

## The Relationship Between The Tourism Impacts and The Quality of Life in the City\*

 Aysen ERCAN İŞTİN<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

The aim of the research is to determine the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in the city. In the study, in which the quantitative research method was preferred, a questionnaire was used. The data were collected between July 2019 and February 2020 via facebook and whatsapp social media. 207 questionnaires were used. As a result of the analysis, it has been determined that there are positive linear low and medium level relationships between the dimensions of variables. As a result of the comparison analysis, according to the working status, the dimension of satisfaction with infrastructure and facilities of the city; according to the age variable and the length of living in Alanya variable, the participants' perceptions regarding the satisfaction with people's personal situation dimension about the quality of life in city differed significantly; according to gender, only the participants' perceptions regarding the economy, image and infrastructure status of destination dimension show a significant difference.

**Keywords:** Tourism, the tourism impacts, the quality of life in city, Alanya.

**JEL Kodu/Code:** L83, D23, M12.

**Referans/Citation:** Ercan İştin, A. (2021). The Relationship Between The Tourism Impacts and The Quality of Life in the City, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Issues*, Vol. 3, No.2, 176-196.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The quality of life is examined from two perspectives in tourism literature. The first is to examine the relationship between tourism activities and the tourists' quality of life. Because traveling and participating in tourism activities improve people's quality of life mentally and physically. The second dimension is to examine the changes in the quality of life that occur as a result of the people's interaction living in tourism regions with tourism. Tourism contributes to the people's social life by enabling social interaction, personal development and the formation of individual identities. In addition, it is observed that participating in touristic activities has indirect and direct positive impacts on people's life satisfaction by providing more happiness, healthier life, length of longer life, high self-confidence and thus more life satisfaction (Türker et al., 2016: 3).

At the point where a tourism destination is born, the people' quality of life, who are living in the destination, is going through radical changes. It can be said that the positive tourism impacts can lead to a higher quality of life for the residents of the region. On the contrary, the negative tourism impacts will lead to a lower quality of life (Zeinali et al., 2015: 293).

<sup>1</sup> Assist. Prof. Dr., School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Şırnak University, aysen\_ercanistin@sirnak.edu.tr, Orcid ID: 0000-0002-7622-361X

\*Since the data were collected before the ULAKBİM decision (Ethics Committee Approval) dated February 25, 2020, retrospective ethics committee approval is not required.

The main purpose of the research is to reveal the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city. It is strategically important to gain insight into the perceptions of the community living in a destination on the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city. Determining the people' perspectives on the tourism impacts and revealing the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city can encourage many decision-makers to invest in the tourism industry, which contributes to the development of society and the improvement of living standards. In this case, it is important for the future of the destination. In addition, it can be taken measures within the scope of the recommendations made in the research in order to eliminate the negative tourism impacts such as the inadequacy of infrastructure and superstructure, noise, traffic, crowd, pollution, unsafe environmental conditions, increase in crime rate, high cost of living, social conflict to increase the quality of life in city, and can be increased gaining an advantage over competition among tourism destinations. It will be beneficial to reveal the resident foreigners' social, cultural or events perspective, who are living in Alanya, and to benefit from this in order to increase the quality of life in city and to provide the integration of these people with the city. By the way, knowing the opinions of foreigners residing in the Alanya district of Antalya, which is an important tourism destination for Turkey, on the effects of tourism and the quality of life in city in Alanya, determining what their effects might be on local tourism and the quality of city life, is an important study in terms of contributing to local tourism. In this context, it is thought that the research will contribute to the literature.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. The Quality of Life in City**

Research on the quality of life in city started in the 1960s. The concept of the quality of life in city was first discussed by Perloff (1969) in "The Quality of the Urban Environment"(İnal Çekiç & Kahraman, 2015). In the 1980s, when research was concentrated, the research of the quality of life in city significantly enriched the development of urban geography. Studies on the quality of life in city have focused on large city or metropolitan areas and analysis of small or medium-sized city with a population of up to one million (Murgas & Klobucnik, 2018: 184-185).

The quality of life is seen as part of the competitive city profile, that is, it is successful in attracting capital and is also a determining factor in urban growth models (Royuela et al., 2007: 5). The quality of life is expressed as meeting the individual's the values, goals and needs through the realization of an individual's abilities or lifestyle (Emerson, 1985: 282). This definition is consistent with the idea that the degree of satisfaction and well-being between the individual's perception of his / her objective situation and his / her needs or desires results from the degree of harmony (Felce & Perry, 1995: 54). According to a more comprehensive definition, the quality of life in city is defined that presenting level of infrastructure of city, communication, transportation, housing and similar facilities is above the predetermined measurements in places that are included in the definition of the city in terms of social, economic and spatial elements (Geray, 1998: 326-327).

Borthwick Duffy (1992) explained the quality of life with three basic models. The first of these is the approach that focuses on the objective living conditions of the individual, can be measured with quantitative data and is the crucial point of the environment. According to this approach, the rising of the quality of life depends on the improvement of economic, social and natural environmental conditions (Borthwick Duffy, 1992: 56). In other words, objective indicators include the households where people live and the environment of these households, job opportunities, business environment and social areas (Emür & Onsekiz, 2007: 367). In the second approach, which takes subjective judgments into account, there is a dominant thought that the quality of life can be explained by the level of satisfaction that the individual feels depending on the living conditions (Borthwick Duffy, 1992: 56). In subjective

indicators, there are indicators that are shaped in line with the individuals' experiences and desires, rather in line with the individuals' experiences. In this criterion, there are expectations, happiness, passions and personal experiences. (Schneider, 1975: 496). The third approach defends that both objective and subjective approaches should be evaluated together (Borthwick Duffy, 1992: 56). In addition to these three approaches, the fourth approach put forward by Felce and Perry (1995) defends that personal desires, expectations and values should also be taken into account (Felce & Perry, 1995: 54). Within the scope of the research, the resident foreigners' perceptions on the quality of life in city were evaluated in terms of objective living conditions.

The quality of life is a result of meeting human needs through the resources, opportunities and facilities provided by the environment, as well as the individual' satisfaction to be met his / her perception, evaluation and needs. Human needs include physical, biological, psychological, economic and social needs. These needs are met with the resources, opportunities and facilities available in the environment. Therefore, according to Das (2008), the quality of life can be interpreted as the ability of environment to provide the necessary resources to be met the daily needs of human life (Rezvani et al., 2013: 207). Shafer et al. (2000) argue that the quality of life is created by an ongoing interaction between environmental and economic characteristics. The physical environment of the society should exist in a way that provides an environment that creates a healthy living space. In addition, all kinds of facilities should be planned and designed to provide a balance between the economic, environmental and social characteristics of a region, so that the residents of the region can live a healthy, productive and enjoyable life (Shafer et al., 2000: 165).

