

## EXPLAINING PERCEIVED IMPACTS OF ALL-INCLUSIVE RESORTS THROUGH COMMUNITY ATTACHMENT<sup>1</sup>

Emrullah ERUL<sup>2</sup>

*Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences  
Texas A&M University, College Station, USA*

Kyle M. WOOSNAM

*Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources -  
Natural Resources Recreation and Tourism  
University of Georgia, Athens, USA*

### ABSTRACT

Antalya, with its high percentage of all-inclusive resorts (hereafter abbreviated AIR), is a prime tourist destination in Turkey. The purpose of this study was to examine the interrelationships between residents' attitudes about their attachment to their local community and attitudes about AIR impacts. A survey was conducted in four key districts in Antalya (based on the concentration of AIRs in the areas): the Antalya city center, Kemer, Serik and Manavgat, yielding a robust sample (n = 660). Exploratory factor analysis of the Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts Scale revealed four unique factors (e.g., three focused on negative impacts and one on positive impacts). The study adopted the Community Attachment (CA) Scale and Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts (PAIR) as conceptual frameworks. The study's findings demonstrated that highly attached residents tend to perceive negative impacts of AIR. Findings provide empirical support for the employment of the community attachment framework within studies concerning AIR perceptions. Implications are described and directions for future research are discussed.

### Article History

Received 30 May 2016  
Revised 23 June 2016  
Revised 30 August 2016  
Accepted 12 October 2016

### Keywords

All-inclusive resorts  
Antalya, Turkey  
Resident attitudes  
Community attachment scale

---

<sup>1</sup> An earlier version of this study was presented at the I. International Conference on Tourism Dynamics and Trends, Antalya, Turkey, May 2016

<sup>2</sup> Address correspondence to Emrullah Erul, PhD Candidate, Texas A&M University, Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, TAMU, College Station, USA. E-mail: eerul86@tamu.edu

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism has been growing rapidly since the 1980s in Turkey, and has become one of the greatest industries within the country (Koseoglu, Topaloglu, Parnell, & Lester, 2013). According to the Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism (TMCT) annual reports (2015), international tourist arrivals and receipts grew from 16.3 million and US\$13.8 billion in 2002 to 36.2 million foreigners and US\$31.4 billion tourism earnings in 2015. In addition to this, according to United Nations World Tourism Organization annual reports, Turkey remained one of the top six most-visited countries in the world, receiving a total of 39.8 million visitors in 2014 (UNWTO, 2015). Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2015) forecasted in 2013 that the country will see 63 million tourists by 2023, which could translate to US\$86 billion tourism earnings and US\$1350 on average spent by tourists.

Antalya (the popular resort city in southwest Turkey on the Mediterranean Sea) has been a prime tourism destination over the last 20 years drawing upon on international tourists in search of sun and sea destinations (Koc, 2005; Ozdemir, Cizel & Bato Cizel, 2012). A large percentage of international tourists (30%) to Turkey spend their vacation in Antalya, which most recently welcomed approximately 11 million visitors in 2015 (TMCT, 2015). Moreover, Antalya was among the top ten most-visited cities in the world in terms of international tourist arrivals (Euromonitor International reports, 2013). As a result, the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly, with a majority of them falling into the all-inclusive resorts categorization (Duman & Tosun, 2010).

AIRs can be defined as: —A [product which includes a] trip planned and pre-paid with a single price, which covers a broad range of items from transport and accommodation to meals and sightseeing, sometimes accompanied with an escort or guide (Sheldon & Mak, 1987, p. 13). Overall, AIRs may include all or at least most of the planning aspects of the individuals' vacations (i.e., transport, accommodation, food and drinks, baggage handling, government taxes, sightseeing, entertainment, etc.) and those details might be taken care of by travel intermediaries such as a travel agency after an initial payment (Ozdemir et al., 2012).

According to Duman and Tosun (2010), the beginning of the last decade was marked by growing popularity of AIRs in Turkish tourism. Furthermore, Turkey, with its wealth of AIRs, has taken its place as a competitive international player in the resort hotel industry throughout the last two decades (Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011). According to the

Association of Turkish Travel Agencies in 2009, Turkey ranked third in selling all-inclusive packages in Europe (Ozdemir et al., 2012). Thus, AIRs have become an important tourism strategy for tourism development throughout Turkey, especially in Antalya (Karamustafa, 2000).

Despite the positive impacts of AIR, such a model is not always profitable for local businesses or beneficial to the community and its members (Bahar, 2004). In fact, the involvement of these all-inclusive resorts in Antalya can result in high levels of leakage of tourism revenue from the host economy. According to Dwyer and Thomas (2012), each form of leakage results in money leaving or bypassing the host economy. In addition, AIRs can fail to promote local development and can decrease the livelihoods of the residents by diverting guests away from local businesses, ultimately reducing potential to spend locally (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009; Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002). As Issa and Jayawardena (2003) have reported, AIRs can actually discourage tourists from leaving their accommodations, which has implications for guest not patronizing local businesses but also potentially missing a true unique experience within the destination. Beyond a financial exchange, the potential for social exchange among residents and tourists is also potentially compromised (Doganer, 2012).

