

A Study to Determine the Immigrants' Attitudes toward Tourism Development

Göçmenlerin Turizmin Gelişimine Yönelik Tutumlarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Çalışma

Halil İbrahim KARAKAN¹

Abstract

This study examines the attitudes of immigrants in Turkey toward tourism development. The population of the study consists of immigrants living in Turkey. The sample consists of 453 migrants from seven regions of Turkey. The findings explain whether migrants' attitudes toward tourism differ according to socio-demographic factors such as gender, age, marital status, educational status, income and geographical location. According to the results of the study, migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to their quality of life are at a high level. On the other hand, migrants' concerns about tourism development are low. Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ in the Contributions to Quality of Life factor depending on gender. According to this result, male migrants perceive the contribution of tourism to their lives more positively. In addition, it was found that migrants' concerns about tourism development showed a statistically significant difference according to age and educational status. According to these results, it has been determined that the level of anxiety of highly educated immigrants toward the effects of tourism development is higher than that of immigrants with high school and lower education levels. It was also observed that young migrants between 18-24 aged responders were more concerned about the effects of tourism development than migrants in other age groups. There was no statistically significant difference between married and single migrants' attitudes toward tourism development. There was no significant difference in migrants' attitudes toward tourism development based on geographical location. The findings also show that age and income do not statistically affect migrants' attitudes toward tourism. It is recommended that tourism planners raise awareness about the adaptation processes of immigrants to tourism destinations and distribute immigrants to these destinations, considering the carrying capacity of the destination.

Keywords: Tourism, Socio-Cultural Effects, Immigrants, Tourism Sociology

Öz

Bu araştırma, Türkiye'deki göçmenlerin turizmin gelişimine yönelik tutumlarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Çalışmanın evrenini Türkiye'de yaşayan göçmenler oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın örneklemini ise Türkiye'nin yedi bölgesinden 453 göçmen oluşturmaktadır. Bulgular, göçmenlerin turizmin gelişimine yönelik tutumlarını cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim durumu ve gelir düzeyine göre farklılık gösterip göstermediğini açıklamaktadır. Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre göçmenlerin turizmin yaşam kalitelerine katkısına yönelik tutumlarının yüksek düzeyde olduğu belirlenmiştir. Öte yandan göçmenlerin turizmin gelişimine yönelik kaygıları ise düşük düzeydedir. Göçmenlerin turizm gelişimine yönelik tutumları cinsiyete bağlı olarak "Yaşam Kalitesine Katkı" faktöründe farklılık göstermektedir. Bu sonuca göre erkek göçmenlerin, turizmin yaşam kalitelerine katkısını daha yüksek düzeyde algıladığı tespit edilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, göçmenlerin turizmin gelişmesine yönelik kaygılarının yaşa ve eğitim durumuna göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık gösterdiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu sonuçlara göre; yüksek eğitilmiş göçmenlerin turizmin gelişmesinin getireceği etkilere karşı kaygı düzeylerinin lise ve altı düzeyde eğitim seviyesine sahip göçmenlere göre daha yüksek olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca 18-24 yaş arası genç göçmenlerin de diğer yaş grubundaki göçmenlere göre turizmin gelişiminin getireceği etkilerden daha fazla kaygı duydukları gözlemlenmiştir. Diğer yandan evli ve bekar göçmenler arasında turizmin gelişimine yönelik tutumlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmamıştır. Bulgular ayrıca yaşın ve gelirin göçmenlerin turizmle yönelik tutumlarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığını göstermektedir. Turizm planlamacılarına göçmenlerin turizm destinasyonlarına uyum süreçlerine ilişkin farkındalık oluşturulmasını sağlamaları ve destinasyonun taşıma kapasitesi göz önünde bulundurularak bu destinasyonlara göçmen dağılımının yapılması önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Turizm, Sosyo-Kültürel Etkiler, Göçmen, Turizm Sosyolojisi

¹ Dr, Orcid: 0000-0003-3335-0923, hikarakan@gmail.com

Introduction

Globalization is a significant phenomenon that impacts modern societies. This intricate process enables individuals across the globe to engage with diverse geographies. Subsequently, global mobility has emerged as a reality for a quarter of the world's population outside their birthplace (Sharma et al., 2018). In this context, the interdependency of migration and tourism is a crucial (Santana-Gallego ve Paniagua, 2022) area of academic study that will continue to attain greater significance. Migration is widely acknowledged as a contributing factor to the allure of the tourism industry (Dreher vd., 2008). It exerts a considerable impact on the tourism demand of both the host country and the countries of origin of the migrants (Çelik, 2021).

Furthermore, the tourism industry has the potential to initiate or expedite migration movements (Adams, 2021; Turner - King, 2018). Within this context, the academic discussion concerns whether travel is exclusively tourism or migration (Smith et al., 2019; Chen & Wang 2020). Due to these and similar issues, the relationship between the two phenomena must be clarified in the literature (Williams & Hall, 2000), as the concepts of tourism and migration overlap (Salazar, 2022). The deficiency in clarifying the relationship between the concepts has yet to be overcome regarding tourism (Cohen & Cohen, 2019). Research on the migration-tourism relationship has mainly focused on the touristic mobility caused by migration (Okafor et al., 2022). However, the need to re-examine the traditional understanding of the concepts of tourism and migration (O'Reilly, 2003) has increased its importance for today's world (Ohashi, 2019), and this need still needs to be met (Adams, 2021). Therefore, the need for future research on the migration-tourism relationship has been emphasized in the literature (Choe & Lugosi, 2022). This association is open to more than tourist destinations and migration movements. Tourist destinations experience an influx of migration due to the tourism industry and migration (Marcher et al., 2020). Over recent years, it has been observed that both migration and tourism have increased in parallel, amplifying each other's impact (IOM, 2022; UNWTO, 2021). However, it is important to note that tourism can have beneficial and detrimental effects on local communities, including migrants, across various areas such as the economy, society, culture, environment, and architecture. Thus, it is commonplace to develop strategies that enhance positive impacts and mitigate negative effects of tourism (Turner & King, 2018).

Turkey's 2023 Tourism Strategy intends to increase tourism diversity and promote varied forms of tourism. The policy attracts more tourists by spreading tourism activities across a broader geographical area and throughout the year (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2007). Tourism has a significant role in socio-cultural communication and mutual understanding between visitors and destinations (Wearing and Neil, 2009, p. 3). Nevertheless, tourism policies should concentrate more than just their technical and economic aspects. Considering residents' attitudes toward tourism development is necessary (Fennell, 1999). Attitudes toward tourism development have typically been observed within local communities in prior literature. Despite this, there needs to be more investigations in the literature on the attitudes toward tourism development among immigrants. Nonetheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that inhabitants of tourist destinations are not solely local individuals. A considerable number of immigrants have settled in Turkey in recent years.

