

Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism on Local People: Antalya Example*

Hande TOKDAŞ

MSc. Student, Ankara HBV University, Institute of Graduate Programs, Ankara, Türkiye, e-mail: hande.kilic135@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9724-4827>

Prof. Dr. Yüksel ÖZTÜRK

Ankara HBV University, Faculty of Tourism, Ankara, Türkiye, e-mail: yuksel.ozturk@hbv.edu.tr ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4320-5626>

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study is to analyze how tourism movements in the centre and districts of Antalya affect the local people and their feelings and thoughts about tourism. The research population consists of local people born and raised in Antalya and people living there for a long time. The study determined face-to-face interviews with 82 participants by snowball sampling between 01.02.2024 and 01.04.2024. Content analysis and descriptive analysis were applied to the data. Participants' perceptions and support for tourism development were examined through variables such as gender, age, place of birth, education level, life expectancy, profession, and interaction with tourists, and the hypotheses were tested. According to the research findings, 31 participants do not work in a tourism-related job, while 51 participants work in the tourism sector. While 98% of the participants who have relations with tourism stated that they want tourism to develop further in the region, 42% of participants who have no connection with tourism stated that they wish for further tourism development in the area. Local participants in the area have a more antagonistic approach to tourism development and support tourism development less than those who are not local. In addition, in line with the research findings, it was observed that individuals who interact with tourists approach the development of tourism more positively, and their support for tourism development is higher than individuals who do not interact with tourists.

Key Words: Tourism, Local People, Socio-Cultural Impact, Effects of Tourism, Antalya.

1. INTRODUCTION

The tourism industry, which plays an active and effective role in developing societies as a determinant of economic development, is supported by many countries and communities in line with the perceived positive effects (Özgüç, 2007). The primary purpose of the initiatives and plans is to accelerate the society's economic and social development process by increasing the positive effects obtained. Uncontrolled tourism plans cause adverse effects. As a result, it grows and negatively affects the local people (Akiş, 1999, p. 42). Studies have shown that individuals who have never had the opportunity to go on vacation for various reasons throughout their lives isolate themselves from society, adopt various bad habits, decrease the productivity of working individuals, and have various feelings such as grudge and hatred towards tourists, and their inability to go on vacation are practical in their inability to do so (Gürbüz, 2002; Mesci & Dönmez, 2016; Ayazlar, 2016; Shobha, 2019, p. 147, Yavuz & Unur, 2021). For this reason, various practices should be implemented and integrated into society to ensure that all individuals can go on vacation. The stakeholders' tendencies should be arranged to appeal to all segments of society,

* Produced from Hande TOKDAŞ's master's thesis.

preventing individuals from being ignored. If the benefits for local people exceed the damages, their perception and attitudes towards tourism development become more negative over time. Successful tourism development is achieved when all tourism stakeholders in the sector work together effectively (Ersoy, 2017, p. 109; Sert, 2024). Sector representatives, policymakers, local services and people come together on common ground and play an active role in the success and sustainability of tourism development initiatives. This study was carried out to examine the perceptions of local people living in Antalya city centre regarding the positive and negative effects resulting from tourism development and their participation in tourism development through variables such as gender, age, place of birth, education level, life expectancy, occupation and interaction with tourists.

COVID-19, which affected the whole world in 2020, has created a milestone and brought tourism, travel and accommodation activities to a standstill and while it has begun to introduce the concepts of isolated holidays, social distance, virtual experience, online visits, and online event to tourism literature, it has been observed that it shows signs of change. The structure prioritizing social contact, sharing, and local culture until COVID-19 has suddenly reversed, and traces of a new change have begun. UNWTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization) describes the new tourist profile with the following keywords; "independent, experienced, compatible with technology, expecting quality products and services, more active, open to getting to know other cultures, able to vacation more frequently during the year, sensitive to the environment and culture" (Cabirini, 2005 cited in: Emekli, İbrahimov & Soykan, 2006, p. 11).

