

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362932646>

Tourist Behavior: Past, Present, and Future THE ATTITUDES OF LOCAL RESIDENTS TOWARD TOURISTS IN THE DESTINAT....

Chapter · August 2022

CITATIONS

0

READS

397

2 authors:



Gizem Özgürel

Balıkesir University

50 PUBLICATIONS 140 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Cevdet Avcikurt

Balıkesir University

154 PUBLICATIONS 1,076 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

CHAPTER 4

THE ATTITUDES OF LOCAL RESIDENTS TOWARD TOURISTS IN THE DESTINATION OF MARMARIS, TURKEY

GIZEM ÖZGÜREL¹ and CEVDET AVCIKURT²

¹Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Marmaris Tourism Vocational School, Muğla, Turkey

²Balıkesir University, Faculty of Tourism, Balıkesir, Turkey

**Corresponding author. E-mail: gizemozguREL@mu.edu.tr*

ABSTRACT

Being one of the known tourism destinations in the world, Marmaris, a coastal city, is preferred by many local and foreign tourists. In 2019, about 1,350,000 foreign tourists and 419,000 local tourists stayed overnight in Marmaris, while local residents, consisting of about 95,000 people, hosted tourists. This study aims to determine the settled attitudes of local residents in Marmaris, which is located in the southwestern region of Turkey and which has transformed from a small fishing town into a preferred tourism destination, toward tourists. In the chapter, the studies of Var, Kendel, and Tarakcioglu (1985) examining Marmaris constituted the starting point. The researchers tried to identify how the local community of this small town that was declared as a tourism development area by the Turkish government in the 1960s perceives the social impacts of tourism. In their

study, they stated that the Marmaris community was not studied from this perspective before and they chose the Marmaris community as the target population of the study as they thought this community symbolized a series of cultural values. The authors conducted a survey for the Marmaris community in the peak season of 1980–1981 and analyzed valid data of 98 participants. Among the results of their study, the following points become prominent: local residents perceive the positive and negative effects of tourism; they find meeting with tourists valuable as an educational experience; and they least prefer to see in Marmaris the tourists who are Turkish locals, who come from the Middle East, and who are Turkish workers living abroad. In this context, it was aimed to determine whether there was any change in the local residents' attitude toward tourism and tourist in Marmaris since the 1980s, and to determine its direction and level, if any. Besides, the issues such as the dissolution of the USSR in 1989, Russian tourists visiting Marmaris with an increasing number of each year, and residents' attitudes toward Russian tourists will be examined for the first time in the scope of the study. In the relevant literature section of the study; the titles such as the effects of tourism, attitudes towards tourism, stereotypes of Turkish people for different nations, and Marmaris destination were mentioned.

In the study, a quantitative research method was adopted, and a questionnaire consisting of 3 parts was applied to collect data from the field, and the data were collected from the population formed by the residents of Marmaris through an online survey. The first part of the questionnaire included questions aiming to determine demographic characteristics, while the second part covered local residents' attitudes towards tourism and its effects, and the third and the final part included questions aimed at determining the stereotypes of local residents for tourists of different nationalities. The data obtained were analyzed in the SPSS 22.0 program, the findings were interpreted, the results and suggestions were made, and the study was concluded. The assumptions and limitations of the research were: the reliability and validity of the data collected in the research were limited by the features of the data collection methods; it was assumed that the participants answered the research questions correctly; the questionnaires planned to be made face-to-face were carried out online due to the Covid-19 and the measures taken by the Turkish government and by social responsibility; finally, insufficient time. The literature of the study has been listed according to the effects of tourism in destinations, perceptions

and attitudes towards tourism, Turkish stereotypes of different nations and the people in Marmaris.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Tourism, which has become an integral part of modern life, directly and indirectly causes change in both the sending and receiving societies. Perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of local people play a key role in ensuring the development and continuity of tourism in places that develop and turn into tourism destinations with the start of tourist visits and become centers of tourism activities. Marmaris district, which was a small fishing town in the 1950s, was declared a tourism development area with the decision of the Turkish government in the 1960s and the central government took the first steps for the development of the tourism sector. Tourism activities in Marmaris, which has hosted more than 2 million local and foreign tourists together with daily visitors in recent years, create various effects with social, cultural, economic, and environmental dimensions as in all other tourism destinations.

In tourism literature, it is known that touristic activities create both positive and negative effects, creating change, and transformation in tourism destinations, and many researchers try to reveal the extent and direction of change by measuring the effects of tourism. It is known that the development of tourism in Marmaris, besides economic effects, creates changes in the natural and physical environment and social life. However, it is possible to trace the social and cultural effects of tourism, with the lifestyle, participation of women in the workforce, family relations, level of commitment to traditions and customs, leisure activities, changes in beliefs, attitudes, and values in Marmaris.

The study tried to reveal how the local people perceive the effects of tourism in the Marmaris and how their attitudes toward tourists are. It has been tried to determine whether there has been a change in the perceptions and attitudes toward the effects of tourism in the local people of Marmaris, stereotypes regarding tourists, and, if there has been a change, its direction and level. The literature of the study has been listed according to the effects of tourism in destinations, perceptions, and attitudes toward tourism, Turkish stereotypes of different nations, and the people in Marmaris. Quantitative research method was used in the study. With the

scale consisting of three parts, data was collected from 393 local people online between 07 and 31 July 2020. The obtained data were analyzed in the SPSS 22.0 program. The study was structured in the form of relevant literature, findings, comments, results, and recommendations.

4.2 EFFECTS OF TOURISM

The tourism sector, whose importance is increasing on a global scale and attracting attention with its effects on societies, has reached a large scale today. Tourism creates various effects in the social, cultural, economic, and natural environments of the societies. Countries compete intensely to be within the targets of international tourist flows and to benefit more from the positive economic effects of tourism. There are various reasons for the efforts made to gain a greater share of tourism. In countries that are successful in attracting tourists by transforming their tourism potential into tourism supply and by creating artificial attractions, the positive effects of tourism in economic, social, cultural, and environmental dimensions turn into gains. In contrast, the intensification of tourist flows to tourism destinations, unplanned tourism development, exceeding the economic, social, ecological, and physical transportation capacities, creates various negative effects and threatens tourism sustainability.

Tourism is an economic activity that directly or indirectly affects many people around the world in terms of production and consumption (Bahar and Kozak, 2015). The positive economic effects of tourism—monetary character and real economic effects—are analyzed with qualitative measures. Among the effects of monetary character—the effects of tourism on foreign payments, national income, domestic prices, investment, and government revenues—among the real effects are the effects on employment, other sectors (agriculture, service, industry, and transportation sectors) and infrastructure (Olalı and Timur, 1988; Çeken, 2014). The economic effects of tourism differ in developed and developing countries, and statistics show that the countries that receive and send tourists the most are the developed countries.

Especially for underdeveloped and developing countries, tourism activities are a driving force in their economies, and tourism is supported and encouraged by government policies due to its positive effects on economic growth and development. Tourism contributes to the national economy,

the current account balance is positively affected, foreign exchange and income increase are created, large employment areas are opened, and new business opportunities arise. In places which have potential to become tourism destinations, infrastructure is completed, existing infrastructure is strengthened, new investments are attracted to the region, and added value are created for the local economy. The tourism sector can be strengthened with the existing sectors by reviving the local economy with tourism. Various adverse economic effects can also arise, such as the opportunity cost of economic choices made in tourism destinations, inflationary pressure, the danger of over-dependence on tourism, low rate of return on investments, rising land values, increased import tendency, seasonal production, and external costs caused by crowding. Opportunities that can be missed in other sectors as a result of transferring the resources owned in destinations to tourism development can create a negative impact on the economy as a cost factor. However, the dependence of the economy on tourism activities, the decrease in demand, income, employment losses, bankruptcies, and economic damages that are difficult to correct can be caused by the negativities experienced in the fragile tourism sector. The pressure created by the touristic demand causes an increase in the prices of the products and services in the destinations, and the resulting inflationary situation is observed as a negative economic effect. In the tourism sector, where investment costs are relatively high, especially under the influence of seasonality, tourism enterprises cannot operate at full capacity throughout the year, which prolongs the investment return process and negatively affects the investment decisions of entrepreneurs in the sector. In the tourism destinations that have reached the growth and development stage, the presence of both national and international capital with investments leads to high increases in land prices, and local people's land ownership and local control can change hands and cause many negativities. In tourism enterprises, mainly beverages, furnishings, and so on, the supply of many products by exporting creates the money that is desired to remain within the country's economy to go abroad. Tourist influx may have a negative impact on the economic climate of the destinations, especially in the high season, due to the crowd and various economic negativities caused by this. The economic effects created by tourism activities continue to be studied with many studies in the literature: Tourism and its economic effects (Comerio and Strozzi, 2019; Tohmo, 2018; Hepaktan and Çınar, 2010); tourism and economic growth (Brida et al., 2020; Kanca,

2015); productivity and economic growth in tourism (Liu and Wu, 2019); tourism demand and economic growth (Santamaria and Filis, 2019; Esen and Özata, 2017; Holzner, 2011); tourism and economic development (Sokhanvar et al., 2018); tourism and local development (Özgürel, 2012); and tourism and regional development (Mesci and Dönmez, 2016; Çeken, 2008) are some of the studies on tourism and economic recovery (Dogru and Bulut, 2018; Jucan and Jucan, 2013).

Tourism has become one of the most important social events at the present times and has attracted attention to the changes and transformations it has created in social life. It has the potential to affect both at the macro level in the societies that send and receive tourists, in the tourists who are the subjects of tourism, and in the individuals, who have contact and relations with the tourists at the micro level. Although globalization, international migration, developments in transportation, and communication technologies affect individuals and societies, the transformation of tourism into a lifestyle provides an environment for social effects and interaction. However, it should be emphasized that it is almost impossible to explain and measure how much of social change and transformation is due to conjunctural developments and how much of tourism. Tourism has the potential to create positive effects in establishing individual social relations, increasing the quality of life of the local people with the social environments it creates, developing the understanding of tourism, strengthening the sense of community in the destination, being proud of the place, the formation or development of social organizations, the increase of social capital, and the socialization of local people. However, different personality traits and expectations can also create conflict environments for tourist—local people, tourism workers, and tourist in tourism destinations. In other words, the effects of tourism on the social structure are explained by considering urbanization, social layers, and changes in political structure and family structure (Doğan, 2004). As the tourists begin to come to the places of attraction, change, transformation, and a city view begin to emerge with the mediation effect of tourism, especially in underdeveloped and developing regions. A small town or a settlement that continues its existence traditionally with its own resources, after being opened to tourism, turns into a presentation to tourists with scenes prepared according to the tourist, and the local people can experience the urban development and transformation of the place where they live their daily life. Tourism affects the family structure in the society, the roles of

family members, especially the family institution, which is the smallest unit of the society, with the participation of women in working life. The work migration created by those who come to the destination for working purposes can create changes in the demographic structure, the increase in second residences, the settlement of lifestyle immigrants, and quantitative and qualitative changes in the social structure can be experienced, especially in coastal destinations. Tourism destinations provide social interaction environments for local people and tourists, and social interaction with mutual social relations can affect tourism, attitudes, and behaviors toward the tourist and the visited society. Positive social interaction is likely to have an impact on the contribution of social peace and tourism to world peace. The tourist can play a role in reducing the cultural distance and stereotypes and prejudices between societies by visiting the destination again, recommending the destination to others, experiencing the life style, and values of the society they visit, and transferring them to their surroundings. The arrival and destination of the tourist do not remain the same, social norms, behavioral styles, communication styles, socialization styles, consumption styles, social institutions, and habits may differ. The local community can act under the “show-off effect” by taking care of tourists, class differences and differences in status between tourist and local people can create an environment of conflict, drug use, excessive alcohol consumption, gambling habits, prostitution, conflicts of interest, infectious diseases, and tourism crimes increase can occur as effects. There is an increasing number of academic studies in recent years on the social effects of tourism (Özgürel, 2020; Matarrita-Cascante and Suess, 2020; Çavuş and Baki, 2020; Kang and Lee, 2018; Scholtz and Slabbert, 2016; Deery et al., 2012; Tayfun and Kılıçlar, 2004; Berber, 2003; Gürkan, 1996).

In some studies, in the literature, the cultural effects of tourism are examined as a dimension in itself, and in other studies, the socio-cultural effects dimension is examined by considering the social and cultural effects from an integrated perspective. The social effects of tourism have been examined separately earlier, and in this section, the cultural effects dimension of tourism has been handled and explained as a separate dimension. Effects of tourism on culture is the transformation and transformation of religious beliefs and behaviors, moral values, lifestyle, language, art, tourism as a cultural institution, and as a part of the culture. Tourism is one of the important sectors that mediate cultural change and spread. Promotion of Turkish culture in terms of Turkey’s tourism, customs and

traditions, eating and drinking behavior, hospitality, religious practices, lifestyle is the synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures, many values of the traditional architecture of the crafts are hosting a huge potential for cultural dissemination (Avcıkurt, 2015). The encounters and contacts of different cultures through tourism can cause local people to become aware of their own culture, to take care of their values and to be proud of their culture. In contrast, local people, who have the opportunity to get to know different cultures, have the opportunity to increase their knowledge. Cultural communication between the tourist–local people broadens the horizons of the parties (Richards, 2006), and the direction of cultural interaction is determinant in the increase of the tolerance level of different cultures. In addition to the positive effects of tourism on culture, negative effects such as the adaptation of foreign words, the adoption of the lifestyle of tourists, the degeneration of religious and moral values, the transformation of cultural values into commercial commodities, and the increase in cultural distance between the parties can be observed in tourism destinations. There are many studies in the literature on the cultural effects of tourism (Wei et al., 2020; Jingyi and Chung-Shing, 2018; Göktaş and Türkeri, 2016; Uslu and Kiper, 2006; Ünlüönen and Tayfun, 2003).

