



Tourism and Recreation

<https://dergipark.org.tr/tourismandrecreation>

E-ISSN: 2687-1971

A research on the evaluation of the effects of tourism by local people in cittaslow destinations*

Cittaslow destinasyonlarında yerel halkın turizmin etkilerini değerlendirmelerine yönelik bir araştırma

Aydın Ünal^{1**}, Onur Çelen², Sinan Baran Bayar³, Muharrem Tuna⁴

¹Kırklareli University, Pınarhisar Vocational High School, Tourism and Travel Program, aydin-unal@hotmail.com.tr, 0000-0002-6377-8587

²Bursa Uludağ University, Harmanlık Vocational High School, Tourism and Hotel Management Program, onurcelen@uludag.edu.tr, 0000-0003-4601-2173

³Kırklareli University, Social Sciences Institute, Tourism Management MBA, sinanbbayar@gmail.com, 0000-0002-3039-3162

⁴Hacı Bayram Veli University, Tourism Faculty, Tourism Management, muharrem.tuna@hbv.edu.tr, 0000-0001-5526-7122

ARTICLE INFO/ MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Research Article / Araştırma

Key Words:

Destination Marketing, Effects of Tourism, Local People, Cittaslow, Vize

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Destinasyon Pazarlaması, Turizmin Etkileri, Yerel Halk, Yavaş Şehir, Vize

Received Date /Gönderme Tarihi:

07.10.2020

Accepted Date /Kabul Tarihi:

28.10.2020

Published Online /Yayımlanma Tarihi:

09.11.2020

ABSTRACT

In this study, it is aimed to determine the evaluations of locals residing in Vize destination in terms of the tourism mobility which is located in Kırklareli province and which gained the status of "cittaslow city" (quiet city) on July 20, 2012. 425 questionnaires prepared in this context were delivered to the local people residing in the destination Vize during 1 May-31 October 2019 period by face-to-face communication. Twenty of the returned questionnaires were excluded from the evaluation since the same answer option was coded for each question and fifteen of the questionnaires were excluded from the evaluation too since more than 50% of the answer codings were left blank. As a result of the research (SPSS), it was found that the majority of the participants (76%) considered tourism to be beneficial for their destination and their viewpoints to the tourists coming to the destination were positive (79%). The dimensions of the scale of evaluating the effects of tourism in their destinations by local people were found to be positive support to tourism development, negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, positive economic effects of tourism, satisfaction with the development of tourism and positive personal benefits of tourism. In addition local people agreed with the statements which were "Tourism should be maintained as an important part of the destination.", "Efforts should be made for the further development of tourism in the destination." and "Tourism investments in the destination should continue increasingly." at a high level. On the other hand the local people agreed with the statements that were "The local people in the destination provide economic gain through tourism.", "I am satisfied with the economic development in destination which is a result of the tourism.", "Tourism supports the local economy in the destination.", "I benefit from the development of tourism in destination.", "Tourism increases the quality of life of the local people in the destination". "I am satisfied with the social development in destination which is a result of the tourism." and "The development of tourism in my destination also has a positive impact on my job." at a low level.

ÖZET

Çalışmada Kırklareli ili sınırları içerisinde yer alan ve 20 Temmuz 2012 tarihinde Türkiye'nin sekizinci Trakya'nın ise ilk ve tek "cittaslow şehri" (yavaş şehir) statüsünü kazanan Vize destinasyonunda ikamet eden yerel halkın destinasyondaki turizm hareketliliğini değerlendirme düzeylerinin belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Bu kapsamda hazırlanan 425 anket formu 1 Mayıs-31 Ekim 2019 döneminde Vize destinasyonunda ikamet eden yerel halka yüz yüze iletişim kurularak uygulanmıştır. Geri dönüş sağlanan anketlerden 20 tanesi her soruya aynı cevap seçeneğinin kodlanması ve 15 anket ise cevap kodlamalarının %50'sinden fazlasının boş bırakılmasından dolayı değerlendirme dışında bırakılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına (SPSS) göre; katılımcıların çoğunluğu turizmi destinasyonları için yararlı (%76) olarak değerlendirmektedirler ve destinasyona gelen turistlere bakış açıları olumludur (%79). Yerel halkın yaşadıkları destinasyonda turizmin etkilerini değerlendirme ölçeğinin boyutları; turizmin gelişimine olumlu destek, turizmin olumsuz sosyo-kültürel etkileri, turizmin olumlu ekonomik etkileri, turizmin gelişiminden memnuniyet ve turizmin olumlu kişisel faydaları olarak adlandırılmıştır. Ayrıca yerel halkın; destinasyonun önemli bir parçası olarak turizm sürdürülmelidir, destinasyonda turizmin daha çok gelişimi için çaba sarf edilmelidir ve destinasyonda turizm yatırımları artarak devam etmelidir ifadelerine katılımları yüksek düzeyde gerçekleşmiştir. Turizmle birlikte destinasyondaki yerel halk ekonomik kazanç sağlamaktadır, turizmle birlikte destinasyonda olan ekonomik gelişimden memnunum, turizm destinasyondaki yerel ekonomiyi desteklemektedir, turizmin destinasyonda gelişiminden bende faydalaniyorum, turizm destinasyondaki yerel halkın yaşam kalitesini arttırmaktadır, turizmle birlikte destinasyonda olan sosyal gelişimden memnunum ve turizmin destinasyonda gelişimi benim işimi de olumlu etkiliyor ifadelerine yerel halkın katılımları ise düşük düzeyde gerçekleşmiştir.