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The growth and development of tourism as a social, economic and environmental activity, the change in its definitions and practices, and the diversification of geographical distribution date back to the 1950s. In these years, when the modern tourism paradigm was strengthened, vacationing, devoting time to tourism and vacation, having sufficient income, and having a suitable education and cultural level played an important role in this development. However, the developments in transportation and communication tools, the diversification of tourism organizations, the spread of industrialization and urbanization, and the ease of payment in holiday expenses (paid holidays, credit cards, instalments, and the increase in social tourism facilities) have added a different dimension to tourism in the increase and change of tourism demand (Zoğal & Emekli, 2017).

Tourism, also called the smokeless industry, is an important economic activity for many countries, with both positive and negative effects. If they have tourism potential, countries trying to industrialize turn to tourism, which is a part of the service sector, due to the foreign exchange requirement required to finance industrialization (Akış, 1996, p. 36; Sert & Sağlam, 2023).

The worldview and trends that emphasize individuality have paved the way for the differentiation of accommodation and travel demands in tourism, accelerating the emergence of some innovations other than traditional tourism practices and starting the post-modern era in tourism. Today, where the effects of globalization have strengthened, these differentiations have affected tourism as a concept in terms of supply, quality and quantity, changed the relations between place-local people and tourists, production and consumption patterns, and caused the emergence of new practices (Zoğal & Emekli, 2017; Dündar & Sert, 2018; Rol & Sert, 2023).

One of the first studies to systematically address the relationship between tourism development and the attitudes and behaviours of local people towards tourists was Butler's study, published in 1980, which attracted a lot of attention (Butler, 1980, p. 10). According to Butler's (1980) hypothesis, as the number of tourists coming to a region increases (as tourism develops), the public, who initially treated tourists with extraordinary tolerance, gradually becomes more

remarkable about the long-term benefits of tourism in economic, social and environmental terms. Therefore, their attitudes towards tourists change negatively. This is because even if the expected economic benefits from tourism development are obtained, the social and environmental costs, never considered or given much importance at the beginning, gradually come to the fore. Therefore, the public has become sceptical that tourists are a blessing. The result is that tourism in the region in question will begin to decline.

Parallel to the development of tourism, the view that the friendly interest shown by the local people to the tourists at the beginning turns into a negative attitude after a particular stage and from that point on, tourism starts to decline in that region has also been addressed in the models developed by Doxey and Murphy (Doxey, 1975, p. 196; Murphy, 1981, p. 190). Although it is possible to criticize such models in general because they evaluate the reaction of the local people in a straightforward framework, it can be said that they are helpful in systematically showing the attitude displayed (Akış, 1996, p. 15).

Tourism provides more employment for the local people, increases the real estate values in the destination, provides the opportunity for tax revenues to increase, contributes to the creation of more entertainment opportunities, provides the opportunity for the visual beautification of the region, helps to increase transportation opportunities in the destination, increases the opportunities of airports, allows for the increase of education opportunities at different levels, and contributes to the increase of the clothing and food sector. On the other hand, it requires additional infrastructure in the relevant destination (sewerage, police, fire department, school, airport works, etc.), causes an increase in crime rates, causes air, water and noise pollution as a result of crowding in the tourist area, causes divorces and social displacements in the society, causes living conditions to worsen, and causes an increase in expenses such as food, rent and transportation (Korkmaz, 1990, p. 407). Tourism's positive impact is evident in the balance of payments, employment, income, and production. Since tourism is a multidisciplinary activity involving various sub-industries and based on various skills, its benefits are spread to a broader section of society compared to other sectors of the economy (Saridoğan, 2019, p. 1310).

Failure to take measures to prevent tourism from causing such damage to the natural environment means that the country that hosts tourists is destroying the values that constitute its tourism supply with its own hands. In other words, the region will have consumed its tourist raw material and given up the economic, social and cultural benefits it will obtain from tourism (Güngör & Karakaş, 2015, pp. 24-25).