This study is uniquely considers immigrant populations settled in Turkey as the sample population selected to represent all regions of Turkey. The study aims to measure immigrants' attitudes toward tourism development, offering valuable insights into their impact on the industry and highlighting the importance of this population group in tourism policies.

Conceptual Framework

Most of the research conducted to measure the socio-cultural effects of tourism has been evaluated through the opinions of local people in a certain region. Throughout history, local people affected by tourism have had many positive and negative opinions about tourism activities. In some regions, it has been argued that tourism provides more benefits to the people of that region, while in other regions, it has been argued that it has harmful consequences.

According to Kozak, Kozak and Kozak (2010), it has been determined that many positive and negative effects will change the socio-cultural structure of the society in the regions where tourism activities are carried out. In the region where tourism activities are carried out, it has been observed that the region's people behave more tolerant in their relations with each other and tourists. In addition, tourism has positive effects on the people of the region, such as increasing awareness of the protection of cultural values and increasing social welfare to higher levels.

On the other hand, tourism has negative effects in many aspects, such as social, cultural, environmental, etc. (Roney, 2011). Negative effects include the anger and hatred of local people against foreigners coming to the region, foreign tourists causing pollution in the language used by the region over time, and this situation's confusing meaning. In addition, the negative effects of tourism, such as the degeneration of the moral values of the regions over time, the increase in crime rates, the meaningless commodification of culture, and the loss of many beliefs and values of the local people by losing their own beliefs and values. The fact that tourism has positive and negative effects leads people living in the destination to exhibit different attitudes toward tourism development at different times.

Tuna (2012) characterized the negative change that tourism creates on the most important values that sustain society as "cultural pollution." He pointed out that this kind of pollution is felt in every aspect of life, from style, clothing, food and drink to the hierarchical structure within the family.

Moyle, Croy and Weiler (2010) explained the cultural interaction between visitors to two islands in Australia and the local people and tourism stakeholders living there based on the assumptions of the Social Exchange Theory.

Lankford and Howard (1994) developed a standard measurement tool to measure the attitudes and behaviors of the region's people toward tourism. The scale, obtained as a two-factor structure due to the application, consists of 27 items. These factors are "views toward regional tourism development" and "personal and social benefits."

Another study conducted on the public was carried out by Özmen (2007) to determine the opinions of the people living in Akçakoca city about tourism activities causing socio-cultural change. At the end of the research, it was determined that tourism causing change in the socio-cultural field did not negatively affect the thoughts and attitudes of the people. However, it was revealed that these thoughts and attitudes differed according to whether they were locals or immigrants of that region.

The researchers Doğan and Üngüren (2010) examined tourism's socio-cultural impact on Alanya's residents. They identified five socio-cultural effects of tourism in the region based on input received from local individuals. The authors have indicated that these headings - namely, perception of social threats, perception of cultural threats, perception of threats to the use of Turkish, social reactions to tourism, and perception of socio-cultural contributions of tourism - encompass the entirety of the Alanya locals' viewpoints on tourism. In the literature,

several models have been created to express the perspective of the local people living in the regions where the tourism sector is active and the relationship they establish with tourism. Doxey (1975) explained the perspective of the local people toward attitudes and behaviors with the "Tolerance Approach (Irridex Model)." With this approach, he stated that a certain cultural metamorphosis process and economic infrastructure should be formed to change the local people's perspective toward tourism activities in the region. The change will be reflected in attitudes and behaviors due to these stages. According to the author, this change occurs due to the formation of a perception that the resources spent on tourism are harmed rather than bringing benefits to the local people. The author listed these stages of change as enthusiasm, indifference and hostility.

Long, Perdeu and Allen (1990) conducted a study supporting the Tolerance Approach. The authors emphasized that with the development of tourism activities in the region, the awareness of the local people toward tourism increased and their desire to develop tourism activities to benefit more from the benefits of tourism. In this context, local people supported tourism activities up a certain threshold. However, over time, due to the rapid increase in the negative effects of tourism activities, there has been a certain decrease in their level of support.

The Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) model proposed by Butler (1980) examines the systematic relationship between tourism and local people. This model states that as tourism develops, its effects in the region will be felt intensely in every field. According to this statement, when the damages arising in the region where tourism activities take place exceed the benefits provided, losses occur in every aspect on behalf of the region, and the region loses its tourism region qualification. After this stage, the region's people enter a process of socio-cultural and economic destruction.

Diedrich and Garcia (2009), in their study on the TALC model, state that the process in which the local people begin to feel the effects of tourism fully is the process in which tourism enters the collapse stage in that region. The Social Change Theory, introduced in the early 1960s, is one of the theories that enable the socioeconomic evaluation of the regions where tourism activities occur. Social Change Theory is developed by utilizing the disciplines of Sociology And Social Psychology (Community Psychology). This theory assumes that individuals will behave in line with their demands and desires within society. According to the situation put forward in the theory, individuals direct all their social relations away from emotionality and in a more realistic (rational) direction and consider their gains and losses. In short, by applying Socrates' ethical and moral rules, individuals shape their relations with society to meet their basic life needs with maximum benefit and minimum cost.

Ap (1992) used the Social Exchange Theory to analyze the interaction between local people and tourists in the region where tourism activities occur. In this context, the author states that the local people consider the developmental effects of tourism on the region and individuals as economic outputs in return for the resources spent on this service. Ap emphasized that social change takes place through a four-stage implementation. These four stages are; "initiation of change," "realization of change," "evaluation of the process of change," and "evaluation of the results of change". On the other hand, the order in which the local people perceive the effects of tourism has been determined as a process consisting of "adoption," "toleration," "adaptation," and "withdrawal" strategies. In short, individuals who benefit positively from the innovations brought by the tourism sector to the region exhibit an attitude that contributes to the region's development in terms of tourism.

Long and Kayat (2011) concluded that when the local people observe that the positive effects of tourism on the region are greater than the negative effects, they begin to break their resistance to change and support tourism development.