In terms of its structure, tourism is a whole with the natural and cultural environment that contains many attractions. Tourism provides positive environmental impacts in terms of protecting natural areas, increasing environmental awareness, improving the quality of the environment, improving infrastructure, protecting archaeological and historical sites, increasing the value of the environment, and ensuring the transfer of local architecture to future generations (Avcıkurt, 2015). However, as a result of exceeding the ecological and physical carrying capacity in tourism destinations, the negative environmental effects of tourism emerge and endanger the sustainability of tourism. The unplanned development of tourism activities predominantly creates negative effects on the natural and cultural environment that are difficult to reverse. Among these negative effects, disturbance of ecological balance, destruction of historical man-made artefacts, loss of characteristics of geographical attractions, change of water, air and soil quality, pollution, loss of biodiversity, and noise effect pollution are some of them. There are many studies focused on the environmental effects of tourism (Chen, 2020; Sun et al., 2020; Robinson et al., 2019; Wang and Zhou, 2019; Özsavaş Uluçay, 2018; Şafaklı, 2017; Tuna, 2007; Kahraman and Türkay, 2004; Demir, 2002).

4.3 PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDE TOWARD TOURISM

The issue of the effects of tourism in the tourism literature attracts a great deal of attention, as stated in the earlier studies. In this context, it should be noted that with the academic studies conducted in recent years, the perceptions and attitudes of the local people toward tourism have remained important, and the literature on theoretical and practical studies continues to develop. The perceptions and attitudes of local people toward tourism depend on the development level of tourism destinations, the demographic structure of the local community, dependency on tourism, the status of being a local or an immigrant, the duration of residence, etc. It can differ according to many variables. However, it cannot be said that there is a full consensus on the variables in the relevant literature. Local people's perceptions of the impact of tourism can be positive or negative in different situations. In some studies, a positive relationship was found between demographic variables and local people's perception of tourism effects, while others may have the opposite situation (Akova, 2006; Yılmaz and Filiz, 2017).

In tourism destinations, local people are faced with many positive and negative effects of tourism, their view on tourism and how they perceive tourism, it seems worth examining because there cannot be a tourism development without local support and tourism cannot be sustained. The fact that the local people are among the main actors in tourism stakeholders and the support of the well-known local people in the success of tourism planning make it important to know the perceptions of the local people toward tourism and tourists.

Perception means "by directing attention to something, to become conscious, to realize that thing" (Türk Dil Kurumu, 2020). When the concept of perception is evaluated in terms of tourism and tourist, it explains how local people see, understand, interpret, and create awareness about tourism and tourist effects. Local people perceive tourism effects in terms of social, cultural, economic, and environmental aspects, and tourist effects as gains and losses (negativities) predominantly on the basis of social and cultural effects.

İşık and Turan (2018) investigated the perceptions of local people on the effects of tourism in Izmir province. They concluded that the general average of local people's perception was high. The researchers stated that the positive economic, environmental, and socio-cultural effects

of tourism, such as creating new business opportunities, supporting the local economy, ensuring the protection and development of the natural environment, improving the environmental quality, ensuring the development of cultural activities, and contributing to the cultural development of the local people are perceived at a high level by the local people. In the study, tourism, socio-cultural negative effects such as increasing the prices of products and services in the region and causing the cost of living, creating environmental pollution, negatively affecting the nature, negatively affecting the attitudes and behaviors of the local people, and causing the destruction of cultural values are also perceived at a moderate level by the local people. According to the results they obtained, the perception of the local people toward the effects of tourism differs according to demographic characteristics. They found that female participants had higher perceptions of socio-cultural negative effects than male participants, married participants perceived negative socio-cultural effects more than single participants, and that there was no significant difference between their perceptions of working status in tourism and the effects of tourism. The researchers also found that the higher the education level of the local population, the higher their perception of economic positive effects.

Yılmaz and Filiz (2017) investigated the tourism perceptions and attitudes of local people two destinations (Mazı and Türkbükü) with different development levels, with Butler's "Tourism Life Cycle Model" and Doxey's "Tolerance Model." The researchers concluded that the local people in Mazı village have insufficient tourism knowledge and negative perception of tourism. In Türkbükü, they reached the conclusion that the general tourism perception of the local people is positive, the decrease in the number of tourists and the reflection of the political events negatively affect the tourism perception of the local people, but they are in a cautiously optimistic approach. It was stated that the participants from the local population of Mazı village perceive the tourists as a financial resource, while the participants in Türkbükü are perceived as people who are associated with cultural differences in the perception of tourists.

In the study of Özdemir and Kervankıran (2011), they concluded that 52.4% of the local people see tourism as an activity that improves the economy, 17.4% enables the increase of culture, and 15.7% preserves nature, historical, and cultural values. In line with the findings of the researchers, they came to the conclusion that local people in Afyonkarahisar expect the economy to develop, natural, historical, and cultural

values to be recognized, protected, and cultural diversity will be caused by tourism. In addition, it has been stated that it is not regarded as an activity that destroys or regresses natural, cultural, economic, and social values.

The concept of attitude that has been defined many times from different perspectives (Albu and Nicolau, 2010); it explained as the tendency of individuals to react positively or negatively to any object, opinion, or environment. It is generally stated that attitudes are a part of individuals' socialization process or a kind of social knowledge (Daruwalla and Darcy, 2005). The body of reactions that assume a guiding mission toward something that an individual, who is a social entity, associates with himself in the socialization process, and daily life can be defined as attitude. Although it is not possible to observe the attitudes of individuals in society, attitudes are important due to the approach that there are tendencies that reveal the behaviors that can be observed and examined. Although the concept of attitude is generally used together or interchangeably with the concepts of belief, value, and opinion, it can be said that it creates some gaps in its explanation. The concept of attitude in the literature to close this gap is tried to be explained by taking emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions, and it requires a comprehensive examination because of the effect of each dimension on the other dimension. Cognitive dimension is shaped by an individual's thoughts, knowledge, and beliefs about anything. Emotional dimension includes the individual's emotions and consists of emotional reactions. Behavioral dimension, in contrast, is the behavioral tendency toward what is the subject of an individual's attitude and it is operational (Odabaşı and Barış, 2016). To achieve the desired attitude development in individuals, there should be consistency between attitude dimensions.

Attitudes toward tourism is the tendency of individuals to react positively or negatively to the phenomenon of tourism. Differences between individuals' attitudes toward tourism can arise from any of the cognitive, emotional, or behavioral dimensions, or the characteristics of the combination of all dimensions. Among these features; the strength of the attitude toward tourism, the level of learning about tourism experiences and tourism through social relations, the state of changing attitude, the formation of attitude with a holistic structure, the complexity of attitude dimensions, and the consistency or inconsistency of the attitudes. Attitudes toward tourism undertake various functions in reaching the needs or wishes of the local people. These functions include creating benefit,

providing value, protecting self-image, and gaining knowledge. For the attitudes toward tourism to turn into a behavior in the local community, some conditions must be formed. Among these conditions, behaviors can occur as a result of the realization of the attitude, the high belief in the attitude, the fact that the attitude is fully known, situational factors such as economic facts are not effective, and knowledge and awareness about the attitude toward tourism or can be formed immediately (Odabaşı and Barış, 2016). There are various sources of information that have a high impact on the formation of attitudes toward tourism. Among the main sources, personality, experiences, personal influence, digital platforms, and mass media may be listed. Introverted or extroverted personality structure, family, peer groups, past experiences, and, today, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc. social media channels, blogs etc., play a key role. Television, newspapers and magazines also play key roles in attitude formation and change as channels for information transfer, sharing, and access to information. It is stated that especially persuasive communication is effective in attitude change (Albu and Nicolau, 2010).

Since the 1970s, the number of studies focusing on the attitudes of local people toward tourism and the effects of tourism on the local community has been increasing. In the studies conducted, it has been determined that tourism can create positive and negative effects, they review the positive and negative effects while determining the attitudes of local people toward tourism, and determine whether local people's attitudes toward tourism will support tourism (O'Leary, 1976; Pizam, 1978; Var et al., 1985; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Berber, 2003; Pennington-Gray, 2005; Akova, 2006; Gursoy et al., 2010; Deery et al., 2012; Scholtz and Slabbert, 2016; Bal et al., 2016; Kang and Lee, 2018; Tohmo, 2018; Robinson et al., 2019; Batmas et al., 2020; Baykal and Ataberk, 2020; Brida et al., 2020; Çakır and Aydın, 2020; Eryılmaz, 2020; İmre, 2020; Koçoğlu et al., 2020; Koday and Akbaş, 2020; Ng and Feng, 2020; Uğur, 2020; Vatan and Bildin, 2020). The attitude of the local people toward tourism and tourists, depends on the destination on tourism, therefore, whether the local people earn income from tourism, the excessive tourism that occurs with the increase in the number of tourists, tourism types in the destination, tourist typologies, the duration of the tourist, the seasonality characteristic of tourism. It is likely that many factors such as the dominance of the local people in the destination, the social and cultural distance between the tourist and the local people, the level of interaction and the tourism

awareness of the local people are the major factors. It is quite difficult to examine the attitudes toward tourism and the tourist and how these positive or negative attitudes affect tourism activities and the success of these activities. However, it would be appropriate to state that the attitudes of local people toward tourism and tourists require multi-dimensional research (Sharpley, 2014). In the following section, the concept of stereotype and the stereotypes of the local people (Turks) that constitute the universe of the study will be explained.

4.4 STEREOTYPES OF TURKS RELATED TO DIFFERENT NATIONS

When considered etymologically, the concept of stereotype consists of the Greek words “stereos” (solid, continuous) and “typos” (attribute, character, type), and it means stereotype or stereotypical thought in Turkish. The concept began to be used in printing in 1798 in naming a type of printing plate (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2020), the first theoretical view in social sciences took place in Walter Lippman’s (1922) book “Public Opinion.” With the concept of stereotype, the researcher tried to explain the ideas, ideologies, or expectations that belong to human beings and have a guiding mission in decision making (Lippmann, 1998). Stereotypes are “complex belief clusters that are sometimes held together by cultural glue or prejudices, but more often joined by theories that reflect a combination of experience and culture” (Schneider, 2004). The concept can be explained as the expression of the individual’s established ideas about out-group members, and the set of beliefs and judgments toward social groups. In this context, stereotypes shape the individual’s knowledge, belief, and expectations toward the other/others in the distinction between self and other, we and others (Hamilton and Sherman, 1994). Stereotypes are formed by bringing together the information heard from others, read in the form of a title, and accepted without questioning its accuracy, and it is evaluated as the effort of the individual to classify the unknown by producing meanings (Gökdayı, 2017). In this context, it is possible to define it as personal characteristics that are believed to be found in a certain group of people, learned from others and learned (Yağan, 2020). In other words; by placing others/other people in descriptive categories, groups of people, for example, the concept of stereotype can be defined as the tendency to categorize and attribute characteristics as a target group

in the form of age, gender, social class, occupation, sexual orientation, political orientation, minority groups, and nationalities. Stereotypes are examined by different disciplines, in line with the approaches is tried to be explained under the headings of cultural and individual stereotypes (Blum, 2004; Carter et al., 2006):

Personal stereotypes are treated as individual thoughts and beliefs about members of another group as a result of experience. Cultural stereotypes are defined as beliefs shared by the whole culture about the characteristics of a group. For example, while it is a cultural stereotype that women are fond of housework and motherhood, it is a personal stereotype that they define women as unreliable as a result of experience (Stangor and Schaller, 1996, as cited in Aktan and Sakallı Uğurlu 2013).

According to stereotypes functions by Snyder and Miene (1994), it is distinguished as cognitive, social, and self-defense function. Cognitive function is about the facilitative aspect of stereotypes of information processing. Social function—the individual’s integration with the group and social environment of which he is a member; self-defense function is related to the individual’s affirmation of his/her self by using stereotypes (Aktan and Sakallı Uğurlu, 2013). Although stereotypes are not formed for a specific purpose, it can serve as a mediator function in perceiving its environment, reducing uncertainties against facts, positioning itself in the society, reflecting its importance and valued things to the outside, adapting to the environment, shaping social and mental representations about reality, and a defense mechanism in dealing with negativities. The way to examine the concept with all its dimensions is through the features it carries. Some of the features of stereotypes are as follows (Karabayev and Tutkun, 2001; Apalı, 2011; Gökdayı, 2017; Yağın, 2020):

- Stereotypes can have positive or negative qualities,
- Usually based on intangible beliefs that need proof,
- Expresses a predictive and emotional value,
- As it may be wrong, it does not reflect the facts exactly,
- It stands out as a way for the individual to obtain information in a short way,
- It is spreading rapidly within the group or society,
- Based on oral culture,
- Resistance to change, and
- It contains simple information.

