traditions
	Standardization of culture
2. Stimulation of social, cultural life	Culture clashes
Increase in social mobility	Economic inequality
	Irritation due to tourist behavior
	Job level friction, child labor
3. Revaluation of culture and traditions	Physical influences causing social stress
Preservation and transmission of cultural and historical traditions	Resource use conflicts
Revival of local arts, crafts, cultural events	Cultural deterioration
	Conflicts with traditional land-uses
	Depriving local people of access
4. Tourism encourages civic involvement and pride	Deviant behaviors, ethical issues
Facilitates the development of the sense of place among the people.	Prostitution and sex tourism
Raise awareness of local issues and needs.	Gambling
Locals take pride in their territory	Alcoholism and drug
	Crime generation, aggression
	Disruption of traditional cultural behavior
	Unacceptable vulgar language
	Harassment, abuse
5. Familiarity with different languages	Acculturation
Better and easier communication	Apathy, irritation and potentially xenophobia
A new and useful skill in local life.	Intercultural conflicts
	Transformation of value systems
6. Strengthening communities	Excess social carrying capacity
	Congestion, noise pollution
	Disruption of peace and tranquility of local community
	Excessive migration
	Disruption of social Networks
7. Tourism as a force for peace	

Impacts of tourism for the host destinations can be sorted into several categories. Many researchers and institutions that study on the subject agree that the most common ones are; economic, environmental and sociocultural impacts (Stynes, 1997; Bauer, 1999; Ikiara and Okech, 2002; Cook, Yale and Marqua, 2006; Fredline et al., 2006; Alhasanat, 2010; Enemuo and Oyinkansola, 2012). These impacts can be positive, and also negative (Stynes, 1997; Ashley, 2000; Haley et al., 2004; Alhasanat, 2010; Enemuo and Oyinkansola, 2012; UNEP, 2016). Impacts of tourism industry can be listed as Table 1, 2, and 3. These tables

created by the authors under cover of the following sources; Lamorski and Dabrowski, 1977; Stynes, 1997; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Ratz, 2000; Baysan, 2001; Ikiara and Okech, 2002; Pickering et al., 2003; Haley et al., 2004; Acharya, 2005; Archer et al., 2005; European Commission, 2007; Chandralal, 2010; Kabote, 2015; UNEP, 2016; GVIC, 2016).

The impacts of tourism are not the same for each host destinations and communities. They will vary widely within and between communities (Ashley, 2000). Many of the fears surrounding tourism are closely associated with uncontrolled, unsustainable, and massed tourism growth. Tourism is an industry and is dominated by private enterprise with a purpose of making money by selling experiences. Market led planning can fail to achieve the objectives of sustainable tourism and has a tendency to forget negative environmental, social and cultural impacts (GVIC, 2016).

It is mostly difficult to measure and also sometimes to notice these impacts. For example; Taylor (2010) states that locals in Galápagos complained that most foreign tourists stayed on the yachts and small cruise ships that filled the Puerto Ayora harbor, agreeing with the research finding that little of the economic benefit of tourism made its way into local businesses and households.

Ikiara and Okech (2002) found out that Kenya’s tourism industry has faced enormous challenges, including declines in per capita spending, average length of stay, hotel occupancy rates, hotel room rates and service quality. Environmental degradation and deterioration in the quality of tourism products due to mass tourism are some of the factors that have contributed to this decline.

In his survey Alhasanat (2010) found that there are positive sociocultural impacts of tourism on the people from Petra, Jordan. The vast majority of the respondents believe that tourism has improved the image of Petra. It creates jobs and investment opportunities as well as enhancing the infrastructure at Petra. In contrast, the study also revealed the negative impacts. Respondents considered that tourism is responsible for some immoral behavior among some people from Petra as well as being the cause of changes in some young people’s behaviors from Petra.

