



Dissecting Turkey's Tourism Development Model: A Political Economy Approach

Türkiye'nin Turizm Kalkınma Modelinin İncelenmesi: Politik Ekonomi Yaklaşımı

Ali YÜCE¹ 

Geliş Tarihi (Received): 15.11.2024

Kabul Tarihi (Accepted): 23.01.2025

Yayın Tarihi (Published): 25.03.2025

Abstract: Since the 1980s, tourism has been employed as a means of economic growth rather as an end, compromising essential resources and disregarding sustainability principles concerning sociocultural values and environmental assets. Many countries have significantly benefited economically from tourism activities due to the ideologically driven paradigm shift, particularly with the adoption of neoliberal policies. However, there is conflicting evidence and assertions in the literature about the success story of tourism-based development strategies. Despite the diversity of discussions, there is limited understanding of the fundamental variables affecting Turkish tourism development plans. Hence, this study systematically and critically analyzes existing literature to enhance the scope, content, and understanding of the theoretical foundations of the tourism development process. This study also provides suggestions and identifies limitations for further research in the domain of tourism.

Keywords: Tourism Development, Third Way, Development First Approach, Tourism First Approach.

&

Öz: 1980'lerden bu yana turizm, en temel kaynakları tehlikeye atarak ve sosyokültürel değerler ve çevresel varlıklarla ilgili sürdürülebilirlik ilkelerini göz ardı ederek, bir amaç olmaktan ziyade ekonomik büyümenin bir aracı olarak kullanılmaktadır. Birçok ülke, ideolojik temelli paradigma değişikliğinin uygulanmasından bu yana, özellikle neoliberal politikaların uygulanmasının ardından ekonomik açıdan turistik faaliyetlerden faydalanmıştır. Bununla birlikte, literatürde turizm temelli kalkınma stratejilerinin başarı öyküsü hakkında birbirleriyle çelişen kanıtlar ve iddialar bulunmaktadır. Tartışmaların çeşitliliğine rağmen, Türkiye'de turizm kalkınma planlarının altında yatan değişkenlere yönelik mevcut literatürde ciddi anlamda bir boşluk olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Bu çalışma, turizm gelişim sürecinin teorik temellerinin kapsamı, içeriği ve anlayışını geliştirmeyi amaçlayarak mevcut literatürün sistematik ve eleştirel bir incelemesini sunmaktadır. Ayrıca, bu alanda gelecekte yapılacak araştırmalar için öneriler geliştirmiş ve araştırmanın sınırlılıkları tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Turizm Kalkınması, Üçüncü Yol, Kalkınma Öncelikli Yaklaşım, Turizm Öncelikli Yaklaşım.

Atıf/Cite as: Yüce, A., (2025). Dissecting Turkey's Tourism Development Model: A Political Economy Approach. *Abant Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 25(1), 437-451. doi: 10.11616/asbi.1585806

İntihal-Plagiarism/Etik-Ethic: Bu makale, en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş ve intihal içermediği, araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulduğu teyit edilmiştir. / This article has been reviewed by at least two referees, and it has been confirmed that it is plagiarism-free and complies with research and publication ethics. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/asbi/policy>

Copyright © Published by Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Since 2000 – Bolu

¹Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Ali Yüce, Kapadokya Üniversitesi, ali.yuce@kapadokya.edu.tr.

1. Introduction

Giddens (2003) asserted that we are residing in a world that is rapidly changing. Archbishop Wulfstan, who lived approximately a thousand years ago, was cited by Giddens (2003), who asserted that everything is changing so quickly because "the world lives in a rush and is getting close to its end". Planning has been an important concept for all involved in the development processes and in every aspect of our lives including the tourism industry. Tourism planning is a mechanism that indicates the direction of development without rushing and going out of control in the future (Tribe, 2009). The tourism industry has undergone rapid transformation, requiring the need for large institutions and nations to devise solutions to address the issues they have created. Tourism is among one of the fastest growing and competitive industries that has numerous economic impacts. According to the Statista, tourism related economic activities produce directly significant amount of -approximately 9.9 trillion dollars which equals to 9.1 percent- the total global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Department, 2024). Despite the numerous benefits in addition to the GDP, destinations have received, the majority of these areas remains undeveloped and are grappling with diverse challenges such as poverty and environmental disasters (Alipour, 1996; Nohutçu, 2002; Tribe, 2009). Hence it is crucial for the governments to develop the tourism development policy to ensure that local and national economic goals are achieved proportionately within the region without undermining sociocultural and environmental values.

