



Research Article

**TOTAL TOURISM IMPACT PERCEIVED BY LOCAL PEOPLE: A RESEARCH IN GIRE SUN,
TURKEY**

Kemal ENES^{1*} (orcid.org/ 0000-0003-3488-314X)

Bayram KANCA² (orcid.org/ 0000-0002-0398-8152)

¹Tarsus University, Vocational School, Department of Transportation Services Mersin, Turkey

²Giresun University Faculty of Tourism Recreation Management Department, Giresun, Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effects of tourism on the environment, the economy and the cultural structure of the region and to reveal the perspective of the local people on tourism by determining the views of the local people living in the province of Giresun, which has the potential to be an important tourism destination. The quantitative research method, descriptive research approach and survey model were used in the study. In the study, the data were collected by the questionnaire technique. The population of the research was defined as the local people living in Giresun province. In the study, the convenience sampling method was chosen from non-probability sampling methods. Data were collected between January and March of 2022. Considering the research findings, the people of Giresun generally have a positive perception of tourism. Therefore, the results of this research are consistent with the research results in the literature.

Keywords: Tourism Perception, Destination, Tourism Impact, Local People, Giresun

* Sorumlu yazar: bayram.kanca@giresun.edu.tr

DOI: 10.33083/joghat.2022.194

Introduction

In recent years, rather than mass tourism, it has been observed that the demand has increased for regions that have not been exposed to deterioration due to the intense impact of social, cultural, environmental and architectural tourism (Unur et al., 2017). The fact that alternative tourism types have started to be preferred has allowed the emergence of new destinations. In regions where there are tourism activities, positive or negative changes are experienced over time (Gündüz, 2018). These changes can occur in environmental, social and cultural areas, primarily in the economy (Perdue et al., 1990; Fesenmaier, 1996; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Haley et al., 2005; Murphy, 2013). All these positive or negative changes affect the lives of the local people, and their approach to tourism directly affects the development process of tourism therefore this situation in that region (Özaltın Türker and Türker, 2014). In a destination where the local people do not approach tourism positively and do not support tourism activities, it will not be possible to achieve sufficient development in this sector (Gürsoy et al., 2010). Therefore, it is undesirable for tourism to have negative effects. As a result of this situation, researches on the different dimensions of tourism perception and attitudes of local people living in newly opened destinations have increased in recent years (Duran and Özkul, 2012; Kozak, et al., 2015; Toprak, 2015; Şanlıoğlu and Erdem, 2017; Ünal and Yücel, 2018; Erkişiç, 2019).

The long-term protection of the values that make up the tourism potential, the sustainable development of tourism, the full support of the local people to the development of tourism, is only possible by ensuring the participation of the local people in every stage of tourism planning, determining their perspective on tourism and their expectations from tourism (Mansuroğlu, 2006; Çelikkanat and Güler, 2014; Güneş and Alagöz, 2018). Examining the perceptions and attitudes of local people towards tourism development is important for the sustainability of tourism development in destinations (Ataman and Özer, 2020). Especially in destinations where alternative tourism types are developed, tourist-local people interaction occurs more because people who are not directly involved in the tourism industry contact tourists (Akış, et al., 1996). For this reason, there may be a potential for tourism to have a greater impact on the lives of local people in destinations that host alternative tourism types. Giresun is a city at the beginning of the destination life cycle. There is not enough tourism infrastructure and superstructure in the destination, and a tourism sector is tried to be created under the leadership of local governments and with the incentives of regional development agencies. This study aims to determine the effects of tourism on the environment, the economy and the cultural structure of the region and to reveal the perspective of the local people on tourism by determining the views of the local people living in the province of Giresun, which has the potential to be an important tourism destination with its nature, rural life, springs, protected island ecology and cultural elements.

Conceptual Framework

In order for tourism to be developed in a region, many components (tourism infrastructure, attractions, urban infrastructure, etc.) should support each other (Alaeddinoğlu, 2007). One of these components is the tourism perception of the local people and what they expect from tourism. When the local people in a destination can take a role in the tourism development process and have a positive attitude towards tourism development, tourism can develop successfully in that region (Lepp, 2007; Ambroz, 2008; Güneş, 2014). Therefore, the perceptions and behaviors of the local people towards tourism are important for the successful policies, planning, execution and marketing processes of current and future tourism programs (Ko and Stewart; 2002; Güneş, 2014; Bilgin and Çetinkaya, 2017). According to Inskip (1991), it is important for the sustainability of tourism to make tourism planning together with the local people. Therefore, the planning process should be conducted in a way that is sensitive to social values, which minimizes the negative effects of tourism development, which preserves and sustains the existing historical, cultural and environmental wealth of the society (Inskip, 1991; McIntyre, 1993). Development strategies carried out without proper planning may lead to an unhealthy development process for the society and deviations from social goals.

The origins of studies on the perceptions or attitudes of local people regarding the effects of tourism date back to the 1970s (Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Kuvan and Akan, 2005). In related studies, the effects of tourism have been evaluated under different dimensions. These dimensions are; economic effects, social effects, cultural effects and environmental effects (Jurowski and Gürsoy, 2004; Vargas-Sanchez et al., 2009; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012; Styliadis et al., 2014). These effects of tourism can be either positive or negative (Prayag et al., 2013).