Table – 3: Environmental Impacts of Tourism Industry

Positive	Negative
1. Improved environmental management and planning	Depletion of Natural Resources
Cleaner production	Overuses water resources: For hotels, swimming pools, golf courses and personal use of water by tourists and generating a greater volume of waste water Pressure on local resources: like energy, food, and other raw materials
Pollution prevention and waste minimization techniques, waste management	Land degradation and deforestation: Important land resources include minerals,

	fossil fuels, fertile soil, forests, wetland and wildlife
2. Protection and preservation of natural and historical sites	Pollution
Regulatory measures	Air, water, land pollution
Land use planning and development control	Air emissions
Capacity building	Noise
Investment in appropriate infrastructure	Releases of sewage
Sustainability indicators and monitoring	Solid waste and littering Oil and chemicals
3. Environmental awareness raising	Aesthetic Pollution
Conscious about the heritage sites, natural environment, flora and fauna	Architectural /visual pollution Construction activities, and infrastructure works
4. The tourism industry can contribute to conservation through direct financial contributions	Physical Impacts
Revenue from park-entrance fees and similar sources can be allocated specifically to pay for the protection and management of environmentally sensitive areas.	Physical impacts of tourism development: Deforestation and intensified or unsustainable use of land, Marina development
Special fees for park operations or conservation activities can be collected from tourists or tour operators.	Physical impacts from tourist activities: Trampling, anchoring and other marine activities, Alteration of ecosystems by tourist activities
5. The tourism industry can contribute to conservation through direct financial contributions	Ecosystem degradation
Revenue from park-entrance fees and similar sources can be allocated specifically to pay for the protection and management of environmentally sensitive areas.	Loss of Biological Diversity Decline of available habitat for local wildlife
Special fees for park operations or conservation activities can be collected from tourists or tour operators.	Damaging of fauna and flora Introduction of alien species that disrupt natural ecosystems
6. The tourism industry contributions to government revenues	Congestion
User fees, income taxes, taxes on sales or rental of recreation equipment, and license fees for activities such as hunting and fishing can provide governments with the funds needed to manage natural resources	Exceeded carrying capacity Traffic congestions
7. Enhancement of the appearance, superstructure, and infrastructure of the city	Depletion of the Ozone Layer
8.	Climate Change
9. Maintenance of historical monuments and sites	Degradation of historical monuments and sites

2. Methodology

Tourism is shown as one of the fastest growing industries in the world. Thanks to tourism industry, significant contributions are provided especially to less developed and developing countries accepting tourists. For instance, new employment opportunities are created, foreign exchange inflows are increased as well as country development is achieved. On the other hand, in less developed and developing countries, most of the tourism policies are established by national governments without taking into consideration tourists' expectations, needs and sensitivities for the destinations and locals.

Tourism is a social event. Tourists, tour operators and hospitality businesses are in interaction with local people, local businesses and local authorities. Thus, they positively or negatively affect each other. The general impacts of tourism on local side can be examined in three parts as economic, sociocultural and environmental. The main purpose of this research is to find out perceptions and attitudes of local people against to economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts of tourism. In other words, it is aimed to introduce positive and negative impacts of tourism on local people. Due to the limitation of time and cost, two cities (Antalya and Canakkale) were included in this research. The reason behind preferring Antalya is to be the most developed city in the tourism sector of Turkey and to be the most visited city in Turkey by foreign tourists. 11.479.236 in 2014 and 10.868.688 in 2015 foreign tourists visited Antalya (approx. 30% of Turkey) (ALTİD, 2017). Also, there is an important contribution of tourism sector to the development of Antalya. As a second city, Canakkale was selected. The reasons can be shown that tourism newly develops, and cultural and battlefields tourism is dominated in Canakkale. Tourism industry has a significant role on the development of the city as well as our university is also located in Canakkale. Due to the different features, it is possible to make comparison between two cities. Quantitative research method was used. Questionnaire was created by the researcher benefiting from the studies of Yoon, Gursoy and Chen (2001); Gumus and Ozupekce (2009); Ozdemir and Kervankiran (2011). A pre-test was conducted in Canakkale among 40 residents to test reliability and validity of the questionnaire. In sampling convenience sample technic from non-probability samples types was applied because of difficulties to count and reach the whole population. A face to face survey was conducted with residents of Antalya and Canakkale provinces in 2013.

2.1. General Findings Related to Participating Local People

Demographic findings related to participating local people can be seen in Table-4. When the gender of the participants are analyzed, it is seen that 48.8 % of the participants of Antalya and 57.9 % of the participants of Canakkale are male while 51.2 % of the participants of Antalya and 42.1 % of participants of Canakkale are female.