Researchers define tourism planning in a myriad of ways. But for this study, tourism planning is defined as developing applicable, eco-friendly, transformable, and innovative strategies aim at minimizing negative impacts and maximizing long-term benefits for all stakeholders involved in the habitat. Ecofriendly tourism planning ensures overall growth from infrastructure to the superstructure; action is taken for a specific destination to achieve sustainable tourism destinations. To create strong economic benefits, a holistic process involves everyone who has a stake in the matter. For both society and visitors, maintaining the environment and interacting with other cultures are important. Moreover, each destination has a unique characteristic. Thus, tourism planners should assess the needs and expectations of the destination and formulate a plan based on each destination's unique social, cultural, natural, and economic characteristics. Hence it is critical for the local, regional, and government organizations to bring the different actors of the destinations together in order to avoid the negative impact of tourism development efforts, which is evident.

There are numerous tourism planning approaches in the literature. But which approach is the most applicable and functional in the long term? Developing a tourism strategy, encompassing master plans for destinations, requires the involvement of all stakeholders, ranging from multidisciplinary professionals to local representatives in the creation process. This is to suggest more sophisticated and integrated development strategies that will maximize overall benefits while ensuring the safety of all living things involved. Therefore, it's crucial to investigate and implement a planning approach that compromises social, cultural, environmental, and economic assets. In this context, this critical paper will first discuss the three major development approaches, and then it will analyze the Turkish tourism development policies that have been implemented since the 1980s, starting with the neoliberal paradigm.

In general, while positive sciences, including math and statistics, affirm that the tourism industry adds significant economic outcomes, some social science literature asserts that tourism-based development plans fail since they cause dramatic sociocultural and environmental harm. Despite Turkey's substantial influx of international tourists, the overall income from travel and tourism do not proportionately benefit the nation or its citizens. Moreover, multiple studies reveal that wealth generated from tourism, regardless of its origin, is not equitably dispersed among stakeholders around the globe (Bianchi, 2018; Nguyen, Schinckus, Su, & Chong, 2021; Scheyvens, 2007).

Turkey is not exempt from this dilemma. Several factors contribute to the unequal distribution of generated tourism profits. Some of them are related to the characteristics and profile of the visitors, fierce competition both internally and nationally, and lack of generating high value of local products, tourism goods, and tourist services.

Furthermore, even though tourism contributes to more than 10% of employment, the industry struggles to find qualified individuals for every branch and industry that is closely related to tourism. From the perspective of the employee, one of the primary causes is the issue of seasonality in tourism (Zvaigzne, Litavniece, & Dembovska, 2022). Therefore, because of concerns like unpredictability and seasonality, tourism is not a livelihood they can pursue throughout their lives. Lastly, tourism planning and management is administered by centralization approaching neglecting or excluding local public involvement and decision process, causing conflicts among organizations and institutions, delaying to produce efficient and timely decisions and overlooks the facts of the sites, local destinations (Tosun & Jenkins, 1996).

One of the common regional issues and challenges of tourism development is how to meet with the infrastructure needs; avoid or impede the potential environmental, ecological degeneration at the destinations areas/sites as visitor numbers constantly growing at a fast pace (Zhang & Zhang, 2022). The local, regional and national plans and authorities have great responsibilities to present effective approaches and make long term regulations to preserve the authenticity of the local culture and to protect bio-ecological environment, improve the living standards, and more.

This study contends that the neoliberal shift in tourism development plans prioritizes financial capital while neglecting the significance of natural and human capital, irrespective of the level of development of a country. In Laissez-faire ideology, capital advocates heavily focus on quantitative based outcomes of tourism activities, they did not only underestimate having alternative economic sources such as agriculture, industrialization and digitalization, but surely disregard the vitality of natural, cultural and historical capital of a country. Despite the diversity of discussions, there remains a lack of interest in examining the primary causes of Turkish tourism development plans from ideological perspectives. Hence, this study systematically and critically reviews the relevant literature to enrich the scope and content of the theoretical foundation of the tourism development process, besides providing suggestions for future studies.