Haley, Snaith and Miller (2005) conducted a study on local people living in the Baht region of England to determine attitudes and behaviors toward tourism development and to reveal whether socioeconomic and demographic structure impacts the perception of local people toward tourism. In a similar study, Wang et al. (2006) stated that tourism in the North Carolina region of Washington is still developing.

Gümüş and Özüpekçe (2009), in their study on the opinions of the people of Foça on tourism, observed that the majority of the people of the region have a moderate perspective toward tourism. They attributed the reason why the people of Foça perceive factors such as social and cultural change and environmental and economic differentiation, which are the benefits of tourism, positively to the high average level of education.

Özdemir and Kervankıran (2011) evaluated the effects of social, cultural, economic and demographic changes caused by tourism development in the region according to the perceptions and attitudes of the local people living in Afyonkarahisar. According to the result, it was determined that these changes positively affect the region's people.

Methodology

This section gives information on the purpose, importance, population and sample of the research, as well as the data collection and analysis techniques used. In addition, the hypotheses and research questions established within the scope of the research are also included in this section.

Aim and Importance of the Research

Turkey plans to expand alternative tourism types in the Tourism Strategy 2023 master plan. Thus, tourism will affect a wider geographical area, spread throughout the year and impact more people. In this context, it is important to develop tourism strategies by investigating the attitudes of all stakeholders toward the development of tourism. In 2015, Turkey hosted nearly two million refugees (Sönmez & Mete, 2015); considering that around four million nine hundred thousand migrants live in Turkey (goc.gov.tr, 2023), it is thought that research on migrants will contribute to the literature. However, we have not seen any study directly on immigrants' attitudes toward tourism development in the literature. This study aims to determine the attitudes of immigrants toward tourism development and to measure whether these attitudes of immigrants differ significantly according to demographic characteristics. Many studies such as Doxey (1975), Ap (1992), Roney (2011) and Moyle et al. (2010) have measured the attitudes of local people and other stakeholders toward tourism development, but not specifically the attitudes of immigrants toward tourism development. In other words, although there are many studies on the effects of tourism in both tourism and sociology in national and international literature, we have not encountered any study on the socio-cultural effects of tourism activities on migrants. Therefore, this study is considered to be unique in the relevant literature. In addition, the studies in the relevant literature were generally conducted on regional samples, but no sample was collected throughout Turkey. The fact that the sample of this study was selected from seven regions of Turkey is important in generalizing the study results.

Research Methodology

The researcher of this study developed a methodologically new and unique approach called 'two-stage research analysis.' Quantitative data is first collected in this research approach, and general findings are obtained and reported. Then, within the scope of these findings, open-ended questions are prepared to obtain more in-depth information by adopting a qualitative approach to the issues under investigation. Finally, these open-ended questions are put to experts in the field, and the answers are reported. This approach ensures the validity of the data obtained in the quantitative analysis and provides more in-depth information.

In this context, the first phase of the research involved analyzing and reporting on the quantitative data collected from the local population and sharing the results with a tourism doctor (academician), a tourism professional, a migration expert and a sociologist. A focus group interview was conducted with these authorities, the results of which were evaluated and formed the second part of the research.

Furthermore, it has been extensively employed in market research and is universally recognized for initial research in social sciences. Focus group interviews are crucial for unstructured conversations and discussions, particularly with the impact of in-group dynamics. This strategy enables researchers to acquire detailed information and encourages participants to communicate their views candidly. Moreover, when used jointly with one-to-one interviews and questionnaires, focus group discussions offer a thorough and robust dataset (Kitzinger, 1995). Byers et al. (2002) defines focus group interviews as informal interviews and discussions between a small group and a moderator. This approach aims to gather comprehensive insights and exchange ideas through group dynamics. According to Casey and Krueger (1994), focus group interviews are a well-orchestrated conversation where participants can candidly share their opinions.

Population and Sample of the Study

The population of the study consists of immigrants living in tourist destinations. The stratified and criterion sampling methods were used to represent seven regions in Turkey. *Stratified sampling* is a method in which subgroups of the population are selected to represent the population. *Criterion sampling* is a type in which the sample is selected according to certain criteria (Balçı, 2011). A stratified sampling method was preferred to ensure the representation of all seven regions of Turkey. Local people living in pilot provinces with high alternative tourism potential from seven regions of Turkey were included in the study. These provinces were Istanbul from the Marmara region, Izmir from the Aegean region, Antalya from the Mediterranean region, Gaziantep from the Southeast Anatolia region, Ankara from the Central Anatolia region, Rize from the Black Sea region and Mardin from the East Anatolia region. In light of Turkey's 2023 Tourism Strategy, the provinces were also selected based on their attractiveness in terms of alternative types of tourism, such as gastronomy, history, faith, city, business and cultural tourism, and their high population density. Therefore, an attempt was made to select the sample by including migrants living in provinces with alternative tourism potential where the effects of coastal tourism are not dominant.

Millions of migrants live in these provinces, which cover a large part of the Turkish population. According to Sekaran (2003), for a population of 100,000, a sample of at least 384 people is sufficient. This size remains mostly the same as the number increases, and the sample size is determined as 384 for any number greater than 100,000. Therefore, this study's sample size is set to be at least 384 people. The data was collected between October and December 2019, and 453 people were reached, with at least 60 people from each region.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents

Gender	N	%
Male	185	40,84
Female	268	59,16
Total	453	100,00
Marital Status	N	%
Married	207	45,70
Single	246	54,30
Total	453	100,00
Geographical Region of Residence	N	%
Marmara Region	66	14,57
Aegean Region	62	13,69
Black Sea Region	68	15,01
Mediterranean Region	70	15,45
Southeastern Anatolia Region	66	14,57
Eastern Anatolia Region	61	13,47
Central Anatolia Region	60	13,25
Total	453	100,00
Age	N	%
18-24 years old	134	29,58
25-34 years old	204	45,03
35-44 years old	71	15,67
45 years and older	44	9,71
Total	453	100,00
Educational Background	N	%
High school and below	111	24,50
Associate Degree	68	15,01
Bachelor's degree	220	48,57
Postgraduate	54	11,92
Total	453	100,00

Table 1 shows the demographic statistics of the respondents. The gender distribution shows a balanced representation, with 40.84% of the respondents identifying as male and 59.16% as female. The data on marital status shows that 54.30% of the respondents are single and 45.70% are married. The respondents come from different parts of Turkey, providing a representative data set. The Marmara region accounts for 14.57% of the respondents, the Aegean region for 13.69%, the Black Sea region for 15.01% and the Mediterranean region for 15.45%. In addition, the Southeast Anatolia region (14.57%), the Eastern Anatolia region (13.47%) and the Central Anatolia region (13.25%) are included in the study. This geographical diversity increases the comprehensiveness of the study.