It is possible to define that age distributions are different for both cities. The rate of the individuals between 25-35 years is 34.9 % for Antalya and 32.5 % for Canakkale. Also, this age group is followed by the individuals who are between 36-48 years with the rates as 29 % for Antalya and 30.8 % for Canakkale.

When the educational status of the participants is analyzed, it is seen that 58.2 % of the participants of Antalya and 37.1 % of the participants of Canakkale are has a degree as

associate degree or university whereas 25.2 % of the people of Antalya and 37.1 % of the people from Canakkale have high school degree.

Table – 4: Demographic Findings Related to Participating Local People

Gender				
Male	210	48,8	139	57,9
Female	220	51,2	101	42,1
Total	430		240	
Age				
Between 18-24	105	24,8	40	16,7
Between 25-35	148	34,9	78	32,5
Between 36-48	123	29,0	74	30,8
Between 49-65	41	9,7	44	18,3
66 and more	7	1,7	4	1,7
Total	424		240	
Educational Status				
Primary School	11	2,7	26	10,8
Secondary School	14	3,4	18	7,5
High School	103	25,2	89	37,1
Associate Degree	44	10,8	28	11,7
University	194	47,4	61	25,4
Master	33	8,1	17	7,1
PHD	10	2,4	1	,4
Total	409		240	
Occupation				
Student	73	17,1	40	16,7
Tradesmen	47	11,0	14	5,8
Farmer	7	1,6	2	,8
Tourism Sector's Employee	46	10,7	38	15,8
Civil Servant	92	21,5	6	2,5
Retired	22	5,1	32	13,3
Housewife	25	5,8	22	9,2
Tourism Sector's Employer	18	4,2	5	2,1
Employee in Private Sector	84	19,6	49	20,4
Other	14	3,3	32	13,3
Total	428		240	
Monthly income				
Less than 1000 TL	36	8,4	78	32,5
Between 1001-1500 TL	39	9,1	51	21,3
Between 1501-2000 TL	120	28,1	52	21,7
Between 2001-2500 TL	55	12,9	35	14,6
Between 2501-3000 TL	81	19,0	13	5,4
Between 3001-4000 TL	27	6,3	1	,4
Between 4001-5000 TL	37	8,7	4	1,7
More than 5001 TL	32	7,5	82	34,1
Total	427		238	

The participants whose monthly income is less than or equal to 2000 TL are 45.6 % from Antalya and 75.5 % from Canakkale. There are also participants whose monthly income

is between 2001 and 4000 TL and their percentages are 38.2 for Antalya and 20.4 for Canakkale.

Table – 5: County of Residence for Participating Local People

Antalya			Canakkale		
	Frequency	Rate (%)		Frequency	Rate (%)
City Center	322	74,9	City Center	147	61,2
Kemer	46	10,7	Küçükkuyu	52	21,7
Manavgat - Side	2	,4	Gelibolu	20	8,3
Gazipaşa	39	9,1	Bozcaada	21	8,8
Belek	3	,7			
Alanya	18	4,2			
Total	430		Total	240	

Table – 5 demonstrates that 74.9 % of the participants from Antalya and 61.2 % of the participants from Canakkale live in the city center. The remaining consist of the individuals living in districts.

In this part, the findings obtained from public are indicated. General findings related to the local people participating in this research are demonstrated in Table – 6.

According to the findings, both 67.7 % of the participants from Antalya and 77.9 % of the participants from Canakkale have never been abroad before.

While 79.2 % of the participants from Antalya states that they travel for holidays, the rate is only 65.8 % for the participants from Canakkale. Thus, it is possible to say that the people of Antalya involve in more tourism activities than the people of Canakkale.

Half of the people who say that they travel for holidays state that the frequency of their travels is once a year. This rate is determined as 47.5 % for Antalya and 51.6 % for Canakkale. On the other hand, one third of the individuals from both cities state that the frequency of their travels is more than once a year. This rate is 26.5 % in Antalya and 23.9 % in Canakkale. 20.4 % of the people from Antalya and 22.6 % of the people from Canakkale state their travels' frequency as once every two or three years.