While several researchers have focused on the popularity of AIR, tourists' satisfaction with AIR, destination image, and destination loyalty for many years in Turkey (Bahar, 2004; Doganer, 2012; Duman & Tosun, 2010; Duman & Tanrisevdi, 2011; Erkus-Ozturk & Terhorst, 2010; Karamustafa, 2000; Koseoglu et al., 2013; Ozdemir et al., 2012; Tumer, 2010, Uner, Sokmen, & Birkan, 2006), little research has incorporated the voices and perceptions of residents concerning AIR in Antalya. Initially, Menekse (2005) drew attention to AIR impacts, but her focus was only on hotel managers. Uner et al. (2006) carried this work forward by examining the influence of AIR on the Turkish Hospitality Industry (primarily among lodging operations). Only Cevirgen and Unguren (2009), who employed the Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts (PAIR) Scale, have tangentially considered the local community's perceptions of AIR impacts. However, the sample from which data were collected was comprised of individuals employed within the tourism sector, dependent on the industry. Despite these previous works drawing greater interest in AIR, it is unclear how residents view AIR or the impacts of AIR on local communities in Antalya. Hence, the present study will serve to bridge the literature gap as one of the first to examine local residents' perceptions about AIR. With a growing concern placed on understanding residents' concerns with AIRs, this

exploratory work has two distinct purposes: 1) to examine the factor structure of a recently formulated scale measuring AIRs impacts and 2) to determine whether local residents' degree of community attachment will significantly predict their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya, Turkey.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### **Perceived impact of tourism**

Residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism in their local communities have been researched for more than four decades (Tosun, 2002). In examining the impacts of tourism on local residents, previous studies have discovered numerous positive and negative tourism impacts (Tatoglu, Erdal, Ozgur, & Azakli, 2002). These impacts can be categorized as economic, social and environmental (Harrill, 2004). In the 1960s, studies tended to focus primarily on positive economic impacts of tourism (Pizam, 1978). It was in the 1970s that scholars began to research the negative social cultural impacts of tourism (De Kadt, 1979). Since the 1980s, academic research on such impacts has encompassed both positive and negative consequences of tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000).

Destination residents can usually perceive positive economic impacts of tourism (Tatoglu et al., 2002) as such impacts can be seen as the most valuable factors for host communities (Long, 2012; Schluter & Var, 1988). First of all, tourism can diversify local economies (Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Yu, Chancellor, & Cole, 2011), contribute to income generation and standard of living such as improvements in health services, airport, water and sewage systems; enhance community infrastructure and general facilities (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Schluter & Var, 1988; Yu et al., 2011). Tourism can decrease unemployment rates by creating new job opportunities (Sheldon & Var, 1984). For example, residents can work in hotels, restaurants, and other service sector positions related to tourism (Tatoglu et al., 2002). Besides the positive economic influences of tourism, residents are also keenly aware of the negative economic impacts (Tatoglu et al., 2002). As destinations attract tourists, prices of goods and services can increase (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Liu & Var, 1986). In addition, tourism can adversely affect the price of land and housing (Pizam, 1978). Residents can suffer from increasing land and housing prices due to increased migration to a destination (Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

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

On the other hand, Pizam (1978) reported that residents can perceive social and cultural impacts of tourism negatively. Tourism can lead to the reduced importance of moral values within society in general and in cultures specifically (Tatoglu et al., 2002). Furthermore, an increase in the number of individuals in a destination (especially in summer seasons) can lead to greater noise and traffic congestion (Kwon & Vogt, 2010; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

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

To sum up, residents' perceptions of the impact of tourism in their local communities are essential determinants of successful tourism (Yu et al., 2011). This is largely due to the fact that residents are affected directly by the tourism industry (Ap, 1992). Moreover, residents not only have a significant influence in shaping tourists' experiences and the decision-making process, but also have an important voice regarding development and marketing of existing and future tourism programs (Gjerald, 2005). Consequently, residents are key actors in planning for tourism development (McGehee & Andereck, 2004) and without them, negative economic, social, cultural and environmental consequences for local communities would likely be greater (Cavus & Tanrisevdi, 2003). Ultimately, these negative influences on residents can reduce the

attractiveness of a destination, which can adversely affect the income potential and employment opportunities for the local tourism industry (Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

### **All-inclusive resort concept**

The AIR model has become a vital component in a growing number of tourism destinations due to the increasing demand for international tourism (Ozdemir et al., 2012; Poon, 1998). Wong and Kwong (2004) described AIRs as a relatively effective and safe way for tourists to travel to distant countries with different cultures while avoiding unreliable transportation and questionable standards of hygiene. Beyond concerns for safety and comfort, motivations for selecting AIRs are abundant in the literature. Some tourists select AIRs because they can be provided with a good experience and a high-quality product at a low cost (Karamustafa, 2000).

Economic reasons and overall convenience are the most important reasons for choosing AIRs (Anderson, 2008; Anderson, Juaneda, & Sastre, 2009). It is usually cheaper than an independent trip to the same destination (Wong & Kwong, 2004). AIRs can also eliminate unexpected costs (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003), allowing tourists to plan more accordingly knowing overall costs for all experiences and goods (Anderson, 2008). Besides economic reasons, personal safety is another important motive for purchasing AIRs (Wong & Kwong, 2004). Tourists can feel safer when they are in a group of people (Armstrong & Mok, 1995), especially those of a similar cultural background where they do not have to fear language and cultural differences (Armstrong & Mok, 1995).

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

earnings are highly compromised especially within Turkey (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009).

### **AIR research in Turkey**

During the 1990s, Turkey experienced three main crises, which adversely affected tourism throughout the country. These crises were the Gulf War (occurring in the early part of the decade), the PKK terrorist group directly targeting tourism destinations (in 1993- 1994), and the major earthquake that impacted many regions throughout the country (in 1999) (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009). These three major crises not only damaged Turkish economies, but also fostered a negative destination image for potential tourists. As a result, numerous hotels in Turkey began to offer AIRs in order to overcome these problems, compensate for their economic loss, change their negative image, and provide a competitive advantage (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009).