Stereotypes are shaped by a cognitive process and have an emotional character. It reflects the mentality of prejudice and preconceptions especially in the relations between people from different cultures and forms behavioral patterns. For example, similar prejudices and hatreds can be seen according to different countries, religions, and races. The individual can weaken or eliminate the stereotypes that emerge with thought processes and the negative attitudes that can be developed with these stereotypes, through life experience and intellectual accumulation over time (İmançer, 2004). The individual/individuals have a tendency to generalize toward large groups of people; therefore, they ignore the individual characteristics of the others due to the overgeneralization and lack of them in the structure of stereotypes, and self-fulfilling prophecies (The Pygmalion Mythos or the Pygmalion Effect) creates its own truth (Sürgevil, 2008; Myers, 2017). Stereotypes, especially regarding large groups of people, resist change and change slowly with the influence of social, political, and economic factors. Stereotypes are used more when social tensions occur between groups and may manifest themselves in the form of hostile behavior (Harlak, 2000). The literature, which began with Katz and Braly's (1933) first empirical study on the contents of nation stereotypes, made significant contributions to understanding the cognitive and affective processes underlying discriminatory behavior. Stereotype content model (SCM), which has recently contributed to and guided the stereotype related literature, is its continuation behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes map (BIAS Map), the social-structural sources of stereotypes. created a theoretical framework that integrates contents, affective, and behavioral consequences (Aktan et al., 2019).

Serving as a bridge between East and West, economic and cultural aspects of the transitional location on the itinerary in Turkey, Turkish society, its values, and social norms are a society that has different characteristics under the influence of external factors, especially the West and globalization. In Turkey, "is tolerant and welcoming of Turkey," "the history of racism is not like in the West," "which are tolerant toward other nations in the Ottoman Empire" as there are strong stereotypes. Textbooks contain sentences supporting these judgments (Çayır, 2018, as cited in Yağan, 2020). Stereotypes that lead to incorrect cultural generalizations, such as "belligerent" Serbs, "cunning" Greeks, "lazy" Turks, "wild" Albanians, which emerged in the historical process, were reproduced according to periodic government policies (Bitirim Okmeydan, 2019). For a Greek,

the “Turks are hospitable” stereotype eliminates the prejudice of “Turks are barbarians,” and for a Turk, the “Greeks are hot” stereotype fails to preserve its existence in front of the prejudice “Greeks are traitors.” However, the positive relations established with the social, political, and economic developments that live in time can create a moderate atmosphere even if they do not erase the negativity completely (Özsüer, 2012).

A limited number of studies have been reached on the stereotypes of Turks toward different nations, and the findings obtained from these studies have been tried to be presented by taking into consideration the tourists of different nationalities who have chosen Marmaris destination. A limited number of studies on national stereotypes in Turkey were examined:

Harlak (2000) worked with two separate sampling groups in the Kuşadası and Kiraz districts, compared the stereotypes of the villagers living in touristic villages with and without contact with foreigners, and that the contact resulted in more positive stereotypes, and that the Turks saw themselves as Europeans. He reached the conclusion that certain nations such as Israelis and Iranians were put in the category of enemies. The researcher stated that “Western” nations and stereotypes generally contain more positive adjectives, and the stereotypes related to “neighboring” nations contain negative adjectives and that the most positive adjectives are used for the Japanese and the most negative adjectives are for the Armenians.

Işık (2012) researched the stereotypes of university students regarding Germans in the axis of intercultural communication and collected data from 139 participants. Işık (2012) stated that, participants marked more positive adjectives for Germans, such as hardworking (90.6%), successful-disciplined (88.5%), self-confident (88.4%), nationalist (83.5%), smart (82%), active / social (82%), punctual (81.3%), sportive (81.3%), patriotic (80.6%), cultured (79.1%), and regular (74.8%). In addition, those with the highest rates of adjectives that can be described as negative for Germans, he stated that they only care about money (83.5%) and racist (82%) and that the participants describe Germans with these adjectives and that the participants generally have positive stereotypes toward Germans.

Demir (2016) investigated the stereotypes of 8th grade students and collected data from 400 participants. According to the findings obtained from the study, the participants agree that Germans are “disciplined” (31.4%), Greeks are “enemies of Turks” (32.5%), Japanese “read a lot of books” (35.3%), Germans are “blond-haired, blue-eyed,” Indians are

“not lagging” (49%), Japanese reminds me of robots (52%), Brazilians are “good football players” (48.3%), Singaporeans are “not good at math” (35.8%), and Russian girls are “beautiful” (60.3%).

Bakan and Canöz (2017) investigated the stereotypes of Turkish university students toward Japanese and collected data from 486 participants. Researchers concluded that the Japanese had a place with positive adjectives in the minds of the majority of the participants. The strongest among Turkish university students’ judgments about the qualifications of the Japanese are the judgments that the Japanese are hardworking (93.1%), successful (92%), and smart (88.7%). The rate of those who find Japanese disciplined (87.9%), cultured (83.8%), respectful (83.2%), and active (81.2%) is also quite high. Based on this, researchers stated that Japanese of university students have stereotypes about being respectful, cultured, disciplined, and active. In general, according to the Turks, the British have cultural stereotypes of “noble,” “cold,” Arabs “treacherous,” “dirty,” Japanese “terrible,” Germans “terribly disciplined,” French “gracious,” Italians “hot,” Swiss “soulless” (Harlak, 2000; Akyıldız, 2017).

Tourism causes different cultures to encounter, to experience intercultural relations, and to affect different groups such as tourists, local people, and tourism workers positively or negatively from the relations experienced. Frequent contacts in tourism destinations and stereotypes in cultural relations undoubtedly move on two separate axes from the perspective of the local people, various stakeholders in the tourism destination such as tourism workers and the tourist perspective, and it is thought that the relations and interactions between them can have an effect on the level and direction. Stereotypes that exist almost everywhere can affect the tourism sector positively or negatively and support the shaping of tourism destinations. However, stereotypes can be re-condensed or restructured as a result of interactions in tourism destinations. Personal and cultural stereotypes of tourists from different nationalities visiting tourism destinations are a must-know situation for the sustainability of tourism. However, in the tourism literature, a limited number of studies have been conducted on the stereotypes of local people toward tourists in the interaction between tourist and local people and have been examined superficially (Var et al., 1985; Ward and Berno, 2011; Monterrubio, 2018).

Harlak (1991) conducted the field study of the research titled “Categories and perception repertoires for various tourists” with participants working in the tourism business in Kusadasi, where one of Turkey’s

most important tourism destinations. Participants' most used positive adjectives for tourists of seven different nationalities (German, American, French, British, Scandinavian, Italian and Greek) were "curious" and "smiling," Germans ranked first, British ranked second, and the least popular. He reached the conclusion that the favorite tourists are Greeks.

Köroğlu, Avcıkurt, Köroğlu, and Karaman (2007) concluded that the nationalities of the tourists that the guides most wanted to work with are Americans, Japanese, and Germans. In addition, American tourists "spend a lot of money," "tolerant," "seek comfort," British tourists are "sincere and friendly," "respectful and polite," "cold character," "looking for comfort," German tourists are "fun and cheerful," "principled and disciplined," "seeking comfort," Russian tourists are "fun and cheerful," "disorganized," "reckless," "disrespectful and rude," "respectful and polite," "cold character" of the French; they concluded that Japanese tourists are "tolerant," Israeli tourists are "complacent," "intolerant," "disrespectful and rude," and "do not like to spend money."

Güzel and Köroğlu (2015) investigated the characteristics and behavior patterns of nationalities from the perspective of the guides. They concluded that the majority of positive statements regarding the characteristics are concentrated in Northern Europe (England, Scandinavian countries, and Scotland) and Western Europe (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, and Holland). In negative statements, they stated that Azerbaijan, the Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, and Kazakhstan came to the fore. In terms of behavior patterns, positive expression of the majority of Far-East Asia (Korea, Japan, and China) for the country, the majority are in negative statements Southern Europe (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Italy, Turkey, Spain, Israel, Greece, and Serbia) stated that for the country. The stereotypes of uncertainty and anxiety caused by lack of information, uncertainty about how to behave, and relationships with tourists from different nationalities or indigenous-subcultures who are temporarily present in tourism destinations can be seen as a guide depending on personal characteristics. Depending on the personality traits of the individuals, the way of obtaining information from scratch by getting to know the stranger and establishing relationships can be preferred. In the following section, information about the Marmaris destination where the field study of the research was carried out was given.

4.5 MARMARIS DESTINATION

The study area-Marmaris, is on the southwest of Turkey is a major port and the coastal city of Muğla province. The district of Marmaris is on 36°51'48 latitude and 28°16'30 longitude coordinates and its surface area is 963.73 km². Reşadiye Peninsula and Kerme Bay are located in the west of the district, Balan Mountain, Karadag, and Günlük hills are in the east, Ula in the north and the Mediterranean in the south. Adaköy, which is connected to the mainland by a thin isthmus to the west of the bay, is located in front of the islands of Bedir, Keçi ve Güvercin. There are regular bus services from Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Denizli, Muğla, and Antalya to Marmaris. Marmaris is 56 km from Muğla city center, 90 km from Dalaman Airport, 140 km from Bodrum-Milas Airport, 281 km from Antalya Airport and 284 km from İzmir Adnan Menderes Airport. There are boat trips between Bodrum-Çamlık and catamaran services between Marmaris and Rhodes (T.C. Muğla Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2020; Marmaris Belediyesi, 2020).

Marmaris is under the influence of the Mediterranean climate where summers are hot and dry and winters are warm and rainy, and it has suitable climatic features for coastal tourism. About three quarters of its land is covered with forest and maquis vegetation. Its features, natural environment, vegetation, suitable climate, low humidity, about 10 km long beach, Cennet (Nimara / Yıldız), Bedir, Keçi islands, boat tours to Turunç, Kumlubük, Çiftlik bays (Blue Voyage) are important geographical features that played a leading role in the initiation and development of coastal tourism in Marmaris (Bozkurt, 2019).

Since ancient times, Marmaris has been an important transit point between the Aegean and the Mediterranean. The indented coastal structure, well-preserved bays and harbors, made it an important place among the connection points between Asia, Europe, and Africa. Marmaris, where the first settlement dates back to 3200 B.C., was named "Physkos," which means "city of nature" during the Carian Civilization. Herodotus mentions the Marmaris as "Happy people living under the most beautiful view" (Özgürel, 2018). Marmaris looks like a unique museum of civilizations displaying traces from the civilizations of Caria, Rhodes and Island, Egypt, Ionian, Doric, Persian, Macedonian, Syrian, Roman, Byzantine, Seljuk, and Ottoman (Birsin, 2017).

There are 13 districts in Muğla province including the central district, Marmaris is the 5th in terms of population (www.nufusu.com, 2020). In

the district with 25 neighborhoods, a significant portion of the settlements transformed from village status to neighborhoods are located on the coast-line, while a small number of other residential areas are located close to the sea or within the forest area. There are various tourism activities such as coastal tourism, rural tourism, agro tourism, camping-caravan tourism, cultural tourism, yacht tourism, bicycle tourism, and event tourism in the Marmaris. City center, Armutalan, Beldibi, İçmeler, Turunç, Selimiye, and Bozburun neighborhoods stand out, especially with coastal tourism.

Agriculture, animal husbandry, sponge fishing, forestry, and fishing were important economic activities until the 1960s, while tourism activities that started with house boarding have taken their place as the most important sector today.

The population of the district of Marmaris, which was 12,780 in 1965, reached 94,749 people in 2019 according to the Address Based Population Registration System (ADNKS) and the annual population growth rate of the district is 5.3 per thousand compared to the previous year (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, 2019). In parallel with the development of tourism in Marmaris, it has become a target destination for those who migrate from neighboring provinces and abroad for various purposes, especially after the 1990s. Migrations from neighboring and eastern provinces for purpose of working in tourism sector increased the population. Furthermore, foreign brides settle in Marmaris due to international marriage, immigrant resident aliens for retirement, or a better life has been effective in increasing population.

In the district, where there were 10 certified hotels and 1 holiday village in the 1960s, the accommodation needs of the tourists were tried to be met by house boarding. Depending on the development of tourism, there has been a significant increase in the number of facilities and bed capacity in the destination. Services are provided with a total of 935 facilities with tourism operation and municipality certificates, 39,419 rooms, and 80,095 beds in the Marmaris. Due to COVID-19, a total of 89 accommodation facilities (Ministry Certified and Municipal Certified) participated in the Safe Tourism Certification Program, 61 facilities received certification, and the certification process of 28 facilities continues (T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2020). There are 216 A Group travel agency in the district (Özgürel, 2020).

A total of 1,024,150 tourists, including 815,458 foreign and 208,692 local (Turkish) tourists, stayed overnight at the facilities with Tourism Management Certificate in Marmaris in 2019 (Yatırım ve İşletmeler Genel

Müdürlüğü, 2019). In Municipal Certified Facilities, a total of 744.536 tourists, including 534.101 foreigners and 210.435 local (Turkish), stayed overnight (Yatırım ve İşletmeler Genel Müdürlüğü, 2019).