Some models have been developed to explain the relationship between tourism and the local people living in the region where it takes place. Doxey (1975) proposed the Tolerance Approach (Irridex Model) to explain the relationship between the effects of tourism and the attitudes of the local people towards tourism. This model argues that the local people's attitude towards tourism activities in that region can change through several stages. According to the author, this change occurs when the costs perceived by the local people exceed the perceived benefits. The stages include enthusiasm, indifference, discomfort and hostility (Özel, 2014, p. 55).

Pizam & Milman (1986, p. 30) argued that the social effects of tourism are never universal. In this sense, they stated that the social effects of tourism are determined within the framework of tourism activities, the cultural and economic distance between tourists and hosts, tourists not harming the desired local activities of the destination and its population, and the speed and intensity of tourism development.

According to Kozak & Nergis (2013, p. 12), due to the characteristics of tourism, socio-cultural and socio-economic interactions occur between individuals and communities visiting a destination and the local people who work in the industry and create a tourism product with the

cultural values it possesses.

According to Khan et al. (1990, p. 541), although tourism has positive social effects in terms of increasing people's interest in the world, understanding foreign and foreign tastes, the quality of the services offered (hotels, restaurants, etc.) and the quality of mass media; prostitution, nudity, deterioration of moral behavior, drug trafficking, theft, increased crime rate, changes in social and cultural values, decreasing the quality of works of art and issues related to their preservation can also cause some adverse social effects.

Theory Duran (2011, p. 298) also stated that "in tourist-local encounters, those who encounter are not tourists and locals, but their personalities, feelings, values, attitudes, behaviors and the cultures of the society they possess" is quite realistic. The status of the relationship established between tourists and locals, the factors that affect it, the behaviors that occur as a result of this relationship, and the results of these can occur in very different ways. While this relationship is sometimes very close and sincere, at other times, it can become a point where aggressive attitudes emerge, and hostility towards each other can progress (Rızaoğlu, 2012).

When visitors leave their hotels and beaches, especially when they rent a car and mingle with the local community to see the unknown aspects, they will meet and interact with local tradespeople; they will tend to talk to restaurateurs and even farmers and shepherds. As a result, foreign words may increase in the spoken language of the local people over time, and foreignization may occur in the language (Pala, 2019, p. 170).

Countries with different cultures, religions, worldviews, and rich traditions impress and inspire admiration from foreigners. Tourists visiting these countries may also find these new styles different from their own and adopt them. In addition, differences in the clothing and attire of foreigners may cause the people of the country or region to enter a negative attitude and behavioral psychology towards foreigners (Barutçugil, 1989, p. 31).

In a study conducted by Yavuz and Unur (2021, p. 645), it has been determined that participants who are involved in tourism think that the difficulties required by the tourism sector, such as long working hours, shift work, working even on official holidays and festivals cause the deterioration of family and kinship relations and that issues such as marriages with foreigners, the weakening of the strict authority of parents over children, and the decrease in the attachment of the young people to the home due to the opening of entertainment venues such as discos and nightclubs in the region come to the fore.

There has been a significant change in the society's traditional-custom structure in the regions opened to tourism. Women having the right to speak in the family, girls working in the tourism sector and marrying foreigners are a few of these (Kozak, Kozak & Kozak, 2010, p. 89).

It is necessary not to overlook the existence of a religious dimension in tourism movements. In their research, Göktaş & Türkeri (2016, p. 110) concluded that 'the high score of individuals aged 55 and over on the moral and cultural degeneration of tourism shows that individuals aged 55 and over have stereotyped ideas and are heavily affected by interfaith problems.'

Yavuz & Unur (2021, p. 648) stated in a study that they divided those who have and do not have a relationship with tourism into two groups; 'both groups think that tourism increases harmful habits and crime rates'. In addition, in the same study, the general opinion of the local people was expressed that 'harmful, bad habits such as alcohol and drugs have increased in tourist areas. The open entertainment venues also encourage people more; tourists and local young people always hang out in these places. Despite the necessary precautions taken by the police, people find the drug addict'.