The Marco Polo has been widely accepted as the first introducer of AIR in Turkey, dating back to the beginning of the 1990s. However, the popularity of all-inclusive resorts in Turkish tourism began at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century due to the increasing demand for international tourism (Alaeddinoglu & Can, 2009). As a result of AIRs in Turkey, the total number of inbound international tourists has increased rapidly, from 10.4 million in 2000 to 36.2 million in 2015, with Antalya accounting for 30% of total arrivals during that year. (Turkish Statistical Institute [TSI], 2015).

Likewise, Oger Tour conducted a survey of 90,000 German tourists in 2007 and 85% of respondents indicated they selected Turkey as a destination because of AIRs (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009). In addition, 7.3 million tourists visited Antalya, with 68% of the individuals indicating they preferred AIRs in 2007 (TMCT, 2015). AIR is arguably the most popular traveling mode for tourists visiting Antalya (Ozdemir et al., 2012).

According to Tumer (2010), so as to keep its position in the top ten most-visited countries in the world, Turkey should use AIR as a tourism strategy to remain competitive. Furthermore, several studies report that many hotels have started offering AIR in order to reduce their costs and increase tourism earnings (Koseoglu et al., 2013). However, Erkus-Ozturk, and Terhorst (2010) have found that AIRs have drawn the attention of lower-middle class tourists and created the cheapest tourism destination image. The authors also report that AIRs may discourage higher-middle

classes from visiting who may want to distinguish themselves from lower-middle class travelers.

Such a finding is in keeping with what Cevirgen and Unguren (2009) found, in that local workers viewed AIR as a short-term marketing strategy, which results in discouraging high-middle class tourists from visiting and encouraging lower-middle class tourists to visit. Yarcan and Ertuna (2002) indicate that despite an increase in the supply of beds through Turkey, the per capita expenditure of foreign tourists has fallen because all inclusive holiday packages have been sold for very low prices.

### **AIR research in Antalya**

As indicated above, AIRs are alive and well in and throughout Antalya, Turkey. Research concerning the impacts of AIRs in the region however, has been slow to materialize (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009). Ozdemir et al. (2012), and Duman and Tosun (2010) have pointed out that tourists to AIRs tend to remain in their accommodations and thus may not be aware of the historical background and social structure of the region. Furthermore, the researchers have posited that AIRs in Antalya are attracting more lower-middle class tourists than before. In addition, AIR can decrease the quality of tourism services so as to increase profitability (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009). Uner et al. (2006) have supported this claim by indicating that AIRs are increasing the number of tourists, on the other hand, decreasing the quality of tourism services.

The researchers also claimed that AIR can provide most, if not all services to tourists, which results in individuals not spending money outside of the hotel, and not recognizing the attractions and culture of the destination. Likewise, Albayrak, Gulmez, Erdinc, Toker, and Aksu (2011) conducted a survey of 13,446 tourists in Antalya and found that 76.4% of tourists preferred AIR during that year. The researchers found that 63.8% of tourists remained at resorts instead of visiting the city center (Albayrak et al., 2011). Local workers did not support AIR and faced issues of losing their jobs because they thought AIR negatively impacted tourism in Antalya and throughout Turkey by reducing business earnings from tourism (Gurkan, 2002).

### **Community attachment theory**

Community attachment is a framework that has been used to explain the relationship between resident attitudes and impacts of tourism (Doh, 2006). It is defined as the “extent and pattern of social participation and integration into community life, and affect toward the community” (McCool & Martin 1994, p. 30). Previous studies revealed that no community was homogeneous in its perspectives of tourism development (Andereck, Valentine, Vogt, & Knopf, 2007; García, Vázquez & Macías, 2015). Education, gender, age, income, employment and a high degree of community attachment were found to be the major factors affecting the attitudes of residents (Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2009; Harrill, 2004).

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

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

In light of the above-mentioned findings, it is clear that AIRs have succeeded in drawing tourists to Antalya, likely increasing tourism earnings, occupancy rates, and profitability. What is unique to Antalya and its surrounding districts is that much of the goods and services rendered to visitors is provided by small businesses selling locally-made crafts, food, and other artisan goods. Such dependence is highlighted by the fact that roughly half of all participants within Erul’s (2014) work in Antalya either owned a tourism-related business or worked for within

such an enterprise. What has occurred to date in Antalya is that many AIRs do not capitalize on such local-produced goods and services which has resulted in a lack of tourist interaction with locals (Erul, 2014). Additionally, residents such as local workers are afforded minimal exposure to tourists and their needs, which can result in limited economic exchange between locals and tourists. In addition, AIRs can fail to promote local development and can decrease the livelihoods of the residents. It can also prevent participation and appreciation of the destination. This lack of local interaction can result in high external money leakage that can hinder economic development of host communities. As a result of these consequences, 1) AIRs have the potential to impact local communities and residents in a negative manner and 2) while AIRs are highly prevalent in and around Antalya, research examining the perceptions of residents living in and around Antalya concerning impacts of AIRs is greatly lacking (see Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009).