In Marmaris, which is especially preferred by British, Russian, German, and Dutch tourists, local tourists visit the district for the trio of sea, sand and sun during Ramadan and Eid al-Adha, which coincides with the summer season. In recent years, it is known that tourists from Middle Eastern countries such as Israel, Iran, Jordan, and Lebanon have increasingly preferred Marmaris destination.

4.6 MATERIALS AND METHODS

4.6.1 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF DATA

The study of Var et al. (1985) was the source of inspiration for this study. In this study, quantitative research method was adopted and benefited from the scale used by Var et al. (1985). In the field study, a scale consisting of three parts and 51 questions was used.

In the first part, socio-demographic characteristics (9 questions), in the second part, perceptions about tourism and its effects (26 questions—5 Likert 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), in the third and final part, there are questions aimed at determining the stereotypes of local people about different tourist nationalities (8 Questions—5 Likert 1=Absolutely Not Preferred 5= Definitely Preferred, 4 Questions E=Yes/H=No and 4 Questions 5 Likert 1= Absolutely Not Participating 5= Definitely Participating).

Fieldwork was conducted during 07 and 31 July 2020, the surveys were conducted online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and data were collected from 393 local people. The data obtained in the study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows 22.0 program. Number, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used as descriptive statistical methods in the evaluation of the data. The *t*-test was used to compare the quantitative continuous data between two independent groups, and the One-way Anova test was used to compare the quantitative continuous data between more than two independent groups. After the Anova test, the Scheffe test was used as a complementary post-hoc analysis to determine the differences.

4.6.2 DATA COLLECTION TOOL

The internal consistency coefficient “Cronbach Alpha” was calculated to calculate the reliability of 20 items in the perception scale about tourism and its effects. The overall reliability of the scale was found to be very high as $\alpha = 0.877$. To reveal the construct validity of the scale, the explanatory factor analysis method was applied. As a result of the Barlett test ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$), it was determined that there is a relationship between the variables included in the factor analysis. As a result of the test ($KMO = 0.876 > 0.60$), it was determined that the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis. The varimax method was chosen in the factor analysis application and the structure of the relationship between the factors was kept the same. As a result of factor analysis, variables were grouped under two factors with a total variance of 52.156%. According to the alpha found for its reliability and the variance value explained, it was understood that the perception scale for tourism and tourism is a valid and reliable tool.

Var et al. (1985) included 6 statements from 26 statements in the perception of tourism and its effects (TA) scale:

TA4. “Tourists have led to changes in our lifestyle.”

TA6. “I would like to see that the government attaches more importance to protecting the Marmaris environment.”

TA9. “Tourism increases property values and housing prices.”

TA10. “Local businesses must pay additional taxes to cover some public expenditure.”

TA16. “I am proud to live in Marmaris.”

TA22. “I feel there is a decline in the ecological environment.” items were excluded because co-loading and factor load were low.

The factor structure of the scale of perception toward tourism and its effects is shown in Table 4.1 below.

TABLE 4.1 Factor Structure of the Perception Scale Toward Tourism and Its Effects.

| Dimensions | Factor loadings |
|---|-----------------|
| Perception Dimension Toward Tourism Gains (Eigenvalue = 7.030; Explained variance = 33.015; Alpha = 0.903) | |
| TA20. Tourism creates jobs. | 0.818 |
| TA7. Tourism earns foreign currency. | 0.795 |
| TA12. Tourism provides income and increases revenues. | 0.769 |

TABLE 4.1 (Continued)

| Dimensions | Factor loadings |
|---|------------------------|
| TA2. Tourists contribute to international peace and the development of peace understanding. | 0.743 |
| TA18. I am aware that growing tourism increases government revenues. | 0.738 |
| TA3. I'm willing to meet tourists from Turkey and many countries of the world. | 0.720 |
| TA8. Tourism encourages local people to participate in various cultural activities. | 0.710 |
| TA1. Meeting with tourists provides an educational experience. | 0.708 |
| TA24. I would like to see more government spending to protect the environment. | 0.669 |
| TA17. I feel very good when I see the tourists enjoying the views of Marmaris. | 0.663 |
| TA21. Tourism reduces unemployment. | 0.640 |
| TA23. The government can control the impact of tourism on the environment by making long-term plans. | 0.571 |
| TA5. I endure discomfort to earn/earn money from tourism and tourists. | 0.403 |
| Perception dimension of negative effects of tourism (Eigenvalue = 3.401; Explained variance = 19.141; Alpha = 0.845) | |
| TA25. Tourism increases the crime rate in Marmaris. | 0.825 |
| TA26. Crime is increasing in Muğla due to tourism. | 0.805 |
| TA13. Tourism increases traffic congestion. | 0.746 |
| TA14. Tourism increases the prices of basic goods. | 0.704 |
| TA19. I think tourists have negative effects on children and young people. | 0.680 |
| TA15. Tourism increases the crowd. | 0.634 |
| TA11. Tourism promotes a greedy business ethic. | 0.613 |
| Total variance = 52.156%; overall reliability (Alpha) = 0.877 | |

In the factor analysis of the dimension of tourism gains, attention was paid to handling factors with eigenvalues greater than one, the high factor loadings indicating the weight of the variables in the factor, and not being close to each other for the same variable. The fact that the reliability coefficients of the factors that make up the scale and the high variance rates

explained show that the scale has a strong factor structure. It was considered as the items in the first factor, the reliability of the 13 items constituting the dimension of perception toward tourism gains was determined as $\alpha = 0.903$, and the variance value explained was 33.015%. It was considered as the items in the second factor, and the reliability of the seven items that constitute the dimension of perception about the negative effects of tourism was determined as $\alpha = 0.845$, and the explained variance value was found as 19.141%. While calculating the scores of the factors in the scale, the factor scores were obtained by dividing the values of the items in the factor by the number of items (arithmetic mean).

4.7 FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

In this section, the results obtained from the analysis of data collected through scales from the participants in the research are included in order to solve the research problem. Explanations and comments were made based on the findings obtained. Table 4.2 below shows the findings regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants from the local people of Marmaris.

TABLE 4.2 Findings Regarding Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants.

| Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Gender | | | Foreign language speaking status | | |
| Male | 217 | 55.2 | Yes | 93 | 23.7 |
| Female | 176 | 44.8 | No | 300 | 76.3 |
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |
| Age | | | English-speaking level | | |
| 20 years and under | 34 | 8.7 | Can't speak | 93 | 23.7 |
| Between 21 and 30 years | 113 | 28.8 | Little | 6 | 1.5 |
| Between 31 and 40 years | 94 | 23.9 | Middle | 105 | 26.7 |
| Between 41 and 50 years | 98 | 24.9 | Good | 104 | 26.5 |

TABLE 4.2 (Continued)

| Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 51 years and over | 54 | 13.7 | Very good | 85 | 21.6 |
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |
| Duration of residence | | | Level of speaking Russian | | |
| 5 years and below | 71 | 18.1 | Can't speak | 241 | 61.3 |
| Between 6 and 10 years | 50 | 12.7 | Little | 103 | 26.2 |
| Between 11 and 15 years | 40 | 10.2 | Middle | 33 | 8.4 |
| 16 years and over | 113 | 28.8 | Good | 10 | 2.6 |
| Since he was born | 119 | 30.2 | Very good | 6 | 1.5 |
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |
| Education level | | | Level of speaking Arabic | | |
| Secondary school | 97 | 24.7 | Can't speak | 317 | 80.7 |
| Associate degree | 99 | 25.2 | Little | 58 | 14.8 |
| Undergraduate | 143 | 36.4 | Middle | 8 | 2.0 |
| Graduate | 54 | 13.7 | Good | 2 | 0.5 |
| | | | Very good | 8 | 2.0 |
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |
| Income level | | | Level of speaking German | | |
| 2500 TL and below | 54 | 13.7 | Can't speak | 369 | 93.9 |
| Between 2501 and 5000 TL | 143 | 36.4 | Little | 9 | 2.3 |
| Between 5001 and 7500 TL | 90 | 22.9 | Middle | 5 | 1.3 |
| Between 7501 and 10,000 TL | 60 | 15.3 | Good | 4 | 1.0 |
| 10,000 TL and over | 46 | 11.7 | Very good | 6 | 1.5 |

TABLE 4.2 (Continued)

| Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) | Groups | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---------------|-------------|--|---------------|-------------|
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |
| Sector | | | Level of speaking another language (Spanish, Italian, French, etc.) | | |
| Tourism | 123 | 31.3 | Can't speak | 379 | 96.4 |
| Out of tourism | 270 | 68.7 | Little | 5 | 1.3 |
| Total | 393 | 100.0 | Middle | 4 | 1.0 |
| Working style in the tourism sector | | | Good | 3 | 0.8 |
| Tourism employee | 83 | 67.5 | Very good | 2 | 0.5 |
| Tourism employer | 40 | 32.5 | | | |
| Total | 123 | 100.00 | Total | 393 | 100.0 |

55.2% of the participants ($n = 217$) were “men” and 44.8% ($n = 176$) were “women.” Total population of Marmaris is 94,749 and 52.47% of the population is men and 47.53% are women. It is close to the male–female proportional distribution (45% female ratio) obtained in the field study and in the studies of Var et al. (1985). According to the “age” variable, 48.8% of the participants are in the “31–50 age range.” According to the “duration of residence” variable, 30.3% ($n = 119$) of the participants “since their birth” and 28.8% ($n = 113$) have been living in Marmaris for “16 years and over.” In the study of Var et al. (1985), it was stated that 64% of the respondents were residents of Marmaris since birth and only 18% lived in Marmaris for less than 5 years. According to the findings, the ratio of local people living in Marmaris for “5 years and less” is 18.1% ($n = 71$) similar to the results obtained from the studies of Var et al. (1985). With the development of tourism in Marmaris, there has been migration from many cities of Turkey, especially from the surrounding provinces. With the settlement of individuals coming for seasonal purposes over time, Marmaris witnesses the settlement of individuals from the different subculture. According to the “education level” variable, 75.3% ($n = 296$)

of the local community participants have a “higher education - associate, undergraduate and graduate” degree.

Var et al. (1985) found that “8% of the local population did not receive primary education, which was mandatory for 5 years in those years.” The findings obtained in this study prove that previous findings have changed over the years and that the level of education in Turkey has increased.

In the field study, it was determined that all of the participants were trained and the rate of those who completed 12-year compulsory education was 24.7% ($n = 97$). “Income level,” according to a variable, has come from 36.4% of the participants’ ($n = 143$) “TL 2501–5000,” 22.9% ($n = 90$) “TL 5001–7500.” About 31.3% of the participants ($n = 123$) are dealing with “tourism,” 67.5% ($n = 83$) of the participants who are engaged in tourism are “tourism workers / employees,” 32.5% ($n = 40$) is “tourism operator / employer.” In their study, Var et al. (1985) found the rate of those dealing with tourism among the participants as 22%. About 76.3% of the participants ($n = 300$) “can speak a foreign language” and 74.8% ($n = 294$) “English,” 12.5% ($n = 49$) “Russian,” 4.5% ($n = 18$) can speak “Arabic,” 3.8% ($n = 15$) “German” at intermediate and above level. In addition, 2.3% of the participants ($n = 9$) can speak other European languages (Spanish, French, Italian, etc.) at intermediate and above level. Var et al. (1985) reported that 32% of the participants were able to speak a foreign language, including participants who were not fluent. It is predicted that the high level of education of the local people of Marmaris, the unique nature of the destination, the intertwining of the tourist attractions with the living spaces of the local people, the fact that some of the local people are in the tourism sector and therefore in the communication environment with the tourist, both directly and indirectly, affect their ability to speak foreign languages.

In Table 4.3, the perception dimensions and point averages of the participants regarding tourism and tourism effects are given.

TABLE 4.3 Perception Point Average for Tourism and Tourism Effects.

| Dimensions | N | Mean | SS | Min. | Max. |
|---|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Perception dimension toward tourism gains | 393 | 4.060 | 0.666 | 1.000 | 5.000 |
| Perception dimension of negative effects of tourism | 393 | 3.343 | 0.845 | 1.000 | 5.000 |

The average “dimension of perception toward tourism gains” of the participants was found to be 4.060 ± 0.666 (min = 1; max = 5). As perceived by local people participants, “Tourism creates jobs” ($\bar{x} = 4.422$), “tourism creates a foreign exchange” ($\bar{x} = 4.394$), “tourism provides income, increases incomes” ($\bar{x} = 4.275$) expressions very high level; “I am aware that growing with tourism increases government revenues.” ($\bar{x} = 4.165$), “tourism reduces unemployment.” ($\bar{x} = 4.115$) expressions high level; “I bear inconvenience to earn/earn money from tourism and tourists.” It was determined that they agree with the expression ($\bar{x} = 2.924$) at a moderate level. The findings show that local people perceive the positive economic effects of tourism at a very high level. The local people of Marmaris say that “tourists contribute to international peace and development of peace understanding” ($\bar{x} = 3.972$), “Turkey and tourists from around the world to meet with a number of countries willing” ($\bar{x} = 3.952$), “meeting tourists provides an educational experience” ($\bar{x} = 3.982$), “I feel very good when I see tourists enjoying the sights of Marmaris” ($\bar{x} = 4.048$) expressions highly agree. The findings show that the positive social effects of tourism are perceived at a high level by the local people. “Tourism encourages local people to participate in various cultural activities.” It has been concluded that the expression ($\bar{x} = 4.025$) is highly attended by local people, and in this context, their awareness of the positive cultural impact of tourism is high. Local people—“I would like to see more government spending to protect the environment” ($\bar{x} = 4.433$) stated at a very high level. In contrast, they highly agree with the expression “government can control the impact of tourism on the environment by making long-term plans” ($\bar{x} = 4.076$).