In the tourism literature, economic effects have been the subject of more research than socio-cultural and environmental effects (Mason, 2003). Tourism activities have both positive economic effects; “its effect on the balance of payments”, “added value on national income”, “impact on employment”, effect on balanced

interregional development”, “effect on other sectors” and “incentive for investments” (Upchurch and Teivane, 2000; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Avcıkurt, 2003; Tosun et al., 2003; Wall and Mathieson, 2006; Ardaheay, 2011; Ünlüönen et al., 2014; Usta, 2014; Çolak, 2017; Kozak et al., 2017) and negative economic effects; “inflation”, opportunity cost”, “overdependence on tourism” and “seasonality” (Çalışkan, 2003; Mason, 2003; İçöz, 2005; Wall and Mathieson, 2006; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012; Bahar and Kozak, 2013; Korkmaz and Güngör, 2015). Economic contributions are considered by the locals as the most important tourism impact (Davis, Allen and Consenza, 1988). Because tourism is seen as one of the easiest ways to raise the living standards of a region and to strengthen the local people economically (Duran and Özkul, 2012). Akış, Peristanis and Warner (1996), in their research on the Greek and Turkish communities living in Cyprus, found that a negative perception caused by the decrease in the tourism development process from high-paid jobs to low-paid jobs, the increase in tax liabilities, and the change in local social and economic statuses and accordingly, they determined that a negative attitude emerged.

Tourism activities are a socio-cultural phenomenon that affects the traditions, lifestyles, beliefs and values of the local people in the region (Garcia et al., 2015). Tourism activities have positive and negative socio-cultural impacts on the local people. The positive socio-cultural effects of tourism can be listed as promoting peace, contributing to the protection of women's rights, encouraging the participation of local people, enabling the emergence of new occupational groups, strengthening family and community ties, increasing social interaction between communities, increasing activities for traditional art products of the region, increasing the historical and cultural values of the local people, to see different cultures, get to know different cultures and make new friends (Perdue et al., 1990; McCool and Martin, 1994; Çalışkan, 2003; Dyer et al., 2007; Çolak, 2017; Kim, 2002; Çelikkanat, 2015; Erdem, 2017). The negative socio-cultural effects of tourism are stated as causing the change and loss of local values and local identity, cultural items becoming commercial commodities, corrupting the native language of the region that accepts tourists, causing moral deterioration, increasing crime rates, and increasing xenophobia (Prentice, 1993; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Çalışkan, 2003; Almeida-Garcia et al., 2016; Filiz, 2017).

It is expected that the correct planning and control of tourism development will contribute to the sustainable use of the environment. The positive effects of tourism activities on the environment are the preservation of the natural, historical and cultural architectural features of the destination, the increase of environmental awareness and quality, the improvement and development of the infrastructure, the protection of wild life, the restoration of historical places, the increase in activities for the protection of the environment (Yoon et al., 2001; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Avcıkurt, 2003; Tuna, 2007; Vargas-Sanchez, Plaza-Mejia and Porrás-Bueno, 2009; Kozak, et al., 2017). However, tourism activities can also have negative effects on the environment. According to some researchers, environmental problems such as environmental pollution, ecological degradation and destruction of natural life, traffic congestion and noise increase with the development of tourism in a region (Latkova and Vogt, 2012; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2010). Liu et al. (1987) in their study in Hawaii, North Wales and İstanbul determined that local people think that despite the economic benefits of tourism, it has some negative environmental effects consisting of garbage, waste and degeneration of natural life.

In the literature, it is seen that researches on tourism perception are examined in the axis of various models. Doxey's irridex model was the first model used in tourism (Butler, 1980; Brida et al., 2011). With the Doxey's (1975) Irridex Model, local people in the regions where tourism develops stated that they experienced some phases and named these phases as “contentment”, “indifference”, “irritation” and “hostility” in the model. Long, Perdue and Allen (1990) developed Doxey's model and found that the tourism attitudes of the local people were positive in the early stages of the tourism development process, but turned into negative in the later stages. Var et al. (1985), in a study they conducted on local people living in Marmaris, determined that in regions where tourism started to develop, local people perceived tourism as a sector that increases accommodation and hospitality services, thus generating additional income, creating new job opportunities and reducing unemployment.

Butler's (1980) destination life cycle model has also similar assumptions. The cycle consists of six stages. With the beginning of the tourism activity in a region, the local people's approach to tourism becomes positive due to the positive economic effects and the interest in tourists (Keogh, 1990). The potential benefit that tourism is thought to bring to the destination is explained as the reason for the positive perception. According to the cycle, after the tourism activities in the destination reach a certain point, the course of tourism perception can turn from positive to negative. Butler (1980) states that this turning point is the stage of development. The researcher states that the main factor affecting the perception of the local people regarding the effects of

tourism is the effects of tourism on their personal living spaces. The tourism perception of the local people begins to differ with the negative effects of tourism on the social, economic and natural environment. In such a case, the support of the local people to tourism gradually decreases and even stops (Brida et al., 2011; Sirakaya et al., 2002).

Some studies in the literature have tested the destination life cycle model and found that the tourism perception is positive in some destinations during the stagnation period, despite the location of the life course and the high level of tourism activities (Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997). Based on such criticisms, the assumptions of various theories such as commitment theory, compensatory theory, conflict theory, attribution theory, and cause-effect chain theory have been tested to explain perception and the concepts that cause perception in the literature on tourism perception (Preister, 1989; Ap, 1992; Andereck et al., 2005; Andriotis, 2005; Nunkoo and Ramkisson, 2009; Brida et al., 2011). This comparison problem in the literature has been overcome by adapting the social exchange theory to tourism (Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997; Chen, 2001; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Gürsoy and Rutherford, 2004; Andereck et al., 2005; Vargas-Snachez et al., 2009; Brida et al., 2011; Park et al., 2017). According to the theory of social change, local people support the development of tourism to the extent that they have the idea that the positive results of tourism in these different domains will outweigh the negative aspects, are included in the tourism development process, and benefit from the development of the sector in the region (Ap, 1992; Getz, 1994; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Gürsoy et al., 2010; Park et al., 2017). In their research conducted in Bodrum, Cengiz and Kırkbir (2007) determined that the most important effect of tourism is environmental effects, followed by social, cultural and economic effects, respectively, and the total effect of tourism affects the support of local people to tourism in a positive way. In their research conducted in Santiponce (Spain), Oviedo-García et al. (2008) found that the perceptions of the effects of tourism vary according to the state of benefiting from tourism, but those who are more concerned with tourism planning are those who do not directly benefit from tourism; that people who directly benefit from tourism ignore the negative consequences of tourism. Although there are studies claiming the opposite of this assumption (Teye et al., 2002), considering a significant part of the studies, it can be said that thinking that the tourism industry will contribute to the region in the future will lead to a positive attitude towards the concept of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005). In this respect, it is thought that it would be more consistent to test the social exchange theory in regions where tourism has not yet developed (Park and Sutowski, 2009).