## METHOD

### **Antalya as a study site**

Antalya is known as the capital of Turkish tourism because of the archaeological and natural resources of the area (Yilmaz, Yilmaz, Icigen, Ekin, & Utku, 2009). It is located on the Mediterranean coast of southwest Turkey and covers approximately 20,815 km<sup>2</sup>. According to Turkish Statistical Institute reports, Antalya boasts a population of slightly more than 2.2 million individuals (TSI, 2015). Antalya has a Mediterranean climate with hot and dry summers and mild and rainy winters. With its beautiful weather, history, sea, cultural assets and high quality tourism facilities, Antalya is the leading destination of Turkey (Yilmaz et al., 2009).

With Belek, Kemer, Side-Manavgat, Alanya, and Kaş, tourism centers, Antalya hosts more than 9 million international visitors every year (Antalya tourism information office, 2009). In 2014, Antalya ranked first in most touristic destination in Turkey because of 11.5 million international arrivals. The next year, it boasted 10.8 million international tourists and ranked second only to Istanbul (TMCT, 2015). Hence, the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly, with a majority having adopted an AIR model (Ozdemir et al., 2012).

### **Sampling and data collection**

The sample population for this study was comprised of local residents living in Antalya. According to Turkish Statistical Institute (2015), the Antalya area was reduced to 15 districts. From the list of districts, Kemer, Antalya city center, Serik, and Manavgat were selected given their proximity to tourism areas and the high percentage of AIRs in each district. Within each district, streets were randomly selected by using city maps. On each of the randomly selected streets, every 4<sup>th</sup> home or business was visited, with the head of household or store employee contacted and asked to participate. When the residents (whom were at least 18 years of age) agreed to participate, a questionnaire was left at the home or business and retrieved by a member of the research team later that day. Data collection occurred over a three-month period (February, March, and April of 2014). While the Community Attachment questionnaire was translated into Turkish for communities with large Turkish-speaking populations, the PAIR scale was translated initially from Turkish to English, and then, from Turkish back to English, by different translators (i.e., back translation) to verify the quality of translation (Brislin, 1970).

The research team ultimately visited 1003 households and businesses, with approximately 5% (n = 53) yielding “no answer” responses. At the remaining 950 homes and businesses, heads of households (or spouses) or business employee were contacted and asked to participate, of whom 223 declined (an acceptance rate of 76.5%). Six hundred and sixty surveys were completed by residents (a completion rate of 90.8%). The overall response rate was 69.5%. Response rates for each specific district were as follows: Kemer and Manavgat—71%; Antalya city center and Serik—68%.

### **Measures and data analysis**

The questionnaire consisted of two sections, one scale found in each section. Such scales and corresponding items can be found verbatim on the questionnaire. The first section pertained to community life and included questions about residents’ community attachment (Matarrita-Cascante, Luloff, & Krannich, 2006), and the second section of the questionnaire presented items measuring AIR impacts on the community. Both the Community Attachment Scale and Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts Scale included multiple items on 5-point Likert scales (where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree).

For the purposes of this paper, 20 of the 25 items (asked on an agreement scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) from the Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts (PAIR) Scale developed by Cevirgen & Unguren (2009) were utilized in analysis. The five items from the PAIR scale that were not included given redundancy and considerations for parsimony—ultimately to reduce respondents' burden of time in completing the questionnaire. Those five items pertained to quality of services, application of AIRs, reduction in local sales, impact of local businesses, and the number of customers in local businesses—each of which were assessed in the remaining 20 items.

This study analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 23 and univariate data screening occurred following Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) by examining *z* scores for standardized data to identify potential outliers from the data distribution. Once univariate data screening was completed, descriptive analysis for each variable in the dataset would occur whereby frequency distributions were requested. In order to address the first purpose of this paper an exploratory factor analysis (i.e., EFA) with varimax rotation, was undertaken that would allow for greater examination of the factor structure of the PAIR Scale. A series of simple linear regression analyses was employed that provided an opportunity to determine whether local residents' degree of community attachment significantly predicted their perceived impacts of AIRs in Antalya. In each model, one AIR factor served as the dependent variable predicted by community attachment.

## RESULTS

### **EFA findings for the PAIR scale**

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted by using principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Factors were retained based on two criteria: scree plot examination and eigenvalues exceeding a value of 1.0 (Woosnam, Norman, & Ying, 2009). Only items with loadings of at least .50 were retained (Costello & Osborne, 2005). However, items that cross-loaded onto multiple factors (i.e., those whose values exceeded .32) were removed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

In the initial analysis, five factors were identified; however, four items had to be removed (two as low-loaders and two as cross-loaders). The items eliminated from this analysis were "AIRs attract more lower-

middle class tourists," "AIRs should be abolished," "AIRs reduce the sale prices of the local businesses," and "Tourists are unaware of the beauty of the region due to AIRs." A second EFA was run and Cronbach alphas were examined for the factors. From the results, two items (i.e., "AIRs contribute positively to suppliers" and "AIRs lead tourists to consume excessive food and alcohol") were then removed so as not to compromise internal consistencies of factors.