The local people who want to receive more government support for the protection of the Marmaris environment and believe that they can control the impact of tourism on the environment in line with the strategic plans of the public have a high awareness of the environmental impacts of tourism. The positive perception of the effects of tourism—social, cultural, economic, and environmental aspects—of the local people can be considered as a precursor to their support for tourism and related policies and to contribute to the development of tourism. It is thought that the positive perception of tourism by the local people of Marmaris is an important finding in terms of the support they will provide for tourism, the competitive advantage to be created with the power to be obtained from the local and the sustainability of Marmaris tourism.

The average of “dimension of perception toward the negative effects of tourism” was found to be medium 3.343 ± 0.845 (min = 1; max = 5). It was determined that local people agree with expressions—“tourism increases the crowd” ($\bar{x} = 4.244$), at a very high level, “tourism increases traffic congestion” ($\bar{x} = 3.761$) at high level, “tourism increases the crime rate in Marmaris” ($\bar{x} = 2.913$) and “crime is increasing due to tourism in Muğla” ($\bar{x} = 2.875$) at a moderate level.

The local people of Marmaris are aware of the social costs/negative effects created by tourism in the societies where it develops. Seasonality effect of tourism brings with it crowd and traffic congestion during the summer months in Marmaris, which stands out especially with coastal tourism. Intensive tourist flows, seasonal tourism workers, the presence of second home owners in Marmaris during the high season, especially on weekends, excursionists from the neighboring provinces can strain their social, and physical transport capacity are some factors. Local people have a moderate perception of tourism crimes and crime rates. It is thought that by lowering the current situation, even more, the arguments that may be subject to crime and crime can be reduced to a much lower level with public measures to be taken.

It was found that participants agreed with the expressions; “I think tourists have negative effects on children and young people” ($\bar{x} = 2.715$) and “tourism promotes greedily governed business ethics” ($\bar{x} = 2.985$) at a moderate level.

In this context, it can be said that the local people of Marmaris perceive the negative effects of tourism on the culture at a moderate level. It can be said that the presence of a multicultural environment in Marmaris and the encounter with different cultures with the arrival of tourists do not contain negativities that cannot be accepted by the local people. Var et al. (1985) stated that 37.5% of the participants agree that the relaxation/deterioration in commercial ethics.

It was determined that the local people of Marmaris agreed with the expression “tourism increases prices of basic goods” at a high ($\bar{x} = 3.906$) level. The findings show that the participants perceive the negative economic impact of tourism. The negative perception of tourism effects by local people means not getting support from the local, negative perceptions have the potential to turn into negative tourism attitudes and/or behaviors. Findings obtained show that it is necessary to act with a planned and sustainable tourism understanding in order not to interrupt the desired and planned tourism development in Marmaris.

Table 4.4 shows the differentiation of the perceptions of the participants, consisting of the local people of Marmaris, toward the effects of tourism and tourism.

TABLE 4.4 Differentiation Status of Perception Toward Tourism and Its Effects According to Descriptive Features.

| Demographic features | n | Perception of tourism gains | Perception of the negative effects of tourism |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| Gender | | | |
| Male | 217 | 4.085 ± 0.764 | 3.292 ± 0.915 |
| Female | 176 | 4.029 ± 0.521 | 3.406 ± 0.747 |
| t= | | 0.831 | -1.334 |
| p= | | 0.389 | 0.174 |
| Age | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| 20 years and below | 34 | 3.959 ± 0.726 | 3.189 ± 0.765 |
| Between 21 and 30 years | 113 | 4.193 ± 0.576 | 3.403 ± 0.892 |
| Between 31 and 40 years | 94 | 4.079 ± 0.579 | 3.439 ± 0.850 |
| Between 41 and 50 years | 98 | 3.900 ± 0.778 | 3.356 ± 0.859 |
| 51 years and over | 54 | 4.104 ± 0.677 | 3.122 ± 0.724 |
| F= | | 2.883 | 1.675 |
| p= | | 0.022 | 0.155 |
| PostHoc= | | 2 > 4 (p < 0.05) | |
| Duration of residence | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| 5 years and below | 71 | 4.203 ± 0.632 | 3.312 ± 0.881 |
| Between 6 and 10 years | 50 | 3.989 ± 0.574 | 3.494 ± 0.824 |
| Between 11 and 15 years | 40 | 3.619 ± 1.010 | 3.357 ± 0.959 |
| 16 years and over | 113 | 4.053 ± 0.572 | 3.242 ± 0.828 |
| Since born | 119 | 4.160 ± 0.602 | 3.389 ± 0.807 |
| F= | | 6.342 | 0.923 |
| p= | | 0.000 | 0.450 |
| PostHoc= | | 1 > 3, 2 > 3, 4 > 3, 5 > 3 (p < 0.05) | |
| Level of education | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| Secondary school | 97 | 3.961 ± 0.743 | 3.155 ± 0.794 |
| Associate degree | 99 | 4.147 ± 0.597 | 3.420 ± 0.887 |
| Bachelor's | 143 | 4.063 ± 0.697 | 3.352 ± 0.871 |

TABLE 4.4 (Continued)

| Demographic features | n | Perception of tourism gains | Perception of the negative effects of tourism |
|--|----------|------------------------------------|--|
| Graduate | 54 | 4.073 ± 0.536 | 3.516 ± 0.733 |
| F= | | 1.284 | 2.674 |
| p= | | 0.279 | 0.047 |
| PostHoc= | | | 2 > 1, 4 > 1 (p < 0.05) |
| Gelir Düzeyi | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| 2500 TL and below | 54 | 3.906 ± 0.823 | 3.111 ± 0.825 |
| Between 2501 and 5000 TL | 143 | 4.023 ± 0.593 | 3.447 ± 0.808 |
| Between 5001 and 7500 TL | 90 | 4.015 ± 0.825 | 3.321 ± 0.886 |
| Between 7501 and 10,000 TL | 60 | 4.146 ± 0.464 | 3.431 ± 0.875 |
| 10,000 TL and over | 46 | 4.334 ± 0.453 | 3.221 ± 0.821 |
| F= | | 3.211 | 1.995 |
| p= | | 0.013 | 0.095 |
| PostHoc= | | 5 > 1, 5 > 2, 5 > 3 (p < 0.05) | |
| Foreign language speaking status | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| No | 93 | 3.869 ± 0.744 | 3.333 ± 0.910 |
| Yes | 300 | 4.120 ± 0.629 | 3.346 ± 0.825 |
| t= | | -3.217 | -0.123 |
| p= | | 0.001 | 0.902 |
| Sector | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| Tourism | 123 | 4.151 ± 0.580 | 3.412 ± 0.838 |
| Out of tourism | 270 | 4.019 ± 0.699 | 3.311 ± 0.847 |
| t= | | 1.822 | 1.102 |
| p= | | 0.069 | 0.271 |
| Employment type in the tourism sector | | Mean ± SS | Mean ± SS |
| Employee | 83 | 4.075 ± 0.617 | 3.492 ± 0.825 |
| Employer | 40 | 4.308 ± 0.463 | 3.246 ± 0.851 |
| t= | | -2.113 | 1.532 |
| p= | | 0.037 | 0.128 |

According to the “gender” variable of the participants, perception points toward tourism gains and negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$). The fact that the distribution of the participants according to the gender variable is close to each other in percentage is important for the analysis results. In some studies, it is stated that people of different genders perceive tourism differently (Milman and Pizam, 1988), while there are significant differences in other studies (Özaltın Türker and Türker, 2014).

According to the “age” variable, the perception points of the participants toward tourism gains differ significantly ($F = 2.883$; $p = 0.022 < 0.05$). The reason for the difference; the perception points of those in the “21–30 age range” toward tourism gains are higher than those in the “41–50 age range” ($p < 0.05$). It was determined that the perception scores of the participants about the negative effects of tourism according to the “age” variable did not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$). Özaltın Türker and Türker (2014) concluded that the age variable showed significant differences in the total impact score of tourism.

Participants’ perception points toward tourism gains in the “durations of residence” variable ($F = 6.342$; $p = 0 < 0.05$) differ significantly. The reason for the difference; the perception points of those with a “duration of residence” 5 years and less toward tourism gains are higher than those of those with a residence time “11–15 years” ($p < 0.05$). Perception scores for tourism gains for those with “6–10 years” are higher than perception scores for tourism gains for those with “11–15 years” ($p < 0.05$). The fact that the perception points toward tourism gains of those with a “duration of residence “16 years and more” are higher than those of those with a “duration of residence of 11–15 years” ($p < 0.05$). Perception points toward tourism gains of those whose residence period “since birth” is higher than those who have a “residence period of 11–15 years” ($p < 0.05$). It can be said that the perception of tourism gains according to their score averages has the lowest perception of tourism gains among those with a “residence time of 11–15 years.” The perception points of the participants about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly according to the “duration of residence” variable ($p > 0.05$).

The perception points of the participants about the negative effects of tourism differ significantly according to the “education level” variable ($F = 2.674$; $p = 0.047 < 0.05$). The reason for the difference; the perception scores of those whose education level is “associate degree” about the

negative effects of tourism is higher than those whose education level is “secondary education” about the negative effects of tourism ($p < 0.05$). The perception scores of those whose education level is “graduate” about the negative effects of tourism is higher than those whose education level is “secondary education” about the negative effects of tourism ($p < 0.05$). The perception points of the participants toward tourism gains do not differ significantly according to the “education level” variable ($p > 0.05$). In some studies, in the literature, it is stated that the level of education of local people affects the level of perception of the effects of tourism (Caneday and Zeiger, 1991).

Participants’ perception scores toward tourism gains differ significantly according to the “income level” variable ($F = 3.211$; $p = 0.013 < 0.05$). The reason for the difference; the perception points of those with an income level of “over 10,000 TL” toward tourism gains are higher than those of those with an income level of “2500 TL and below” ($p < 0.05$). The fact that the perception points of those with an income level of “over 10,000 TL” toward tourism gains are higher than those of those whose income level is between “2501–5000 TL” ($p < 0.05$). The fact that the perception points toward tourism gains of those whose income level is “over 10,000 TL” is higher than the perception points of those whose income level is between “5001–7500 TL” ($p < 0.05$). The perception points of the participants about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly according to the “income level” variable ($p > 0.05$). Özalın Türker and Türker (2014) concluded that the total impact score of tourism does not differ significantly according to the income variable.

According to the variable of “speaking a foreign language”; the perception scores ($x = 3.869$) toward tourism gains of “non-foreign language speakers” were found to be lower than those of “foreign language speakers” ($x = 4.120$) ($t = -3.217$; $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). Being able to speak a foreign language enables establishing formal and informal relationships and forms an integral part of communication with tourists in social, cultural and economic relations. It is normal for local people to perceive that the gains they have achieved in this context increase and increase according to their language skills. The perception points of the participants about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly according to the “speaking a foreign language” variable ($p > 0.05$).

The perception points of the participants about their perception of tourism gains and negative effects do not show a significant difference

according to the “sector of work” variable ($p > 0.05$). The perception points ($x = 4.075$) of those who work in the tourism sector as a “tourism worker (employee)” were found to be lower than the perception points ($x = 4.308$) of those whose employment status is “tourism operator (employer)” ($t = -2.113$) $p = 0.037 < 0.05$). Participants who are in the position of employee/operator are considered to have higher average scores due to the gains they have achieved in economic, social, and cultural aspects (most of the businesses in Marmaris are small/medium sized enterprises and the operators are in close contact with tourists) due to tourism activities. The perception points of the participants about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly according to the variable “employment type in the tourism sector” ($p > 0.05$).

In the following section, the findings of the perceptions and stereotypes of the participants from the local people of Marmaris about tourists are included. It has been tried to determine the level of preference of the local people of Marmaris to tourists from different countries and with different characteristics with a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = I Definitely Do Not Prefer 5 = I Definitely Prefer).

Table 4.5 presents the distribution of the responses of the participants to the statements regarding tourist preferences.