When the studies in the literature are examined in detail, it is seen that the perceptions and attitudes of the local people about the effects of tourism have turned from positive to negative and have turned into the belief that they cause irreversible destruction in the long term (Duran and Özkul, 2012). As a matter of fact, the support of the local people for tourism development is necessary for a successful and sustainable tourism development (Yoon et al., 2001). The support of local people to tourism is shaped according to social, cultural, economic and environmental results (Liu et al., 1987; Perdue et al., 1990; McCool and Martin, 1994). Understanding the support of local people for tourism development is important for local governments, policymakers and employers. The active support of the local people ensures that the development is successful and sustainable. The occurrence of the opposite situation may prevent or completely stop the development. It is possible that societies that perceive change as a problem have a negative attitude towards tourism development (Andriotis, 2005). In a study they conducted in Kuşadası, Çavuş and Tanrısevdi (2002) found that there is a relationship between the age of the local people and the length of time they have lived in the region and their attitudes towards tourism development. According to this; It has been determined that the perceptions and attitudes of the people living in Kuşadası towards tourism development change negatively as the length of time they live in the region.

Methodology

Quantitative research method, descriptive research approach and survey model were used in the study (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012; Altunışık et al., 2012). In the study, the data were collected by the questionnaire technique. The survey consists of two parts. In the first part, there are questions about determining some demographic characteristics of the participants. In the second part of the questionnaire, there is a scale measuring the perception of the local people regarding the total tourism impact. The scale used to measure the perception of the local people regarding the total tourism impact was prepared by using the studies in the literature (Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Unur et al., 2017; Özyurt, 2018). There are 47 items in the scale, and the response categories are subject to a 5-point Likert rating (1: Strongly Disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Undecided, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly Agree). The prepared questionnaire was finalized in line with expert opinions. It was evaluated ethically by Giresun University Science and Engineering Sciences Research Ethics Committee dated

December 1, 2021, and numbered 17/13. In the study, the convenience sampling method was chosen from non-probability sampling methods (Altunışık et al., 2012; Büyüköztürk et al., 2018). The population of the research was defined as the local people living in Giresun province. Data were collected between January and March in 2022 using face-to-face and drop-collect methods.

Results

Within the scope of the research, 449 questionnaires were applied in the different regions of Giresun province. 48 of these questionnaires were eliminated due to missing data and extreme values. To find an extreme value all the questionnaire has been analyzed with the explore options. If a questionnaire had extreme values in more than 3 questions, it was excluded from the assessment. The remaining analyzes were made with questionnaires provided by 401 participants. It is seen that 176 (43.9%) of the participants were female, 225 (56.1%) were male and 206 (51.4%) of them were married and 195 (48.6%) were single.

The ages of the participants are between 18 and 62, of which 103 25.7% (103 people) are between 18 and 24 years old, 26.9% (108 people) are between 25 and 30, 13.7% (55 people) are between 31 and 35, 10.2% (41 people) between 36 and 40 years old, 8% (32 people) between 41 and 45, 15.5% (62 people) 46 years and older is detected. If we look at how many years they have lived in the district; 19.7% (79 people) less than 5 years, 12.7% (51 people) between 6 and 10 years, 13.2% (53 people) between 11 and 20 years 27.2% of them (109 people) live between 21 and 30 years, 12.5% (50 people) live between 31 and 40 years, 14.7% (59 people) live for 41 years or more. The age of the participants and their life expectancy in the region is determined to be relatively close to each other.

According to educational status; the total of associate, bachelor's, master's and doctorate graduates is 237 and this constitutes 59.1% of the total participants. The remaining 164 people's education levels are below the undergraduate level and constitute 40.9% of them.

In the analysis, the participants were distributed in 97 different sectors. The largest participating group is students with 16.5% (67 people). After students, 9.2% (37 people) housewives and 7.2% (29 people) drivers. When separate as a group (except students), 12.7% (51 people) of the respondents are working as civil servants with 18 different job descriptions. Than civil servants, 25.9% (104 people) own a workplace as a small business in 20 different business lines. It is seen that 12.5% (50 people) of retired, unemployed and housewives do not work actively, and the remaining 32.4% (130 people) work in 53 different positions in a private enterprise. Answering the questionnaire from many different professions and groups ensures that the questionnaire represents a wider audience. Also, this grouping will be used in the analysis in the following parts.

All negative items in the scale are reverse coded because of the regarding the total tourism impact perceived by the people of Giresun. In this way, consistency between expressions is ensured. The reliability of the whole scale is ,892. This situation is considered to be very high in researches about social sciences (Baş, 2008; Ural and Kılıç, 2006). Factor analysis was applied to the scale consisting of 47 questions to understand how many groups will examine the tourism effect perceived by the people of Giresun. Among the questions in the scale, those with an eigenvalue above 1 were evaluated. While grouping the factors, only the factor chosen that the load 0,500 and above (Denis, 2019). It was noted that the factors should consist least 3 items (Balci, 2011). While applying the factor analysis, varimax was used as a rotation method.