When the studies in the literature (Gürbüz, 2002; Doğan, 2004; Uslu & Kiper, 2006; Mesci & Dönmez, 2016; Ayazlar, 2016; Yavuz & Unur, 2021) are taken into consideration, it is seen that the main difference between the perceptions of tourists and local people is that tourists mainly focus on the factors affecting the holiday experience in the changes experienced in tourism, while the perceptions of the local people are based on their quality of life. It is also emphasized that tourists and locals of the destination are affected by each other. However, the most affected group is the local people living in the region who accept tourists, and the lifestyle of the local people should be protected while benefiting from tourism. They believe that tourism, an important tool for recognizing different cultures, should be compatible with the destination's culture. In addition, according to the principles of global tourism ethics, it is emphasized that tourism activities should be planned in a way that will sustain and develop traditional cultural products rather than deteriorating or standardizing these values.

3. METHOD

This research is a descriptive type of research. Descriptive research is the expression of the current status of the object or phenomenon in the focus of the research (Coşkun, Altunışık & Yıldırım, 2017, p. 76).

Qualitative research is defined as research that is conducted to present perceptions and events realistically and holistically in a natural environment and uses qualitative data methods such as observation, interview and document analysis for the solution of a problem and follows a qualitative process (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016, p. 41). In this research, the interview technique, which is one of the qualitative data collection techniques, was used.

The Universe and Sample of Research

The application was in line with the purpose of research for the local people in Antalya province. Antalya province was chosen as the research universe because the region's tourism movement is intense, the sector constitutes the majority of employment, and it is a region where historical, cultural and natural beauties are prominent. According to data from the Antalya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, the length of Antalya's coasts is 640 km, including indentations and protrusions, and 500 km in straight lines. According to the data of 2023, its total population (the size of the research universe) is 2,696,249 people. The history of tourism activity is quite old, and it is a destination that has made Turkey's voice heard worldwide in tourism.

The research used a sampling method instead of reaching the entire universe due to time, cost, and accessibility reasons. The convenience sampling method was used to determine the sample from the universe, and a survey was conducted by reaching 82 people selected with this method.

Creation of the Survey Form

The survey used in the research consists of four sections. In the first section, twenty questions were asked to determine the social and economic sensitivity level of the local people; in the second section, ten questions were asked to determine the attitude level of the local people towards the development of tourism; in the third section, seven questions were asked to determine the cultural and emotional sensitivity level, and in the fourth section, ten disaster closed-ended questions were asked to measure the effects of tourism on the local people. Then, to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants, questions were asked about gender, age, marital status, education level, occupation, income level and the duration of living in the region. Finally, an open-ended question was asked under the heading of the issue that the participants would like to add so that they could explain their thoughts more clearly. The judgments stated in the survey were rated with a 5-point Likert-type scale. Here, in determining the socio-cultural impacts of tourism, local people were asked to mark their attitudes on the

subject according to their level of agreement with the statements "1. Strongly Agree, 2. Agree, 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4. Disagree, 5. Strongly Disagree".

Data Collection Method

A survey was used as the data collection method in this research, which aims to determine the socio-cultural effects of tourism on local people. The survey technique was preferred because it is economical, more reliable in accessing data, and provides collective access to the opinions of different individuals.

4. FINDINGS

All participants interviewed face to face within the scope of the research have been living in Antalya for at least 11 years, and 20 of the 51 participants out of 82 who are directly related to tourism are male, and 31 are female. The participants are between the ages of 25-55, and the average age is 40. Forty-three are married, 42 have undergraduate degrees, and 7 have postgraduate degrees.

The number of male interviewees is 32; 15 of them were born and raised in Antalya. Twelve of them are married, 20 of them are single. Nine of them are civil servants in institutions affiliated with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 1 retired from tourism, two are unemployed, and 20 are working in tourism businesses. Of the male participants, 1 has a postgraduate degree, 16 are university graduates, and 15 are high school graduates.