In terms of age distribution, most of the respondents belong to the 25-34 age group (45.03%), followed by the 18-24 age group (29.58%). The 35-44 age group represents 15.67% of respondents, while those aged 45 and over represent 9.71%. These age group distinctions highlight the generational perspectives within the sample. In terms of educational attainment, a significant proportion of respondents hold a Bachelor's degree (48.57%). In addition, 24.50% reported having a high school education or less, 15.01% had an associate degree and 11.92%

had completed postgraduate studies. This educational diversity among respondents allows for a nuanced exploration of perspectives based on different levels of academic achievement.

Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

The research consisted of two phases. Quantitative data were collected and analyzed in the first phase using the questionnaire technique. In the second phase, the results of these quantitative data were reported and presented to a team of a tourism academician, a tourism professional, a migration expert and a sociologist. On 15 December 2019, the focus group meeting was held with a facilitator. The meeting lasted approximately one hour. This team carried out evaluations by conducting focus group interviews. The experts' views on the research question were obtained from different perspectives in the focus group interview.

In the first research stage, the survey technique was used among the quantitative data collection techniques. In this regard, a 13-item "Attitude toward tourism" scale of Wang et al. (2006)'s study; entitled "Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a case study of Washington, NC" was used in the study.

A 5-point Likert scale type was used in the scale. The demographic data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using the SPSS 21 statistical program. Descriptive statistics (percentage frequency analysis) were used to analyze the demographic data. Exploratory factor analysis was applied to the scale items, and factors were obtained. Independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to measure whether these factors differed according to demographics and geographical regions.

Research Problem

This study aims to analyze migrants' attitudes and perceptions toward tourism development. It also explores migrants' views on tourism's positive and negative impacts and assesses their impact on their attitudes towards tourism development. This study aims to understand the socio-cultural, economic and environmental factors that migrants associate with tourism and to develop recommendations for tourism policies and practices. In this context, the following research questions and hypotheses have been formulated.

H₁: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to gender.

H_{1a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to their quality of life differ significantly according to gender.

H_{1b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differ significantly according to gender.

H₂: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to their marital status.

H_{2a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to their marital status.

H_{2b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differ significantly according to their marital status.

H₃: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to region.

H_{3a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to region.

H_{3b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differ significantly according to region.

H₄: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to age.

H_{4a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to age.

H_{4b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differ significantly according to age.

H₅: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to education level.

H_{5a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to education level

H_{5b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differs significantly according to education level

H₆: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to monthly income.

H_{6a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to monthly income.

H_{6b}: Migrants' attitudes toward concern for tourism development differ significantly according to monthly income.

In the second phase of the research, after analyzing and reporting on the data collected from the migrant sample in the first phase, the research findings were presented to specialist participants, and a focus group interview was conducted. The focus group interview is the second phase of the research. The focus group interview sought answers to the following research questions:

Research question 1: Does tourism contribute to the quality of life of migrants?

Research question 2: Do migrants have concerns about tourism development in the destinations?

Results

This study presents in detail the results of the analyses carried out during the two phases of the research. By combining the quantitative research data from the first phase with the qualitative data from the second phase, a comprehensive overview of migrants' attitudes towards tourism, its impact on their quality of life and their concerns about the development of tourist areas is presented. This chapter allows the main findings of the research to be understood and evaluated from a broader perspective.

Table 2. Results Related to the Scale Used in the Study

Factors	Eigenvalues	Explained Variance %	Alpha Coefficients	Sampling Adequacy Test
Contributions to Quality of Life (CTQOL)	2,8	37.0%	0.813	,870 (K.M.O.)
Concern for Tourism Development (CFTD)	7,4	14.0%	0.917	

Source: (Wang et al., 2007) titled "Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a case study of Washington, NC.

Table 2 provides essential details of the scale used in the study, adapted from the research by (Wang et al., 2007) entitled 'Residents' attitudes towards tourism development: a case study of Washington, NC.' The following paragraphs provide an interpretation of the factors presented in the table:

Concern for Tourism Development: The first factor, "Concern For Tourism Development," is noteworthy due to its eigenvalue of 7.4. Eigenvalues represent the significance of factors in explaining the dataset's variance. A higher eigenvalue suggests a greater impact on the model. In this case, an eigenvalue of 7.4 indicates substantial importance. Furthermore, this factor explains 14.0% of the total variance, illustrating its contribution to the overall data variability. The alpha coefficient, a measure of internal consistency, is impressively high at 0.917. Such a high coefficient indicates that the items within this factor are closely related and reliable. Moreover, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic, a test of sampling adequacy, yields a value of 0.870, exceeding the threshold. This result affirms that the dataset is suitable for factor analysis, strengthening the credibility of the Concern For Tourism Development findings.

Contributions to Quality of Life: The second factor, "Contributions To Quality Of Life," is characterized by an eigenvalue of 2.8. While this eigenvalue is notably lower than the first factor, it still contributes meaningfully to the dataset. Specifically, this factor accounts for 38.0% of the total variance, signifying a substantial influence on the dataset's variability. The alpha coefficient for this factor is 0.813, indicating a satisfactory level of internal consistency among its constituent items. Overall, the study's scale is founded on the research of Wang et al. (2006). "Concern For Tourism Development" and "Contributions To Quality Of Life" are significant factors accounting for variance in the dataset.

Table 3. Independent Sample T-Test Results

Factors	Gender	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	Result	
					t	p
CTQOL	Male	185	2.2553	1.056	-1.483	0.139
	Female	268	2.4035	1.029		
CFTD	Male	185	3.9239	0.819	2.223	0.027*
	Female	268	3.7436	0.860		
Factors	Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	T- Test	
					t	p
CTQOL	Married	207	2.7892	1.249	0.873	0.383
	Single	246	2.6897	1.151		
CFTD	Married	207	3.4683	1.041	-0.013	0.989

	Single	246	3.4693	1.031
--	--------	-----	--------	-------

Note: CTQOL= Contributions to Quality of Life CFTD= Concerns for Tourism Development

Table 3 shows the results of The Independent Sample T-Test conducted to measure whether immigrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ according to gender and marital status. It is determined that the attitudes of the migrants toward "CFTD" ($p=.383$) or "CTQOL" ($p=.939$) do not show a significant difference according to marital status. It is seen that the Concerns For Tourism Development attitudes of married participants ($\bar{x}=2.7892$) and single participants ($\bar{x}=2.6897$) are low. At the same time, CTQOLE factor are high in both single participants ($\bar{x}=3.4693$) and married individuals ($\bar{x}=3.4683$).