As a result of the factor analysis, 24 out of 47 questions were not included in the valuation because they had a factor load of 0.3 or less (Denis, 2019). Questions not included in the assessment are; (7. Tourism increases the prices of real estate and land, 8. Tourism increases the price of services and products, 9. Tourism creates a high cost of living, 11. Tourism increases the number of recreational activities in our region, 12. Tourism creates job opportunities for women and youth, 13. Tourism makes the people more tolerable. 14. Tourism contributes to the cultural development of the society, 15. Tourism develops public infrastructure services (transportation, water, internet, etc.), 16. Tourism leads to overcrowding, 18. Tourism increases drug and alcohol consumption, 19. Tourism negatively affects our traditional lifestyle, 23. Tourism causes parking and traffic problems for vehicles, 28. Tourism income goes to outside companies and individuals, 29. Only a few people living here benefit from tourism income, 30. I feel uncomfortable living in the same area and being together with tourists, 32. It becomes more and more difficult to find a quiet place around to have fun/rest because of the tourists, 33. The development of tourism has made it difficult for us to use our entertainment/recreation facilities. limits, 34. The use of natural areas by tourists has harmful effects on the environment, 37. Tourism changes the dressing style of the young generation, 38. Political approaches change depending on the development of tourism, 39. Tourism causes changes in the religious approach in the region,

40. The development of tourism is moral It is not true that it changes the values, 41. Touristic facility constructions are natural beauty 42. Agricultural lands in the region are decreasing due to tourism) the remaining 22 questions were included in the factor analysis. According to these conditions, the factor analysis is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Factor Analysis of the Total Tourism Impact Perceived by the People of Giresun

Factor loading and Dimension	Comp.	Ext.	Aver.	Total Vary.	α
1. Impact on Living Standards			4,43	18,79	,872
3. Tourism has improved employment opportunities in my town.	0,848	0,742	4,46		
2. Tourism creates new sources of income.	0,829	0,707	4,54		
4. Tourism enables other sectors to revive.	0,822	0,688	4,48		
1. Tourism contributes to the economic development of our region.	0,771	0,623	4,56		
5. Tourism attracts new investments to our region.	0,754	0,622	4,42		
6. Tourism supports traditional production methods (agriculture, handicrafts).	0,582	0,456	4,17		
10. Tourism increases the number of cultural activities in our region.	0,505	0,345	4,38		
2. Impact on the Natural Environment			4,22	14,171	,831
25. Tourism causes solid waste problems.	0,806	0,709	4,23		
27. Tourism causes noise pollution.	0,789	0,661	4,2		
24. Tourism causes pollution (air, water and soil).	0,777	0,665	4,24		
26. Tourism harms the natural environment.	0,716	0,592	4,26		
17. Tourism increases the crime rate (extortion, theft, murder).	0,627	0,433	4,15		
3. Impact on the social environment			4,17	10,852	,772
46. The lack of coordination and cooperation between the public and private organizations related to forestry and tourism has been negatively affecting the forests in the area.	0,826	0,728	4,23		
47. The failure of public authorities to effectively manage and coordinate the use of the Natural area in tourism has caused major damage to the environment.	0,792	0,701	4,24		
45. In the allocation of the forest areas to tourism, political gain usually overrides objective criteria	0,786	0,644	4,11		
43. Tourism investors do not spend sufficient efforts to protect the forests.	0,51	0,383	4,09		
4. Awareness Effect			3,84	9,212	,731
20. Tourism increases the number of green spaces and parks for the local people.	0,814	0,677	3,59		
21. Tourism ensures the preservation of historical and cultural structures.	0,768	0,64	4,01		
22. Tourism develops environmental protection awareness.	0,757	0,655	3,91		
5. Cultural Effect			4,16	8,189	,641
36. Tourism has a negative impact on the language of the younger generation.	0,776	0,646	4,12		
35. Tourism has a negative impact on the young generation's perspective about traditions and customs.	0,764	0,643	4,09		
31. Tourism harms our culture.	0,688	0,507	4,26		

Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation method: varimax; Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: %84,3; Total Average: 4,22; approx. Chi-Square for Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 3430,75; sd:231; $p < 0,001$; Total Cronbach's Alpha (α): ,892; Total Variance's: %61,214

According to analysis, five factors were obtained. These factors are formed in parallel with the studies of Kuvan and Akan (2005) and Unur et al. (2017). While 7 factors were formed in previous studies, 5 factors were formed in the study conducted in Giresun. The main reason for this is that the negative factors were examined under a separate heading in the study by Kuvan and Akan (2005). In the study, negative factors were coded in reverse and evaluated together with positive factors.

Extracted factors are explained by a total variance of 61.217%. The KMO Measure of sampling Adequacy is 84.3% and the Bartlett sphericity test is greater than 0.001. According to factor analysis the 1st factor out of 5 explains 18.3% of the total variance. This factor was named as "Impact on Living Standards". It has an overall average of 4.43. Within the framework of the relevant articles, the expectation of a positive impact on tourism

is determined as high in relation to new job opportunities, new investments, the revival of other sectors, the development of production methods and economic developments.

The second factor is called “Impact on the Natural Environment”. The related factor explains 14.171% of the total variance and the questions have an average of 4.22. In this context, the tourism perception that noise pollution, damage to the natural environment, waste generation, pollution and an increase in crime rates are determined as negative environmental problems.

The third factor explains 10,852 % of the total variance and is classified under the title of “Impact on the social environment ”. The questions in this factor have an average of 4.17. Under the title of this factor, the environmental efforts of tourism investors, the effect of political gains in tourism allocations, the public and private sector coordination in tourism investments, and the perception of tourism related to the coordination of public administrations in the use of natural areas are determined.

The fourth factor is classified as the “Awareness Effect” and explains 9.212% of the total variance. The questions in this factor have an average of 3.84. Under the title of this factor, the perception of tourism related to increasing green areas and parks, protecting historical and cultural structures and raising environmental protection awareness is determined.