The number of female interviewees is 50; 27 were born and raised in Antalya. Thirty-one of them are married, 19 of them are single. Seven female participants are civil servants in institutions affiliated with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 4 participants are retired, 2 participants are unemployed, 4 participants are doctors, 1 participant is a lawyer, 1 participant is a banker, and 31 participants work in tourism businesses. 6 of the female interviewees are postgraduate graduates, 26 are university graduates, and 18 are high school graduates.

Demographic data of the participants obtained as a result of the study are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	Group	Number
Gender	Female	50
	Male	32
Marital Status	Married	43
	Single	34
Education Level	High School	34
	University	41
	Postgraduate	7
Working Sector	Lawyer	1
	Banker	1
	Civil Servant (Ministry of Culture and Tourism)	16
	Doctor	4
	Retired	2
	Unemployed	4
	Worker in Tourism Enterprise	54
Monthly Income Level	1-17.000	8
	17.001-35.000	40
	35.001-51.000	13

	51.000 and above	21
Life Expectancy in Antalya	11-15 years	20
	16-20 years	18
	Since Birth	44

The participants generally complained that tourism in Antalya does not benefit the locals because of the five-star all-inclusive accommodation establishments that squeeze tourists into four walls. The participant was disturbed by the tourists' clothing, which is against the traditions of the local people, and he shared his observation that the locals are affected by these and that there are adverse effects on their clothing and morale. He also mentioned his observations that since they are in another country and behave more comfortably, it spoils the local people's morality, and there are even conflicts within the family.

When we evaluate in general, male participants commented that tourism has more positive aspects because it prioritizes the economic dimension. Female participants commented that it has more negative aspects because it prioritizes the religious and moral dimensions of the region and its traditions and customs.

Table 2. Participant's Social and Economic Sensitivity Level

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Tourism improves the quality of life of local people.	55	12	6	4	5
2. Tourism provides more significant economic gains to local people.	60	9	10	2	4
3. Tourism helps revitalize the local economy.	58	8	10	4	2
4. Tourism creates new job opportunities for local people.	60	8	6	5	3
5. Tourism makes it easier for local people to reach tourist attractions in the city.	49	15	8	6	4
6. The development of tourism allows more investment to be made in the region.	58	10	5	7	2
7. Tourism diversifies the leisure time opportunities of local people.	47	11	14	5	5
8. Tourism enables local people to meet different cultures.	54	9	11	4	4
9. Tourism enables the development of cultural activities.	50	12	9	7	4
10. Tourism positively affects the behavior of local people.	43	16	16	2	5
11. Tourism increases environmental awareness.	44	13	15	2	8
12. Tourism supports the protection and development of the natural environment.	45	13	10	5	9
13. More effort should be made to develop the tourism sector.	51	12	9	7	3

14. Tourism enables the development of cultural activities.	55	1	9	4	3
15. Tourism increases the production of local products.	53	1	12	1	6
16. Tourism causes environmental pollution (soil, air, water, etc.).	24	1	10	7	24
17. Tourism creates problems such as crowding, noise pollution, etc.	27	1	16	8	18
18. It increases the entertainment and leisure opportunities of local people.	32	1	13	12	11
19. It negatively affects the attitudes and behaviors of local people.	16	1	16	9	26
20. It causes social problems such as crime, prostitution, and drugs.	21	8	22	11	20

When the survey results are evaluated in detail, it is observed that the people living in the region for 11 years support the development of tourism in the region economically but are more hesitant about the social structure of the society compared to the people who were born and raised in the region. The local people think that tourism harms the people's moral values, but they also support its development due to its economic benefits.