On the other hand, it was determined that immigrants' attitudes toward "CFTD" did not differ statistically significantly according to gender ($p=.139$). However, it was observed that the CTQOL factor of the immigrants toward tourism development differed significantly according to gender ($p=.027$). Accordingly, it was determined that CTQOL were perceived highly by the participants in both categories. This perception was higher in males ($\bar{x}=3.9239$) than in females ($\bar{x}=3.7436$). CFTD attitudes of males ($\bar{x}=2.2553$) and females ($\bar{x}=2.4035$) were low.

Table 4. One-Way ANOVA Analysis Results For Regions

Factors	Regions	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	F	p
CTQOL	Marmara Region	66	3.7165	0.111	.427	.357
	Aegean Region	62	3.9980	0.144		
	Black Sea Region	68	3.8739	0.126		
	Mediterranean Region	70	3.7199	0.114		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	66	3.9242	0.150		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	61	3.7283	0.132		
	Central Anatolia Region	60	3.7714	0.124		
CFTD	Marmara Region	66	2.1818	2.181	.403	.237
	Aegean Region	62	2.5444	2.544		
	Black Sea Region	68	2.2574	2.257		
	Mediterranean Region	70	2.1800	2.180		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	66	2.4596	2.459		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	61	2.4809	2.480		
	Central Anatolia Region	60	2.3323	2.333		

Note: CTQOL= Contributions to Quality of Life CFTD= Concerns for Tourism Development

Table 4 shows the results of the One-Way ANOVA Analysis to measure whether immigrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ according to region.

According to these results, it was determined that the CTQOL attitude ($p=.357$) and CFTD attitude ($p=.237$) of the immigrants toward tourism development did not show a significant difference according to the regions. It is seen that the CTQOL attitude of the immigrants is high. In this context, the highest CTQOL attitude of immigrants is in the Aegean Region ($\bar{x}=3.9980$) and Southeastern Anatolia Region ($\bar{x}=3.9242$). It is seen that the CFTD attitude of immigrants is at a low level in all categories. The regions with the highest averages

of immigrants' CFTD attitudes are the Aegean Region ($\bar{x}=2.5444$), Eastern Anatolia Region ($\bar{x}=2.4809$) and Southeastern Anatolia Region ($\bar{x}=2.4596$).

The results show that migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to quality of life are similar. However, the CTQOL factor is generally high, indicating that immigrants have a positive perspective on the positive effects of tourism. In particular, for migrants living in the Aegean Region and Southeastern Anatolia Region, there is evidence that tourism contributes positively to the quality of life.

Migrants' concerns about tourism development are not statistically different across regions. However, migrants' concerns about the negative impacts of tourism are generally low. In particular, migrants living in the Aegean, Eastern Anatolia and Southeastern Anatolia regions seem more concerned about tourism development.

As a result, migrants' CTQOL and CFTD attitudes towards tourism development are similar across regions. In general, migrants have positive attitudes towards tourism development but have low concerns about it.

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA Analysis Results For Age

Factors	Age Groups	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	f	p
CTQOL	18-24 years old	134	3,7472	0,883	.427	.498
	25-34 years old	204	3,8477	0,856		
	35-44 years old	71	3,8793	0,725		
	45 years old and older	44	3,8055	0,896		
CFDT	18-24 years old	134	2,9794	1,014	1.403	.047
	25-34 years old	204	2,3461	1.048		
	35-44 years old	71	2,3263	1,072		
	45 years old and older	44	2,2236	1,069		

Note: CTQOL= Contributions to Quality of Life CFTD= Concerns for Tourism Development

Table 5 shows that the "CTQOL" attitudes of immigrants do not show a statistically significant difference according to age ($p=.498$). This result shows that age is not a significant factor affecting migrants' attitudes toward tourism's contribution to their quality of life.

However, when analysing the means, some notable findings emerge. For example, the 35-44 age group has the highest mean in terms of "CTQOL" attitudes towards tourism development ($\bar{x}=3.8793$). This result shows that immigrants in this age group have a more positive perspective on the contribution of tourism to the local quality of life.

On the other hand, there is a statistically significant difference in migrants' attitudes towards 'CFTD' according to age ($p=.047$). In this context, it was found that the age group with the highest attitude towards 'CFTD' was the 18-24 age group ($\bar{x}=2.9794$), which differs from other age groups. This result shows that young migrants are more concerned about tourism development.

As a result, although there is no statistically significant difference between age groups in migrants' attitudes towards tourism's contribution to quality of life, it has been concluded that age has some effect on migrants' attitudes of concern towards tourism development. The result that age does not affect the contribution of tourism to migrants' quality of life shows that age is not a determining factor in migrants' positive or negative perceptions of tourism. However, it is

seen that migrants in the 35-44 age group believe that tourism makes a more positive contribution to the quality of life. This result supports the idea that migrants in this age group may have a more positive association with tourism.

On the other hand, the result that age is effective in terms of the effect of tourism on migrants' concerns shows that young migrants have more concerns about tourism development. In particular, it was observed that immigrants aged 18-24 had high concerns about tourism development. This result shows that young migrants are more sensitive to the negative effects of tourism and give more importance to local environmental protection and social ethics.

In conclusion, these findings suggest that migrants' attitudes toward tourism development may vary depending on their age and life experiences. This results may help tourism policies to understand the diversity and needs of migrants better and contribute to better integration of this community in the tourism sector.

Table 6. One-Way ANOVA Analysis Results For Education

Factors	Education Level Groups	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	f	p
CTQOL	High school and below	111	3,6647	0,815	0.427	.005
	Associate degree	68	3,7374	0,903		
	Bachelor's degree	220	3,8903	0,798		
	Postgraduate	54	3,9852	1,002		
CFDT	High school and below	111	2.4610	1,014	.0370	.803
	Associate degree	68	2.3725	1.048		
	Bachelor's degree	220	2.2770	1,072		
	Postgraduate	54	2.3417	1,069		

CTQOL= Contributions to Quality of Life CFDT= Concerns for Tourism Development

Table 6 shows that immigrants' CTQOL attitudes towards tourism development shows a significant difference according to their level of education ($p=0.005$). The homogeneity of the variances was examined to determine which educational groups were responsible for this difference. As the variances of the groups with significant differences were homogeneous, the Tukey test was used. There was a significant difference between all groups. The contributions to quality of life increases with the level of education of the immigrants. According to the level of education, the means were determined as follows: "graduate ($\bar{x}=3.9852$)", "undergraduate ($\bar{x}=3.8903$)", "associate degree ($\bar{x}=3.7374$)" and "high school and below ($\bar{x}=3.5647$)". On the other hand, it was found that the CFDT attitudes of immigrants did not show a significant difference according to the level of education ($p=.803$).