* This article 2-4 September 2020 between organized online "The Conference on Managing Tourism Across Continents" was presented as oral presentations in congress and published in Proceedings book "Cittaslow destinasyonlarında yerel halkın turizmin etkilerini değerlendirmelerine yönelik bir araştırma: Vize Örneği" Report of the extended state.

**Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar.

Assistant Professor, Kırklareli University, Pınarhisar Vocational School, Tourism and Travel Program, aydin-unal@hotmail.com.tr, 0000-0002-6377-8587

1. Introduction

The concept of globalization has affected all industries in a wide and multifaceted way, especially since the end of the 18th century (Egresi, 2016). Globalization has also become a concept that allows different nations all over the world to carry out tourism activities and work together without restrictions. Especially in the last decade, not only the world population but also international tourism has shown a high level of increase. Advanced transportation vehicles, information technology networks, and promotional activities of new destinations are at the basis of this increase (Kozak & Baloglu, 2011). On the other hand, the rapid increase in tourism demand may cause rapid urbanization, congestion in airline, road, and railway transportation, noise and environmental pollution. Cities and destinations are also affected by these changes and increases in social, cultural, and economic aspects. Sometimes the changes caused by globalization can negatively affect the local characteristics, traditions, and culture of cities and destinations. Especially after the 1980s, cities were the first places to be affected by the incredible impact of globalization in terms of economic, social, and political aspects, and city structures were greatly damaged by these developments. For this reason, all cities and destinations competing in tourism markets try to seek and implement strategies to gain a competitive advantage and maintain their existence by highlighting aspects that are different from others. In addition, the diversity of people's reasons for participating in tourism, the momentary and continuous changes in their decisions and consumption habits, the dependence of tourism on place and time, and the continuity of tourism expectations and gains of the local people living in the destination lead to the emergence of various systems (Martinez-Perez et al., 2019). Small and medium sized tourism destinations tend to be a brand through the resources they have, but they also want to benefit from these strategies and systems in their marketing activities. The slow city (*cittaslow*) philosophy has come to the fore as one of these systems and strategies in recent years, and it is seen as an effective tool in branding and marketing small cities and destinations (Zengin & Genç, 2018). The slow city trend is a global system that aims to increase the life standards of the people living in the destinations and the guests coming to the destination, and is based on planning and using small-scale destinations rather than large-scale destinations. According to another definition, the slow city philosophy is an extension of the slow food concept, a structure created by setting global standards in the protection of destinations that carry various characteristics and local lifestyles of the local people (Coban & Harman, 2016). The name of the related system and philosophy was born from the combination of the words "citta," which means city in Italian, and "slow" in English (Acar, 2018). Slow city is a philosophy that respects local cultures, history, and the environment, values social responsibility and diversity, and includes sharing and interacting with other tourists and local people in a destination. The slow city encourages tourists to learn more about cultural heritage sites, local cuisine, traditions and unique qualities, as opposed to the hasty understanding of vacation (Caffyn, 2012).