## **2.2. The Tourism Impacts**

Tourism, which is an important driving force in the use of natural and human resources, has always been and will continue to be a path to progress for all countries of the world (Bandoi et al., 2020: 1). Tourism can have many different impacts on the social and cultural aspects of life in a particular region or area, depending on the cultural and religious strengths of a region (Zaei & Zaei, 2013: 15). Researches on the phenomenon of tourism, which introduce thousands of people with different economic, social and cultural backgrounds to each other every year, are increasing day by day. Recreational travel and tourism create many changes in social life, and these changes constitute the tourism impacts. Tourism has positive and negative impacts on the country or region where it begins to develop, as well as on the economic and social structure due to the changes it creates (Özdemir & Kervankıran, 2011: 3-4).

The positive tourism impacts on a destination are foreign currency earnings and employment opportunities, more job opportunities, creating more income for people working in the tourism industry, improving the quality of life and protecting cultural heritage (monuments, world heritage, important tourism attractions) (Gondos, 2014: 881). In addition, tourism contributes to the protection of more environmental values and biodiversity and the protection of ecosystems (Nkemngu, 2015: 5-6). Tourism can generate significant local tax revenues. These taxes can also be used in the development of public investment, various services and infrastructure related to schools, medical clinics, library, parks and recreation facilities. Personnel working in the tourism sector gain new skills and learn new technologies. This feature increases the development and quality of human resources in the region. In addition, this skill and use of technology can also be transferred to other economic sectors and activities (Günel, 2011).

Possibly the negative tourism impacts include overcrowding, traffic, economic stress caused by inflation of goods and services prices, increasing property values, change in culture and practices, pollution, loss of biodiversity, crime and undesirable behaviors such as alcohol and drug use (Zeinali et al., 2015: 293). It is seen as negative impacts that tourism causes changes in the lifestyle of the society, weakening of family ties, changes in the structure of values and beliefs (Özaltın Türker, 2020a). In addition, although

the increase in property and land prices due to tourism seems to be a positive impact for property owners, it can be considered as a negative impact for buyers. Tourism causing a regional inflation is also seen as another negative impact. Price increases in the tourism region can reach a level that makes it difficult for the people of the region to live there. On the other hand, although tourism has a positive impact on employment, this impact is seasonal in many destinations. Therefore, it is possible to state that a seasonal unemployment arises due to tourism. If the people of region give up their other economic activities, especially agriculture and animal husbandry, due to tourism activities, tourism has a negative impact on other economic activities (Özaltın Türker, 2020b).

Tourism has many impacts on both tourist sending and receiving societies. For this reason, it is a phenomenon that needs to be examined with its socio-cultural dimensions. Similarly, the phenomenon of immigration impacts societies and leads to social changes. Along with the migration movement, social and cultural relations are established between local people, resident foreigners and tourists in tourism destinations, and these relations create socio-cultural impacts. Behaviors of resident foreigners individually, family relations, lifestyles, moral attitudes, the ball of values they carry and their contribution to the society they live emerge as social and cultural impacts (Özgürel & Avcıkurt, 2018).

### **2.3. Research Hypotheses**

In order to be able to talk about the quality of life in a destination, the destination must have some economic, environmental, social and cultural standards. Today, touristic activities organized in some city cause changes in the quality of life in city (Atik et al., 2014). When the researches conducted in this context are examined, in the results of the research conducted by Andereck & Nyaupane (2011) in Arizona to measure the tourism impacts on the quality of life, it has been determined that there is a positive relationship between the quality of life and personal financial benefits such as income and employment from tourism, and between the quality of life and participation in events such as festivals and fairs, and tourism increases the quality of life. Similarly, Kim et al. (2013) found in their research that tourism development impacts the people's general life satisfaction. The hypothesize of the research developed in this context ( $H_1$ );

**H<sub>1</sub>:** There is a significant positive relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city.

Boğan & Sarıışık (2016) aimed to determine the people's perceptions and views in Alanya regarding tourism activities in terms of their economic, social and environmental impacts. In the research, t-test (gender, marital status, being born in Alanya, whether there is a relative working in the tourism sector) and ANOVA (age group, income status, residence time and education status) were carried out to determine whether the attitudes regarding the tourism impacts differ according to the demographic characteristics of the local population. According to the findings of the t-test, it has been determined that individuals who are male, single and have relatives working in tourism have participated intensely in the statement "It is an excellent experience to be together with tourists from all over the world". According to the findings of ANOVA, it was observed that the participants' perceptions aged 41 and over was higher that tourism provides more job opportunities for foreigners. Therefore, the hypotheses of the research developed in line with these findings ( $H_2$ );

**H<sub>2</sub>:** According to the gender variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H<sub>3</sub>:** According to the marital status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H4:** According to the pension status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H5:** According to the working status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H6:** According to the age variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H7:** According to the nationality variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H8:** According to length of living in Alanya variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H9:** According to the education variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.

**H10:** According to the gender variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

Salihoğlu & Türkoğlu (2019) found that there was no significant difference in terms of satisfaction with the quality of life in city according to gender, marital status, and employment status in their research, which aimed to examine the relationship between the perception and satisfaction levels of households regarding various features of residential areas in Istanbul and quality of life in city. On the other hand, he found that there was a significant difference according to education level. Çam (2014) found in his research that aimed to measure the quality of city life, that the participants' perceptions did not make a significant difference according to the age and gender variable. Therefore, the hypotheses of the research developed in line with these findings;

**H11:** According to the marital status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H12:** According to the pension status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H13:** According to the working status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H14:** According to the age variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H15:** According to the nationality variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H16:** According to length of living in Alanya variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

**H17:** According to the education variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.

### **3. METHOD**

The aim of the research is to determine the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city. The universe of the research consists of resident foreigners living in Alanya. The sample of the research consists of resident foreigners who can be reached in numbers to represent the universe. In



this context, data were collected between July 2019 – February 2020 with a survey via facebook and whatsapp. The data obtained were analyzed using the statistical package program.

Tabachnick & Fidell (2018: 675) and Child (2006) stated that 5 times the number of items in the scale is sufficient for the sample size. The scale used in this research includes 29 items in total (13 items in the scale related to the tourism impacts and 16 items in the scale related to the quality of life in city). The scale of the tourism impacts has been developed by Kostalova (2017). It was used the quality of life in city scale applied to European city (Flash Eurobarometer 366). A sample of 207 resident foreigners were found suitable to provide data. Thus, it was reached sufficient sample size ( $29 \times 5 = 145$ ).