The third and final EFA yielded satisfactory loadings, however modest reliabilities in two of the four resulting factors. The four factors accounted for 68% of the total variance in the construct and yielded factor loadings between 0.62 and 0.90 with Cronbach's alphas ranging from 0.60 to 0.91. The first factor was labelled AIRs negative economic impacts on local businesses (five items) and pertained to AIRs contributing to decreased sales in and profitability for local businesses, reduced numbers of visitors frequenting local businesses, and a weakening of the competitive power of local businesses. The second factor, AIRs positive impacts (four items), contained items concerning the positive benefits (i.e., applying it in less than desirable locations, applying it everywhere, increasing hotel occupancy rates, and in general, AIRs being a good idea). AIRs negative impacts on quality (three items) was the third factor and included items that related to AIRs appealing to a lower socio-economic group of tourists, compromising service quality, and that it was a short-term solution. The final factor, AIRs negative impacts on population (two items) concerned AIRs decreasing work force for local businesses and reducing number of tourists in the area. These results can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. *Exploratory Factor Analysis of PAIR Scale Items*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean <sup>a</sup>	Eigen-value	Total Rotated SS <sup>b</sup>	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach $\alpha$ Reliability
<b>AIRs negative economic impacts on local businesses<sup>c</sup></b>		4.22	5.06	3.83	27.35	0.91
AIRs cause decrease in local business owner sales	0.90	4.28				
AIRs reduce profitability of local businesses	0.90	4.26				
AIRs weaken competitive power of local business owners	0.82	4.16				
AIRs affect adversely the local business owners	0.81	4.31				
AIRs reduce the number of customers in local businesses	0.74	4.08				
<b>AIRs positive impacts<sup>c</sup></b>		3.02	1.95	2.12	15.11	0.71
AIRs should be applied in unattractive tourism regions as an alternative strategy	0.72	3.49				
AIRs contribute positively to tourism in Turkey	0.70	2.52				
AIRs should be applied everywhere tourism exists	0.68	2.35				
AIRs increase occupancy rates of hotels and businesses	0.67	3.71				
<b>AIRs negative impacts on quality<sup>c</sup></b>		3.66	1.42	2.06	14.70	0.66
AIRs impair quality of tourist and service	0.79	3.72				
AIRs discourage higher-middle class tourists from visiting	0.74	3.86				
AIRs is a short-term marketing strategy in the industry	0.62	3.39				
<b>AIRs negative impacts on population<sup>c</sup></b>		3.51	1.03	1.47	10.48	0.60
AIRs has lessened the number of staff members in the local businesses	0.76	3.64				
The number of tourists will increase once the AIRs system is abolished	0.75	3.38				

Total variance explained 67.64 %; Cronbach  $\alpha$  reliability for overall scale: .75

<sup>a</sup> items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*

<sup>b</sup> sum of squares

<sup>c</sup> KMO was 0.86, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

## EFA findings for community attachment

The Community Attachment (CA) Scale from Matarrita-Cascante et al. (2006), with its five items, was also examined for dimensionality through an EFA. The scale was found to be unidimensional, explaining 61% of the variance in the construct. Factor loadings were fairly high, ranging between 0.71 and 0.86. Cronbach alpha for the scale was also high (i.e., 0.84). These results can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. *Exploratory Factor Analysis of CA Scale*

Factor	Factor Loading	Mean <sup>a</sup>	Eigen-value	Variance Explained (%)	Cronbach $\alpha$ Reliability
<b>Community Attachment</b>		3.21	3.07	61.40	0.84
I feel this community is a real home to me	0.86	3.41			
I feel I am fully accepted as a member of this community	0.82	3.58			
The longer I live in this community, the more I feel I belong here	0.79	3.66			
If I was in trouble, most people in this community would go out of their way to help me	0.73	2.65			
Most of the people in this community can be trusted	0.71	2.75			

<sup>a</sup> items were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

<sup>b</sup> KMO was 0.78, and Barlett's Test of Sphericity was 0.000

### Relationship between community attachment and AIR impacts

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

As seen in Table 3, three of the four models were significant ( $p < 0.05$ ); indicating that CA factor significantly predicted all, except the AIR positive impacts factor. In Model 1, CA ( $F = 5.084$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.008$ ) significantly predicted perceived AIR negative impacts, and it ( $t = 2.26$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.09$ ) was a significant predictor in the model. In Model 2, CA ( $F = 1.986$ ,  $p = 0.159$ ,  $R^2 = 0.003$ ) did not significantly predict perceived AIR positive impacts. In Model 3, CA ( $F = 5.453$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.008$ ) however did significantly predict perceived AIR impacts on quality, and it ( $t = 2.34$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.09$ ) was a significant predictor in the model. Likewise in Model 4, CA ( $F = 6.472$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.01$ ) significantly predicted perceived AIR impacts on population, and it ( $t = 2.54$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.10$ ) was a significant predictor in the model.

The results show that when the residents' level of agreement with items comprising the community attachment factor increases, residents indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising AIR negative impacts factor (i.e., comprising AIRs negative economic impacts on local businesses, AIR impacts on quality and AIR impacts on population).

Table 3. Simple Linear Regression Analysis: Relationship between CA and AIR

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

<sup>a</sup> Each of the CA and AIR items were asked on a 5-pt scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

<sup>b</sup>  $M = 3.21$   $SD = 0.88$

\* $p < 0.05$

## CONCLUSION

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

Overall, no studies have been conducted concerning the association between community attachment and impacts of AIR. However, prior studies emphasize the importance of the relationship between CA and resident attitudes toward tourism. Hence, this study considers the relationship between CA AIR impacts in light of extant findings regarding attitudes toward tourism in general and its accompanying development.