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA Analysis Results For Income Level

Factors	Income Level	N	\bar{X}	Sd.	f	p
CTQOL	Very low income	111	3,6976	0,875	.702	.084
	Low Income	99	3,7916	0,798		
	Average Income	58	3,7941	0,951		
	High Income	72	3,6944	0,884		
	Very High Income	113	3,9777	0,768		

	Very low income	111	2,3348	0,999		
	Low Income	99	2,4781	1,023		
CFTD	Average Income	58	2,2549	0,897	.485	.298
	High Income	72	2,4259	1,093		
	Very High Income	113	2,2227	1,127		

CTQOL= Contributions to Quality of Life CFTD= Concerns for Tourism Development

Table 7 presents the results of a one-way ANOVA analysis conducted to assess the effect of income level on immigrants' attitudes towards tourism development. Regarding CTQOL, the p-value associated with income level ($p=0.084$) indicates no statistically significant difference in immigrants' attitudes towards tourism's contribution to their quality of life across income levels. This result suggests that income level did not influence immigrants' perceptions of how tourism affects their quality of life. Regarding the CFTD, there is also no statistically significant difference in immigrants' concerns about tourism development based on income level. In other words, regardless of their income level, immigrants have similar concerns ($p=0.485$).

Table 8. Hypothesis Test Results

Hypotheses	Results
H₁: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to gender.	Partial
H_{1a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to gender.	Accept
H_{1b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to gender.	Reject
H₂: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to marital status.	Accept
H_{2a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to marital status.	Reject
H_{2b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to marital status.	Reject
H₃: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to region.	Reject
H_{3a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to region.	Reject
H_{3b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to region.	Reject
H₄: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to age.	Partial
H_{4a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to age.	Accept
H_{4b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to age.	Reject
H₅: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to education level.	Accept
H_{5a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ significantly according to education level.	Accept
H_{5b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to education level.	Reject
H₆: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to monthly income.	Reject
H_{6a}: Migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to the quality of life differ	Reject

significantly according to monthly income.

H_{6b}: Migrants' attitudes toward tourism development differ significantly according to monthly income. Reject

Table 8 shows the results of the research hypotheses. As a result of the analyses, hypotheses H₁, H₄ and H₅ were partially accepted. All hypotheses except these three hypotheses were rejected. Therefore, it is concluded that immigrants' attitudes toward tourism development partially differ according to gender, age and educational status.

4.2. Qualitative Research Results

In the second phase of the research, the report on the findings obtained in the first phase was presented to a professions who participated in the focus group discussion. The data obtained were reported using the phenomenology design, one of the qualitative research methods. The research questions and answers are as follows:

Open-Ended question: *"What can tourism development contribute to migrants and migrants' concerns about tourism development in destinations where migrants live?"*

The answers received from a tourism doctor, a tourism professional, a sociologist and a migration expert within the scope of the focus group interview are given in Table 6.

Table 8. Focus Group Interview Results

Participants	Tourism Academician	Tourism Professional	Sociologist	Migration Expert
Themes	Contribution of Tourism Development to Immigrants			
Increasing Job Opportunities	x			x
Economic Contributions	x			x
Cultural Exchange		x		
Social Integration/Adaptation		x	x	x
New Experiences		x		
Social Diversity		x		
Tolerance		x		x
Sense of Belonging			x	
Themes	Concern of Immigrants about Tourism Development			
Culture Deformation	x			
Increasing Cost of Living	x			
Competition		x		
Unemployment		x		
Consumption of Local Resources		x		
Cultural Discrimination			x	
Conflict with the local population			x	
Working in low-paid jobs				x
The Challenge of Integration into Local Society				x
Housing Problems				x

Table 8 summarises the results of a focus group discussion on the impact of tourism on migrants. This table presents the participants' views on the effects of tourism on migrants under two main themes. The first of these themes is the positive effects of tourism development on migrants. Among these positive effects, increased job opportunities and economic contributions come to the fore. Tourism creates employment opportunities for migrants and contributes to

local economies. In addition, under the theme of cultural exchange and social integration/adaptation, professionals state that tourism can provide a positive experience for migrants. Interaction of different cultures, tolerance and helping migrants to better integrate into society are among these effects.

On these issues, the tourism academic emphasized employment and economy and answered:

"The contributions of tourism development to migrants may include increased job opportunities and economic contributions. The possibility of finding a job in tourist areas is high, providing employment opportunities for migrants. In addition, the tourism sector can stimulate the local economy, and migrants can benefit economically."

A senior tourism professional emphasized social integration and cultural exchange, answering:

"The contribution of tourism development to migrants can include cultural exchange and social integration. Interaction with different cultures in tourist destinations can enable migrants to gain new experiences while preserving their culture. It can also increase social diversity by bringing together people from different backgrounds in tourist areas".

A sociologist, referring to issues such as sense of belonging, ethnicisation and social integration, answered:

"Among the contributions of tourism development to migrants, social integration and a sense of belonging are important. Migrants can interact with local communities in tourist areas, enhancing their social integration. At the same time, tourism can make migrants feel part of a new society."

In addition to these responses, one migration expert stated that tourism reduces discrimination:

"...tourism brings together people from different cultures, which can help to reduce discrimination".

On the other hand, the concern of immigrants about tourism development were also discussed. These problems include cultural erosion, increased cost of living, unemployment, depletion of local resources, cultural discrimination, conflict with local people, low-paid jobs, difficulty integrating into the local community and housing problems. These negative impacts show that tourism carries potential risks for some communities.

In this regard, a tourism academic referred to the destruction of cultural values and the increase in the cost of living:

"However, negative impacts can include factors such as the erosion of local cultural values and increased living costs."

A tourism professional mentioned issues such as competition in business life, unemployment and depletion of local resources:

"Among the negative effects of tourism, problems such as increased competition, unemployment and depletion of local resources can negatively affect the lives of migrants."