The most preferred accommodation type is all-inclusive according to 43.8 % of the participants from Antalya and 45.2 % of the participants from Canakkale. The rate of the people who prefer full board is determined as 25.1 % for Antalya and 13.1 % for Canakkale. Whereas 13.1 % of the people from Antalya and 11.9 % of the people from Canakkale prefer half board. Lastly, 14.3 % of the people from Antalya and 21.4 % of the people from Canakkale indicate their choice as bed and breakfast.

Table – 6: General Findings Related to Participating Local People

	Antalya		Canakkale	
	Frequency	Rate (%)	Frequency	Rate (%)
Having been abroad before				
Yes	139	32,3	53	22,1
No	291	67,7	187	77,9
Total	430		240	
Traveling for holiday				
Yes	339	79,2	158	65,8
No	89	20,8	82	34,2
Total	428		240	
The frequency of travel for holidays				
More than once a year	91	26,5	38	23,9
Once a year	163	47,5	82	51,6
Once every two or three years	70	20,4	36	22,6
Once every four years or less	19	5,5	3	1,9
Total	343		159	
The most preferred accommodation type				
Only Bed	9	3,6	7	8,3
Bed and Breakfast	36	14,3	18	21,4
Half Board	33	13,1	10	11,9
Full Board	63	25,1	11	13,1
All Inclusive	110	43,8	38	45,2
Total	251		84	

2.2. General Findings Related to Attitudes of Local People living in Antalya and Canakkale against the Impact of Tourism

The survey is conducted to figure out the attitudes of local people living in Antalya and Canakkale against impact of tourism. In this part, Cronbach's Alpha is firstly calculated in order to determine the reliability of the survey. Moreover, exploratory factor analysis is used to calculate the validity of survey. Based on KMO and Bartlett's test results, it is determined that factor analysis is proper to run.

For construct validity, principal component analysis and Varimax rotation were implemented. Since the results of KMO and Bartlett's allows to run factor analysis, component factor analysis was applied to identify the principal components of the scale. During the calculation of factors, eigenvalues were utilized. After reliability test has applied to the scale consisting of 27 items, 10 items were deleted from the research due to reducing reliability. As a result of removing 17 items, Cronbach's Alpha α is calculated as 0.715. Since Cronbach's Alpha value is close to 1, the value for this analysis is determined as adequate based on statistical significance and the scale is determined as consistent and reliable.

KMO value of the scale was calculated as 0.828 which is quite satisfactory. Therefore, the existing set of data is quite good for factor analysis. Also, Bartlett's test of sphericity was calculated as 3101.463 which shows the research factors and variables are statistically meaningful at a level of 0.00. Since KMO and Bartlett's tests allows to run factor analysis,

component factor analysis is run in order to identify the principle components of scale. As a result of factor analysis implemented to the scale, 4 factors were created. Table – 7 shows these 4 factors as well as the eigenvalues related to these factors, % variance explained and factor loadings (indicating which each items is associated with which factor). Total variance explained is %58.428.

Factor 1: Positive Sociocultural Impacts has Cronbach’s Alpha value as .799 and variance explained as %18.333. **Factor 2:** Negative Sociocultural Impacts has Cronbach’s Alpha value as .811 and variance explained as %18.237. **Factor 3:** Economic Impacts has Cronbach’s Alpha value as .614 and variance explained as %12.817. Lastly, **factor 4:** Environmental Impacts has Cronbach’s Alpha value as .630 and variance explained as %9.041.

Table – 7: Attitudes of Local People living in Antalya and Canakkale against the Impact of Tourism – Factor Analysis Results

Components	Expressions	Factor Loadings	% Varia. Explained	Eigen value	Cronb’s Alpha
Positive – Sociocultural Impacts	Development of tourism increases the public’s wishes to learn foreign languages and foreign cultures	,744	18,333	3,993	,799
	Development of tourism provides socializing with people from different cultures	,743			
	Development of tourism provides getting to know different cultures and life styles	,692			
	Development of tourism provides the participation of women in business life	,675			
	Development of tourism improves our social life	,622			
	Development of tourism provides additional business opportunities	,541			
Negative – Sociocultural Impacts	Development of tourism provides causes degeneration of moral values	,812	18,237	2,994	,811
	Development of tourism causes that local people emulate tourists negatively	,797			
	Tourism increases the use of alcohol and drugs	,723			
	Tourists’ disorderly behaviors to our traditions and life style causes cultural conflicts	,701			
	Development of tourism causes the changes on local people’s	,700			