As mentioned in the literature review, generally, tourism researchers claim that the relationships between community attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism can be negative. Similarly, the results of this study indicated that when a respondent was highly attached to his/her community, he/she was also likely to have a more negative attitude toward AIR. The findings of the current study are also consistent with those of Brunt and Courtney (1999), Gursoy et al. (2009), Harrill and Potts (2003), Lankford and Howard (1994), Ryan and Montgomery (1994), Um and Crompton (1987), Vargas-Sánchez, Porras-Bueno, and Plaza-Mejía (2014), and Yoon, Gursoy, and Chen (1999), who found that residents who were strongly attached to their community perceived tourism development negatively. However, this does not mean that the relationship between Community Attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism development may not be positive. There are also some studies that have revealed that residents who were strongly attached to their community viewed tourism development positively (Chen & Raab, 2012; Choi & Murray 2010; Gursoy & Rutherford 2004; Hao, Long, and Kleckley 2011; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams 1997; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Lee 2013; McCool & Martin, 1994; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). For example, In contrast to Harrill and Potts (2003), Vesey and Dimanche (2000) found that community attachment was positively related to residents' attitudes toward tourism. Researchers stated that the more residents live and are involved in their neighborhood, the more positive their perceptions will

be concerning tourism because of its economic benefits and contributions to historic preservation.

Much of this is because no community is homogenous in its perspectives of tourism development (Andereck et al., 2007; García et al., 2015) largely due to diverse socio-demographic and socio-economic residential compositions (Gursoy et al., 2009; Harrill, 2004). Education, gender, age, income, employment and a high degree of community attachment can be given as an example of the major factors affecting the attitudes of residents.

The results are supported by the community attachment theory, which claims that highly attached residents tend to perceive negative impacts of AIR. Harrill (2004) stated that tourism has a potential to adversely influence the quality of the life in the community, hence highly attached residents can feel more negative about tourism. For instance, as the number of tourist increases, highly attached residents feel a greater threat to their extant ways of life. In other words, AIRs may increase the total amount of tourists, which result in forcing highly attached residents to share the enjoyment of resources and infrastructures of common use such as beaches, bars, shops, roads, public services, and other amenities with visitors. The relationship between CA and resident attitudes towards AIRs can be negative for these reasons. By exploring the influence of community attachment on residents' attitudes toward tourism development, this study is able to add to the existing body of knowledge of AIR considering levels of community attachment.

## IMPLICATIONS

From this work, both theoretical and practical implications can be drawn. Having formulated and applied the initial PAIR Scale in a district of Antalya, Cevirgen and Unguren (2009) did not report any reliabilities for the resulting factor structure. While the current study yielded internal consistency measures, coefficients were collectively low. This may be due in part to the novelty of the scale and its limited application up to this point (Nunnally, Bernstein, & Berge, 1967). We would expect these coefficients to increase through subsequent modifications made to particular items.

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

contribution is the support for community attachment theory logic. This study's result found that community attachment critically influences perceived impacts of AIR. The second contribution of this research is that this study extended community attachment theory by including the construct of AIR.

This study also has several practical implications for policymakers, government officials, managers and planners in Antalya in order to sustainably plan for tourism and tourism development. First, governing bodies must consider residents' opinions and perceptions about AIRs so as to reduce the negative impacts. It is clear from the findings that residents by and large have negative impressions of AIRs. In an effort to address this, residents must be involved in each stage of the AIRs development process: planning, implementing and monitoring. Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2003) have supported this idea by claiming that policymakers, government officials, and planners should pay more attention to the problems of locals and should try to train locals about costs and benefits of tourism.

In addition, if residents' needs and demands are not considered in tourism development, residents will view tourism negatively and potentially act hostile toward tourists, which can ultimately damage tourism (Harrill, 2004; Kwon & Vogt, 2010). Policymakers, government officials, and planners need to actively convey to AIR investors and managers, the potential for backlash from residents if their concerns are not addressed. If, however (as a last resort), residents' issues with AIR are not considered, more regulatory action would need to be proposed that would seek to minimize the negative impacts of the resorts and maximize their positive impacts. Given the push by the Turkish government through its Ministry of Tourism office to increase AIRs development, it is unlikely regulatory action would be developed.

Furthermore, policymakers, government officials and planners should seek to increase per capita expenditures rather than increase the absolute number of foreign tourists. Such a focus may serve as a shift away from AIRs to more locally-owned hotels with immediate access to local artisans and craftspeople. Finally, as a form of corporate social responsibility, managers of AIRs in Antalya need to consider financially supporting local parks, schools, civic centers, etc. as an act of showing they do indeed care about local communities and their residents. Such an approach can be viewed as a win-win situation or mutualism, where AIRs

benefit from positive marketing publicity and residents gain from having better parks, schools, etc.

Findings also demonstrated that highly attached residents tended to perceive negative impacts of AIR. Policymakers, government officials, managers and planners should educate or at least inform less attached individuals about the negative impacts of AIR (Harrill, 2004).

### LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Representativeness of the sample is one concern of the study. As indicated, only four districts were included in the sample of Antalya residents (based on the concentration of AIRs in the area). Albeit, this is an advancement from the work of Cevirgen and Unguren (2009) (that only focused on one district—Alanya, roughly 140 km east of Antalya City Center), it is recommended that work linking all-inclusive resorts and residents' attitudes should be done in more than four districts, so as to replicate findings. Additionally, the sample included a very large percentage of business owners or those who derive income from tourists. Such an oversampling may have implications for findings. Future studies may consider focusing intentionally on collecting from business owners and non-business owners as a means to compare attitudes regarding AIR and tourism development.