The nature and size of touristic activities in travel destinations may vary depending on different variables. Factors

such as tourism types in destinations, types of tourists coming to the destination, socio-economic characteristics of tourists, tourist density and average length of stay of tourists, types of touristic activities, characteristics of the destination, capacity and image of the destination are important elements that determine the impact of tourism on the destination (Avcıkurt, 2015). The views and perceptions of the local people about the economic, environmental, cultural, and social impacts of tourism are extremely effective in the development and implementation of tourism. At this point, it is very important to identify the views and wishes of the local people who live their lives in tourism-themed destinations (Çelikkanat & Güçer, 2014). In destinations that are open to tourism or want to carry out tourism activities, it becomes difficult to achieve success in the implementation and management of touristic systems unless planning is made according to the opinion, structural integrity, and environmental characteristics of the local people and if the activities carried out are not supported by the local people (Güneş & Alagöz, 2018). Tourism is a chain of social and cultural events both for the people participating in touristic activities and for the local people living in the destinations. People moving for touristic purposes are called tourists; communities that create certain alternatives by providing direct (hotel, restaurant, souvenir, transportation, etc.) or indirect (giving directions, offering friendship, taxi drivers, banks, shopkeepers, etc.) services at the destination are called local people (Ersoy, 2017). In this respect, local people may face both positive and negative effects of tourism activities directly or indirectly. For this reason, it is important for local people to participate in the production and presentation of touristic products and to meet tourism-based needs in destinations. In addition, since touristic products and activities are often associated with local rituals, traditions, cultural values and meanings, local people can better understand the nature and characteristics of tourism products. Therefore, it should be noted that the local community is an important stakeholder in determining what being suitable for the local situation during tourism planning and development process in the destinations (Park & Kim, 2015).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Slow City Philosophy

The slow city philosophy was coined in 1999 by Paolo Saturnini, a former mayor of the Chianti region of Tuscany, a small town in Italy (Cittaslow, 2020). Cittaslow, which consists of the words "Citta" (City) in Italian and "Slow" in English, means "slow city." The slow city network is a network of cities derived from the "Slow Food" movement to prevent globalization from standardizing the texture of destinations, residents, and lifestyle and eliminating local characteristics. Carlo Petrini started the Slow Food movement in 1986 in response to the opening of a McDonald's branch, a fast-food chain, in Rome's Piazza Spagna. Over time, Slow Food has become an international movement aiming to sustain gastronomic and cultural values (Yurtseven, 2007). The slow city philosophy is generally the act of experiencing the texture, color, music, and story of the destination at a pace that local people and

visitors can enjoy in harmony. In addition to questioning the concept of globalization, the slow city movement alternatively offers practices such as preserving cultural heritage, improving the quality of life of local people, and ensuring sustainable development. This movement is considered an important step towards a world where a destination and its people can enjoy their lives (Yurtseven & Harman, 2010). The slow city movement includes a lot of criteria to increase the quality of life of both visitors and local people. Organization, coordination, and integration management process, which is among the criteria for a destination to become a slow city, encourages this destination to adopt a long-term common strategy (Presenza et al., 2015).

To evaluate slow city criteria in general, destinations must develop programs and projects that comply with these criteria in order to become a member of the relevant association. After the evaluation of the projects carried out by the destinations, cities with a score of 70 or more can become a member of the association (Cittaslow, 2020). After completing the membership process, destinations must renew their certificates every four years on the continuation of the urban life quality and the protection of its values. Relatively small towns are the primary focus of the increasing movement of Cittaslow certification. There is no charge to be designated as a Cittaslow town, but a candidate destination's population must be less than 50,000 and meet 72 quality criteria, which are grouped under seven main headings: (i) energy and environmental policy, (ii) infrastructure policies, (iii) quality of urban life policies, (iv) agriculture, tourism, and artisan policies, (v) hospitality, awareness, and training policies, (vi) social cohesion, and (vii) partnerships. Some requirements are mandatory because destination candidates are expected to start education and training initiatives that consistently follow the guidelines and improve local practices (Cittaslow, 2020).

2.2. Related Research

Cakici, Yenipinar & Benli (2014) undertook to determine how the people of Seferihisar perceived the slow city movement and how it affected their life satisfaction. According to the results of the survey conducted with 416 participants for the related purpose, it was found that the perception of local people towards tourism was positive and tourism had positive effects on the life satisfaction of local people. Park & Kim (2015) qualitatively evaluated the impact of the cittaslow philosophy on social development at Goolwa destination in Australia, the first cittaslow outside Europe. According to the results of the research, cittaslow accreditation and the accompanying practices did not enable local people to participate in decision-making, but the cittaslow practices in the destination positively contributed to the regeneration of local food and wines, cittaslow contributed to the empowerment of local people in the development and management of tourism, and due to the positive effects stated above, cittaslow positively contributed to the sustainability of the society.