2. Conceptual and Theoretical Background

Since the 1980s, neoliberal policies have significantly altered the economic models of developing countries, such as Turkey (Akkemik, 2012: 3; Alipour, 1996: 2). Neoliberalism derives its ideological foundation from the 18th century, particularly from the French physiocrats who advocated for a laissez-faire capitalist model designed to foster free market competition among enterprises without government intervention (Vardi, 2012: 15). As many countries around the world adapted to laissez-faire model which is also adapted by Turkey in 1980s as panacea. As a result of transition to the neoliberalism policies, Turkey changed its state based economic model to free market model that focusing on privatization in every layer of the economy. From the local tourist perspective, traditional performance metrics and standard economic indicators reveal that tourism significantly boosts national GDP, generates employment opportunities, and stabilizes import-export trade (Dwyer, 2023: 2). Yet, from a broader dimension, international tourism became an essential source for global economies in the case of Turkey only after the minimum government intervention, privatization, and promotion the free economy (Alipour, 1996; Tosun & Jenkins, 1996).

The tourism industry is influenced by three distinct ideological approaches. Firstly, 'tourism as business', which is also called The Tourism-First Approach (P. Burns, 1999), prioritizes the benefits of the companies. Secondly, "tourism as development," also called The Development-First Approach (P. Burns, 1999), suggests that tourism is the primary means to the end of the development process. Lastly, The Third Way proposes that the tourism development process should go beyond these two ideological approaches, taking into account all the aspects of the places where all living things reside. Indeed, neoliberal perspectives (the tourism-first approach) and the second one, which can be called the state-centric approach (the development-first approach) disregarded the alternative tourism development approaches. While the first approach, known as the Tourism-First Approach, prioritized liberating the tourism market, the other approach aimed at government intervention. While the liberalist approach emphasized the importance of individualist benefits, the state-centric approach focused on society. Nonetheless, the third option, referred to as the "Third Way" (Giddens, 2003), offers a prospect for formulating an economic model that promotes

capital investment in economic advancement, conserves natural resources, and strategizes urban, local, and regional development through sustainable practices.

On the other hand, the Turkish government's intervention in the early 1970s led to the development of traditional Turkish tourism. Since the early 1970s, Turkey, as a developing nation, has concentrated on income derived from tourism and commenced attracting international tourism demand in the 1980s (Akkemik, 2012, pp. 2-3). Turkey is one of the developing countries that place tourism as an important economic means in terms of improved GDP, lowering unemployment and generating foreign exchange earnings as well as contribution to regional development. The shift from long-rooted traditional economic activities to the market based economic transformation needed financial and technical support for the creation of tourism, in particular, on the coastal area of Antalya. Neoliberalism had also plan to finance from the global institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Shifting the traditional economic development model to the neoliberal policies, Turkish tourism became not only one of the major economic sources of the country and became one of the most preferred important destinations in the Europe.

Tourism development has not been achieved without cost. Tourism industry became a major problem for many countries around world including Turkey. First of all, country's long rooted agrarian-based production and development was declined significantly (Hatipoglu, Alvarez, & Ertuna, 2016). Currently, four decades after the early 1980s, tourism faces numerous substantial environmental obstacles, such as overcapacity, pollution, land and water degradation, escalating living costs, loss of agricultural land, waste management difficulties, and deforestation. Furthermore, it also faces social and cultural challenges, including the erosion of cultural authenticity and an increase in stereotyping towards tourists.