TABLE 4.5 Distributions of Participants’ Answers to the Expressions Related to Tourist Preferences.

| | Absolutely I do not prefer | | I do not prefer | | Neither I prefer nor I do not prefer | | I prefer | | Absolutely I prefer | | Av. | Ss |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----|--------------------|------|--|------|----------|------|------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | | |
| Tourists from Western Europe | 34 | 8.7 | 26 | 6.6 | 60 | 15.3 | 158 | 40.2 | 115 | 29.3 | 3.748 | 1.195 |
| Tourists from Eastern Europe | 33 | 8.4 | 41 | 10.4 | 85 | 21.6 | 170 | 43.3 | 64 | 16.3 | 3.486 | 1.136 |

TABLE 4.5 (Continued)

| | Absolutely I do not prefer | | I do not prefer | | Neither I prefer nor I do not prefer | | I prefer | | Absolutely I prefer | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|------|----------------------------|------|---|------|-----------------|------|--------------------------------|------|-------|-------|
| Tourists from United States | 44 | 11.2 | 42 | 10.7 | 80 | 20.4 | 146 | 37.2 | 81 | 20.6 | 3.453 | 1.245 |
| Local Tourists | 38 | 9.7 | 53 | 13.5 | 77 | 19.6 | 153 | 38.9 | 72 | 18.3 | 3.427 | 1.210 |
| Turkish Tourists Living Abroad | 37 | 9.4 | 57 | 14.5 | 71 | 18.1 | 166 | 42.2 | 62 | 15.8 | 3.405 | 1.190 |
| Tourists from Far East | 59 | 15.0 | 48 | 12.2 | 98 | 24.9 | 131 | 33.3 | 57 | 14.5 | 3.201 | 1.265 |
| Hippies | 88 | 22.4 | 63 | 16.0 | 123 | 31.3 | 85 | 21.6 | 34 | 8.7 | 2.781 | 1.255 |
| Tourists from Middle East | 112 | 28.5 | 78 | 19.8 | 101 | 25.7 | 73 | 18.6 | 29 | 7.4 | 2.565 | 1.278 |

According to the average score of the expressions in line with the answers of the participants in the study about tourist preferences; (1) ranked “Western European,” (2) “East European” ranked third, “American” ranked fourth, “Native (Turkish)” ranked fourth, “Turkish Living Abroad” ranked fifth, and local people agreed with the statements at a high level. When the mean scores of the expressions of the participants are examined; “Far Eastern,” “Hippies,” and “Middle Eastern” tourists are in the lower ranks. Participation of “Far Easterners” and “Hippies” in the statement toward “Middle Eastern” tourists was found to be at a moderate level, and they were found to be at a low level. According to the Var et al. (1985) tourist perceptions and stereotypes of local people in Marmaris (the most preferred ones) are as follows: tourists from Western Europe, tourists from the Far East, tourists from America, tourists from Eastern European countries, tourists from Middle Eastern countries, local tourists, Turkish workers live abroad, and Hippies.

When the findings of both studies are compared, it is seen that Western European and American tourists maintain the ranking. It has been determined that Eastern European, local (Turkish) tourists, and Turkish tourists living abroad climb to the top, Far Eastern and Middle Eastern tourists fall to the bottom, and Hippies go up only one rank from the bottom row. In the works of Hippies were perceived as a separate tourist group without nationality and was included in the scale for comparison in the study of Var et al. (1985).

Table 4.6 shows the findings of the participants about the preferences of the Turkish living abroad and the domestic (Turkish) tourists living in the country. Table 4.6 shows that 77.1% of respondents ($n = 303$) prefer “Turks living abroad to come on holiday in Turkey,” but 72.0% ($n = 283$) “prefer of Turks living abroad come to Marmaris on vacation.” Var et al. (1985) stated that local people strongly support “*Turkish workers abroad to come to Turkey for holiday.*” but they added that there are strong stereotypes about coming to Marmaris and that they are the least preferred tourists.

It has been determined that the stereotypes of the local people regarding the arrival of Turks living abroad to Marmaris for vacation since 1985 have changed over time. In contrast, 60.6% ($n = 238$) of the participants of the local people of Marmaris stated that “they did not learn better and new things from Turks living abroad.” The findings obtained support the results found by Var et al. (1985). About 70.0% ($n = 275$) of the local people, “prefer local (Turkish) tourists to come to Marmaris on holiday.” The findings obtained do not match the findings of Var et al. (1985). The researchers stated that local (Turkish) tourists are not preferred by the local people, either.

TABLE 4.6 Participants’ Preferences for Turkish and Local (Turkish) Tourists Living Abroad.

| Groups | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|--|---------------|-------------|
| Would you prefer turks living abroad to come on vacation to turkey? | | |
| Yes | 303 | 77.1 |
| No | 90 | 22.9 |
| Would you prefer Turks living abroad to come on vacation to Marmaris? | | |
| Yes | 283 | 72.0 |
| No | 110 | 28.0 |

TABLE 4.6 (Continued)

| Groups | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|
| Would you prefer local (Turkish) tourists to come on vacation to Marmaris? | | |
| Yes | 275 | 70.0 |
| No | 118 | 30.0 |
| I learn better and new things from Turks living abroad | | |
| Yes | 155 | 39.4 |
| No | 238 | 60.6 |

In Table 4.7, expressions about how participants view tourists of different nationalities as “pleasant and thoughtful” are given by their level of participation, frequency and percentage. According to Table 4.7, the percentage of participants rated tourists “pleasant and considerate” is as follows: 57.5% ($n = 226$) “British tourists,” 39.7% ($n = 156$) “Russian tourists,” 39.5% ($n = 155$) “American tourists,” and 15%, 5 ($n = 61$) “Arab tourists.” In addition, when the answers given in the other option are examined; 30 participants from Marmaris local people “German tourists, 28 participants “Dutch tourists,” 20 participants “Scandinavian tourists,” 16 participants “European tourists,” 15 participants “Finnish tourists,” 10 participants “Japanese tourists,” and 10 participants “Danish tourists” found pleasant and thoughtful. Eight participants stated that they did not find “local tourists” pleasant and considerate.

The destination of Marmaris, which has been preferred by British tourists for many years, has been hosting Russian tourists, whose number continues to increase with each year, especially after the 1990s, and the locals show a positive trend in stereotyping of British, Russian, and American tourists. The positive stereotypes of the local people of Marmaris toward European tourists are supported by their answers to the other option. Negative stereotypes of Turks about Arabs from the past were supported in the study, and 60.1% of the participants stated that they did not find Arabs pleasant and considerate. Var et al. (1985) noted that the participants expressed their perceptions of various tourists by national origin and found that 44% of the local population found American tourists pleasant and considerate.

TABLE 4.7 Distribution of Participants' Responses to the Expression of Finding Tourists of Different Nationalities as Welcoming and Considerate.

| Groups | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|
| British tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 18 | 4.6 |
| I disagree | 35 | 8.9 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 114 | 29.0 |
| I agree | 152 | 38.7 |
| Absolutely I agree | 74 | 18.8 |
| Total | 393 | 100.00 |
| Russian tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 32 | 8.1 |
| I disagree | 57 | 14.5 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 148 | 37.7 |
| I agree | 114 | 29.0 |
| Absolutely I agree | 42 | 10.7 |
| Total | 393 | 100.00 |
| American tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 24 | 6.1 |
| I disagree | 46 | 11.7 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 168 | 42.7 |
| I agree | 113 | 28.8 |
| Absolutely I agree | 42 | 10.7 |
| Total | 393 | 100.00 |
| Arab Tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 135 | 34.4 |
| I disagree | 101 | 25.7 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 96 | 24.4 |
| I agree | 41 | 10.4 |
| Absolutely I agree | 20 | 5.1 |
| Total | 393 | 100.00 |

TABLE 4.7 (Continued)

| Groups | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|---|----------------------|--------------------|
| Other (nationality and participation status) | | |
| German tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 1 | 3.0 |
| I disagree | 1 | 3.0 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1 | 3.0 |
| I agree | 19 | 57.7 |
| Absolutely I agree | 11 | 33.3 |
| Total | 33 | 100.00 |
| Dutch tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 1 | 3.3 |
| I disagree | 1 | 3.3 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 14 | 46.7 |
| I agree | 14 | 46.7 |
| Total | 30 | 100.00 |
| Scandinavian tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I agree | 9 | 45.0 |
| Absolutely I agree | 11 | 55.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.00 |
| European tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 1 | 5.9 |
| I agree | 6 | 35.3 |
| Absolutely I agree | 10 | 58.8 |
| Total | 17 | 100.00 |
| Finnish tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I agree | 8 | 53.3 |
| Absolutely I agree | 7 | 46.7 |
| Total | 15 | 100.00 |

TABLE 4.7 (Continued)

| Groups | Frequency (n) | Percent (%) |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Local tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| I strongly disagree | 3 | 25.0 |
| I disagree | 5 | 41.7 |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1 | 8.3 |
| I agree | 1 | 8.3 |
| Absolutely I agree | 2 | 16.7 |
| Total | 12 | 100.00 |
| Japanese tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1 | 9.0 |
| I agree | 5 | 45.5 |
| Absolutely I agree | 5 | 45.5 |
| Total | 11 | 100.00 |
| Danish tourists' visiting Marmaris are pleasant and thoughtful | | |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 1 | 9.1 |
| I agree | 4 | 36.4 |
| Absolutely I agree | 6 | 54.5 |
| Total | 11 | 100.00 |

4.8 CONCLUSION

In the study conducted by Var et al. (1985) in 1980–1981, it was tried to determine whether their results have changed from the past to the present. The study received various criticisms due to the lack of sampling. In this study, it was tried to be re-examined by reaching a sufficient number of samples. The following can be stated about the results obtained from the study:

About 59.11% of the respondents from the local population (16 years old and over and was born in Marmaris [$n = 232$]) lived for many years in Marmaris, 75.3% ($n = 296$) have Bachelor's, Assoc. or graduate degree, 31.3% ($n = 123$) of them are in the "tourism" sector, 67.5% ($n = 83$) of those are employees, and 32% of them ($n = 40$) are "tourism operators/employers.

It was determined that 76.3% ($n = 300$) of the local respondents speak “foreign language” and 74.8% ($n = 294$) speak “English,” 12.5% ($n = 49$) speak “Russian,” 4.5% ($n = 18$) speak “Arabic,” and 3.8% ($n = 15$) speak “German” at intermediate and advanced level. It is believed that the fact that most of the participants lived in Marmaris for many years makes the information valuable. The high levels of education and foreign language skills of the local people in Marmaris, which grows and develops with tourism, is promising in terms of tourism and tourist perspective.

When the answers given to the scale regarding the effects of tourism and tourism are analyzed; “Tourism gains” and “negative effects of tourism” dimensions have emerged.

The average “dimension of perception toward tourism gains” was found to be high 4.060 ± 0.666 (Min = 1; Max = 5), and the average “Dimension of perception toward the negative effects of tourism” was found to be 3.343 ± 0.845 (Min = 1; Max = 5).

According to the findings obtained, the local people agree in **very high level** with the expressions; “Tourism creates jobs.” ($\bar{x} = 4.422$), “Tourism creates a foreign exchange.” ($\bar{x} = 4.394$), “Tourism provides income, increases incomes.” ($\bar{x} = 4.275$), “I would like to see more government spending to protect the environment.” ($\bar{x} = 4.433$).

They agree in **high level** with the statements “I am aware that growing with tourism increases government revenues.” ($\bar{x} = 4.165$), “Tourism reduces unemployment.” ($\bar{x} = 4.115$), “Tourists contribute to international peace and the development of peace understanding.” ($x = 3.972$), “Turkey and tourists from around the world to meet with a number of countries willing.” ($\bar{x} = 3.952$), “Meeting tourists provides an educational experience.” ($\bar{x} = 3.982$), “I feel very good when I see tourists enjoying the sights of Marmaris.” ($\bar{x} = 4.048$), “Tourism encourages local people to participate in various cultural activities.” ($\bar{x} = 4.025$), “The government can control the impact of tourism on the environment by making long-term plans.” ($\bar{x} = 4.076$), “I would like to see more government spending to protect the environment.” ($\bar{x} = 4.433$).

Their moderate agreement with the statement “I bear inconvenience to earn/earn money from tourism and tourists.” ($\bar{x} = 2.924$) is important in terms of expecting positive attitudes and behaviors toward tourism and tourists. The findings, which can be considered as a sign that the tourism carrying capacity in the destination has not yet been exceeded, is important in terms of developing and making Marmaris tourism sustainable.

Regarding the negative effects of tourism; they stated that they agree with the statement “Tourism increases the crowd.” ($\bar{x} = 4.244$) at **very high** level, and “Tourism increases traffic congestion.” ($x = 3.761$) at **high** level, “Tourism increases the crime rate in Marmaris.” ($\bar{x} = 2.913$) and “Crime is increasing due to tourism in Muğla. ($x = 2.875$) at a **medium** level. Crowd and traffic congestion must be eliminated for sustainable tourism. It is thought that by reducing the adverse effects of the seasonality of coastal tourism with different types of tourism and by providing different activities planned with a temporal and spatial distribution at the destination, crowding effect and traffic congestion can be reduced. In this context, it has been determined that the local people of Marmaris perceive the positive and negative effects of tourism, and they agree with the expressions pointing to the economic, social, cultural, and environmental aspects of tourism at different levels.