	clothes negatively			
Economic Impacts	Tourism sector has a positive impact on the solution of unemployment problem	,780		
	Tourism provides the improvement of local economy	,691		
	Tourism sector has a positive impact on the increase in income	,630		
	Thanks to tourism sector, infrastructure developments (road construction, sewage system etc.) are increased.		12,817	1,231
Environmental Impacts	Development of tourism damages natural environment	,874		
	Development of tourism damages historical structures	,746	9,041	1,131
		Total	58,428	,614
Kaiser Meyer Olkin Sampling Adequacy		,828		
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square		3101,463		
df	120			
Sig.	,000			
Cronbach's Alpha		,715		

Based on the results of independent samples t-test and analysis of variance, statistically meaningful differences were determined between the attitudes of local people living in Antalya and Canakkale against to sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts of tourism.

Table – 8 demonstrates the differences between the local participants from Antalya and Canakkale for Factor 1: Positive Sociocultural Impacts. While the people of Antalya agree with the statement ‘Development of tourism increases the public’s wishes to learn foreign languages and foreign cultures’, the public of Canakkale more strongly agree with this statement. Likely, the people of Antalya agree with the statements ‘Development of tourism provides socializing with people from different cultures’, ‘Development of tourism provides getting to know different cultures and life styles’, ‘Development of tourism provides the participation of women in business life’ and ‘Development of tourism provides additional business opportunities’ whereas the people of Canakkale more strongly agree with these statements. All these findings show that there are differences between the attitudes of these two groups. However, the people from both Antalya and Canakkale agree with the statement ‘Development of tourism improves our social life’. Thus, there is no statistically meaningful difference for this statement for both group.

Table – 8: Factor 1 - Positive Sociocultural Impacts

Expressions	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Development of tourism increases the public's wishes to learn foreign languages and foreign cultures	Antalya	430	4,2070	1,02028	-4,173	,000
	Canakkale	240	4,4958	,75433		
Development of tourism provides socializing with people from different cultures	Antalya	430	4,1860	1,01632	-4,140	,000
	Canakkale	240	4,4667	,72531		
Development of tourism provides getting to know different cultures and life styles	Antalya	430	4,1093	1,11136	-5,446	,000
	Canakkale	240	4,4917	,70261		
Development of tourism provides the participation of women in business life	Antalya	430	3,9023	1,11558	-6,382	,000
	Canakkale	240	4,3917	,84631		
Development of tourism improves our social life	Antalya	430	4,0209	1,12070	-1,489	,137
	Canakkale	240	4,1513	1,01165		
Development of tourism provides additional business opportunities	Antalya	430	4,0814	1,09900	-2,819	,005
	Canakkale	240	4,3208	,96875		

Table – 9: Factor 2 – Negative Sociocultural Impacts

Expressions	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Development of tourism provides causes degeneration of moral values	Antalya	430	3,1140	1,34443	6,301	,000
	Canakkale	240	2,4333	1,33340		
Development of tourism causes that local people emulate tourists negatively	Antalya	430	3,2163	1,40999	5,955	,000
	Canakkale	240	2,5542	1,32453		
Tourism increases the use of alcohol and drugs	Antalya	430	3,2558	1,38747	3,662	,000
	Canakkale	240	2,8375	1,47030		
Tourists' disorderly behaviors to our traditions and life style causes cultural conflicts	Antalya	430	3,2372	1,34823	3,442	,001
	Canakkale	240	2,8583	1,39812		
Development of tourism causes the changes on local people's clothes negatively	Antalya	430	2,9977	1,48418	3,179	,002
	Canakkale	240	2,6208	1,44711		

Table – 9 compares the perceptions of the local participants from Antalya and Canakkale against to Factor 2: Negative Sociocultural Impacts. Based on the findings, there are meaningful differences between the perceptions of the local people from both Antalya and Canakkale for the five statements of Factor 2. While the public of Antalya is undecided about the statement 'Development of tourism provides causes degeneration of moral values', the people of Canakkale usually disagree with that. While the people of Antalya are undecided about the statement 'Development of tourism causes that local people emulate tourists negatively', the public of Canakkale usually disagree with that. The people of Antalya are usually undecided about the statements 'Tourism increases the use of alcohol and drugs' and 'Tourists' disorderly behaviors to our traditions and life style causes cultural conflicts' whereas the people of Canakkale partly disagree with these statements. While people of Antalya are undecided about the statement 'Development of tourism causes the

changes on local people's clothes negatively', the public of Canakkale states that they are usually disagree with this statement.