Moreover, tourism directly influences the lives of local communities (Nugroho & Numata, 2022). A variety of studies indicate a parallel relationship between the development of tourism and the increasing concerns of communities regarding their living standards, environment, and sociocultural values. Therefore, it is essential to engage the local community in the development of tourism plans. Particularly in developing countries, public involvement tourism development process is crucial to achieve the proactive management plan implementation successfully. Management or leadership strategy of tourism development is another critical dimension that requires commitment, fair, effective, flexible and strong resilience in order to produce solutions and achieve balance among diverse groups of stakeholders in the this very complex process of tourism development and operation of tourism industry both at public level and private entrepreneurship (Hoang, Wilson-Evered, Lockstone-Binney, & Luu, 2021; Larson & Poudyal, 2012).

Studies assert that the adoption of a neoliberal tourism development approach solely focuses on financial capital, which leads to numerous and severe environmental, social, and economic problems caused by unsustainable tourism activities and practices (Kosmas & Vatikioti, 2024; Olssen, 2020). This perspective implies that a free-market economy is accompanied by irreplaceable costs. Despite receiving millions of visitors and billions of tourist dollars, the natural resources, cultural assets, and social values around the touristic destinations are gradually and dramatically deteriorating.

However, the effort should not solely concentrate on the quantitative or digital values found in statistical databases, which are linked to indicators such as maximizing economic growth, increasing foreign exchange volume, or improving the employment rate. However, the study argues that the plan should encompass qualitative values such as sociocultural assets; equitable income distribution, enhanced life standards, and recognition of resources utilized in tourism that still contribute to national identity. In other words, long-term sustainable tourism development should aim for both maximization of tourism benefits and minimizing the negative impact of development.

Master planning for tourism coined by Gunn (1988) who alerted the negative impact of tourism if it is not carefully planned. Hence, numerous studies state that effective planning and management are essential elements for mitigating the adverse effects of unsustainable human practices and optimizing the advantages of sustainable tourism criteria for all shareholders of the habitat (Dwyer, 2023; Inskeep, 1988; Tosun & Timothy, 2001; Wu, Wu, Liu, & Hsueh, 2018). A strong correlation exists between proposed

tourism development strategies and the outcomes of tourism activities (Alipour, 1996). Most destinations' primary goal is promoting their unique natural, historical, cultural resources using highly state-of-the-art tourism development approaches to increase their incoming visitor arrivals and multiply their tourism related incomes (P. Burns, 1999). As P. Burns (1999) argues that development in tourism goals so-called "master planning" approaches, can be achieved at the cost of failure to deliver development to civil society. P. Burns (1999) continuously stated that it is even more crucial for the destinations where there are lack of sufficient financial resources and particularly disadvantaged areas. In the light of this given information, this section aims to discuss briefly the diverse tourism development plans, the role government and community involvement, awareness and participation of the community in "master planning" by focusing on the decades' Turkish tourism development efforts.

The plans are "Tourism First Approach," "Development First Approach," and "Third Way." In addition to discussing the fundamentals of tourism development approaches, this paper will also delve into the role of the government and its interventions that shape tourism development projects.

2.1. Two Major Tourism Development Pathways: Neoliberal and Political Economy Approach

There is a close relationship between chosen tourism development plans and the consequences of the touristic activities. Hence, planning and management are crucial steps in reducing the negative impacts of unsustainable human activities and maximizing the benefits of tourism activities for all members of society. This section will delve into various approaches to tourism development, highlighting their significance for tourism destinations.

The Tourism First Approach, a sophisticated and integrated tourism development strategy, arises from a Keynesian multiplier mechanism which primarily concerns about the economic outcomes (P. Burns, 1999; P. M. Burns, 2004). The Tourism First Approach derives from the supply-driven approach of tourism development promoted by the World Bank and its affiliated consultants or planners (P. Burns, 1999). As its name suggests, the 'tourism development first approach' contributes to overall economic growth by generating economic outcomes that align with the production of services and goods. Generally, national planners chose tourism development due to its ease of implementation, lower cost compared to other industries, and greater focus on achieving earlier goals. Paradoxically, the plan fails to specify the beneficiaries and the extent of their benefits to society. The plan primarily targets global market players who will invest their capital for development with the intention of multiplying the capital they invest. Additionally, local, regional, or national authorities try to appeal to investors with incentives such as tax deductions and free land use. All these dimensions of the development plan influence either significantly in a positive or dramatically negative direction for the future of a destination area's economic, sociocultural, and environmental assets in the long run.