The fifth factor explains 8.189% of the total variance and is named "Cultural Effect". The questions in this factor have an average of 4.16. Under the title of this factor, tourism perception regarding the negative effects of tourism on culture, traditions and customs, language of younger generations is determined.

The dimensions as a result of the factor analysis were compared according to the demographic characteristics of the participants. The differences according to the age of the participants, the duration of their stay in the district, their gender and educational status were investigated. Since the significance of none of the data obtained as a result of the T-test was less than 0.05, it is seen that they are distributed homogeneously and there is no significance. For this reason, there is no difference between the factors according to gender.

According to the one-way anova test performed on the factors to the duration of the participants in the district, the significance of the "Impact on living standards" and "Impact on the natural environment" is less than 0.05. For this reason, there is a significant difference in these two factors according to the duration of the individuals living in the districts. other factor dimensions, the significance value is higher than 0.05. This shows us that the distributions are homogeneous.

Table 2. The Effect of the Total Tourism Impact Perceived by the People of Giresun According to Their Lifetime

Dependent Variables			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	F	Sig.
Impact on living standards	Less than 5 years	Between 6 and 10 years	-0,31107	0,10316	0,032	2,810	0,017
		41 years and more	-0,30077	0,09882	0,030		
Impact on natural environment	Less than 5 years	Between 31 and 40 years	-0,40114	0,10015	0,001	5,615	0,000
		41 years and more	-0,44078	0,09535	0,000		

According to the table-2; people who live in Giresun districts less than 5 years are perceived as having less impact on living standards than between 6-10 years and 41 years or more. With these, who’s living less than 5 years are perceived as having less impact on the natural environment than between 31- 40 years and 41 years or more. In addition, in the tests performed according to the age of the participants, the level of significance is determined as a value above 0.05 in all factors. Except this situation is measured as 0.036 only for those aged between 18-24 and those aged 36-40 in the factor of “Awareness effect”, and it is perceived more negatively in between the ages of 18-24.

Table 3. The Effect of the Total Tourism Impact Perceived by the People of Giresun According to Their Education Level

Dependent Variables			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	F	Sig.
Impact on natural environment	Primary school	Secondary school	+0,44606	0,11484	0,003	7,825	0,000
		High school	+0,43962	0,10335	0,001		
		Undergraduate	+0,52437	0,10088	0,000		
		Bachelor degree	+0,66003	0,09395	0,000		
		Master degree	+0,59608	0,13669	0,000		

Impact on the social environment	Primary school	Secondary school	+0,39205	0,12066	0,027	3,670	0,001
		High school	+0,42108	0,10858	0,003		
		Bachelor degree	+0,35466	0,09870	0,009		

Finally, according to the one-way Anova test performed to the education level of the participants, the Significance in the first, fourth and fifth factors is greater than 0.05. This shows us that there is no significant difference. In the remaining two factors, the Significance is less than 0.05. In this case, according to factor two, it is seen that there is a significant difference between those who go to primary school, those who go to secondary school, high school, associate degree, undergraduate and graduate. Considering that the number of participants who have a doctorate is 2 and the number of literate people who have never been to school is 5, it is seen that there is a significant positive difference in the factor of "impact on the natural environment" among the participants who went to primary school compared to the majority of those who did not. Similarly, there is a significant difference between those who go to primary school and those who have education at secondary school, high school and undergraduate level in the 3rd Factor, "The Impact on Social Environment". This is happening positively. All significant differences according to education level occur in relation to those who receive education at primary school level.

Conclusion and Discussion

Tourism is accepted as a sector that brings economic gain at local and national level for many countries and the support of local people is of great importance for the success of tourism development in a region. For this reason, studies examining the approaches of local people to the development effects of tourism in the region they live in are found in the literature. Tourism development must be successful and mutual benefit must be achieved between tourists and local people. How the local people perceive the positive and negative effects of tourism development is decisive in creating a sustainable tourism area in the region in the future.

Giresun is a destination at the beginning of this development process with its plateaus, island, castles, various historical structures and natural beauties such as the blue lake. When compared with the studies in the literature on the tourism perception of the local people examined in the research and the support they give to the development of tourism, it was seen that similar results were reached. Considering the research findings, it can be said that the people of Giresun generally have a positive perception of tourism. Therefore, the results of this research are consistent with the theories of attitude of local people towards tourism development and in agreement with research results of Var et al. (1985), Uslu and Kiper (2006), Akova (2006), Alaeddinoğlu (2007), Huttasin (2008), Gümüş and Özüpekçe (2009), Keskin and Çontu (2011), Güneş (2014), Abdollahzadeh and Sharifzadeh (2014), Özaltın Türker and Türker (2014), Ünlüönen and Özekici (2017) and Erkilic (2019). Considering the factor averages, the lowest average of 3.84 in the factor dimension related to awareness and the highest average in the dimension of living standards related to economic effects with an average of 4.43 were reached. This result, again in line with the literature, shows that the local people primarily consider the economic effects of tourism in the regions where tourism has started to develop and support the development of tourism in the region with economic expectations.

Those who live in Giresun districts for less than 5 years have lower perceptions of the dimension of "impact on living standards" and "impact on natural environment". Considering that the participants of the research are 18 years or older, it can be said that those who live in the region for less than 5 years are predominantly public personnel and private sector employees or university students coming to Giresun from other cities. It can be said that people in this group may have lower awareness about the economic, social and environmental changes in the region (they are young, they are new to the city, etc.) or their perception levels may be lower because they do not have expectations about the economic effects of the development of tourism in the region. In addition, considering the education level of those in this group, it can be thought that young people and university graduate public employees may be more conscious of the effects of tourism on the natural environment than other groups.