Additionally, while the current research was conducted to utilize the existing PAIR Scale and modify it sparingly (i.e., removing superfluous items), this study suggests a potential modification of the scale. Those items, which have low standardized factor loadings, may be considered for exclusion (Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009). The rationale for this is that such items are unclear and likely do not contribute significantly to the variance explained in the construct factors. Of course, assessing reliability of the factor with such items removed will be of importance as well. Many of the effect sizes ( $R^2$ ) statistics for the regression analyses were modest, indicating a low degree of variance was explained in the dependent variables in the models. A reduction in the size of scale will make the measure more parsimonious and reduce the potential for confusion and cognitive overload experienced by participants, ultimately improving response rates in subsequent research (Doh, 2006; Woosnam et al., 2009; Woosnam, 2012). Of course, once reliable results are consistently found utilizing a modified scale, future research at that point should involve the employment of confirmatory factor analysis to further

examine factor structure and psychometrics, most notably forms of validity as Boley, McGehee, Perdue, and Long (2014), and Woosnam and Aleshinloye (2013) have done most recently.

While findings from the current study reveal continued support for the application of the PAIR Scale in various contexts where AIRs are found (i.e., other regions of Turkey and throughout the world), modifications need to be made to account for potential semantic concerns. Most noticeably is that the word “local” only appears in negatively-worded items (as Cevirgen & Unguren, 2009 had designed), which may have had impacted the factor structure and its corresponding factor reliabilities. In an effort to not only potentially increase reliability of factors but also aid in greater clarification of items, future research should modify such wording issues by making sure all items are written in a general context, removing the word “local” from each item.

## REFERENCES

- Alaeddinoglu, F., & Can, A. S. (2009). Developing international market entry strategy for cultural tourism of Turkey. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6 (1), 509-527.
- Albayrak, T., Gulmez, M., Erdinc, S. B., Toker, B., & Aksu, A. A. (2011). *Antalya yoresi turist profil arastirmasi 2011* [The study of Tourist Profile in Antalya, 2011]. Antalya: Akdeniz University.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Vogt, C. A., & Knopf, R. C. (2007). A cross-cultural analysis of tourism and quality of life perceptions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15 (5), 483-502.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39 (1), 27-36.
- Anderson, W. (2008). *Analysis of all-inclusive travel mode: Demand and supply perspectives in the Balearic Islands*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Balearic Islands, Palma de Mallorca, Spain.
- Anderson, W., Juaneda, C., & Sastre, F. (2009). Influences of pro- all-inclusive travel decisions. *Tourism Review*, 64 (2), 4-18.
- Antalya Tourism Information Office. (2009). Foreign Travelers' Statistics. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from <http://www.antalyakultur.gov.tr/belge/1-70672/2008-yili.html>.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19 (4), 665-690.
- Armstrong, R. W., & Mok, C. (1995). Leisure travel destination choice criteria of Hong Kong residents. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 4 (1), 99-104.
- Bahar, O. (2004). *Turkiyedeki turizim sektorunun rekabet gucune etkisi uzerine bir arastirma: Mugla ornegi* [An empirical investigation of the competitive position of the tourism sector in Turkey: A case study of Mugla]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Mugla, Mugla, Turkey.

- Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. R., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33-50.
- Brislin, R.W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 1 (3), 185-216.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of socio-cultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (3), 493-515.
- Cavus, S., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2003). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study in Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis*, 7 (3-4), 259-269.
- Cevirgen, A., & Unguren, E. (2009). Yore esnafinin her sey dahil sistemine yonelik tutumlari [The local tradesmen's attitudes towards all-inclusive system]. *Ege Academic Review*, 9 (2), 637-658.
- Chen, S., & Raab, C. (2012). Predicting resident intentions to support community tourism: Toward and integration of two theories. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21 (3), 270-94.
- Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18 (4), 575-594.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10 (7), 1-7.
- De Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism: Passport to development?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Doganer, S. (2012). Resort hotel transition: Antalya, Turkey. In *The Proceedings of 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Sustainable Tourism*, 161, 331-342.
- Doh, M. (2006). *Change through tourism: Resident perceptions of tourism development*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Duman, T., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2011). Profiling of English tourists visiting Turkey based on attitudes toward Internet use in vacation decision making. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20 (5), 525-550.
- Duman, T., & Tosun, C. (2010). Current developments in Turkish tourism. *Anatolia*, 21 (1), 5-9.
- Dwyer, L., & Thomas, F. (2012). Tourism yield measures for Cambodia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15 (4), 303-328.
- Erkus-Ozturk, H., & Terhorst, P. (2010). Variety of modes of governance of a global value chain: The case of tourism from Holland to Turkey. *Tourism Geographies*, 12(2), 217-245.
- Erul, E. (2014). *Antalya residents' attitudes regarding the impacts of all-inclusive resorts in the Turkish coastal destination*. Unpublished Master of Science Thesis, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. Retrieved from <http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/153454>
- Euromonitor International (2013). Top 100 city destination rankings. Retrieved February 23, 2016, from <http://blog.euromonitor.com/2015/01/top-100-city-destinations-ranking.html>
- García, F. A., Vázquez, A. B., & Macías, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33-40.
- Gjerald, O. (2005). Sociocultural impacts of tourism: A case study from Norway. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 3 (1), 36-58.
- Gurkan, T. (2002). *Her sey dahil (all inclusive) sisteminin Turk turizmi acisindan incelenmesi: Antalya- Kemer ornegi* [The search of effects of all inclusive system on Turkish