Turkey possesses greater potential than its competitors, including other Mediterranean countries and many other global destinations, as it offers more than just sea, sand, and sun, so-called 3Ss. As previously mentioned, Turkey possesses numerous unexplored cultural, natural, and historical assets within its authentic environment. However, to meet the demands of growing tourism activities, Turkey also needed hotels, roads, telecommunications, and trained individuals. Therefore, beginning with the neoliberal policies, Turkey adopted a tourism-first approach, and international institutions provided financial support to ensure that the infrastructure and superstructure met the needs and demands of tourists. Authors such as Nohutçu (2002); Tosun and Jenkins (1996) draw attention to the Tourism Encouragement Law, which passed in 1982 and made significant changes and improvements in economic growth along with the physical infrastructure improvements.

Adopting a newer development master plan has led to a paradigm shift in tourism development, resulting in increased accommodation, increased visitor numbers, increased tourist revenue, and the creation of employment opportunities for citizens. However, it is concrete and observable that the geographical structure of the coastal areas has drastically changed, leading to a deterioration in natural, historical, and cultural resources. Furthermore, with a Tourism First Approach, the function of tourism is solely to

facilitate business growth without governmental interference. This approach excludes quality of life standards, social identity, cultural values, equitable economic distribution, and sustainable development within a safe and healthy environment. Therefore, the primary goal of tourism development plans should be to develop and implement a holistic approach that considers all aspects of the ecosystem rather than focusing on an eco-centric, in other words, an economy-centric approach.

2.2. Tourism Development: Neoliberal Approach

The Development First Approach places tourism as an only means of a country's development progress. The fundamental difference between development first and Tourism First Approach is, while the first one sees the 'tourism as business' the second one sees the 'tourism as impact' it generates for development of a country (P. Burns, 1999). Another significant difference is that Development First Approach, however, suggest to eliminate the overall poverty, rural development and support women's rights (P. Burns, 1999).

On the other hand, the Development First Approach is a leftist ideology that focuses on resolving the dualism issue, specifically social inequality between developed and undeveloped locations. The Development First Approach also aimed to avoid the dependency issue. World organizations also offered The Development First Approach, which aimed to address issues of dualism, dependency, and underdevelopment (P. Burns, 2004; Hughes & Scheyvens, 2016). Dualism is the difference between two geographic areas of the same country, like Antalya and Hatay. The Mediterranean surrounds both of these locations, yet they exhibit significant socioeconomic differences.

The lack of resources in the planned area also raised concerns about dependency. Underdevelopment of the location to achieve the planning goals, consideration of cultural identities, and the creation of alternative economic powers were major factors that made the "development-first" approach a more favorable and usable option. Adopting or applying tourism as a system to close socioeconomic inequalities while accounting for sociocultural and geographical discrepancies also provides a strong foundation for the successful implementation of the plan and achieving positive outcomes. Finally, a development package for economic growth cannot solely include tourism. It has its own dynamics, needs, requirements, and restrictions within its territory.

As a result, the Development First Approach is more likely to enhance living conditions and contribute to the overall improvement of the Turkish economy than the Tourism First Approach. Yet, this approach lacks the fundamental dimensions of an effective development approach, such as accepting an entire country as a homogeneous place as if one model can fit all strategy. Since each destination has its own uniqueness, implementing The Development First Approach in tourism may exaggerate or worsen the inequality of the destinations. Therefore, The Development First Approach, which solely focuses on tourism, cannot provide an equitable and fair development plan for the entire country.

2.3. Tourism Development: Political Economy Approach

Despite the great attention that most planning efforts receive, eliminating flaws and contradictions in tourism planning is almost inevitable (P. M. Burns, 2004). In the quest for the optimal development tool, 'The Third Way' method merits consideration as a leading option relative to the previously described perspectives. Many authors have defined the Third Way as a multidisciplinary approach. Some argue that the Third Way is about social democracy. However, Giddens (1998: 26) asserts that the forces of globalization and new hegemonies are influencing social democracy, making it an illusion. So that, for Giddens (1998), cited from P. M. Burns (2004), the Third Way is as follows:

[A] "third way" refers to a framework of thinking and policymaking that seeks to adapt social democracy to a world which has changed fundamentally over the past two or three decades. It is a third way in the sense that it is an attempt to transcend both old-style social democracy and neoliberalism (1998:26).