#### 4. FINDINGS

The distribution of the participants according to their demographic characteristics is given in Table 1. The participants' demographic characteristics consist of gender, marital status, working status, educational status, pension status, nationality, age and length of living in Alanya.

**Table 1. Findings regarding the participants' demographic characteristics**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>			<b>Marital Status</b>		
Female	151	72,9	Married	105	50,7
Male	56	27,1	Unmarried	102	49,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Pension Status</b>			<b>Working Status</b>		
Yes	58	28,0	Working	69	33,3
No	149	72,0	Not working	138	66,7
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Age</b>			<b>Nationality</b>		
15-30 age	32	15,5	Republics of Turkey	42	20,3
31-46 age	86	41,5	Russian	59	28,5
47-62 age	54	26,1	Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	32,9
63+ age	35	16,9	Others	38	18,4
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Length of Living in Alanya</b>			<b>Education Status</b>		
Less than 12 months	34	16,4	Education before undergraduate	70	33,8
13-24 months	36	17,4	Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	66,2
25-36 months	35	16,9	-	-	-
37-48 months	43	20,8	-	-	-
49 months and over	59	28,5	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>100</b>

#### 4.1. Reliability and Factor Analysis

The reliability of the scales used in the research was calculated by using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient and item-all correlations method in order to determine the foreigners' perceptions residing in Alanya regarding the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city. For the items that were decided to be excluded from the scales, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to be obtained was checked when the item was deleted. Item-total correlations are expected to not be negative and greater than 0,250 (Kalaycı, 2014: 412).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was conducted to check whether the sample size was suitable for factoring before conducting explanatory factor analysis (Çokluk, et al., 2012: 207). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was applied in order to determine whether the data related to the scales show multivariate normal distribution or not (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010: 208).

In the factor analysis of the scales, if there is an item giving cross load, the difference should be at least ,100 (Bayram, 2009: 205). In addition, it was paid attention that the factor load for the items should not be below ,40 (Büyüköztürk, 2018: 134). In addition, variables with large weights under one factor were taken into account in order to name the factors (Kalaycı, 2014: 330).

Cronbach's Alpha value of the quality of life in city scale was calculated as ,835. Afterwards, it was deemed appropriate to exclude the expression "*From schools and other reductional facilities in Alanya*" in the scale, since the total correlation value of the item is less than ,199<0,250 and the expression "*From my personal job situation in Alanya*" in the scale was deemed appropriate to be removed, since the whole correlation value of the item is equal to ,250≤0,250. In addition, Cronbach Alpha coefficient increased from 0,835 to 0,845 after the item was removed. As a result of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, the KMO sampling adequacy value was found to be ,845. This finding shows that the sample size is highly sufficient for factor analysis application (Çokluk et al., 2012: 207). Bartlett sphericity test value of the quality of life in city scale is 888,285; This value is significant at the 0,0001 level. The significance of the chi-square values for the Bartlett test at the level of 0,0001 is an indication that the data came from the multivariate normal distribution (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2010: 208). Therefore, this result reveals that the research data show multiple normal distribution and shows that multivariate statistical techniques can be applied to the data (Çokluk et al., 2010: 208).

In the factor analysis regarding the quality of life in city, a cross-load item ("*From cultural facilities such as concert halls, theaters, museums and libraries in Alanya*" - factor loads, respectively: ,407 - ,432) was found. No item with a factor load of ,40 below the acceptance level was found in the scale items. The factor analysis results regarding the quality of life in city are shown in Table 2.

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the results of the factor analysis regarding the quality of life in city are in accordance with the stated pre-acceptances. 13 items out of a total of 16 items that explain the quality of life in city come together under 3 factors and contribute 58,110% to the total variance.

In order to name the factors, it has been considered the dimensions in the quality of life in city scale applied to European city. The first factor was named "*Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city*", the second factor was named "*Satisfaction with people's personal situation*", the third factor was named "*Satisfaction with facilities of the city*".

The eigenvalue of the first factor is 4,701, its average is 4,4420. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is ,849. This factor contributes 36,159% to the explained variance and is expressed with 8 items. The eigenvalue of the second factor is 1,730 and the average is 4,3657. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is ,714. This factor contributes 13,310% to the explained variance and is expressed with 3 items. The eigenvalue of the third

factor is 1,123 and the average is 4,1283. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is ,560. This factor contributes 8,640% to the explained variance and is expressed with 2 items.

**Table 2. Factor analysis results related to the quality of life in city scale**

Items	Communalities	Factor load	Eigen values	Variance explained	Mean	Alpha
<b>1. FACTOR: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city (8 expressions)</b>			<b>4,70</b>	<b>36,15</b>	<b>4,44</b>	<b>,84</b>
From the state of the streets and buildings in my neighborhood in Alanya	,687	,765				
From cleanliness in Alanya	,612	,742				
From the quality of the air in Alanya	,532	,716				
From public spaces such as markets, squares, pedestrian areas in Alanya	498	,700				
From green spaces such as parks and gardens in Alanya	485	,685				
From sports facilities such as sport fields and indoor sport halls in Alanya	,586	,667				
Form the noise level in Alanya	,433	,580				
From availability of retail shops in Alanya	,405	,436				
<b>2. FACTOR: Satisfaction with people's personal situation (3 expressions)</b>			<b>1,730</b>	<b>13,310</b>	<b>4,3657</b>	<b>,71</b>
From the life I lead	,756	,858				
From the financial situation of my household in Alanya	,689	,812				
From the place where I live	,573	,689				
<b>3. FACTOR: Satisfaction with facilities of the city (2 expressions)</b>			<b>1,123</b>	<b>8,640</b>	<b>4,1283</b>	<b>,56</b>
From health care services, doctors and hospitals in Alanya	,678	,816				
From public transport, for example the bus, tram or metro in Alanya	,651	,750				
Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation - Explained total variance: 58,110%; KMO Sampling Adequacy: ,845 - Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 888,285 s.d. : 78 p <0,001 Overall Average: 4,3761 - Cronbach's Alpha: ,838						
Response categories: 1) Strongly dissatisfaction, (2) Dissatisfaction, (3) No idea, (4) Satisfaction, (5) Strongly satisfaction						

Cronbach's Alpha value was calculated as ,802 for the whole scale regarding the tourism impacts in the study. It was deemed appropriate to exclude the "Traffic congestion" and "Public sevices" expressions in the scale since all item correlation values were less than ,230<0,250 and ,220<0,250 respectively (Kalaycı, 2014: 412). In addition, after the item was removed, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient increased from ,802 to ,830. As a result of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, the KMO sampling adequacy value was found to be ,840. This finding shows that the sample size is highly sufficient for the application of factor analysis. Bartlett's sphericity test value of the scale of the tourism impacts is 673,748. The significance of this value at the level of 0,0001 reveals that the data show multiple normal distribution



and shows that multivariate statistical techniques can be applied to the data (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk 2010: 208).