In case the participants’ perceptions of tourism and its effects differ according to the descriptive characteristics:

- According to the “gender” variable, the perception points about tourism gains and negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$),
- According to the “age” variable, the perception points of the participants toward tourism gains show a significant difference ($F = 2.883$; $p = 0.022 < 0.05$), while the perception points about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$),
- According to the “residence period” variable, the perception points of the participants toward tourism gains show a significant difference ($F = 6.334$; $p = 0 < 0.05$), but the perception scores for the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$),
- According to the “education level” variable, the perception points of the participants toward tourism gains do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$), and the perception scores of the negative effects of tourism differ significantly ($F = 2.674$; $p = 0.047 < 0.05$),
- According to the “income level” variable, the perception points of the participants toward tourism gains differ significantly ($F = 3.211$; $p = 0.013 < 0.05$), the perception points about the negative effects of tourism do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$),
- According to the variable of “speaking a foreign language”; the perception scores of those who do not speak a foreign language ($x = 3.869$) toward tourism gains ($x = 3.869$) are lower than those of

those who can speak a foreign language ($x = 4.120$) ($t = -3.217$; $p = 0.001 < 0.05$), regarding the negative effects of tourism perception scores do not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$),

- The perception points of the participants about their perception toward tourism gains and their negative effects do not differ significantly according to the “sector of work” variable ($p > 0.05$).
- According to the variable “working style/employee or employer/ in the tourism sector,” those who are “tourism workers (employees)” have lower perception scores ($x = 4.075$) toward tourism gains than those whose working status is “tourism operator (employer)” ($x = 4.308$) ($t = -2.113$; $p = 0.037 < 0.05$), and the perception scores of the participants about the negative effects of tourism did not differ significantly ($p > 0.05$).

The participants from the local people of Marmaris who answered the questionnaire; “Western European,” “Eastern European,” “American,” “Domestic (Turkey) “and” Turks Living Abroad “tourists prefer a high level,” Far Easterners “and” hippies “in the middle level. It can be said they do not prefer “Middle Eastern” tourists. Also, 77.1% of the respondents ($n = 303$) prefer “Turks coming on holiday to Turkey living abroad,” 72.0% of them ($n = 283$) “Turks are coming on holiday to Marmaris living abroad,” 70.0% ($n = 275$) preferred “local (Turkish) tourists to come to Marmaris on holiday.” Only 39.4% ($n = 155$) of the participants who answered the questionnaire thought that “they learned better and new things from Turks living abroad.”

The rates of being pleasant and considerate according to the nationalities are as follows: British (57.5%; $n = 226$), Russian (39.7%, $n = 156$), American (39.5%; $n = 155$) and Arab 15.5% ($n = 61$). In addition, when the answers given in the other option are examined; 30 participants from Marmaris local people consider “German tourists” are pleasant and considerate. According to the 28 participants “Dutch tourists,” 20 participants “Scandinavian tourists,” 16 participants “European tourists,” 15 participants “Finnish tourists,” 10 participants “Japanese tourists,” 10 participants “Danish tourists” are pleasant and thoughtful, 8 participants stated that they did not find “local tourists” pleasant and considerate. The fact that tourists from European countries in the other option were found pleasant and thoughtful by a total of 119 participants, shows that their stereotyping toward European tourists is strong and positive. Var et al. (1985) stated that the participants expressed their perceptions of various

tourists by national origin and that 44% of the local population found American tourists pleasant and considerate. The result obtained supports the findings of Var et al. (1985).

As a result, it has been presented in detail with the literature and field study results within the scope of the study that tourism creates various effects in the destinations that tourism developed. These effects are perceived by the local people, perceptions can change, although it is difficult to change stereotypes, they can change with time and experience.

The reliability and validation of the data collected, data collection techniques, participants are to assume that they give the correct answer to the research questions, carrying out the survey online due to COVID-19, and lack of time are the assumptions and limitations of the research.

KEY WORDS

- effects of tourism
- perceptions and attitudes towards tourism
- Marmaris-Turkey
- Turkish stereotypes of different nations

REFERENCES

- Akova, O. Yerel Halkın Turizmin Etkilerini Algılamalarına ve Tutumlarına Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* **2006**, 2 (1), 1–34.
- Aktan, T.; Sakallı Uğurlu, N. (2013). Kalıpyargı İçeriği Modeline Sosyal Bağlamsal Bir Yaklaşım: Bağlam İçinde Kalıpyargı İçerikleri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları* **2013**, 16 (31), 15–31.
- Aktan, T.; Yalçındağ, B.; Ünal, T.; Süllü, M. E. Ulus Kalıpyargılarının İçerikleri: Sosyal-Yapısal Değişkenler Ve Kimliklenmenin Kalıpyargı İçerikleriyle İlişkisi. *Alternatif Politika* **2019**, 11 (3), 623–650.
- Akyıldız, G. Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Banal Milliyetçilik: İlkokul Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi Uluslararası İlişkiler ABD, 2017, Nisan.
- Albu, R. G.; Nicolau, L. C. Changing Attitudes in Tourism—A Possible Way to Win the Battle with the Current Economic Crisis. *Bull. Transilvania Univ. of Braşov Series V: Econ. Sci.* **2010**, 3 (52), 201–206.
- Andereck, K. L.; Vogt, C. The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options. *J. Travel Res.* **2000**, 39 (1), 27–36.

- Apalı, Y. Sosyolojik Açından Kadınlarla İlgili Kalıp Yargılar. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* **2011**, 26, 49–64.
- Avcıkurt, C. *Turizm Sosyolojisi: Genel ve Yapısal Yaklaşım (4 b.)*; Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2015.
- Bahar, O.; Kozak, M. *Turizm Ekonomisi (7 b.)*; Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2015.
- Bakan, Ö.; Canöz, K. Kültürlerarası İletişim Bağlamında Türk Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Japonlara Yönelik Kalıp Yargıları. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2017**, 37, 91–107.
- Bal, H.; Akça, E. E.; Bayraktar, M. The Contribution of Tourism to Economic Growth. *Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi* **2016**, 7 (1), 1–20.
- Batmas, H. K.; Ulusoy Yıldırım, H.; Köroğlu, Ö. Yerel Halkın Kırsal Turizme İlişkin Tutumlarının İncelenmesi: Balıkesir Örneği. *J. Recreat. Tour. Res.* **2020**, 7 (2), 190–208.
- Baykal, F.; Ataber, E. Kozbeyli’de (Foça/İzmir) Kırsal Turizmin Geliştirilmesi Hakkında Yerel Halkın Görüşleri. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi* **2020**, 29 (1), 1–17.
- Berber, Ş. Sosyal Değişme Katalizörü Olarak Turizm ve Etkileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2003**, 9, 205–221.
- Birsin, H. Marmaris Tarihi, Jan 1, 2017. July 24, 2020 tarihinde www.muqlamarmaris.com: www.muqlamarmaris.com/marmaris-in-tarihi adresinden alındı.
- Bitirim Okmeydan, S. Kültürlerarası İletişim ve Uluslararası Halkla İlişkiler. In *Kültürlerarası İletişim: İletişim Odaklı Güncel Yaklaşımlar*; Bitirim Okmeydan, S., Saran içinde, M., Eds.; Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi, 2019; pp. 93–124.
- Blum, L. Stereotypes and Stereotyping: A Moral Analysis. *Philosophical Papers* **2004**, 33 (3), 251–289.
- Bozkurt, G. Yerel ve Mekansal Dinamiklerin Turizm Temelli Girişimcilik Üzerine Etkileri: Marmaris Yerleşmesindeki Girişimcilik Yapısı ve Girişimciliği Etkileyen Faktörlerin Çözümlemesi. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*; Gazi Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü: Ankara, 2019.
- Brida, J. G.; Gomez, D. V.; Segarra, V. On the Empirical Relationship between Tourism and Economic Growth. *Tour. Manage.* Aug10, 2020 tarihinde. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0261517720300571?token=7575AE9FAE5B24ECCFA3A6A8DF72B8F91482208CC7C0082B0661D42D7192C419C77235EA421C80C8077D89A0AD025434> adresinden alındı
- Çakır, M.; Aydın, F. Yerel Halkın Termal Turizme Yönelik Görüşleri: Haymana İlçesi Örneği. *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi* **2020**, 25 (43), 93–100.
- Caneday, L.; Zeiger, J. The Social, Economic, and Environmental Costs of Tourism to a Gaming Community as Perceived By Its Residents. *J. Tour. Res.* **1991**, 30 (2), 45–50.
- Carter, J. D.; Hall, J. A.; Carney, D. R.; Rosip, J. C. Individual Differences in the Acceptance of Stereotyping. *J. Res. Personal.* **2006**, 40 (6), 1103–1118.
- Çavuş, A.; Baki, A. Yerel Halk Üzerindeki Sosyal Etkileri Bakımından Akçaabat Müzik ve Halk Oyunları Festivali. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2020**, 24 (1), 279–289.
- Çeken, H. Turizmin Bölgesel Kalkınmaya Etkisi Üzerine Teorik Bir İnceleme. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. *Dergisi* **2008**, X (II), 293–306.
- Çeken, H. *Turizm Ekonomisi*; Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2014.
- Chen, H. Complementing Conventional Environmental Impact Assessments of Tourism with Ecosystem Service Valuation: A Case Study of The Wulingyuan Scenic Area,

- China. *Ecosystem Services* **2020**, *43*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212041620300425> adresinden alındı.
- Comerio, N.; Strozzi, F. Tourism and Its Economic Impact: A Literature Review Using Bibliometric Tools. *Tour. Econ.* **2019**, *25*, 109–131.
- Daruwalla, P.; Darcy, S. Public Sympathy: Private Antipathy: Personal and Societal Attitudes Towards. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2005**, *32*(3), 549–570.
- Deery, M.; Jago, L.; Fredline, L. Rethinking Social Impacts of Tourism Research: A New Research Agenda. *Tour. Manage.* **2012**, *33*, 64–73.
- Demir, C. Turizm Ve Rekreasyon Faaliyetlerinin Olumsuz Çevresel Etkileri: Türkiye'deki Milli Parklara Yönelik Bir Uygulama. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi* **2002**, *17* (2), 93–117.
- Demir, M. A. 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinde Rastlanan Kalıpyargılar ve Kalıpyargıların Kaynakları: Aydın İli Örneği. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Muğla: Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2016, Şubat.
- Doğan, H. Z. *Turizmin Sosyo-Kültürel Temelleri* (2. b.); Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2004.
- Dogru, T.; Bulut, U. Is Tourism an Engine for Economic Recovery? Theory and Empirical Evidence. *Tour. Manage.* **2018**, *67*, 425–434.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. *Stereotype*, Jan 1, 2020. July 29, 2020 tarihinde www.britannica.com: <https://www.britannica.com/technology/stereotype-printing> adresinden alındı
- Eryılmaz, B. Yerel Halkın Turiste ve Turizme Bakışı: Amasya Örneği. *J. Tour. Gastron. Stud.* **2020**, *8* (2), 1381–1395.
- Esen, E.; Özata, E. Turizmin Ekonomik Büyümeye Etkisi: Turizme Dayalı Büyüme Hipotezinin Türkiye İçin Geçerliliğinin ARDL Modeli ile Analizi. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* **2017**, *17* (1), 43–58.
- Gökdayı, H. Bir Kalıp Yargı Olarak Türk Lokumu. *TÜRÜK Uluslararası Dil, Edebiyat ve Halkbilimi Araştırmaları Dergisi* **2017**, *5* (9), 59–70.
- Göktaş, L. S.; Türkeri, İ. Turizmin Kültürel ve Ahlaki Etkisi: Şanlıurfa İlinde Uygulamalı Bir Araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Teknik Araştırmalar Dergisi* **2016**, *12*, 104–117.
- Gürkan, M. İ. Turizmin Sosyal Yapı Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Anatolia* **1996**, 112–119.
- Gursoy, D.; Chi, C. G.; Dyer, P. Locals' Attitudes toward Mass and Alternative Tourism: the Case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *J. Travel Res.* **2010**, *49* (3), 381–394.
- Güzel, Ö. F.; Koroğlu, Ö. Turlarda Turistlerin Sergiledikleri Davranış Kalıplarının Belirlenmesi: Turist Rehberlerine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Hakemli Beşeri ve Akademik Bilimler Dergisi* **2015**, *4* (11), 1–22.
- Hamilton, D.; Sherman, J. Stereotypes. In *Handbook of Social Cognition: Volume 1 Basic Processes*; Wyer, R., Srull içinde, T. K., Eds., 2 b; Psychology Press: New York, 1994; s. 1–68.
- Harlak, H. *Çeşitli Turistlere İlişkin Kategoriler ve Algı Repertuvarları*; Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası Yayını: Turizm Yıllığı, Ankara, 1991; pp 237–244.
- Harlak, H. *Önyargılar. Psikososyal Bir İnceleme*; Sistem Yayıncılık: İstanbul, 2000.
- Hepaktan, C. E.; Çınar, S. Turizm Sektörünün Türkiye Ekonomisi Üzerindeki Etkileri. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2010**, *8* (2), 135–154.
- Holzner, M. Tourism and Economic Development: The Beach Disease. *Tour. Manage.* **2011**, *32* (4), 922–933.