Table 3. Participant's Attitudes Towards Tourism Development

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think tourism has a vital role in my region	63	6	7	2	4
2. It is the right decision for the government to support tourism in my region.	67	6	5	2	2
3. I have more tourist activity opportunities thanks to tourism in my region.	44	24	9	3	2
4. More waste has been created in my region due to tourism.	34	10	27	8	3
5. The tourism industry provides the desired employment opportunities in my region.	40	24	10	4	4
6. Tourism has increased my standard of living in my region.	40	20	13	6	3
7. My region's public service quality has increased thanks to tourism.	41	14	14	11	2
8. The benefits of tourism outweigh the negative consequences of tourism development.	40	10	18	4	10
9. Tourism negatively affects the environment.	19	6	16	7	34
10. Tourism has increased the crime rate in my region.	18	6	14	5	39

When the survey results were evaluated in detail, it was observed that the region's locals generally supported tourism development. However, at the same time, they were concerned about the negative returns of tourism. It was observed that 51 people currently working in

tourism enterprises, compared to other participants, ignored the negative returns of tourism. However, it supported tourism development in the region economically and socially.

Table 4. Participant's Cultural and Emotional Sensitivity Level

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.	52	16	6	5	3
2. I made friends with some visitors in Antalya.	39	18	13	4	8
3. I am proud that visitors come to Antalya.	58	8	7	5	4
4. I respect the values of people from different cultures.	58	13	7	2	2
5. I think Antalya benefits from hosting visitors.	47	19	4	7	5
6. I appreciate visitors because they contribute to the local economy.	49	16	11	3	3
7. I respect the behavior of people from different cultures.	54	13	6	6	3

When the survey results are evaluated in detail, it is observed that the locals' emotional and cultural sensitivity level towards tourism and tourists is generally high. The local people generally respect the values and cultures of tourists, communicate with them and want tourism development to be supported. It was observed that the ideas and answers of the 39 single participants who participated in the survey were very close to each other on this issue. Almost everyone respected tourists' values by making friends and even enjoyed it. In addition, the participants' education levels were also emphasized in this section, and it was observed that participants with a bachelor's degree and above had a higher level of sensitivity regarding tourism than others. Almost all participants with a bachelor's degree and above agreed with the questions about communication with tourists. Based on these results, it is also possible to conclude that 'the level of emotional sensitivity increases with the increase in the level of education'.

Table 5. Participant's Views on the Impact of Tourism on Local People

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Tourism affects daily conversation	41	15	12	11	3
2. Tourism affects clothing	47	17	11	3	4
3. Tourism affects family relationships	26	7	16	7	26
4. Tourism affects traditions and customs	27	12	14	14	15

5. Tourism affects culinary culture	30	13	12	14	13
6. Tourism affects eating out	30	13	10	17	12
7. Tourism affects moral values	21	11	24	9	17
8. Tourism affects religious values	15	11	17	17	22
9. Tourism increases harmful habits	18	13	10	19	22
10. Tourism affects crime rates	15	12	13	16	26

When the survey results are evaluated in detail, the effects of tourism on the local people are observed more dominantly by the people born and raised in the region. All participants have lived in Antalya for at least 11 years and are now considered locals. However, significant differences were observed in their responses from those born and raised in the region. Therefore, it may be possible to conclude that 'the views of the local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a significant difference depending on whether the participants are locals of the region or not' in line with these results.

5. CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of this study is to determine how tourism movements and tourists coming to the region affect the local people in the centre and districts of Antalya and how tourism movements affect the social life of the local people by analyzing the feelings and thoughts of the local people about tourism. It aims to reveal how local people have personally experienced and observed the effects of tourism on the region and how they perceive the effects of tourism from the perspective of the people who have lived there for a long time. Another purpose of this study is to determine whether the evaluation of the socio-cultural effects of tourism movements towards Antalya differs according to whether the participants earn direct income from tourism or not. In line with this purpose, one-on-one interviews were conducted with the local people who lived in Antalya and continue to live there before the international tourism movements towards Antalya started.

The study's objective is to determine the effects of tourism movements on the social life of the local people in Antalya. According to the research findings, 31 participants do not work in a tourism-related job, while 51 participants work in the tourism sector. While 98% of the participants who are involved in tourism stated that they want tourism to develop more in the region, 42% of the participants who are not involved in tourism stated that they want tourism to develop more in the region. The study will likely contribute to sustainability efforts in determining local people's perceptions of tourism.