Erdogan (2016) conducted a study with 13 local people in Gökçeada destination and concluded that local people had knowledge about the slow city philosophy, and that they supported it. Basarangil & Ulas (2017), as a result of their study

with 401 local people in Vize destination, concluded that the local people living in Vize supported the slow city movement, but only the welfare dimension from the slow city movement perception dimensions had a positive effect on local people's life satisfaction living in Vize. In addition, Kement & Göral (2014) examined the effects of the attitudes of individuals living in the cittaslow Perşembe and visiting the district on revisit intention. As a result of the study, they found that the attitudes of the individuals affected the revisit intention.

Akman et al. (2018) as a result of their research in Seferihisar destination carried out with 402 participants from the local community, concluded that in Seferihisar, Turkey's first slow city destination, the majority of local people were satisfied in general with the activities carried out since it received the slow city title. According to the results of the study conducted by Dündar and Sert (2018) through the interview technique in order to determine the perception of local community living in Seferihisar about the slow city concept, it was determined that the local community was pleased with the philosophy of slow city, that involvement in this system invigorated the economy, that there was a significant increase in the number of visitors to the destination, and that the destination made progress in environmental, social, and cultural aspects. On the other hand, this study also suggested that the local community considered the unplanned urbanization, regional inflation and increase in vehicle traffic, environmental pollution, and crowding as problems that came along with the cittaslow. According to the results of the research in which Walker & Timothy (2019) used survey and semi-structured interview technique with tourists and local people in Kesennuma destination, which is a cittaslow member located in the northeast of Japan, the local people were satisfied with the slow city practices, cittaslow had a positive effect on tourists choosing the destination, and also the local food and tastes were one of the important factors in choosing the destination.

3. Methodology

3.1. The Aim of the Research

In this study, the aim was to determine the level of tourism mobility evaluation of the local people living in Vize destination, located in Kırklareli city and receiver of cittaslow status on July 20, 2012, 8th in Turkey and 1st in Thrace. It is possible to come across studies in the relevant literature that present the local people's evaluation, which constitutes the scope of this research, of the tourism mobility and activities (Dilek et al., 2017; Ersoy, 2017; Hançer & Mancı, 2017; Güneş & Alagöz, 2018; Olcay & Araboğa, 2018; Akpulat & Üzümcü Polat, 2019; Walker & Timothy, 2019). However, no study has been found in the relevant literature that evaluates the subject from this aspect in Vize destination, selected as the research area.

3.2. Selection Process of the Research Area

In selecting the relevant destination, factors such as being Turkey's 8th and Thrace's first and only Cittaslow destination, being home to a lot of historical (Little Hagia Sophia Church, Ancient Theater, Vize Castle, Ayanikol Monastery, etc.),

cultural, natural, and gastronomic attractions, being a stomping ground of local and foreign tourists (Bulgarian and Greek tourists) coming to Kırklareli in which it is located, and the fact that no previous study on the subject of this research has been conducted in this destination were effective (Vize Governor, 2020; Vize Municipality, 2020).

3.3. Creating the Scale of the Research

Survey technique was used in the data collection process of the research. In this study, a survey form consisting of two parts was used. The first part of the survey form consists of eight questions aimed at determining the demographic characteristics of the local population and multiple choice options that the respondent can choose as an answer. In the second part of the survey, 24 Likert-type statements (5-Strongly Agree-1-Strongly Disagree) are used to determine the local people's evaluation of the effects of tourism on the destination they live in. The study of Dilek et al. (2017) was used to form the statements in the survey. In this study, experts and competent people were consulted in order to ensure the content validity of the survey. As for structural validity, criteria such as content validity, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, explanatory factor analysis, convergence, separation, and unidimensionality should be met. Within the framework of the feedback obtained as a result of content validity, the survey was finalized and conducted with the local people.