In contrast to the other two developing economies identified by P. M. Burns (2004) as rightist and leftist, leftist perspectives emphasize social development as a priority, whereas rightist viewpoints concentrate on

industrial growth and its financial implications. Consequently, a tourism-first approach is adopted as the principal purpose of achieving their goals.

Conversely, the Third Way provides a more advantageous solution compared to other development methodologies due to its adaptability and availability. The third approach posits that every destination possesses unique qualities, implying a transition from coastal-based mass tourism to diverse tourist activities like diving, cultural and religious tours, winter vacations and skiing, health tourism, congress tourism, and various other tours, thereby transforming tourism into a year-round industry across various regions of the nation (P. Burns, 1999; P. M. Burns, 2004). On the other hand, tourism planning requires multidisciplinary coordination due to its multidimensional impacts on “social, economic, political, psychological, anthropological, and technological factors” (Alipour, 1996). Third Way offers collaboration between each of the stakeholders in order to produce a coherent, workable, and sustainable plan. Therefore, planning efforts in Turkey as a whole should consider this method instead of centralized approaches, which often lead to conflicts among stakeholders. Some of these conflicts occur between national and local authorities, such as between the Ministry of Tourism in Turkey and the municipality of Bodrum (Alipour, 1996).

A third-way approach emerged to offer more sophisticated solutions, aiming to bridge the gap between the other two approaches, which were characterized by unrealistic and improper methods. Whether the development process prioritizes tourism or development, these approaches often ignore intangible values. Focusing solely on economic growth failed to ensure equitable income distribution and enhance the living standards of the communities where development occurred. Moreover, the classical centralized approaches failed to sustain natural resources, minimize the negative impacts of tourism on sociocultural values, and close the disparate development gaps across the country's regions. A Third Way guarantees the achievement of local participation and the establishment of institutions for the design and implementation of a sustainable development plan. A Third Way proposes and strives to comprehensively identify the resources and issues within the local society, involving a diverse range of local individuals. The process then necessitates a decision-making process once the political vision has been established, and the proposed plan's recommendations have been clarified. Subsequently, the plan undergoes implementation and monitoring mechanisms to ensure its updating in response to potential challenges.

2.4. Examining Tourism Development in Turkey

Sustainability has been a panacea in all disciplines in the current literature including tourism studies. Sustainable tourism development requires a comprehensive physical assessment of the destination in terms of its capacity, fragility of the natural sources and sensitivity of the historical and cultural values (Hajian & Kashani, 2021). Sustainability has many different definitions in literature. United Nations' World Commission on Environment and Development defined it as “sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need” (WCED, 1987). As the definition suggests, sustainable development regardless of the field aims to develop policies and plans not only for the today's needs to be satisfied, but also the need of future generations by conserving the resources. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), tourism industry employs worldwide one out of ten products and services, within Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and one out of 10 jobs in 2017. An important indicator that shows the impact and success of tourism is the volume of foreign visitor expenditures and foreign investments, rather foreign tourism related economic activities in country. Turkey is one of the ten top destinations for both as tourist arrivals and tourist generated foreign exchange receipts (Akkemik, 2012). Based on the latest data that is of WTTC, Turkey ranks on the 7th place in both indicators impressively comparing to among the well-established and/or emerging 30 country destinations between 2011 and 2017.

Turkey's climate and geographical location offer all types of tourism activities throughout the year. Turkey adapted its policies in the 1980s to ensure the country would achieve economic growth with the tourism industry and its industry along with industrial-based production (Yolal, 2016). Hence, the governments planned and promoted mass tourism as the catalyst for the development process. The new type of tourism would achieve the national objectives in terms of generating foreign exchange, reducing unemployment,

and decrease the deficit in the country's budget, enhance the overall country's image (Tosun, 1998; Yolal, 2016). It was predicted that international tourism as an alternative development tool would initiate favorable impressions and create positive destination images on foreign tourists, in particularly, Europeans. Besides coastal tourism, there are other types of travel activities such as winter tourism, and historical destination such as Gallipoli, ecotourism, and cruises, are a few to mention to offer for foreign visitors.