In the study, women opposed the increase in cafeterias and bars, concerned that noise pollution and road safety would decrease and immorality would increase. At the same time, men supported it with the expectation that their businesses would open up. Milman and Pizam (1995) also concluded in their studies that gender is an important factor in determining the perception of the economic benefits of tourism and that women are more against the development of tourism than men.

The negative perception of the local people hinders the support for tourism development and is in the direction of preventing tourism development. Therefore, to prevent a decrease in support for tourism development, it is necessary to eliminate the negative perception, minimize the perceived adverse effects and ensure that the positive effects are seen. Local governments, policymakers, planners and entrepreneurs can see under what conditions the local people's perspective and support for tourism development change through studies carried out in this direction and can implement the necessary improvements (Akiş, 1999, p. 42). It will be possible to ensure that the initiatives and investments to be made are successful only by considering the

local people's expectations and requests. In addition, the local people can be included in the plans to be made, their opinions can be obtained, and more successful initiatives can be realized in the tourism planning process.

In order to obtain healthy results from the studies carried out to determine the perception and support of the local people towards tourism development, to ensure a balanced distribution of the development obtained from tourism, and to develop appropriate solutions to existing problems, local governments and local people must be willing and even work together.

In the study, perception and support for tourism development were evaluated using variables such as age, place of birth, level of education, occupation, interaction with tourists, and gender. In future studies, the relationship between perception and support for tourism development can be examined by adding variables such as commitment to the community, personal benefit, satisfaction with tourism development and destination life course, which are included in the relevant literature. In addition, the study was conducted only with local people residing in Antalya province. Local people residing in all districts of Antalya province can be included in the studies, the number of samples can be increased, and it can be seen whether the obtained results will change. The studies can be conducted with specific time intervals, the obtained results can be compared, and whether there are differences between periods can be tested. In future studies, the problems perceived by local people can be determined by choosing the qualitative method, correct evaluations can be made by establishing a cause-effect relationship and solution suggestions can be presented on the subject.

In this study, a survey was conducted in Antalya, one of the regions where tourism has been intensively carried out for many years, to obtain information about the views of the local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism. The selected region is a region that can be preferred in all seasons of the year due to its historical, natural beauty, and climate. It is a destination where mass tourism is prevalent. It also has an important position in domestic and foreign tourism activities. According to Erkuş Öztürk (2010), the Antalya region has been a tourism destination since the 1960s and showed significant development with the Southwest Antalya Tourism Development Project of the central government in the 1970s. In the 1980s, it was accepted as a turning point in this region, like many other tourism centres in our country, with the Tourism Incentive Law (Ersoy, 2017, p. 109).

REFERENCES

- Akış, S. (1996). Turizmin ekonomik, sosyal ve çevresel etkileri. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(2), 10-15.
- Akış, S. (1999). Sürdürülebilir turizm ve Türkiye. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10(1), 36-46.
- Ayazlar, G., & Arslan Ayazlar, R. (2016). Yerel halkın turizmin etkilerine yönelik tutumunda aidiyet duygusu ve yaşam tatmininin rolü, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(4), 1451-1470.
- Barutçugil, İ. S. (1989). *Turizm İşletmeciliği*. Ankara: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.
- Briedenhann, J. & Wickens, E. (2004). Kırsal alanların ekonomik kalkınması için bir araç olarak turizm rotaları-canlı bir umut mu yoksa imkânsız bir hayal mi? *Turizm İşletmeciliği*, 25(1), 71-79.
- Coşkun, R., Altunışık, R. & Yıldırım, E. (2017). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri SPSS Uygulamalı*, (9. Baskı), Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık.