3.4. The Population and Sample of the Research

The population of the research is the whole of the local people residing in Vize destination. In the study, population statistics of the Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) were used to identify the exact number of local people residing in Vize destination in order to determine the research population size and the sample size that would represent this population (TSI, 2020). According to TSI data, a total of 13,986 people resided in Vize as of the end of 2018. However, the exact number of people that resided in the relevant destination during the data collection period of this research (1 May-31 October 2019) could not be determined. Since the number of individuals in the target was unknown, the formula $n = t^2pq/d^2$ was used in order to calculate the research sample (Yazıcıoğlu & Erdoğan, 2007). The elements indicated by the letters in the formula are as follows: n: Sample size, i.e. the number of individuals within the sample, p: Occurrence frequency of the event examined, i.e. probability of occurrence, q: Absence frequency of the event examined, i.e. probability of not occurring, t: Theoretical value in the t table at a certain significance level (For $\alpha = 0.05$, the t value at ∞ degrees of freedom is 1.96.), d: \pm sampling error accepted according to the frequency of occurrence of the event. If we replace the values within the framework of the formula; $n = (1.96)^2 \cdot (0.5) \cdot (0.5) / (0.05)^2$; $n = 384$ was determined as the number of study sample. It is important for the reliability of a study that every element in a certain population has equal chance of being selected and equal chance of being included in the sample (Ural & Kilic, 2005). For this reason, convenience sampling method, which is among the sampling methods that are not based on probability, was used in the study because of its time and cost advantage, ease of access, application advantages

to available or volunteer individuals (Erkuş, 2011). To reach the sample size (384 participants) that can represent the size of the population, a total of 425 survey forms were administered face to face to the local people in the destination. However, 26 of the returned surveys were excluded from the evaluation because the same answer option was marked for each question and 22 were excluded because more than 50% of the questions were left unanswered. 390 surveys were included in the evaluation process of the study and the return rate was 92%.

3.5. Research Analyses

The data obtained from the survey forms were analyzed via SPSS statistical data program. The data on the demographic characteristics of the local community obtained from the survey in the study were analyzed with percentage and frequency values. After the frequency analysis, the reliability of the scale was analyzed. The scale was subjected to normality test before proceeding with other tests related to the scale. During the normality test, it was found that the significance level of Shapiro-Wilks values of the data was $p > 0.05$. This result shows that the scale is suitable for parametric tests. After the reliability and normality analyses, explanatory (exploratory) factor analysis was conducted to test the construct validity of the scale regarding the local people's evaluations of the effects of tourism in the destination, and descriptive analysis was conducted regarding the local people's evaluations of the statements in the scale.

4. Results

4.1. Findings Regarding the Participants

According to the frequency analysis results (Table 1), 53.9% of the participants were male, 62.9% were married, 61.5% were in the 25-60 age range, 37.2% had a high school level education or lower, 34.6% had their own business, 52.5% had a monthly income of 2,021-5,000 TL, 67.9% had no direct connection with tourism. In addition, 75.6% of the participants considered tourism as beneficial for the destination, and 78.7% of the participants had a positive view of tourists coming to the destination.

4.2. Findings Related to Reliability Analysis

As a result of the reliability analysis, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the scale of evaluating the effects of tourism on the destination used in the research was found as .896. The coefficient ratios obtained indicate that the scale is reliable.

4.3. Findings Regarding Factor Analysis

As a result of the explanatory factor analysis used in the study (Table 2), the KMO value was found to be 0.898 ($p = 0.000$). This value is considered to be excellent within the framework of value ranges accepted in the literature (Durmuş et al., 2010). Furthermore, the result of the Barlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be 4528.675. The level of this ratio also indicates that the sample size is sufficient and suitable for factor analysis. The study also aimed to increase the validity of the exploratory factor analysis by excluding the statement with the factor loads

Table 1. Distribution of Local People by Demographic Characteristics (n=390)

Demographic Characteristics		Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	180	46.1
	Male	210	53.9
Marital Status	Single	145	37.1
	Married	245	62.9
Age	15-24	90	23.1
	25-60	240	61.5
	61 and Above	60	15.4
Educational Level	High School Level or Lower	145	37.2
	Associate Degree	95	24.3
	Bachelor's Degree	110	28.2
	Postgraduate Degree	40	10.3
Occupation	Student	40	10.3
	Business Owner/Self-Employed	135	34.6
	Private Sector Employee	75	19.2
	Public Sector Employee	88	22.5
Monthly Income	Retired	52	13.4
	2,020 TL and Less	95	24.4
	2,021-5,000 TL	205	52.5
Occupation-Tourism Relationship	5,001 TL and Above	90	23.1
	Yes	125	22.1
	No	265	67.9
Evaluation of the Tourism Impact	Useful	295	75.6
	Harmful	95	24.4
Perception on Visitors	Positive	307	78.7
	Negative	83	21.3
Total		390	100