Table – 10: Factor 3 – Economic Impacts

Expressions	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Tourism sector has a positive impact on the solution of unemployment problem	Antalya	430	4,3698	,89052	1,815	,070
	Canakkale	240	4,2333	1,00404		
Tourism provides the improvement of local economy	Antalya	430	4,5349	,89934	-1,268	,205
	Canakkale	240	4,6125	,66899		
Tourism sector has a positive impact on the increase in income	Antalya	430	3,7791	1,34668	3,983	,000
	Canakkale	240	3,3083	1,52960		
Thanks to tourism sector, infrastructure developments (road construction, sewage system etc.) are increased	Antalya	430	3,9628	1,17015	-1,903	,058
	Canakkale	240	4,1250	,99001		

The comparison of the perceptions of the local participants from Antalya and Canakkale against to Factor 3: Economic Impacts is shown in Table – 10. For three statements 'Tourism sector has a positive impact on the solution of unemployment problem', 'Tourism provides the improvement of local economy' and 'Thanks to tourism sector, infrastructure developments (road construction, sewage system etc.) are increased', there is no statistically meaningful difference between the attitudes of the people from both Antalya and Canakkale. Both cities agree with these statements. However, different attitudes are valid between both groups for the statement 'Tourism sector has a positive impact on the increase in income'. While the people of Antalya strongly agree with this statement, the public of Canakkale is partly undecided about that.

Table – 11: Factor 4 – Environmental Impacts

Expressions	Location	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Development of tourism damages natural environment	Antalya	430	3,1977	1,37764	-1,130	,259
	Canakkale	240	3,3333	1,54883		
Development of tourism damages historical structures	Antalya	430	3,0558	1,41640	6,964	,000
	Canakkale	240	2,2625	1,40897		

Lastly, the comparison of the attitudes of the local participants from Antalya and Canakkale for Factor 4: Environmental Impacts is shown in Table – 11. For the first statement 'Development of tourism damages natural environment', there is no meaningful difference for both groups. The people from both Antalya and Canakkale are undecided about this statement. On the other hand, there is a meaningful difference for the statement 'Development of tourism damages historical structures'. The participants from Antalya are undecided about this statement whereas the public of Canakkale disagrees with that.

Conclusion and Discussion

In consequence of the tourism development in a destination; its social, cultural and environmental costs are increased. In other words, the negative impacts of tourism are increased as a result of exceeding the carrying capacity of the destination. This situation also initiates a decline in the destination's visitor rate (Ikiara and Okech, 2002). In order to provide tourism development in a best way, the negative impacts of tourism must be managed to minimize as well as the positive impacts must be accentuated (Archer et al., 2005, p. 79).

For the management of tourism or the enhanced planning, the solution might be shown as to create 'the responsible consumption of tourism' concept (Archer et al., 2005, p. 81). Therefore, it is aimed not only to achieve sustainable tourism management in a destination but also to enrich the life quality of local livelihoods there (Baysan, 2001, p. 219). Positive impacts of tourism can be greatly enhanced only through the protection or enhancement of the local people's existing assets and attributes. In this sense, it is significant to make careful design based on an understanding of local people (Ashley, 2000; Kreag, 2010). The tourism planning should be made after the attitudes of local people against the tourism impacts have been addressed. As a result, the involvement of local residents and the cooperation with tourism developers could be gained which is quite necessary to achieve sustainable tourism destinations (Brooks, 2001).

In this research, it is purposed to find out the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the local people. Thus, creating a roadmap for both future studies and tourism developers is aimed both to maximize the tourism's positive impacts and to minimize negative effects on local residents. Moreover, the research findings might be utilized to improve sustainable tourism strategies in the best way.