- Doğan, H. Z. (2004). *Turizmin Sosyo-Kültürel Temelleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Duran, E. (2011). Turizm, kültür ve kimlik ilişkisi; turizmde toplumsal ve kültürel kimliğin sürdürülebilirliği, *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(19), 289-313
- Dündar, Y., & Sert, A. N. (2018). Yerel halkın yavaş (sakin) şehir hakkındaki algıları: Seferihisar’da nitel bir araştırma. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), 74-91.
- Emekli, G. ve İbrahimov, A. & Soykan, F. (2006). Turizmde küreselleşmeye coğrafi yaklaşımlar ve Türkiye. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi*, 15(1-2), 1-16.
- Erkuş-Öztürk, E. 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.
- Ersoy, H. (2017). *Turizmin gelişiminin yerel halk üzerine sosyo-kültürel etkileri: Manavgat örneği* (Master's thesis, İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University (Turkey)).
- Gürbüz, A. (2002). Turizmin sosyal çevreye etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Teknoloji Dergisi*, (1-2), 49-59.
- <https://www.unwto.org/news/international-tourism-to-reach-pre-pandemic-levels-in-2024#:~:text=Looking%20Ahead%20to%202024,economic%20and%20geopolitical%20downside%20risks>. Erişim tarihi: 03.05.2024
- Karakaş, A. & Güngör, H. Y. (2015). Turizm faaliyetlerinin çevreye etkisi, *Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi Çevre Sorunları Sempozyumu*. 24-25 Mart 2015 Diyarbakır.
- Khan, H., Seng, C. F. & Cheong, W. K. (1990). The social impact of tourism on Singapore. *The Service Industries Journal*, 10 (3), 541-548
- Korkmaz, S. (1990). Turizmin ekonomik ve sosyal etkileri. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 46: 391-417.
- Kozak, M. A., Evren, S. & Çakır, O. (2013). Tarihsel süreç içinde turizm paradigması. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 24(1), 7-22.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A. & Kozak, M. (2010). *Genel turizm ilkeler kavramlar*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Mesci, M. & Dönmez, G. (2016). Turizmin bölgesel kalkınma ve yerel halk üzerindeki etkisi: Mudurnu örneği, *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16(2), 21-50.
- Özgüç, N. (2007). *Turizm Coğrafyası*. İstanbul: Çantay Kitabevi.
- Pala, G. (2019). *Yerel Halkın Turizmin Sosyokültürel Etkilerine Bakışı İle Kültürel Duyarlılık Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki*, (Master's thesis, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).
- Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1986). The social impacts of tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 11(1), 29-33.
- Rızaoğlu, B. (2012). *Turizm Davranışı*, (3. Baskı), Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Rol, S., & Sert, A. N. (2023). The Role of official websites in destination branding: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Management and Economic Studies*, 5(2), 113-135.
- Sarıdoğan, H. Ö. (2019). Turizmin ekonomik etkileri: Akdeniz ülkeleri örneği. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 21(4), 1308-1315.
- Sert, A. N. (2024). Rural tourism as promoter of rural development: A conceptual

overview. *Journal of Management and Economic Studies*, 6(4), 370-379.

Sert, A. N., & Sağlam, Ş. B. (2023). Konaklama işletmelerinde dijital pazarlama araçlarının kullanımı: Ankara Örneği. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(4), 2996-3010.

Shobha, K. B. (2019). A case study on irritation among local people towards the growth of tourism in Kodagu district: With the reference of Doxey's Irridex model. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies*, 6(1), 146-148.

Şimşek, K., & Yıldırım, N. (2016). Bilim ve teknoloji parklarında inovasyona açık olmanın getirdiği kısıtlamalar. *Procedia-Sosyal ve Davranış Bilimleri*, 235, 719-728.

Yavuz, H. & Unur, K. (2021). Alanya'da yerel halkın turizmin sosyo-kültürel etkilerini algılamalarına yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 18(3), 633-655.

Zoğal, V. & Emekli, G. (2017). Yaratıcı turizme kavramsal ve coğrafi bir yaklaşım. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi*, 26(1), 21-34.