In the factor analysis of the scale of the tourism impacts, no item with a cross load or an item with a factor load of ,40 (lowest: 0,403 - highest: 0,859) below the acceptance level was found (Büyüköztürk, 2018: 134). However, since the value of communalities (,277) is very low, it was deemed appropriate to remove the item "Prices". Thus, the Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale increased from ,830 to ,833. The factor analysis results regarding the scale of the tourism impacts are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Factor analysis results regarding the tourism impacts scale**

Items	Communalities	Factor load	Eigen values	Variance explained	Mean	Alpha
<b>1.FACTOR: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts (7 expressions)</b>			<b>4,13</b>	<b>41,36</b>	<b>3,9</b>	<b>,81</b>
Environment	,659	,770				
Community spirit	,606	,765				
Crowding	,448	,643				
The overall city (destination)	,559	,627				
Culture (traditions and habits)	,475	,604				
Public spaces (recreational, opportunities such as park, etc.)	,475	,596				
Standard of living	,402	,546				
<b>2.FACTOR: Economic impacts (3 expressions)</b>			<b>1,30</b>	<b>13,05</b>	<b>3,9</b>	<b>,73</b>
Economy of the destination	,637	,795				
Infrastructure	,631	,776				
Destination image	,579	,714				
Varimax Rotation Principal Component Analysis - Explained total variance: 54,420%. KMO Sampling Adequacy: ,840 - Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: 673,748 s.d. : 45 p <0,001; Overall Average: 3,9778 - Cronbach's Alpha: ,833						
Response categories: 1) Strongly negative, (2) Negative, (3) No idea, (4) Positive, (5) Strongly positive						

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the results of the factor analysis regarding the tourism impacts are in accordance with the stated pre-acceptances. 10 items out of a total of 13 items that explain the tourism impacts come together under 2 factors and contribute 54,420% to the total variance.

Considering variables with large weights under a factor (Kalaycı, 2014: 330), the first factor was named as "*Socio-cultural and environmental impacts*" and the second factor was named as "*Economic impacts*".

The eigenvalue of the first factor is 4,137. Its average is 3,9848. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is ,811. This factor contributes 41,367% to the explained variance and is expressed with 7 items. The eigenvalue of the second factor is 1,305. Its average is 3,9614, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is ,731. This factor contributes 13,053% to the explained variance and is expressed with 3 items.

#### 4.2. Correlation and Regression Analysis

Correlation analysis was performed to determine the association and direction between two variables (Nakip, 2005: 244-245). In addition, simple linear regression analysis was performed to express mathematically how the independent variables affect the dependent variable (Kalaycı, 2014: 199).

**Table 4. Means, standard deviations and correlations**

Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	1	2	3	4	5
1. Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city	4,44	,60436	1				
2. Satisfaction with people's personal situation	4,36	,70668	,289**	1			
3. Satisfaction with facilities of the city	4,12	,77027	,460**	,218**	1		
4. Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	3,98	,49664	,348**	,152*	,085	1	
5. Economic impacts	3,96	,53427	,356**	,189*	,095	,476**	1
<b>The tourism impacts</b>	3,97	,44677	1				
<b>The quality of life in city</b>	4,37	,51280	,371**	1			

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0,01 level (2-tailed).

According to the result of the correlation analysis made on the dimensions of the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city in Table 4, when the relationship between the dimensions of the quality of life in city is examined, it is seen that there is a positive linear low correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city and satisfaction with people's personal situation ( $r = ,289^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ). It is seen that there is a positive linear mid-level correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city and satisfaction with facilities of the city ( $r = ,460^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ). Finally, it is seen that there is a positive linear low correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with people's personal situation and satisfaction with facilities of the city ( $r = ,218^{**}$ ,  $p = ,002 < 0,01$ ). When the relationship between the dimensions of the tourism impacts is examined, it is seen that there is a positive linear mid-level correlation between the dimensions of socio-cultural and environmental impacts and economic impacts ( $r = ,476^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ) (Köklü et al., 2006).

When the relationship between the dimensions of the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city is examined, it is seen that there is a positive linear mid-level correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city and socio-cultural and environmental impacts ( $r = ,348^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ). It is seen that there is a positive linear mid-level correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city and economic impacts ( $r = ,356^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ). It is seen that there is a very low positive linear correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with people's personal situation and socio-cultural and environmental impacts ( $r = ,152^*$ ,  $p = ,029 < 0,05$ ). It is seen that there is a very low positive linear correlation between the dimensions of satisfaction with people's personal situation and economic impacts ( $r = ,189^*$ ,  $p = ,006 < 0,05$ ). However, a significant relationship was not found between the dimensions of satisfaction with facilities of the city and socio-cultural and environmental impacts ( $r = ,085$ ,  $p = ,222 > 0,01$ ), satisfaction with facilities of the city and economic impacts ( $r = ,095$ ,  $p = ,175 > 0,01$ ).

According to the correlation analysis of the scales for the total, it was determined that there is a positive linear mid-level correlation between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city ( $r = ,371^{**}$ ,  $p = ,000 < 0,01$ ). In this case, it is accepted hypothesize that is " $H_1$ : There is a significant positive relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city."

According to the analysis results in Table 5, it was found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of socio-cultural and environmental impacts on the dimension of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city ( $F = 28,186$ ,  $p = ,000$ ).  $R^2$  was been accounted as 0,121. In this case, it can be stated that 12,1% of the variability in participants' perceptions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city is explained by the independent variable socio-cultural and environmental impacts. Being close to 2 Durbin-Watson coefficient (1,213) indicates that there is no autocorrelation between these variables.