There are various differences in the support and perceptions of the local people with different education levels towards the development of tourism. In the study, this difference emerged in dimensions related to the natural environment and social environment. In the studies of Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), Lindberg et al., (1999), Güneş (2014) in the literature, it was predicted that there is a relationship between education and the positive attitude of the local people towards the development of tourism, and it was stated that the positive approach of the local people towards tourism development increased as the education level increased. It is also mentioned in these studies that this positive perception stems from economic expectations. In this study, however, a result contrary to the findings obtained regarding the education factor in the literature has emerged.

It has been observed that primary school graduates have more positive perceptions about the impact of tourism development on social and natural environments. This situation may be due to the development of environmental awareness of educated individuals in recent years with the influence of mass media. Another thought is that due to the positive economic expectations mentioned in the literature, individuals with low education levels may be ignoring these effects more because the natural or social environmental effects have not been seen in this region, which is at the beginning of the tourism development stages.

When the research is considered as a whole, the people of Giresun have a generally positive perception of the effects of tourism. However, this perception is thought to be on expectations rather than an assessment of the current situation, since the region is at the beginning of the tourism development stages. The findings of the study are also in this direction. As it is stated in the literature, the local people support the development of tourism at the beginning. However, considering the tourism development stage in the literature, it has been revealed by various studies (such as Butler, 1980; Kariel, 1989; Allen et al., 1994; Harrill and Potts, 2003; Schofield, 2011) that the positive perception of the public turns into a negative as tourism develops. Therefore, if the necessary precautions are not taken by considering the possible negative perception in the future, the destination life curve of the region may take a very short time. Today, in tourism development, factors such as the number of facilities, the number of tourists, the level of expenditure of tourists, as well as the sustainability of the destination, the protection of nature and local culture must also be taken into account. Sustainable environmental elements are indispensable for sustainable tourism development (Kozak, 2014).

The research focuses on local people's perception of related impacts rather than the actual total impact of tourism. Therefore, as the tourism sector develops in Giresun, this research is planned to be repeated or it is recommended to be repeated by other researchers. It will be possible to make a healthy interpretation of the total impact of tourism within the framework of possible changes that may occur in future research on the subject. In the process, it can be useful to research how the efforts of local governments, non-governmental organizations and the state and how these efforts affect the perception and attitudes of the people towards tourism. Considering the similar studies in the literature, the main recommendation of this research to tourism planners and local governments is that the benefit of the local people should be prioritized in the investments to be made, the active participation and support of the local people in the tourism development process should be ensured, and therefore cooperation with the local people should be made at every stage of tourism development. Such studies to be carried out can provide a controlled sectoral development. As a result, the perceived negative effects of tourism by the local people in a touristic region may harm tourism development. In order to realize an environmentally sensitive and sustainable tourism development, the perceptions and attitudes of the local people should be measured and evaluated at regular intervals. In addition, it can be said that the objectives of tourism development can be achieved in a healthier way within the framework of sustainable tourism studies, with the participation of local people, local and central government, non-governmental organizations, professional organizations, experts, university and private sector representatives in tourism planning studies.

References

- Abdollahzadeh, G. and Sharifzadeh, A. (2014). Rural residents' perceptions toward tourism development: A study from Iran. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 126-136.
- Akış, S., Peristanis, N. and Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus, *Tourism Management*, 17(7), 481-494.
- Akova, O. (2006). Yerel halkın turizmin etkilerini algılamalarına ve tutumlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 1(2), 77-109.
- Alaeddinoğlu, F. (2007). Van Halkının Turisti ve Turizmi Algılama Şekli. *Coğrafi Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 1-16.
- Allen, L. R., Hafer, H. R., Long, P. T. and Perdue, R. R. (1994). Rural residents attitudes toward recreation and tourism development, *Journal of Travel Research*, 3(4), 27-33.
- Almeida-García, F., Peláez-Fernández, M. Á., Balbuena-Vazquez, A. and Cortes-Macias, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259-274.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. and Yıldırım, E. (2012). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri (SPSS uygulamalı)* (7th Edition). Adapazarı: Sakarya Kitabevi.

- Ambrož, M. (2008). Attitudes of local residents towards the development of tourism in Slovenia: The case of the Primorska, Dolenjska, Gorenjska and Ljubljana regions. *Anthropological notebooks*, 14(1).
- Andereck, K. L. and Vogt, C. A. (2000). The Relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 27-36
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R. C. and Vogt, C.A. (2005). Residents' Perceptions of Community Tourism Impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076.
- Andriotis, K. and Vaughan. R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete, *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172-185.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). Community Group's Perceptions Of And Preferences For Tourism Development: Evidence From Crete. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29(1), 67-90.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' Perceptions On Tourism Impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665- 690.
- Ardahaey, F. T. (2011). Economic impacts of tourism industry. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(8), 206.
- Ataman, D. and Özer, Ö. (2020). Mardin Yerel Halkının Turizm Algısının Turizmi Destekleme Niyeti Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues*, 2(2), 203-215.
- Avcıkurt, C. (2003). *Turizm Sosyolojisi: Turist Yerel Halk Etkileşimi*. Ankara: Detay Yayınları.
- Bahar O. and Kozak, M. (2013). *Turizm ekonomisi. "Turizm sektörünün ulusal ekonomiler üzerindeki etkileri"*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi
- Balcı, A. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntem, Teknik ve İlkeleri* (9th. Edition). Ankara: Pegem Yayınevi.
- Baş, T. (2008). *Anket Nasıl Hazırlanır, Uygulanır, Değerlendirilir?* (5th. Edition). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Bilgin, Y. and Çetinkaya, A. (2017). The Role of Tourism in Sustainability of the Rural Settlementfabrics: Cumalıkızık Example. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 6(2), 58-65.
- Brida, J. G., Osti, L. and Faccioli, M. (2011). Resident's Perception And Attitudes Towards Tourism Impacts. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 18(3), 359-385.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implication for the management of resources, *Canadian Geographer*, 24(1), 5-12.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. and Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (11th. Edition). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cengiz, E. and Kırkibir, F. (2007). Yerel halk tarafından algılanan toplam turizm etkisi ile turizm desteği arasındaki ilişkiye yönelik yapısal bir model önerisi, *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1, 19-37.
- Chen, J. S. (2001). Assessing And Visualizing Tourism Impacts From Urban Residents' Perspectives. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 25(3), 235-250.
- Çalışkan, U. (2003). *Turizmin yerel halk üzerindeki etkileri ve Kuşadası ilçesi uygulaması*. Unpublished Master Dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Çavuş, Ş. and Tanrisevdi, A. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism: A case study of Kuşadası, Turkey, *Tourism Analysis*, 7(3-4), 259-269.
- Çelikkanat, N. and Güçer, E. (2014, November, 13-16). *Yerel Halkın Turizme Bakış Açısı: Bodrum İlçesi Örneği*, 15. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi, Engelsiz Turizm, Gazi Üniversitesi, Turizm Fakültesi, Ankara.
- Çolak, E. (2017). *Muğla halkının turizm olgusuna ve turizm etkilerine bakış açılarını anlamaya yönelik bir alan araştırması*. Unpublished Master Dissertation, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.
- Davis, D., Allen, J. and Consenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions toward tourism, *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 2-8.
- Denis, D. J. (2019). SPSS Data Analysis for Univariate, Bivariate, and Multivariate Statistics. In *SPSS Data Analysis for Univariate, Bivariate, and Multivariate Statistics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119465775>