The sociologist who participated in the focus group interview stated the following regarding issues such as cultural discrimination and conflict with local people:

"However, among the negative effects, problems such as cultural discrimination and conflicts with local people can make migrants' lives difficult."

On the other hand, one migration expert mentioned that migrants' concerns about tourism development for migrants include difficulties in finding work, integration into the local community and the impact on natural resources. The migration expert explained.

"It can be difficult to find work in tourist destinations, and migrants may be forced to work in low-paid and low-skilled jobs. This situation can lead to income inequality and social exclusion. Migrants may struggle to integrate into the local community and face cultural discrimination. Tourism can also damage the local ecosystem and natural resources, leading to environmental problems. Finally, intensive construction activity in tourist areas can increase housing costs in areas where migrants live, leading to displacement. Thus, concerns about tourism development for migrants can cause serious problems for migrants."

Conclusion

This study aims to explore and analyze migrants' attitudes toward tourism development by considering a range of socio-demographic factors. The findings of this research provided valuable insights into the nuanced dynamics of migrants' perceptions of tourism.

When migrants' attitudes toward tourism development were analyzed according to their marital status, no statistically significant differences were found. Both married and single migrants have similar views on tourism development. This result suggests that marital status is not very important in shaping how migrants perceive the impact of tourism on their lives.

However, gender emerged as a significant factor in migrants' attitudes toward tourism. Male migrants showed a more positive outlook on the contribution of tourism to their quality of life than their female counterparts. Although there was no significant gender-based difference in concerns about tourism development, the gender-based difference in attitudes toward tourism's contribution to quality of life is a noteworthy finding. This result suggests that gender plays a significant role in shaping migrants' perspectives on the positive aspects of tourism.

The study revealed that migrants' attitudes toward tourism development do not differ significantly across regions. Regardless of their geographical location in Turkey, migrants believe that tourism contributes positively to their quality of life. Moreover, their concerns about tourism development exhibited a consistent pattern, suggesting that the regional context does not significantly influence migrants' overall attitudes.

In terms of age, the study found that age did not have a statistically significant effect on migrants' attitudes toward the contribution of tourism to their quality of life. However, an important finding is that younger migrants express more concern about tourism development. This result suggests that the young migrant population is more sensitive to the potential negative impacts of tourism and strongly emphasizes protecting the local environment and ethical considerations.

The study results showed that migrants' attitudes towards the contribution of tourism development to their quality of life differed according to education level. As the level of education increased, migrants' positive perspectives on the contribution of tourism to their quality of life increased. However, it was worth noting that their concerns about tourism development did not differ according to level of education. Furthermore, the contribution of tourism to immigrants' quality of life and immigrants' concerns about the development of tourism did not differ according to immigrants' monthly income. These findings suggest that

while education level is an important determinant of migrants' assessment of the impact of tourism, the effect of income level on this issue is more limited.

The results of this study have several implications for tourism policy and practice. The consistency in attitudes across regions suggests that tourism policies can be formulated on a broader scale, taking into account the collective perspective of migrants.

Discussion

There are similarities and differences between the results of this study and some previous studies in the literature. There is a similar result between this study and the study conducted by Kozak, Kozak and Kozak (2010). Both studies show that tourism has both positive and negative effects. The views that tourism affects the socio-cultural structure parallel these two studies. There is also a similar result between this study and the study conducted by Moyle et al. (2010). Both studies examined the cultural interaction between the people living in the destination and tourists. At this point, it was concluded that tourism contributes to cultural interaction and creates a positive relationship between local people and tourists. There is a similar result between this study and the study conducted by Tuna (2012). Tuna argued that tourism negatively affects society's most important values, and this effect can be called "cultural pollution." This result coincides with the findings of this study. As a result of the study conducted by us, results were obtained that tourism causes cultural deformation.

This study differs from the results of some studies in the literature. There is also a different result between this study and the study conducted by Long et al. (1990). Long et al. stated that tourism increases the willingness of local people to support tourism, but this support decreases with the increase of negative effects over time. However, this study shows that migrants generally positively evaluate tourism, but it shows that the effects of tourism are complex and may change over time depending on local factors.

Recommendations

In this section, based on the study's main findings, comprehensive recommendations on the attitudes of migrants toward the tourism sector in Turkey are presented. These recommendations aim to increase the contribution of migrants to the development of tourism, improve their quality of life and enable them to have more positive interactions with tourists in tourist destinations. These recommendations derived from the study's findings can contribute to a more effective management of the role of migrants in the tourism sector by providing both an academic and a practice-oriented perspective. The suggestions made in this context are as follows:

1. **Understanding Regional Differences:** The research shows that regional differences do not significantly affect migrants' tourism attitudes. Therefore, tourism policies can be implemented similarly in different regions of Turkey. However, sensitivity to local characteristics and needs is important.

2. **Strengthening Environmental and Ethical Awareness:** The sensitivity of young migrants to the negative impacts of tourism requires an emphasis on environmental and ethical issues. In this context, sustainable tourism training programs can be established, and these programs can be opened to the participation of migrant youth.

3. **Environmental and Sustainability Education:** Migrants should be provided with environmental and sustainability education to sustain their life processes in their destinations.

These trainings should cover topics such as protecting local ecosystems, sustainable use of natural resources and waste management. As the environmental sensitivity of migrants increases, the negative environmental impacts of tourism can be reduced.

4. Placement According to Carrying Capacity: When placing migrants in destinations, the carrying capacity of these regions should be considered. Overpopulation can increase environmental stress and cause depletion of natural resources. When planning migrant settlements, arrangements should be made to be compatible with the infrastructure and resources of the destinations. This result can both improve the quality of life of migrants and maintain environmental sustainability.

5. It is recommended that this study be conducted again since different results may be obtained in studies conducted in the same region at different times.

These recommendations can help migrants live sustainably in tourist destinations and develop environmental awareness. They can also be considered important steps to minimize the negative impacts of tourism.