**Table 5. Regression analysis**

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		Beta	Std. Error	Beta		
Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city	(Constant)	2,756	,320		8,613	,000
	Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	,423	,080	,348	5,309	,000
R: ,348; R <sup>2</sup> : ,121; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,117; F for model: 28,186; P=,000; D-W: 1,213						
Satisfaction with people's personal situation	(Constant)	3,505	,394		8,886	,000
	Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	,216	,098	,152	2,198	,029
R: ,152; R <sup>2</sup> : ,023; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,018; F F for model: 4,832; P=,029; D-W: 1,736						
Satisfaction with facilities of the city	(Constant)	3,602	,433		8,310	,000
	Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	,132	,108	,085	1,225	,222
R: ,085; R <sup>2</sup> : ,007; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,002; F F for model: 1,500; P=,222; D-W: 1,612						
Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city	(Constant)	2,848	,295		9,650	,000
	Economic impacts	,402	,074	,356	5,450	,000
R: ,356; R <sup>2</sup> : ,127; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,122; F for model: 29,698; P=,000; D-W: 1,300						
Satisfaction with people's personal situation	(Constant)	3,374	,363		9,305	,000
	Economic impacts	,250	,091	,189	2,760	,006
R: ,189; R <sup>2</sup> : ,036; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,031; F for model: 7,619; P=,006; D-W: 1,766						
Satisfaction with facilities of the city	(Constant)	3,588	,401		8,954	,000
	Economic impacts	,137	,100	,095	1,362	,175
R: ,095; R <sup>2</sup> : ,009; Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> : ,004; F for model: 1,854; P=,175; D-W: 1,612						

It was found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of socio-cultural and environmental impacts on the dimension of satisfaction with people's personal situation ( $F = 4,832$ ,  $p = ,029$ ).  $R^2$  has been accounted as 0,023. In this case, it can be stated that 2,3% of the variability in participants' perceptions of people's personal situation is explained by the independent variable socio-cultural and

environmental impacts. Being close to 2 Durbin-Watson coefficient (1,736) indicates that there is no autocorrelation between these variables.

It was not found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of socio-cultural and environmental impacts on the dimension of satisfaction with facilities of the city ( $F = 1,500$ ,  $p = ,222$ ). Therefore, it is seen that there is no significant impact of participants' perceptions of socio-cultural and environmental on satisfaction with facilities of the city. Since the model was found to be insignificant, a simple linear regression model for the result could not be created.

It was found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of economic impacts on the dimension of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city ( $F=29,698$ ,  $p=,000$ ).  $R^2$  has been accounted as ,127. In this case, it can be stated that 12,7% of the variability in participants' perceptions of satisfaction with infrastructure and facilities of the city is explained by the independent variable economic impacts. Being close to 2 Durbin-Watson coefficient (1,300) indicates that there is no autocorrelation between these variables.

It was found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of economic impacts on the dimension of people's personal situation ( $F=7,619$ ,  $p=,006$ ).  $R^2$  was been accounted as ,036. In this case, it can be stated that 3,6% of the variability in participants' perceptions of satisfaction with people's personal situation is explained by the independent variable economic impacts. Being close to 2 Durbin-Watson coefficient (1,766) indicates that there is no autocorrelation between these variables.

It was not found to be statistically significant the effect of the dimension of economic impacts on the dimension of satisfaction with facilities of the ( $F=1,854$ ,  $p=,175$ ). Therefore, it is seen that there is no significant relationship between participants' perceptions of economic impacts and satisfaction with facilities of the city. Since the model was found to be insignificant, a simple linear regression model for the result could not be created.

#### **4.3. Differentiation situation of participants' perceptions according to demographic features**

T-test was used to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city differ significantly according to gender, marital status, working status, pension status and education status. Table 6 shows the results of the t-test.

As a result of the t-test performed in Table 6, it was found that the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city differ significantly only for the dimension of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city according to working status ( $p = ,035 < 0,05$ ). On the other hand, according to working status, it was found that there was no significant difference in terms of satisfaction with people's personal situation dimension ( $p = ,152 > 0,05$ ) and satisfaction with facilities of the city dimension ( $p = ,354 > 0,05$ ). At the same time, it was found that the participants' perception of the quality of life in city dimensions did not show a significant difference according to gender, marital status and education status.

According to pension status, it was found that the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city only regarding the dimension of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city differ significantly ( $p = ,022 < 0,05$ ). On the other hand, it was found that the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city did not differ significantly in terms of satisfaction with people's personal situation dimension ( $p = ,697 > 0,05$ ) and satisfaction with facilities of the city dimension ( $p = ,187 > 0,05$ ). At the same time, it was found that the perceptions of the participants of quality of life in city dimensions did not show a significant difference according to gender, marital status and education status.

**Table 6. Differentiation situation of participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city (t-testi)**

Dimensions of The quality of life in city	Demographic Variables	N	Mean	Std.	t	Sig.	
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Gender	Female	151	4,45	0,61	,292	,771
		Male	56	4,42	0,58		
		Female	151	4,32	0,71	-1,773	,079
		Male	56	4,49	0,59		
		Female	151	4,09	0,81	-1,080	,281
		Male	56	4,22	0,65		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Marital Status	Married	105	4,39	0,60	-1,305	,193
		Unmarried	102	4,50	0,60		
		Married	105	4,39	0,69	,517	,606
		Unmarried	102	4,34	0,73		
		Married	105	4,14	0,68	,195	,845
		Unmarried	102	4,12	0,86		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Working Status	Working	69	4,32	0,63	-2,122	<b>,035</b>
		Not Working	138	4,50	0,58		
		Working	69	4,27	0,75	-1,437	,152
		Not Working	138	4,42	0,68		
		Working	69	4,06	0,76	-,929	,354
		Not Working	138	4,16	0,78		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Pension Status	Yes	58	4,55	0,68	2,314	<b>,022</b>
		No	149	4,30	0,71		
		Yes	58	4,09	0,69	-,389	,697
		No	149	4,14	0,80		
		Yes	58	4,35	0,66	-1,331	,187
		No	149	4,48	0,58		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Education Status	Education before undergraduate	70	4,54	0,53	1,755	,081
		Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	4,39	0,63		
		Education before undergraduate	70	4,27	0,64	-1,445	,150
		Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	4,42	0,73		
		Education before undergraduate	70	4,20	0,75	,957	,340
		Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	4,09	0,78		

1) Strongly dissatisfaction, (2) Dissatisfaction, (3) No idea, (4) Satisfaction, (5) Strongly satisfaction



ANOVA was used to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city differ significantly according to age, nationality and length of living in Alanya. Table 7 shows the results of ANOVA.