- tourism sector: Sample region Antalya-Kemer]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2009). An examination of locals' attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research, 36* (4), 723-726.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31* (3), 495-516.
- Hao, H., Long P., & Kleckley, J. (2011). Factors predicting homeowners' attitudes toward tourism: A case of a coastal resort community. *Journal of Travel Research, 50* (6), 627-640.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature, 18* (3), 251-266.
- Harrill, R., & Potts, T. D. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts. Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 69* (3), 233-244.
- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 46* (4), 446-455.
- Issa, J. J., & Jayawardena, C. (2003). The "all-inclusive" concept in the Caribbean. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15* (3), 167-171.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 36* (2), 3-11.
- Karamustafa, K. (2000). Marketing-channel relationships: Turkey's resort purveyors' interactions with international tour operators. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 41* (4), 21-31.
- Koc, E. (2005). New product development in the Turkish tourism market: The case of football tourism. *Journal of Sport Tourism, 10* (3), 165-173.
- Korca, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23* (3), 695-697.
- Koseoglu, M. A., Topaloglu, C., Parnell, J. A., & Lester, D. L. (2013). Linkages among business strategy, uncertainty and performance in the hospitality industry: Evidence from an emerging economy. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*, 81-91.
- Kwon, J., & Vogt, C. A. (2010). Identifying the role of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components in understanding residents' attitudes toward place marketing. *Journal of Travel Research, 49* (4), 423-435.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism attitude impact scale. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24* (1), 121-139.
- Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research, 51* (1), 50- 67.
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management, 34*, 37-46.
- Liu, J.C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13* (2), 193-214.
- Long, P. H. (2012). Tourism impacts and support for tourism development in Ha Long Bay, Vietnam: An examination of residents' perceptions. *Asian Social Science, 8* (8), 28-39.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D., Luloff, A. E., & Krannich, R. S. (2006). Community participation in rapidly growing communities in Southern Utah. *Journal of Community Development Society, 37* (4), 71-87.

- McCool, S. F., & Martin S. R., (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (3), 29-34.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (2), 131-140.
- Menekse, R. (2005). Her sey dahil sisteminin ve sistemden faydalananlar açısından etkilerinin otel yöneticilerinin gözünden değerlendirilmesi (Marmaris örneği) [Hotel managers' views on all-inclusive system and its effects on beneficiaries: The case of Marmaris]. *AIBU-IIBF Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1, 97-124.
- Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ozdemir, B., Cizel, B., & Bato Cizel, R. (2012). Satisfaction with all-inclusive tourism resorts: The effects of satisfaction with destination and destination loyalty. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 13 (2), 109-130.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Kang, Y. S. (1995). Resident support for gambling as a tourism development strategy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34 (2), 3-11.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16 (4), 8-12.
- Poon, A. (1998). All-inclusive resorts. *Travel & Tourism Analyst*, 6, 62-77.
- Ryan, C., & Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism. *Tourism Management*, 15 (5), 358-69.
- Schluter, R., & Var, T. (1988). Resident attitudes toward tourism in Argentina. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15 (3), 442-445.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Mak, J. (1987). The demand for package tours: A mode choice model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25 (3), 13-17.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5 (1), 40-47.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tatoglu, E., Erdal, F., Ozgur, H., & Azakli, S. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts: The case of Kusadasi, Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 3 (3), 79-100.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), 231-253.
- Tumer, N. (2010). Measuring hotel performance using data envelopment analysis. *Anatolia*, 21 (2), 271-287.
- Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism [TMCT]. (2015). Tourism Statistics, Foreign Travelers' in 2007, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2015. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,36568/number-of-arriving-departing-visitors-foreigners-and-ci.html>
- Turkish Statistical Institute [TSI]. (2015). Population statistics. Retrieved March 10, 2016, from <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist>
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26 (1), 27-29.
- Uner, M. M., Sokmen, A., & Birkan, I. (2006). Türkiye'de her sey dahil uygulamasının konaklama işletmeleri üzerindeki etkisi: Antalya örneği [Influence of all-inclusive system in the Turkish hospitality industry: The case of Antalya]. *Anatolia*, 17 (1), 35-50.

- United Nations World Tourism Organizations [UNWTO] (2015). Tourism Statistics, Foreign Travelers' in 2014. Retrieved from March 15, 2016, from <http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284416899>
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & Plaza-Mejía, M. A. (2014). Residents' attitude to tourism and seasonality. *Journal of Travel Research, 53* (5), 581-596.
- Vesey, C. M., & Dimanche, F. (2000). Urban residents' perceptions of tourism and its impacts. *Unpublished manuscript, University of New Orleans, LA.*
- Wong, C. S., & Kwong, W. Y. (2004). Outbound tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours. *Tourism Management, 25* (5), 581-592.
- Woosnam, K. M. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 51* (3), 315-327.
- Woosnam, K. M., & Aleshinloye, K. D. (2013). Can tourists experience emotional solidarity with residents? Testing Durkheim's model from a new perspective. *Journal of Travel Research, 52* (4), 494-505.
- Woosnam, K. M., Norman, W. C., & Ying, T. (2009). Exploring the theoretical framework of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. *Journal of Travel Research, 48* (2), 245-258.
- Yarcan, S., & Ertuna, B. (2002). What you encourage is what you get: The case of Turkish inbound international tourism. *Anatolia, 13* (2), 159-183.
- Yilmaz, Y., Yilmaz, Y., Icigen, E. T., Ekin, Y., & Utku, B. D. (2009). Destination image: A comparative study on pre and post trip image variations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 18* (5), 461-479.
- Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities' characteristics. *Anatolia, 10* (1), 29-44.
- Yu, C. P. S., Chancellor H. C., & Cole, S. T. (2011). Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: A reexamination of the sustainable tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 50* (1), 57-63.