The surveys were conducted to the residents from both Antalya and Canakkale. During the sample selection, it is taken into consideration that the local participants have different demographic characteristics (gender, age, educational status etc.) almost with the same rate. As a result of the methodology, four factors were created as Positive Sociocultural Impacts, Negative Sociocultural Impacts, Economic Impacts and Environmental Impacts. Whole participants from both Antalya and Canakkale agree or strongly agree with the each statements of the first factor, Positive Sociocultural Impacts. Also, the local people in Canakkale disagree or partly disagree with each statements of the second factor, Negative Sociocultural Impacts whereas Antalya's participants are undecided all about these statements. Therefore, it is possible to say that the local residents in both Antalya and Canakkale (Canakkale is more strongly) do not believe the existence of tourism's negative impacts. For the third factor, Economic Impacts, both Antalya and Canakkale residents agree with the positive economic impacts of tourism except the statement 'Tourism sector has a positive impact on the increase in income'. Only the participants from Canakkale are undecided about this statement whereas the local people in Antalya again agree with that. Lastly, the local residents are undecided about each statements of the forth factor, Environmental Impacts while Canakkale is undecided about the statement 'Development of tourism damages natural environment'. Also, Canakkale disagrees with the statement 'Development of tourism damages historical structures' which again means they don't believe the tourism's negative impacts. Perception differences in the two destinations may be due to different backgrounds of tourism experiences. Antalya is already the most tourist

receiving city in Turkey and all- inclusive system is implemented heavily. In Canakkale, tourism is a newly developing industry, and identified as one of the target sectors.

According to the findings, it is possible to say that the local residents do generally have positive attitudes against to all the tourism impacts except the environmental ones. For the environmental impacts, there is neither negative nor positive attitudes of the local people who are mostly undecided. In other words, there is no negative impact of tourism on local livelihoods for sociocultural, economic and environmental terms. Only, it might be better that the tourism developers in Canakkale create strategies in order to increase local residents' income. New tourism investments (hospitality businesses), increasing employment opportunities, improving local food and beverage centers and selling the local products in the shopping centers etc. can be shown as instances. Also, sustainable tourism strategies might be prioritized as well as eco-friendly hospitality businesses and destinations might be created in order to protect from the damages on natural environment and historical structures.

This research includes only the local residents from two cities where Antalya and Canakkale due to the limitation of time and cost. In the future studies, new destinations as cities and countries might be added in order to enhance the research findings.

Note: This article has been supported as part of the Scientific Research Projects of Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University (Project No: 2011/087)

References

- Acharya, P. (2005). Socio-economic Impacts of Tourism in Lumbini, Nepal: A Case Study. *Dhaułagiri Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*. 1, 193-206.
- Alhasanat, S. (2010). Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism on the Local Community at Petra, Jordan. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 44(3), 374-386.
- ALTİD (Alanya Turistik İşletmeciler Derneđi) (2017). *2015 Ziyaretçi Sayıları*. Available: <http://www.altid.org.tr/tr/Turizm-Istatistikleri/1906-2015-Ziyaretci-Sayilari.html> (accessed March 14, 2017).
- Archer, B., Chris C. and Lisa R. (2005). *The positive and negative impacts of tourism*. Global Tourism Third edition. Edited by William F. Theobald.
- Ashley, C. (2000). The Impacts of Tourism on Rural Livelihoods: Namibia's Experience. *Overseas Development Institute*. Working Paper 128.
- Aydın, S. and Boz, M. (2006). The Importance of Alternate Types of Tourism in the Continuous Development of the Tourism Industry: Antalya Case. Paper presented at Turk-Kazakh International Tourism Conference: "New Perspectives and Values in World Tourism and Tourism Management in the Future, Alanya, Turkey, November 20-26, 2006.
- Bauer, I. (1999). Tourism in Developing Countries on the Health of the Local Host Communities: The need for more research. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*. 10(1), 1999.
- Baysan, S. (Külçür). (2001). Perceptions of the environmental impacts of tourism: a comparative study of the attitudes of German, Russian and Turkish tourists in Kemer, Antalya. *Tourism Geographies* 3(2), 218-235.