References

- Adams, K. M. (2021). What western tourism concepts obscure: intersections of migration and tourism in Indonesia. *Tourism Geographies*, 23(4), 678-703.
- Akman, A. D. (2007). *Turizm gelişmesinin yarattığı doğal ve kültürel değişimler: Kaş Örneği*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Ankara).
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perception on tourism impacts. *Annals of Travel Research*, 19(4), 665-690.
- Balcı, A. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Baytok, A., Elbeyi, P., & Soybalı, H. H. (2017). Alternatif Turizm mi Turizmde Çeşitlilik mi? Kavramsal bir Değerlendirme. *Erzincan University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences (Special Issue)*, 4(1), 1-14.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 24(1), 5-12.
- Byers, P. Y., Zeller, R. A., & Byers, B. D. (2002). Focus group methods. *Handbook for conducting research on human sexuality*, 173-193.
- Casey, M. A., & Krueger, R. A. (1994). Focus group interviewing. In *Measurement of food preferences* (pp. 77-96). Boston, MA: Springer US.
- Chen, J., & Wang, B. (2020). "Unattended" retirement: Lifestyle migration and precarity of the Houniao. *Population, Space and Place*, 26(8), e2369.
- Choe, J., & Lugosi, P. (2022). Migration, tourism and social sustainability. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(1), 1-8.
- Cohen, S. A., & Cohen, E. (2019). New directions in the sociology of tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(2), 153-172.
- Çelik, U. (2021). Göç ve Turizm İlişkisi: Arkadaşları ve Akrabaları Ziyaret Turizmine Kavramsal Bir Yaklaşım. In *Global Challenges–Scientific Solutions III* (pp. 114-120).

-
- Çelik-Uğuz, S. (2012). Göç ve Turizm: Türkiye-Almanya Örneği. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(9), 1-30.
- Diedrich, A., & García B., E. (2009). Local Perceptions of Tourism as Indicators of Tourism Destination Decline. *Tourism Management*, 30, 512-521.
- Doğan, H., & Üngüren, E. (2010). Alanya halkının turizme sosyo-kültürel açıdan bakışı. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy Social Sciences*, 3C0055, 5(4), 396-415.
- Doxey, G. 1975. A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: methodology and research inferences in the impact of tourism. In: Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association. San Diego, California.
- Dreher, A., Gaston, N., Martens, P. (2008). *Measuring globalisation. Gauging its consequences*. New York: Spring.
- Fennel, D. (1999). *Ecotourism: An Introduction*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gümüş, N., & Özüpekçe, S. (2009). Foça'da turizmin ekonomik, sosyal, kültürel ve çevresel etkilerine yönelik yerel halkın görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 398-417.
- Gürbüz, A. (2002). Turizmin sosyal çevreye etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Teknoloji*, 5(1-2), 49-59.
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism: A case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647-668.
- IOM. (2022). *World Migration Report 2022*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Organization for Migration.
- Kitzinger, J. (2006). Focus groups. *Qualitative research in health care*, 21-31.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A., & Kozak, M. (2010). *Genel turizm ilkeler kavramlar*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. (2007). *Türkiye Turizm Stratejisi (2023)*. Ankara.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121-139.
- Long, H. P., & Kayat, K. (2011). Residents' perceptions of tourism impact and their support for tourism development: The case study of Cuc Phuong National Park, Ninh Binh Province, Vietnam. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(2), 123-146.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. R. (1990). Rural Resident Tourism Perceptions and Attitudes by Community Level of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Marcher, A., Kofler, I., Innerhofer, E., & Pechlaner, H. (2020). Perceptions of and interactions between locals, migrants, and tourists in South Tyrol. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(1), 56-72.
- Moyle, B., Croy, G., & Weiler, B. (2010). Tourism interaction on islands: The community and visitor social Exchange. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(2), 96-107.
- O'Reilly, K. (2003). When is a tourist? The articulation of tourism and migration in Spain's Costa del Sol. *Tourist Studies*, 3(3), 301-317.
- Ohashi, K. (2019). The interpenetration of migration and tourism: the case of Russian-speaking tourism in Nha Trang, Vietnam. *RUDN Journal of Economics*, 27(1), 153-158.
- Okafor, L. E., Khalid, U., & Burzynska, K. (2022). The effect of migration on international tourism flows: the role of linguistic networks and common languages. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(4), 818-836.
-

-
- Özdemir, M., & Kervankıran, İ. (2013). Turizm ve turizmin etkileri konusunda yerel halkın yaklaşımlarının belirlenmesi: Afyonkarahisar örneği. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*, (24), 1-25.
- Özmen, M. (2007). Turizmin Sosyo-Kültürel Etkileri: Akçakoca Örneği, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. 98 sayfa, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilgiler Enstitüsü, Bolu.
- Roney Akış, S. (2011). Turizm Bir Sistemin Analizi. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Salazar, N. B. (2022). Labour migration and tourism mobilities: Time to bring sustainability into the debate. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(1), 141-151.
- Santana-Gallego, M., & Paniagua, J. (2022). Tourism and migration: Identifying the channels with gravity models. *Tourism Economics*, 28(2), 394-417.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach (4th ed.). USA: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Sharma, P., Tam, J. L., Kim, N., Zhan, W., & Su, Y. (2018). Intercultural service encounters (ICSEs): Challenges and opportunities for international services marketers. In *Advances in Global Marketing: A Research Anthology* (pp. 449-469).
- Smith, M. K., Sziva, I. P., & Olt, G. (2019). Overtourism and resident resistance in Budapest. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 16(4), 376-392.
- Sönmez, M. E., & Mete, M. (2015). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli göçmenlerin profili ile insan kaynağının belirlenmesi ve Türkiye ekonomisine olası etkileri. *Coğrafyacılar Derneği Uluslararası Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, 21-23.
- Tuna, M. (2012). Turizm gelişmesinin sosyo-kültürel etkileri. *Turizm Sosyolojisi*, 64-83.
- Turhan, Ç. (2010). Cumalıkızık köyünde kültürel miras ve turizm algısı. *Millî Folklor*, 22(87), 181-190.
- Turner-King, R. (2018). Creating welcoming spaces in the city: Exploring the theory and practice of 'hospitality' in two regional theatres. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 23(3), 421-437.
- UNWTO. (2021). *UNWTO Tourism Highlights*. Madrid: United Nations World Tourism Organization.
- Urry, J. (1987). Some social and spatial aspects of services. *Society and Space*, 5, 5-26.
- Wang, Y., Pfister, R. E., & Morais, D. B. (2006, April). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study of Washington, NC. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (Vol. 14, pp. 411-418).
- Wearing, S., & Neil, J. (2009). *Ecotourism: Impacts, Potential, and Possibilities?* (2nd ed.). Butterworth Heinemann.
- Williams, A. M., & Hall, C. M. (2000). Tourism and migration: new relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism geographies*, 2(1), 5-27.
- Presidency of Migration Management (2023). Statistics " <https://en.goc.gov.tr/>". İstatistikler, (Access date: 05.07.2023).
-