2.5. The Economic, Social and Environmental Impact of Turkish Tourism

There is a consensus that tourism has positive impact on economic development (Wu et al., 2018). As it was abovementioned, the constant and continuous development of tourism has the major source of the economic growth of many countries at any development scale. The swift evolution of tourism has profoundly impacted the economic growth of underdeveloped countries, particularly due to deficiencies in resources such as adequate financing, efficient planning systems, and the effects of centralized governmental strategies. Turkey as one of these developing countries also implemented development plans based on the terms of 5 and 10 years plans to reduce the deficit, improving the living standards, creating the employment opportunities, closing the gap between the regional inequalities, and creating better country image on the eyes of the foreigners by stimulating entrepreneurship in tourism industry (Akkemik, 2012; Tosun & Jenkins, 1996). The Turkish government offered number of incentive for the adaptation of development shift approach (Akkemik, 2012; Tosun, 1998; Tosun & Jenkins, 1996). Bahar (2006) points that tourism created number of benefits on Turkish economy and prosperity; based on empirical study yet ignored the qualitative dimension of tourism development process.

Turkey benefited greatly from tourism development in quantitative terms (Okuyucu, 2013). However, the negative impacts in terms of ecological, environmental and sociocultural aspects were not measured qualitatively approaches. It is also argued that coastal tourism development plans significantly damage the environment leading the public authorities to adopt changes tourism activity types.

The negative impact of tourism development is revealed and discussed by many prominent authors such as Bianchi (2018), P. Burns (1999), Inskeep (1988), and Tosun (2002). Majority of the cited authors state that tourism has been under the influence of the neoliberal policies which only focus on the short-term economic benefits instead of creating sustainable tourism development that benefit overall the Turkish society. Turkey promoted international tourism as a panacea that would cure economic problems as private organizations with or without liability and capital benefited from the incentives that national government provided. The financial capital approach ignored the potential threats of uncontrolled and favorite tourism in the realm of natural, cultural, social, historical and ecological capitals. Lastly, this approach proved that land-use planning is essential for the long-term sustainability of the resources. It is clear that uncontrolled, quantity oriented approach won't hesitate to exploit even the most valuable 'the riches of the virgin lands' (Alipour, 1996) as already occurred at many destinations throughout Turkey.

Comer (2014) argues that tourism operates as a laissez-faire industry, indicating that free market ideology is the predominant ideological framework worldwide. Certain political ideologies, like neoliberalism and globalization, influence the success or failure of development plans in general (Song, Li, & Cao, 2017). Therefore, a well-prepared tourism development plan should be implemented by considering the characteristics of each destination such as its sociocultural values, economic resources, tourism perceptions of local people and potential risks of the archeological, ecological and historical assets and physical capital of the destinations. As Nohutçu (2002) argues that the planners should create "coherent, feasible, and proactive policies" in order to achieve the desired goals and objectives of tourism development plan. This may not reverse the environmental deteriorations that took place in the past in the short term, but it may, at least, preserve the present assets and values in the country.

On the other hand, studies in tourism literature overemphasize sustainability in a way as if; it is a magic word that maximizes the outcome of tourism for all involved (Elmo, Arcese, Valeri, Poponi, & Pacchera, 2020; Uralovich et al., 2023). The assumption proposes that once tourism activities begin, all the challenges, difficulties that a community faces will be resolved smoothly whilst the quality of life is to be improved

and the cost of living decreases (Song et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2018). Although that theoretical approach sounds impressive the number of academic studies indicating that this type of development has many failures is not negligible (Katircioglu, 2009, 2010; Pratt, 2015).