- Brooks, G. (2001). *Heritage at Risk from Tourism*. Available: <http://www.icomos.org/risk/2001/tourism.htm> (accessed June 16, 2016)
- Brunt, P. and Courtney, P. (1999). Host Perceptions of Sociocultural Impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 26(3), 493-515.
- Chandralal, K. P. L. (2010). Impacts of Tourism and Community Attitude towards Tourism: A Case Study in Sri Lanka. *South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage*. 3(2), 41 – 49.
- Cook, A. R., Laura J. Y. and Marqua, J. J. (2006). *Tourism: The Business of Travel*. Third Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Enemuo, O. B and Oduntan O. C. (2012). Social Impact of Tourism Development on Host Communities of Osun Oshogbo Sacred Grove. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (JHSS)*. 2(6), 30-35.
- European Commission. (2007). Environmental Impacts of Tourists. *BIO Intelligence Service*. 67, 2007.
- Fredline, L., Margaret D. and Leo J. (2006). Development of a Scale to Assess the Social Impact of Tourism within Communities. CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd 2006. Technical Reports ISBN 1 920704 60 4.
- Gumus, N. and Ozupekce, S. (2009). Foça'da Turizmin Ekonomik, Sosyal, Kültürel ve Çevresel Etkilerine Yönelik Yerel Halkın Görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi [Bağlantıda]*. 6:2. 398-417. Available <http://www.insanbilimleri.com> (accessed March 12, 2013).
- GVIC (Gawler Visitor Information Centre). (2016). *The Social & Cultural Impacts of Tourism, Tourism Fact Sheets 5*. https://vanweringh8.wikispaces.com/.../5_ (accessed July 14, 2016)
- Haley, A. J., Tim S., and Graham M. (2004). The Social Impacts of Tourism: A Case Study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 32(3), 647-668.
- Ikiara, M. and Okech, C. (2002). Impact of Tourism on Environment in Kenya: Status and Policy. *KIPPRA (Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis) Discussion Paper*. 19.
- Kabote, F. (2015). Tourism Development and Social Carrying Capacity of Zimbabwe's Victoria Falls Rural Peripheries. *International Journal of Safety and Security in Tourism/Hospitality*. 3(1).
- Kreag, G. (2010). *The Impacts of Tourism*. Available: <http://www.seagrant.umn.edu/tourism/pdfs/ImpactsTourism.pdf> (accessed May 16, 2010)
- Lamorski, T. and Dabrowski, P. (1977). Tourism and Its Impacts on Biodiversity. The Case Study of Babia Góra National Park / Biosphere Reserve Poland. Case study on Guidelines for the preparation of case studies. *International Workshop "Tourism in Mountain Areas" Ecological Tourism in Europe (ETE), Bonn-Germany*.
- Ozdemir, M. A. and Kervankiran, I. (2011). Determining the Attitudes of Local People Towards Tourism and Its Effects: A Case Study From Afyonkarahisar. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*. No.24, July 2011, 1-25.
- Pickering, C. M., Janice H. and Graeme W. (2003). Environmental Impacts of Tourism on the Australian Alps Protected Areas Judgments of Protected Area Managers. *Mountain Research and Development* 23(3), 247–254.

- Ratz, T. (2000). *The Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism Case of Balaton*. Research Support Scheme Electronic Library. <http://e-lib.rss.cz> (accessed May 10, 2010)
- Scowsill, D. (2015). *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2015*, United Kingdom. Report of WTTC. Foreword. *The Authority on World Travel & Tourism* (2015).
- Stynes, D. J. (1997). *Economic Impacts of Tourism: A Handbook for Tourism Professionals* Editor: Vanessa Arnold. *Tourism Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*.
- Taylor, J. E. (2010). *Technical Guidelines for Evaluating the Impacts of Tourism Using Simulation Models. Impact-Evaluation Guidelines Technical Notes No. IDB-TN-229*. Office of Strategic Planning and Development Effectiveness. Inter-American Development Bank.
- UNEP (United Nations Environment Program) (2016). *Impacts of Tourism*. Available: <http://www.unep.org/resourceefficiency/Business/SectoralActivities/Tourism/FactsandFigureaboutTourism/ImpactsofTourism/Socio-CulturalImpacts/tabid/78780/Default.aspx> (accessed July 14, 2016)
- UNWTO (2012). *UNWTO (World Tourism Organization) Annual Report 2011*. Madrid: UNWTO
- UNWTO (2013). *UNWTO (World Tourism Organization) Annual Report 2012*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D. and Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a Tourism Development Theory with Structural Equation Modeling. *Tourism Management*, 22 (2001) 363-372.