below 0.30 and with the communalities below 0.50. As a result of these two procedures, it was decided to exclude three of the 24 statements in the scale (tourism increases the prices of the products and services in the destination, tourism causes the cost of living in the destination, and my work will be very difficult without tourism in the destination). As a result of the explanatory factor analysis applied again with the remaining 21 statements, a scale was created for the local people to evaluate the effects of tourism on the destination within the scope of five dimensions in which these statements were collected. The dimensions of the scale of evaluating the effects of tourism were named as taking the work by Dilek et al. (2017) as reference: Positive Support to the Development of Tourism (PSDT), Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism (NSCET), Positive Economic Effects of Tourism (PEET), Satisfaction with Development of Tourism (SDT) and Positive Personal Benefits of Tourism (PPBT).

5. Discussion and Suggestion

In this study, it was intended to determine the evaluations of locals residing in Vize destination in terms of the

tourism mobility. According to the results of the frequency analysis applied in the study, the majority of the research participants were male, married, between the ages of 25-60, had an educational level of high school or below, had their own business, and had a monthly income of 2,021-5,000 TL. Occupation of the majority of the participants (68%) was not directly related to tourism activities. While most of the participants considered tourism as beneficial for the destination (77%), their perception of tourists coming to the destination was at a positive level (79%).

As a result of the explanatory factor analysis applied to the research scale, it was found that the scale statements regarding the evaluation of the effects of tourism on the destination by the local people were gathered under five dimensions. The dimensions of the scale of evaluating the effects of tourism were named as follows: Positive Support to the Development of Tourism (PSDT), Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism (NSCET), Positive Economic Effects of Tourism (PEET), Satisfaction with Development of Tourism (SDT) and Positive Personal Benefits of Tourism (PPBT). The results obtained are compatible with the relevant literature (Dilek et al., 2017). According to the analysis results regarding

Table 2. Factor Analysis Results of the Research Scale (n=390)

Statements	PSDT	NSCET	PEET	SDT	PPBT	Mean
Eigenvalues	7.195	3.515	1.755	1.601	1.100	(\bar{X})
Efforts should be made for the further development of tourism in the destination.	.864					3.94
Tourism investments in the destination should increasingly continue.	.859					3.76
Tourism should continue to be an important part of the destination.	.854					3.98
I support the development of tourism in the destination.	.827					3.40
Tourism negatively affects the environmental quality at the destination.		.769				3.27
Tourism negatively affects the behavior of local people in the destination.		.758				3.00
Tourism causes destruction of the cultural values of the local people in the destination.		.697				3.12
Tourism leads to an increase in crimes and social negativities in the destination.		.644				3.19
Tourism causes overcrowding and traffic in the destination.		.638				3.15
The development of tourism in the destination causes environmental pollution.		.616				3.37
Thanks to tourism, local people in the destination get economic gains.			.860			2.97
Tourism supports the local economy in the destination.			.843			2.85
Tourism improves the quality of life of local people in the destination.			.761			2.78
Tourism contributes to the protection of the natural environment in the destination.			.748			3.19
Tourism contributes to the cultural development of the local people in the destination.			.715			3.32
I am satisfied with the environmental improvement that tourism has created in the destination.				.818		3.24
I am happy with the development of public services in the destination along with tourism.				.707		3.48
I am satisfied with the economic development in the destination with tourism.				.695		2.91
I am happy with the social development in the destination with tourism.				.665		2.64
The development of tourism in the destination affects my business positively.					.775	2.60
I also benefit from the development of tourism in the destination.					.750	2.79
Alpha Values of Factors	.905	.813	.831	.771	.756	
Variance Values of Factors (%)	29.979	14.646	7.311	6.671	4.585	
Total Variances Explained (%)			63.193			
KMO Sampling Measurement Adequacy			.898			
Value of Barlett's Test of Sphericity			4528.675			
Sig. p value-Probability Value			0.000			