<b>Table 7. Differentiation situation of participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city (ANOVA)</b>							
<b>Dimensions of The quality of life in city</b>		<b>Demographic features</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city	Age	15-30 age	32	4,58	0,44	,933	,42
		31-46 age	86	4,43	0,67		
		47-62 age	54	4,45	0,51		
		63+ age	35	4,34	0,70		
Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation	Age	15-30 age	32	4,17	0,73	4,934	<b>,00</b>
		31-46 age	86	4,24	0,82		
		47-62 age	54	4,47	0,50		
		63+ age	35	4,70	0,53		
Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Age	15-30 age	32	4,35	0,77	1,029	,38
		31-46 age	86	4,08	0,84		
		47-62 age	54	4,11	0,65		
		63+ age	35	4,07	0,75		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with Infrastructure and environment of the city	Nationality	Türkiye	42	4,52	0,48	2,110	,10
		Russian	59	4,56	0,42		
		Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	4,31	0,71		
		Others	38	4,40	0,73		
Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation	Nationality	Türkiye	42	4,14	0,88	1,096	,10
		Russian	59	4,48	0,54		
		Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	4,40	0,69		
		Others	38	4,38	0,74		
Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Nationality	Türkiye	42	4,08	0,80	,924	,43
		Russian	59	4,08	0,70		
		Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	4,10	0,77		
		Others	38	4,32	0,84		
Factor 1: Satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city	Lenght of living in Alanya	Less than 12 months	34	4,47	0,45	1,473	,21
		13-24 months	36	4,50	0,53		
		25-36 months	35	4,48	0,62		
		37-48 months	43	4,56	0,62		
		49 months and over	59	4,29	0,68		
Factor 2: Satisfaction with people's personal situation	Lenght of living in Alanya	Less than 12 months	34	4,07	0,88	2,911	<b>,02</b>
		13-24 months	36	4,22	0,69		
		25-36 months	35	4,53	0,61		
		37-48 months	43	4,47	0,65		
		49 months and over	59	4,45	0,65		
Factor 3: Satisfaction with facilities of the city	Lenght of living in Alanya	Less than 12 months	34	3,87	0,78	1,749	,14
		13-24 months	36	4,09	0,78		
		25-36 months	35	4,27	0,57		
		37-48 months	43	4,28	0,68		
		49 months and over	59	4,11	0,89		

1) Strongly dissatisfaction, (2) Dissatisfaction, (3) No idea, (4) Satisfaction, (5) Strongly satisfaction

As a result of the analysis made in Table 7, it was found that there was no significant difference between the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city regarding satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city ( $p = ,425 > 0,05$ ) and satisfaction with facilities of the city ( $p = ,381 > 0,05$ ) according to the age variable. On the other hand, it has been found that there is a significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the dimension of satisfaction with people's personal situation ( $p = ,002 < 0,05$ ) according to the age variable. According to the post hoc test, it was determined that this significant difference in dimensions was between the ages of 15 and 30 and 63 ages and over groups, and between the ages of 31 and 46 to 63 ages and over groups.

According to the variable of nationality, it was found that the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city did not differ significantly regarding the dimensions of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city ( $p = ,100 > 0,05$ ), satisfaction with people's personal situation ( $p = ,102 > 0,05$ ) and satisfaction with facilities of the city ( $p = ,430 > 0,05$ ).

According to length of living in Alanya, it has been determined that there is no significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city ( $p = ,212 > 0,05$ ) and satisfaction with facilities of the city dimensions of the quality of life in city ( $p = ,141 > 0,05$ ).

**Table 8. Differentiation situation of participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts (t-testi)**

Dimensions of The tourism impacts	Demographic features	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.	
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Gender	Female	151	3,99	0,51	,092	,92
		Male	56	3,98	0,45		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Gender	Female	151	4,01	0,49	2,117	<b>,03</b>
		Male	56	3,83	0,63		
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Marital Status	Married	105	3,98	0,51	-,273	,78
		Unmarried	102	3,99	0,49		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Marital Status	Married	105	3,95	0,51	-,245	,80
		Unmarried	102	3,97	0,57		
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Working Status	Working	69	4,04	0,59	,940	,34
		Not Working	138	3,96	0,44		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Working Status	Working	69	4,04	0,57	1,476	,14
		Not Working	138	3,92	0,51		
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Pension Status	Yes	58	3,91	0,59	-1,271	,20
		No	149	4,02	0,45		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Pension Status	Yes	58	3,86	0,68	-4,512	,13
		No	149	4,00	0,46		
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Education Status	Education before	70	3,89	0,44	-1,895	,06
		Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	4,03	0,52		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Education Status	Education before undergraduate	70	3,95	0,42	-,172	,86
		Education of undergraduate and graduate	137	3,97	0,58		

1) Strongly negative, (2) Negative, (3) No idea, (4) Positive, (5) Strongly positive

T-test was used to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts differ significantly according to their gender, marital status, working status, pension status and education status. Table 8 shows the results of the t-test.

As a result of the t-test conducted in Table 8, it was found that there was a significant difference between the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts regarding the dimension of economic impacts ( $p=,035<0,05$ ) according to gender. It was found that there was no significant difference between the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts regarding socio-cultural and environmental impacts dimension ( $p = ,927>0,05$ ). At the same time, it was found that the participants' perceptions on the dimensions of the tourism impacts did not show a significant difference according to marital status, working status, pension status and education status.

ANOVA was used to determine whether the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts differ significantly according to their age, nationality and length of living in Alanya. Table 9 shows the results of ANOVA.

**Table 9. Differentiation situation of participants' perceptions regarding tourism (ANOVA)**

Dimensions of The tourism impacts	Demographic features	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	Sig.
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	15-30 age	32	4,02	0,42	,215	,88
	31-46 age	86	3,99	0,49		
	47-62 age	54	3,99	0,50		
	63+ age	35	3,93	0,57		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	15-30 age	32	4,03	0,38	,526	,66
	31-46 age	86	3,99	0,49		
	47-62 age	54	3,91	0,73		
	63+ age	35	3,91	0,40		
Faktör 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Türkiye	42	3,93	0,45	2,309	,07
	Russian	59	4,04	0,42		
	Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	4,06	0,52		
	Others	38	3,83	0,58		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Türkiye	42	3,97	0,42	1,914	,12
	Russian	59	4,09	0,43		
	Germany, Ukraine and Lithuania	68	3,90	0,58		
	Others	38	3,86	0,67		
Factor 1: Socio-cultural and environmental impacts	Less than 12 months	34	4,11	0,56	2,043	,09
	13-24 months	36	3,92	0,42		
	25-36 months	35	3,89	0,45		
	37-48 months	43	4,11	0,34		
	49 months and over	59	3,91	0,60		
Factor 2: Economic impacts	Less than 12 months	34	4,00	0,65	,326	,86
	13-24 months	36	3,89	0,36		
	25-36 months	35	4,01	0,62		
	37-48 months	43	3,98	0,45		
	49 months and over	59	3,94	0,56		

1) Strongly negative, (2) Negative, (3) No idea, (4) Positive, (5) Strongly positive

The analysis result in Table 9, according to age, nationality and length of living in Alanya, it was found that the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts on socio-cultural and environmental impacts and economic impacts dimensions did not differ significantly.

Briefly, as a result of ANOVA and t-test analysis, it was determined that there is a significant difference among the participants' perceptions of the quality of life in city regarding the satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city according to working status and pension status, and regarding the satisfaction with people's personal situation according to age variable and length of living in Alanya. Also, it was determined that there is a significant difference among the participants' perceptions of the tourism impacts regarding the economic impacts according to gender.