- İmançer, D. Sosyal Psikolojik Açından Stereotip Kavramının Dil ve Metin Analizinde Kullanımı. *Selçuk İletişim* **2004**, 3 (3), 128–142.
- İmre, N. Yerel Halkın Turizme Bakış Açısının Belirlenmesi: Kemaliye Örneği. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2020**, 13 (1), 1–16.
- Işık, C.; Turan, B. Yerel Halkın Turizmin Etkilerine Yönelik Algısı. *Güncel Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* **2018**, 2 (2), 101–133.
- Işık, Ş. Kültürlerarası İletişim Bağlamında Cumhuriyet Üniversitesindeki Gençlerin Almanlara Yönelik Kalıp Yargıları. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* **2012**, 36 (2), 159–191.
- Jingyi, L.; Chung-Shing, C. Local Cultural Vicissitudes in Regional Tourism Development: A Case of Zhuhai. *Tour. Manage. Perspect.* **2018**, 25, 80–92.
- Jucan, C. N.; Jucan, M. S. Travel and Tourism as a Driver of Economic Recovery. *Procedia Economics and Finance* **2013**, 6, 81–88.
- Kahraman, N.; Türkay, O. *Turizm ve Çevre*; Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2004.
- Kanca, O. C. Turizm Gelirleri ve Ekonomik Büyüme. *Marmara Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi* **2015**, 8, 1–14.
- Kang, S. K.; Lee, J. Support of Marijuana Tourism in Colorado: A Residents' Perspective Using Social Exchange Theory. *J. Destin. Market. Manage.* **2018**, 9, 310–319.
- Karabayev, B.; Tutkun, Ö. F. (2001). Türk Cumhuriyetlerinde Gelen Öğrencilerin Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Vatandaşlarına Karşı Taşadıkları Kalıp Yargılar. *Bilig* **2001**, 18, 1–26.
- Koçoğlu, C. M.; Saraç, Ö.; Batman, O. Safranbolu' da Sürdürülebilir Turizm Gelişmesine Yönelik Yerel Halkın Tutumları. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* **2020**, 4 (1), 202–219.
- Koday, S.; Akbaş, F. Kırsal Turizmin Gelişimi ile İlgili Olarak Yerel Halkın Algıları: Urla (İzmir) Örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2020**, 24 (2), 689–703.
- Koroğlu, Ö.; Avcıkurt, C.; Koroğlu, A.; Karaman, S. The Effects of Professional Tourist Guides' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Tourist Groups on Job Behaviour Forms. *Int. Tour. Biennial (April 30–May 05)*; Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, School of Tourism and Hotel Management: Canakkale, 2007; s. 651–659.
- Lippmann, W. *Public Opinion* (2 b.); Transaction Publishers: London, 1998.
- Liu, A.; Wu, C. Tourism Productivity and Economic Growth. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2019**, 76, 253–265.
- Marmaris Belediyesi. *Marmaris Rehberi Ulaşım*, Jan 1, 2020. July 19, 2020 tarihinde www.marmaris.bel.tr: http://www.marmaris.bel.tr/icerik/24/29/ulasim.aspx adresinden alındı.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D.; Suess, C. Natural Amenities-Driven Migration and Tourism Entrepreneurship: Within Business Social Dynamics Conducive to Positive Social Change. *Tourism Management*, 2020. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0261517720300662?token=B1CBE984E8240228105693513F6E88F3543524BDFDB1EA4D0E16A87271EA5CDD3BA392032FB35C7A4A9805B03D55D97F> adresinden alındı
- Mesci, M.; Dönmez, G. Turizmin Bölgesel Kalkınma ve Yerel Halk Üzerindeki Etkisi: Mudurnu Örneği. *AİBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2016**, 16 (16), 21–50.
- Milman, A.; Pizam, A. Social Impact of Tourism on Central Florida. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **1988**, 15 (2), 191–204.
- Monterrubio, C. Tourist Stereotypes and Servers' Attitudes: A Combined Theoretical Approach. *J. Tour. Cult. Change* **2018**, 16 (1), 57–74.

- Myers, D. *Sosyal Psikoloji* (S. Akfırat, Çev.); Nobel Yayıncılık: İstanbul, 2017.
- Ng, S. L.; Feng, X. Residents' Sense of Place, Involvement, Attitude, and Support for Tourism: A Case Study of Daming Palace, A Cultural World Heritage Site. *Asian Geo.* **2020**, 37 (2), 189–207.
- Odabaşı, Y.; Barış, G. *Tüketici Davranışı* (16. b.); MediaCat Akademi: İstanbul, 2016.
- Olalı, H.; Timur, A. *Turizm Ekonomisi*; Ofis Tic. Mat. Şti: İzmir, 1988.
- O'Leary, J. T. Land Use Redefinition and The Rural Community: Disruption of Community Leisure Space. *J. Leisure Res.* **1976**, 8, 268–274.
- Özaltın Türker, G.; Türker, A. Yerel Halkın Turizm Etkilerini Algılama Düzeyi Turizm Destegiğini Nasıl Etkiler: Dalyan Örneği. *Electr. J. Vocation. Coll.* **2014**, 81–98.
- Özdemir, M. A.; Kervankıran, İ. Turizm ve Turizm Etkileri Konusunda Yerel Halkın Yaklaşımının Belirlenmesi: Afyonkarahisar Örneği. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi* **2011**, 24, 1–25.
- Özgürel, G. *Tunceli İlinin Kalkınmasında Turizm: Yerel Kurum Yöneticileri Boyutuyla Bir Araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*; Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: Balıkesir, 2012.
- Özgürel, G. Kültürel Mirasa Bir Bakış: Marmaris Örneği. *J. Soc. Hum. Sci. Res. (JSHSR)* **2018**, 5 (31), 4894–4906.
- Özgürel, G. *Turizm Destinasyonlarında Yerleşik Yabancı-Yerel Halk Etkileşimi Üzerine Bir İnceleme. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*. Balıkesir Üniversitesi SBE: Balıkesir, 2020.
- Özsvaş Uluçay, N. Turizmin Geleneksel Bodrum Konut Yapısı Ve Kent Sakinleri Üzerindeki Etkisi. *J. Acad. Soc. Sci. Stud.* **2018**, 72, 299–310.
- Özsüer, E. Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde “Biz” ve “Öteki” Önyargıların Dinamikleri. *Avrasya İncelemeleri Dergisi (AVİD)* **2012**, 1 (2), 269–309.
- Pennington-Gray, L. Resident Attitudes towards Tourism in A Destination in The Stagnation Stage of the Tourism Life Cycle. *WIT Trans. Ecol. Environ.* **2005**, 84, 1411–1418.
- Pizam, A. Tourism's Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by the Residents. *J. Travel Res.* **1978**, 16 (4), 8–12.
- Richards, G. *The Impact of Travel Experiences on the Cultural, Personal and Social Development of Young People*. Summary Report of A Research Study Undertaken for the International Student Travel Confederation 2nd draft, TRAM (Tourism Research and.), 2006.
- Robinson, D.; Newman, S. P.; Stead, S. M. Community Perceptions Link Environmental Decline to Reduced Support for Tourism Development in Small Island States: A Case Study in The Turks And Caicos Islands. *Marine Policy* **2019**, 108. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0308597X18300149?token=9A7220B51D7E58560799008940FB3DC81FF35F0682A872EE91BAC2D928A213255FA433760A0A051F6115D15FD979E7EB> adresinden alındı.
- Şafaklı, O. V. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Turizmin Olumsuz Çevre Etkilerini Algılama Düzeyi: Kuzey Kıbrıs Örneği. In *International Conference on “Scientific Cooperation for the Future in Economics and Administrative Sciences”*; Usak University: Thessaloniki, 2017; s. 117–124.
- Santamaria, D.; Filis, G. Tourism Demand and Economic Growth in Spain: New Insights Based on the Yield Curve. *Tour. Manage.* **2019**, 75, 447–459.
- Schneider, D. J. *The Psychology of Stereotyping*; The Guilford Press: New York, 2004.

- Scholtz, M.; Slabbert, E. The Relevance of the Tangible and Intangible Social Impacts of Tourism on Selected South African. *J. Tour. Cult. Change* **2016**, *14* (2), 107–128.
- Sharples, R. Host Perceptions of Tourism: A Review of the Research. *Tourism Management* **2014**, *42*, 37–49.
- Şıvgın, N. Cinsiyet Rollerini Eğitim Etkinliklerinin Anasınıfına Devam Eden 60–72 Aylık Çocukların Toplumsal Cinsiyet Kalıp Yargılarına Etkisinin İncelenmesi. *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*; Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü: Ankara, 2015.
- Snyder, M.; Miene, P. K. (1994). Stereotyping of the Elderly: A Functional Approach. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* **1994**, *33* (1), 63–82.
- Sokhanvar, A.; Çiftçioğlu, S.; Javid, E. Another Look at Tourism- Economic Development Nexus. *Tour. Manage. Perspect.* **2018**, *26*, 97–106.
- Sun, Y.-Y.; Cadarso, M. A.; Driml, S. Tourism Carbon Footprint Inventories: A Review of the Environmentally Extended Input-Output Approach. *Ann. Tour. Res.*, 2020. <https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0160738320300724?token=1FA951D12B02F80AA8A92E935390A93E669A085A565C27CE53265AEB15903A3F01226A531114DB4B1FA158FD01CB50F9> adresinden alındı
- Sürgevil, O. Farklılık Kavramına ve Farklılıkların Yönetimine Temel Oluşturan Sosyopsikolojik Kuramlar ve Yaklaşımlar. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2008**, *11* (20), 111–124.
- T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. *Güvenli Turizm Sertifikasyon Programı*, July 15, 2020. July 26, 2020 tarihinde T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı: <https://www.ktb.gov.tr/> adresinden alındı
- T. C. Muğla Büyükşehir Belediyesi. *Marmaris hakkında* Jan 1, 2020. July 19, 2020 tarihinde www.mugla.bel.tr: <https://www.mugla.bel.tr/sayfa/marmaris-hakkinda> adresinden alındı
- Tayfun, A.; Kılıçlar, A. Turizmin Sosyal Etkileri ve Yerli Halkın Turiste Bakışı. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Fakültesi Dergisi* **2004**, *1*, 1–17.
- Tohmo, T. The Economic Impact of Tourism in Central Finland: A Regional Input-Output Study. *Tour. Rev.* **2018**, *73* (4), 521–547.
- Tuna, M. *Turizm, Çevre ve Toplum* (2. b.); Detay Yayıncılık: Ankara, 2007.
- Türk Dil Kurumu. *Türk Dil Kurumu Sözlükleri*, 2020. July 10, 2020 tarihinde <https://sozluk.gov.tr/> adresinden alındı
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. Merkezi Dağıtım Sistemi, Dec 31, 2019. TÜİK: <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=tr> adresinden alındı.
- Uğur, İ. Yerel Halkın Turizmin Çevresel Etkileri Konusundaki Beklenti ve Algılarının Belirlenmesi. *Anasay* **2020**, *4* (12), 165–182.
- Ünlüöner, K.; Tayfun, A. Turistlerin Yerli Halkın Tüketim Davranışlarına Etkileri Üzerine Ampirik Bir Araştırma. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2003**, *10*. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/217151> adresinden alındı.
- Uslu, A.; Kiper, T. (2006). Turizmin Kültürel Miras Üzerine Etkileri: Beypazarı/Ankara Örneğinde Yerel Halkın Farkındalığı. *Tekirdağ Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi* **2006**, *3* (3), 305–314.
- Var, T.; Kendall, K.; Tarakcioglu, E. Resident Attitudes towards Tourists in a Turkish Resort Town. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **1985**, *12* (4), 652–658.
- Vatan, A.; Bildin, E. A Research Evaluating the Attitudes of Local People towards the Effects of Tourism in Bozcaada. *J. Econ. Cult. Soc.* **2020**. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/972031> adresinden alındı.

- Wang, S.-J.; Zhou, L.-Y. Integrated Impacts of Climate Change on Glacier Tourism. *Adv. Clim. Change Res.* **2019**, *10* (2), 71–79.
- Ward, C.; Berno, T. (2011). Beyond Social Exchange Theory. Attitudes towards Tourists. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2011**, *38* (4), 1556–1569.
- Wei, C.; Dai, S.; Xu, H.; Wang, H. (2020). Cultural Worldview and Cultural Experience in Natural Tourism Sites. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* **2020**, *43*, 241–249.
- www.nufusu.com. *Muğla İlçeleri Nüfusları*, Jan 1, 2020. July 19, 2020 tarihinde www.nufusu.com: <https://www.nufusu.com/ilceleri/mugla-ilceleri-nufusu> adresinden alındı.
- Yağan, E. Çakışan Öyküler-Çatışan Beklentiler: Türk ve Yabancı Öğrencilerin Ortak Deneyimleri ve Gelecek Beklentilerinin İncelenmesi (İstanbul-Pendik’te Yapılan Karma Çalışma, 2019). Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. T. C. Maltepe Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü: İstanbul, 2020, Şubat.
- Yatırım ve İşletmeler Genel Müdürlüğü. İşletme (Bakanlık) Belgeli ve Belediye Belgeli Konaklama İstatistikleri Yıllık Bültenleri. T. C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2019, Aralık 31. <https://yigm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-201121/isletme-bakanlik-belgeli-tesis-konaklama-istatistikleri.html> adresinden alındı.
- Yılmaz, Ö. D.; Filiz, A. Turizm Gelişim Yaklaşımları Kapsamında Yerel Halkın Turizme Yönelik Algı ve Tutumları: Mazı Köyü-Türkbükü Karşılaştırmalı Analizi. *Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* **2017**, *10* (2), 1799–1824.