local people's evaluation of the scale statements included in the study, local people agreed with the following statements at a high level: tourism should continue to be an important part of the destination (\bar{X} =3.98), efforts should be made for the further development of tourism in the destination (\bar{X} =3.94), and tourism investments in the destination should increasingly continue (\bar{X} =3.76). They agreed with the following statements at a lower level: thanks to tourism, local people in the destination get economic gains (\bar{X} =2.97), I am satisfied with the economic development in the destination with tourism (\bar{X} =2.91), tourism supports the local economy in the destination (\bar{X} =2.85), I also benefit from the development of tourism in the destination (\bar{X} =2.79), tourism improves the quality of life of local people in the destination (\bar{X} =2.78), I am happy with the social development in the destination with tourism (\bar{X} =2.6), the development of tourism in the destination affects my business positively (\bar{X} =2.60). Local people's evaluations of other statements were moderate and close to each other (\bar{X} =3.00-3.40).

Cittaslow is an understanding based on the philosophy of slow food, and it is carried out for sustainability purposes. Considering the previous studies on the subject (Çakıcı et al., 2014; Park & Kim, 2015; Dündar & Sert, 2018; Walker & Timothy, 2019), it is understood that cittaslow has many positive effects on destinations. Although the phenomenon of tourism is universal, the approach of the local people in the destinations and their perception of tourism may differ. In the research, it was found that tourism was evaluated positively because of the income generating effect, job creation, and other positive economic contributions of the local people. Within the framework of the relevant result, it is possible to say that the local people at Vize destination evaluate the economic effects of tourism activities positively. Cittaslow's philosophy and properly planned and managed tourism activities contribute positively to preservation of local food, sustainability, preservation of historical, cultural, and natural resources, enabling them to be passed on to future generations. When Vize destination is evaluated from this aspect, it is understood that the local

people do not evaluate tourism negatively in terms of relevant historical, cultural, and gastronomic values. In destinations where the process is mismanaged, tourism activities can cause inflation, increase in foreign purchases, and increase in the use of harmful substances, traffic-parking problems and unplanned urbanization problems. However, it was found that the local people have not perceive these negativities in Vize destination yet. The result obtained is similar to the related literature (Çakıcı et al., 2014; Çelikkanat & Güçer, 2014; Park & Kim, 2015; Olcay & Araboğa, 2018; Akpulat & Üzümcü Polat, 2019).

It is thought that this study will contribute to the relevant destination, literature, and future studies. However, due to the limited financial resources and time, the study could not be applied to a larger sample size, while it was within the limits accepted in the literature. For this reason, increasing the diversity and sample size of the local community included in the study in future studies would make a positive contribution in terms of generalization of the study results.