- Doxey, G. V. (1975, September, 8-11). *A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants, methodology, and research inferences*. Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research association. San Diego, CA: Travel and Tourism Research Association.
- Duran, E. and Özkuli, E. (2012). Yerel halkın turizm gelişimine yönelik tutumları: Akçakoca örneği üzerinden bir yapısal model. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, (9)2, 500-520.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B. and Carter, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409-422.
- Erdem, A. (2017). *Turizm faaliyetlerinin yerel halk tarafından nasıl algılandığının tespitine yönelik bir çalışma: Kayseri örneği*. Unpublished master dissertation, Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- Erkılıç, E. (2019). Yerel halkın turizm algısı ve turizmin gelişimine yönelik tutumları: Rize örneği. *International Journal of Contemporary Tourism Research*, 3(1), 66-82.
- Faulkner, B. and Tideswell, C. (1997). A Framework For Monitoring Community Impacts Of Tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 1-28.
- Fesenmaier, D. R., O'Leary, J. and Uysal, M., (1996). *Advances in tourism marketing methodologies*. New York: Haworth Press.
- Filiz, A. (2017). *Yerel halkın turizme yönelik algı ve tutumlarının turizm gelişim yaklaşımları kapsamında değerlendirilmesi: Mazı Köyü-Türkbükü karşılaştırmalı analizi*, Unpublished Master Dissertation, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- García, F. A., Vázquez, A. B., and Macías, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33-40.
- Getz, D. (1994). Residents' attitudes toward tourism: A longitudinal study in Spey Valley, Scotland, *Tourism Management*, 15(4), 247-258.
- Gümüş, N. and Özüpekçe, S. (2009). Foça'da turizmin ekonomik, sosyal, kültürel ve çevresel etkilerine yönelik yerel halkın görüşleri, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2),398-417.
- Gündüz, S. (2018). Yerel Halkın Turizm Algısını Belirlemeye Yönelik Alternatif Bir Ölçek Geliştirme: Karataş Destinasyonu Örneği. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 13(52), 343-357.
- Güneş, E. and Alagöz, G. (2018). Yerel halkın turizm algısı: Erzincan'da bir araştırma. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15, 409-442.
- Güneş, N. (2014). *Yerel Halkın Turizm Algısı ve Turizme Katılımı: Antalya Konyaaltı ve Kepez İlçesi Örneği*. Unpublished Master Dissertation, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Gürsoy, D. and Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host Attitudes Toward Tourism: An Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31, 495-516.
- Gürsoy, D., Chi, C. G. and Dyer, P. (2010). Locals' attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of travel research*, 49(3), 381-394.
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T. and Miller, G. (2005). The Social Impacts of Tourism: A Case Study of Bath, UK, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647-668.
- Haralambopolous, N. and Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived Impacts Of Tourism: The Case Of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 503-526.
- Harrill, R. and Potts, D. T. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233-244.
- Huttasin, N. (2008). Perceived social impacts of tourism by residents in the OTOP tourism village, Thailand, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 175-191.
- Inskip, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- İçöz, O. (2005). *Turizm ekonomisi*. Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.