According to the ANOVA and t-test results on the tourism impacts, it is acceptable to hypothesize that is "*H<sub>2</sub>: According to the gender variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts.*". It is rejected hypotheses that are H<sub>3</sub>, H<sub>4</sub>, H<sub>5</sub>, H<sub>6</sub>, H<sub>7</sub>, H<sub>8</sub>, H<sub>9</sub>.

According to the ANOVA and t-test results on the quality of life in city, it is acceptable hypotheses that are "*H<sub>12</sub>: According to the pension status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.*", "*H<sub>13</sub>: According to the working status variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.*", "*H<sub>14</sub>: According to the age variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.*" ve "*H<sub>16</sub>: According to length of living in Alanya variable, there is a statistically significant difference between the participants' perceptions regarding the quality of life in city.*". It is rejected hypotheses that are H<sub>10</sub>, H<sub>11</sub>, H<sub>15</sub>, H<sub>17</sub>.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the research, it was aimed to determine the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city. For this purpose, it was found that there are positive linear low and medium level relationships between dimensions. In the context of the findings, it can be said that their levels of satisfaction with people's personal situation and satisfaction with facilities of the city increase, as their levels of the satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city increase regarding the participants' perceptions on the quality of life in city. In addition, their levels of satisfaction with facilities of the city increase, as their levels of the satisfaction with people's personal situation increase. Regarding the tourism impacts, it can be said that the participants' perceptions of economic impacts increase, as their perceptions of socio-cultural and environmental impacts increase. Their perceptions of socio-cultural and environmental impacts increase, as their levels of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city increase. Similarly, it can be said that the participants' perceptions of economic impacts increase, as their levels of satisfaction with infrastructure and environment of the city increase. Their perceptions of socio-cultural and environmental impacts and economic impacts increase, as their levels of satisfaction with people's personal situation increase. In summary, according to the correlation analysis of the scales for the total, their satisfaction levels with regarding the quality of life in city increase, as the participants' perceptions regarding the tourism impacts increase.

When researches showing similarities with research results are examined, the results obtained in the researches that belong Eser et al. (2018), Nkemngu (2015) and Kim (2002) are similar to the results of this research. In addition, Yumuk and Alıntaş' finding (2019) that the participants' perception of quality of life in city differs from demographic variables only by age is in line with the results of this research. By the way, according to report on the quality of life in 83 European city (2020), it has been found that

people living in northern EU city are highly satisfied with their city, and satisfaction in eastern EU city is rapidly increasing. European city host 39% of the EU population. In addition, EU city provide access to many different employment opportunities, better access to public transport, and proximity to many points that can facilitate walking and cycling. When the results of the 2020 European City report are examined and compared within the scope of this research, It has been found that the perception of positive satisfaction by foreigners residing in Alanya with the quality of life in city is similar to that of those living in Northern EU city with a high level of satisfaction with the quality of life in city.

In the research conducted by Campbell et al. (1976), the multidimensional experience issues of life were focused instead of past living conditions. Thus, it was determined that besides measuring satisfaction, the living environment and individual characteristics are also important in understanding the quality of life. They also found that life size was affected by objective features. In this research, the finding regarding the resident foreigners' positive perceptions of the quality of life in city regarding objective objects parallels the finding in the research conducted by Campbell et al. (1976) that life dimension is affected by objective characteristics.

Facilities and opportunities in the people's basic living areas, who are living in tourism destinations, can create significant changes in their quality of life and satisfaction levels. Especially in destinations with intensive tourism activities; increasing competition, increase in income and welfare level, technological developments can increase the people's expectations, who are living there regarding the quality of life. The quality of life in city is effected significantly on the factors such as noise level, crowd, air pollution, environmental pollution, the presence of green areas such as parks and gardens, public spaces and sports facilities, the status of streets and buildings, infrastructure, health services, public transportation, employment opportunities in tourism destinations. Therefore, it is important to develop applicable policies regarding urban livability and identifying and improving the problems related to the factors affecting the quality of life in city in order to meet the people' expectations, who is living in tourism destinations, regarding the quality of life in city and to increase their quality of life. Thus, first of all, the living standards and satisfaction levels of the living people will be increased by improving the negative tourism impacts. In addition, destinations will be able to stand out with their unique characters and have a sustainable tourism market by creating a positive image.

The research has several limitations. The first of these is that only resident foreigners living in Alanya participated in the research, but resident foreigners living in other tourism destinations were not included in the research. The second limitation is that the local people living in Alanya as well as the local people living in other tourism destinations were not included in the research. However, in determining the relationship between the tourism impacts in a region and the quality of life in city, it will be important to include not only resident foreigners living in Alanya, but also local residents and foreigners living in other tourism destinations within the scope of the research. Conducting the research with larger samples and different samples in different destinations may provide the opportunity to have a more comprehensive perspective on the relationship between the tourism impacts and the quality of life in city, and to compare the differences and similarities.

#### **KAYNAKÇA**

Andereck, K. L. & Nyaupane, G.P. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248-260.

Atik, A., Taçoral, E. & Altunkasa, F. (2014). Kent halkının kentsel yaşam memnuniyeti üzerinde etkili sosyodemografik özelliklerinin belirlenmesi üzerine bir araştırma: Kemaliye örneği. *İnönü Üniversitesi Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 4(9), 21-33.



- Bandoi, A., Jianu, E., Enescu, M., Axinte, G., Tudor, S. & Firoiu, D. (2020). The relationship between development of tourism, quality of life and sustainable performance in EU countries. *Sustainability*, 12, 1-24.
- Bayram, N. (2009). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi*. İstanbul: Ezgi Kitabevi.
- Boğan, E. & Sarıışık, M. (2016). Yerel halkın turizm faaliyetine yönelik görüş ve algılamalarının belirlenmesi üzerine Alanya’da bir araştırma. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (12), 325-342.
- Borthwick Duffy, S. A. (1992). *Quality of life and quality of care in mental retardation*. (L. Rowitz, Ed.) Springer Verlag.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2018). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. (24th ed.) Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Campbell, A., Converse P.E. & Rogers W.L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York: Russel Sage.
- Child, D. (2006). *The essentials of factor analyze*. A&C Black.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. & Büyüköztürk Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Emerson, E. B. (1985). Evaluating the impact of deinstitutionalisation on the lives of mentally retarded people. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 90(3), 277-288.
- Emür, S. H. & Onsekiz, D. (2007). Kentsel yaşam kalitesi bileşenleri arasında açık ve yeşil alanların önemi-Kayseri/Kocasinan ilçesi park alanları analizi. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(22), 367-396.
- Geray, C. (1998). Yerel yönetimler ve çevre. *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 7 (3), 57-64.
- İnal Çekiç, T. & Kahraman, T. (2015). Planlama. *Türk Mühendis ve Mimar Odaları Birliği Şehir Plancıları Odası*, 25(2). Retrieved from [https://www.spo.org.tr/resimler/ekler/241e39867458298\\_ek.pdf](https://www.spo.org.tr/resimler/ekler/241e39867458298_ek.pdf) (Accessed on 26 April 2021).
- Report on the Quality of Life in European City (2020). Retrieved from [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/information/maps/quality\\_of\\_life/](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/maps/quality_of_life/) (Accessed on 02 April 2021)
- Eser, K., Çelik, N. & Yıldız, O. (2018). Turizmin yerel halkın yaşam kalitesi üzerindeki etkileri: Muğla Akyaka örneği. *Ekonomi Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(2), 60-73.
- Felce, D. & Perry, J. (1995). Quality of life: Its definition and measurement. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 16(1):51-74. DOI: 10.1016/0891-4222(94)00028-8
- Gondos, B. (2014). Relationship between tourism and quality of life - researches at lake Balaton, In human capital without borders: Knowledge and learning for quality of life; *Proceedings of the Management, Knowledge and Learning International Conference*, 879-888.
- Günel, V. (2011). Turizmin olumlu etkileri ve Midyat ilçesindeki geleneksel taşçılık sanatı örneği. *Marmara Coğrafyası Dergisi*, (24), 433-471.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2014). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil Yayıncılık.

- Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M.J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36, 527–540.
- Kim, K. (2002). *The effects of the tourism impacts upon quality of life of residents in the community*. (Unpublished Doctor of philosophy in Hospitality and Tourism Management), the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Kostalova, B. (2017). *Tourism impact and residents' perspectives: The case of Zell am See-Kaprun*. (Unpublished Master Thesis), Modul Vienna University, Austria.
- Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk Ş. & Bökeoğlu, Ö.Ç. (2006). *Sosyal bilimler için istatistik*. Ankara: Pegem-A Yayıncılık.
- Murgas, F. & Klobucnik, M. (2018). Quality of life in the city, quality of urban life or well-being in the city: Conceptualization and case study. *Ekológia (Bratislava)*, 37(2), 183-200. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/eko-2018-0016>
- Nakip, M. (2005). *Pazarlama araştırmalarına giriş (SPSS destekli)*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Nkemngu, A-A. P. (2015). Quality of life and the tourism impacts: A community perspective. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 4(1),1-13.
- Özaltın Türker, G. (2020a). Turizmin yerel halk üzerine etkileri: Seyahat acentaları perspektifinden bir inceleme. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, 16, 65-84.
- Özaltın Türker, G. (2020b). Turizmin etkileri olumlu mu, olumsuz mu? Türkiye’de yapılmış çalışmalara yönelik bir inceleme. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(2), 1477-1492.
- Özdemir, M. A. & Kervankıran, İ. (2011). Turizm ve turizmin etkileri konusunda yerel halkın yaklaşımlarının belirlenmesi: Afyonkarahisar örneği. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*, 24, 1-25.
- Özgürel, G. & Avcıkurt, C. (2018). Yerleşik yabancıların Türkiye turizmine etkileri: Marmaris ilçesi örneği. *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 15(1) ,195-225.
- Rezvani, M. R., Mansourian, H. & Sattari, M. H. (2013). Evaluating quality of life in urban areas (case study: Noorabad City, Iran). *Soc Indic Res*, 112, 203–220.
- Royuela, V., Moreno, R. & Vaya, E. (2007). Is the influence of quality of life on urban growth non-stationary in space? A case study of Barcelona. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6301583.pdf> (Accesses on 07 April 2021).
- Schneider, M. (1975). The quality of life in large American city: Objective and subjective social indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, 1, 495-509.
- Shafer, C. S., Koo Lee, B. & Turner, S. (2000). A tale of three greenway trails: User perceptions related to quality of life. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 49:163–178. DOI:10.1016/S0169-2046(00)00057-8
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2018). *Using multivariate statistics (7<sup>th</sup>. Edition)*. Pearson.
- Türker, N., Selçuk, S. & Özyıldırım, A. (2016). Turizmin yerel halkın yaşam kalitesi üzerine etkisi: Safranbolu örneği. *Karabük Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6(1), 1-13. DOI:10.14230/joiss224
- Yumuk, Y. & Altıntaş, V. (2019). Bodrum’da yaşayan yerel halkın kentsel yaşam kalitesi algılarının aşırı turizm (overtourism) kapsamında değerlendirilmesi. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (Özel sayı), 90-102.

- Zaei, M. E. & Zaei, M. E. (2013). The impacts of tourism industry on host community. *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Research*, 1(2), 12-21.
- Zeinali, B., Jafarpour, M., Omid, E. & Tahmasbi, N. (2015). Will tourism development improve the quality of life in Hashtpar city? An analyze of local residents' attitudes. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 293-300.

---

**Yazar(lar) Hakkında/About Author(s)**

---

**Ayřen ERCAN İŐTİN/ aysen\_ercanistin@sirnak.edu.tr**

Assist. Prof. Dr. Aysen ERCAN İŐTİN completed her undergraduate education in 2010 at Mustafa Kemal University, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management. In addition, she completed her master's degree in 2014 at Akdeniz University, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management and her Ph. D. Degree in 2018 at Mersin Universty, Department of Tourism Management. Aysen ERCAN İŐTİN, who started to work as a Research Assistant in 2017, was appointed as a Assistant Profesör in 2018 at department of Tourism and Hotel Management at Őırnak University. She carries on her career as the Head of Gastronomy and Culinar Arts Deparment in the same university. She instructs undergraduate and graduate level in the fields of management and organization and issues related tourism businesses. She has articles, books chapters and papers in the same fields and carries on her studies.

**ETİK BEYAN FORMU**

<b>Arařtırma Desteęi Bilgisi:</b> Arařtırma desteęi alınmamıřtır.	
<b>Etik Kurul Onay Durumu</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Etik kurul onayı gerekmektedir.	
<b>Etik Kurul Raporunu Veren Kurum</b>	
<b>Etik kurul raporu karar tarihi:</b>	<b>Karar Sayı No:</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Etik kurul onayı gerekmemektedir. Nedeni ařaęıda belirtilmiřtir.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Veriler 2020 tarihinden önce toplandıęından etik kurul izni alınmamıřtır.	
<input type="checkbox"/> alıřmada kullanılan yöntem etik kurul izni gerektirmemektedir.	
<b>Yazar(lar)ın Katkı Oranı</b>	
<b>1. Yazar: %100</b>	
<b>Bilgilendirilmiř Onam Formu:</b> Tm taraflar kendi rızaları ile alıřmaya dhil olmuřlardır.	