References

- Acar, Y. (2018). Turistlerin Tercih Edilen Destinasyonlara Yönelik Bilgi Düzeyleri: Türkiye'deki Sakin Şehirleri Ziyaret Eden Yerli Turistler Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Aksaray Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(1), 45-56.
- Akman, E., Akman, C. & Karakuş, M. (2018). Yavaş Şehir Kriterleri Çerçevesinde Seferihisar Belediyesi'nin Faaliyetlerinden Yerel Halkın Memnuniyet Düzeyi. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(2), 65-84.
- Akpulat, A. N. & Üzümcü Polat, T. (2019). Turistik Destinasyonlarda Turizmin Etkilerine Yerel Halkın Bakış Açısı: Çeşme Örneği. *Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research*, 6(4), 448-463.
- Avcı Kurt, C. (2015). *Turizm Sosyolojisi Genel Yapısal Yaklaşım (4th edition)* Ankara: Detay Publishing.
- Başarangel, I. & Ulaş, S. (2017). A Research on The Perceptions, Attitudes and Life Satisfaction of the Cittaslow Citizens Sample of Vize County. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 8(1), 107-116.
- Caffyn, A. (2012). Advocating and Implementing Slow Tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 37(1), 77-80.
- Çakıcı, A. C., Yenipinar, U. & Benli, S. (2014). Yavaş Şehir Hareketi: Seferihisar Halkının Tutum ve Algıları ile Yaşam Doyumları. *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi*, 11(3), 26-41.
- Çelikkanat, N. & Güçer, E. (2014). Yerel Halkın Turizm Bakış Açısı: Bodrum İlçesi Örneği. 15. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi, (pp.272-289), 13-16 November, Ankara, Turkey.
- Cittaslow (2020). *Cittaslow Philosophy*. <https://www.cittaslow.org/> Date of Access: 13.01.2020.
- Çoban, O. & Harman, S. (2016). Yavaş Şehir (Cittaslow) Türkiye Ağı'na Üye Olan Şehirlerin İnternet Sitelerinde Yavaş Şehir Temasının Görünürlüğü Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 235-253.
- Dilek, E. S., Çoban, O. & Harman, S. (2017). Hasankeyf Halkının Turizmin Gelişimine Yönelik Tutumu, *Turizm ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 6(2), 59-72.
- Dündar, Y. & Sert, A. N. (2018). Yerel Halkın Yavaş (Sakin) Şehir Hakkındaki Algıları: Seferihisar'da Nitel Bir Araştırma, *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), 74-91.
- Durmuş, B., Yurtkoru, E. S. & Çinko, M. (2010). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi (3th. edition)*, Beta Publishing, İstanbul.
- Egresi, I. (2016), Globalization, Mass Tourism, and Sustainable Development. *Alternative Tourism in Turkey*, 3-22.
- Erdoğan, M. (2016). Local Community Perception Towards Slow City: Gokceada Sample. *Asian Social Science* 12(5), 241-246.
- Erkuş, A. (2011). *Davranış Bilimleri İçin Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci (3th edition)*, Seçkin Publishing, Ankara.
- Ersoy, H. (2017). *Turizmin Gelişiminin Yerel Halk Üzerine Sosyo-Kültürel Etkileri: Manavgat Örneği*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. İzmir Kâtip Çelebi University.
- Güneş, E. & Alagöz, G. (2018). Yerel Halkın Turizm Algısı: Erzincanda Bir Araştırma. *İğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15, 409-442.
- Hançer, S. & Mancı, A. R. (2017). Yerel Halkın Turizm Bakış Açısının Belirlenmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Diyarbakır Örneği, *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 5(4), 70-91.
- Kement, Ü. & Göral, M. (2015). Demografik Özellikleri Açısından Turistlerin, Cittaslow Uygulaması ile İlgili Tutumlarının Değerlendirilmesi ve Tekrar Ziyaret Etme Niyetlerine Etkisi: Perşembe Örneği, *Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research*, 2(2), 12-19.
- Kozak, M. & Baloglu, S. (2011). *Managing and Marketing Tourist Destinations: Strategies to Gain Competitive Edge*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Martinez-Perez, A., Elche, D. & Garcia-Villaverde, P. M. (2019). From Diversity of Interorganizational Relationships to Radical Innovation in Tourism Destination: The Role of Knowledge Exploration. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 11, 80-88.
- Olcay, A. & Araboğa, Y. (2018). Bitlis İlinin Turizm Potansiyeli ve Yerel Halkın Turizm Olgusuna Bakış Açısı. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(57), 945-961.
- Park, E. & Kim, S. (2015). The Potential of Cittaslow for Sustainable Tourism Development: Enhancing Local Community's Empowerment. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 13(3), 351-359.
- Prezenta, A., Abbate, T. & Micera, R. (2015). The Cittaslow Movement: Opportunities and Challenges for the Governance of Tourism Destinations. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 12(4), 479-488.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI) (2020). *Vize Demographic Information*, http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreTablo.do?alt_id=1059. Date of Access: 12.01.2020.
- Ural, A. & Kılıç, I. (2005). *Bilimsel Araştırma Süreci ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi*. Detay Publishing, Ankara.
- Vize Governor, (2020). *City*. <http://www.vize.gov.tr/ilcemiz>. Date of Access: 12.01.2020.
- Vize Municipality, (2020). *Tourism*. <https://vize.bel.tr/sayfa/turizm/>. Date of Access: 12.01.2020.
- Walker, T. B. & Timothy, J. L. (2019). Visitor and Resident Perceptions of the Slow City Movement: the Case of Japan. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 19(2), 112-127.
- Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2007). *SPSS Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri (2th edition)*, Detay Publishing, Ankara.
- Yurtseven, R. H. (2007). *Slow Food ve Gökçeada: Yönelimsel Bir Yaklaşım (2nd edition)*. Ankara: Detay Publishing.
- Yurtseven, H. R. & Harman, S. (2010). *Yavaş Hareketi*. Ankara: Detay Publishing.
- Zengin, B. & Genç, K. (2018). Yavaş Şehirlerin (Citta-Slow) Pazarlanması: Göynük Örneği. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(2), 585-599.