- Jurowski, C. and Gürsoy, D. (2004). Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296-312.
- Kariel, H. G. (1989). Socio-cultural impacts of tourism in the Austrian Alps, *Mountain Research and Development*, 9(1), 59-70.
- Keogh, B. (1990). Public Participation In Community Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 449-465.
- Keskin, E. and Çontu, M. (2011). Mustafapaşa (Sinassos) Kasabasında yaşayan halkın turizme bakış açısını belirlemeye yönelik bir alan araştırması, *Aksaray Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 3(2), 37-55.
- Kim, K. (2002). *The Effects of Tourism Impacts Upon Quality of Residents in The Community*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.
- Ko, D. W. and Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development, *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521-530.
- Korkmaz, S. and Güngör, Ö. (2015). Festivallerin katılan ziyaretçiler üzerine etkileri: Alaçatı ot festivali örneği. *Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Elektronik Dergisi*, 6(14), 59-68.
- Kozak, M. (2014). *Sürdürülebilir turizm (Kavramlar-uygulamalar)* (1st Edition). Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A. and Kozak, M. (2015). *Genel Turizm: İlkeler-Kavramlar (Yenilenmiş 17. Baskı)*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A. and Kozak, M. (2017). *Genel turizm: İlkeler-Kavramlar (Yenilenmiş 19. Baskı)*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kuvan, Y. and Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya, *Tourism Management*, 26, 691-706.
- Latkova, P. and Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities, *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 50-67.
- Lepp, A. (2007). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi village, Uganda. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 876-885.
- Lindberg, K., Dellaert, B. G. and Rassing, C. R. (1999). Yerleşik ödünleşimler: Bir seçim modelleme yaklaşımı. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 554-569.
- Liu, J., Pauline, C., Sheldon J. and Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(1), 17-34.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R. and Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism, *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Mansuroğlu, S. (2006). Turizm Gelişmelerine Yerel Halkın Yaklaşımlarının Belirlenmesi: Akseki/Antalya Örneği. *Akdeniz Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), 35-46.
- Martin, B. S. and Uysal, M. (1990). An examination of the relationship between carrying capacity and the tourism lifecycle: Management and the policy implications, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 31(4), 327-333.
- Mason, P. (2003). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.
- McCool, S. F. and Martin, S. T. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.
- McIntyre, G. (1993). *Sustainable tourism development: guide for local planners*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization (WTO).
- Murphy, P. (2013). *Tourism: A community approach (RLE Tourism)*. London: Routledge.
- Nunkoo, R. and Ramkisson, H. (2009). Applying The Means-End Chain Theory And The Laddering Technique To The Study Of Host Attitudes To Tourism. *Journals of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(3), 337-355.

- Nunkoo, R. and Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Modeling community support for a proposed integrated resort project, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 257-277.
- Nunkoo, R. and Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997-1023.
- Oviedo-Garcia, M. A., Castellanos-Verdugo, M. and Martin-Ruiz, D. (2008). Gaining residents' support for tourism and planning, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 95-109.
- Özaltın Türker, G. and Türker, A. (2014). Yerel Halkın Turizm Etkilerini Algılama Düzeyi Turizm Desteğini Nasıl Etkiler: Dalyan Destinasyonu Örneği, *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, 4(1), 81-98.
- Özyurt, P. M. (2018). *Turizm gelişiminin yerel halkın bireysel ve toplumsal yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkilerinin incelenmesi*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Akdeniz University, Antalya.
- Park, K., Lee, J. and Timothy, J. L. (2017). Residents' Attitudes Toward Future Tourism Development In Terms Of Community Well-Being And Attachment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 160-172.
- Park, M. and Stokowski, P. A. (2009). Social Disruption Theory And Crime in Rural Communities: Comprasions Across Three Levels Of Tourism Growth. *Tourism Management*, 30, 905-915
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T. and Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R. and Alders, T. (2013). London residents' support for the 2012 Olympic Games: The mediating effect of overall attitude, *Tourism Management*, 36, 629-640.
- Preister, K. (1989). The Theory and Management of Tourism Impacts. *Tourism Recreational Research*, 14(1), 15-22.
- Prentice, R. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences, *Tourism Management*, 14, 218-227.
- Schofield, P. (2011). City resident attitudes to proposed tourism development and its impacts on the Community, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(3), 218-233.
- Sırakaya, E., Teye, V. and Sönmez, S. (2002). Understanding residents' support for tourism development in the central region of Ghana. *Journal of travel research*, 41(1), 57-67.
- Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J. and Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts, *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.
- Şanlıoğlu, Ö. and Erdem, A. (2017). Kayseri örneğinde yerel halkın turizm faaliyetlerini nasıl algıladığının tespitine yönelik bir araştırma. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. (27), 277-298.
- Teye, V., Sonmez, S. and Sarikaya, E. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.
- Toprak, L. (2015). Mardin'de Halkın Turizm Algısı. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14 (54), 201-218.
- Tosun, C., Timothy, D. J. and Öztürk, Y. (2003). Tourism growth, national development and regional inequality in Turkey. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(2-3), 133-161.
- Tuna, M. (2007). *Turizm, çevre ve toplum* (2nd. Edition). Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Unur, K., Kanca, B. and Ertaş, Ç. (2017, September 28-30). *Yerel Halk Tarafından Algılanan Toplam Turizm Etkisi: Dereli'de (Giresun) Bir Araştırma*. 1st International Congress on Future of Tourism: Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability. Mersin, Turkey.
- Upchurch, R. S. and Teivane, U. (2000). Resident perception of tourism development in Riga, Latvia, *Tourism Management*, 21(5), 499-507.
- Ural, A. and Kılıç, İ. (2006). Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi (Extended 2nd Edition). *Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık*.

- Uslu, A. and Kiper, T. (2006). Turizmin kültürel miras üzerine etkileri: Beypazarı/Ankara örneğinde yerel halkın farkındalığı, *Tekirdağ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(3), 305-314.
- Usta, Ö. (2014). *Turizm: Genel ve yapısal yaklaşım (4th. Edition)*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Ünal, Ç., and Yücel, B. (2018). Kırsal Turizmin Geliştirilmesi ve Yönetilmesinde Yerel Halkın Algı ve Tutumları: Ödemiş/Birgi Örneği. *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi*. 23(39), 113-130.
- Ünlüöner, K., and Özekici, Y. K. (2017). Yeni gelişen destinasyonlarda turizm algısı: Yozgat ili üzerine bir alan. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 5(4), 466-488.
- Ünlüöner, K., Tayfun, A. and Kılıçlar, A. (2014). *Turizm ekonomisi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Var, T., Kendall, K. W. and Tarakçıoğlu, E. (1985). Resident attitudes toward tourists in a Turkish resort town, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(4), 652-658.
- Vargas-Sanchez, A., Plaza-Mejia, M. A. and Porrás-Bueno, N. (2009). Understanding residents' attitudes toward the development of industrial tourism in a former mining Community, *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 373-387.
- Wall, G. and Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism: change, impacts, and opportunities*. London: Pearson Education.
- Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D. and Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modeling, *Tourism Management*, 22(3), 63-72.