2.6. Creation of Special Tourism Infrastructure on Coastal Turkey (Coastal Development)

The Turkish government issued the Tourism Encouragement Law in 1982 to initiate an effective tourism development, primarily benefiting investors with incentives on coastal destinations (Bahar, 2006; Nohutçu, 2002). The endorsement of financial incentives improved the economic and physical superstructure at national and regional levels. The government selected the 'priority tourism zones' on the Mediterranean, placing Antalya at the center of development (Nohutçu, 2002). The World Bank allocated key funds (US\$26 million) to meet the cost of creating special tourism infrastructure for the region. The World Bank allocated this fund to finance communication, facilities, electricity, power, sewage systems, and the construction of a hotel for employee training and education at Kemer (Nohutçu, 2002).

Special tourism infrastructure primarily takes the form of physical structures and is confined to land. The superstructure of tourism includes training and educating guides, creating information centers, operating hotels, and travel firms for both international and domestic travelers. Tourism significantly contributes to the improvement of infrastructure in line with economic prosperity. The local and national authorities have a responsibility to ensure innovative and sophisticated tourist facilities at destinations. As more visitors arrive and bigger airports and roads are built, public transportation is improved (Pratt, 2015). Governments are responsible for ensuring the provision of quality telecommunication and electricity services. To be more prosperous and increase welfare, a destination should offer modern facilities for both local people and visitors; this can be done by changing the structure of the local economic system. Hotels and restaurants alone cannot meet the needs of tourists. The needs of tourists cannot be met solely by hotels and restaurants. Tourism planners, investors, and authorities should collaborate to provide additional amenities such as gas stations, banks, airstrips, information centers, proper sidewalks, public transportation, and other relevant physical infrastructure and superstructure facilities. A destination with all the facilities will attract foreigners and boost the local economic growth in a span of time.

2.7. Locals and the Need for Local Business Opportunities

The tourism industry utilizes the community as a resource to produce goods and services, and in exchange, tourism-related economic activities are anticipated to enhance the welfare of the local populace. The nature of seasonal employment, as previously discussed, creates numerous obstacles for the tourism industry. However, Seckelmann (2002) claims that tourism allowed the local people to have a supplementary income source without shifting their traditional economic activity, which is generally agriculture-based production. In other words, many local people at touristic destinations opened markets, local restaurants, coffee shops, and souvenir stores for tourists, which resulted in economic growth local communities. On the other hand, Pratt (2015) asserts that the constraints on local natural and financial resources lead to increased resource leakages, resulting in significant losses for both local communities and governments. Hence, in order to raise the living standards of poor communities, involvement of the more vulnerable groups should be involved in tourism businesses as an employee or local business owner (Alam & Paramati, 2016).

2.8. Effects of Tourism on Socio-cultural Resources

The social values, cultural legacy, and assets of a local community provide the primary resource for the tourism business. Tourism exerts a reciprocal influence on societal values nationwide. Interactions between residents and tourists generate substantial outcomes and attitudes that shape the trajectory of tourism growth (Akova & Atsiz, 2019). Consequently, it is essential to ascertain the elements that influence the negative or positive attitudes and perceptions of the sociocultural values of host communities and visitors (Su, Huang, & Huang, 2018). Inhabitants who have been in their towns, villages, and cities for generations encountered strangers with diverse cultures, beliefs, and lifestyles, seeking an improved quality of life without compromising their sociocultural values, both tangible and intangible.

Tourism, reliant on human connection, inevitably results in problems stemming from development. Although the majority of existing literature suggests that tourism adversely affects sociocultural values (Akova & Atsiz, 2019), there are other studies acknowledging the beneficial impact of tourist development on these values (Moyle, Weiler, & Croy, 2013; Su, Huang, & Huang, 2018).

2.9. Impact of Tourism on Quality of Life

Studies indicate that measuring improvements in a country's quality of life through tourism is a challenging task (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Pearce, 2011). Quantitative measurements, such as the amount of foreign visitor expenditures, the number of visitors, and the accommodation capacity, can be misleading when used as indicators of a country's improved quality of life. For Turkey, in addition to generating foreign exchange earnings and establishing a favorable destination image in foreign countries, the government has been promoting the tourism industry for decades with the goal of achieving a better quality of life. Therefore, the planners positioned the development of tourism at the core of their overall development strategies.

However, several critical challenges arose during the development plan and implementation phases, which were intended to enhance the quality of life. As a matter of fact, the following issues are observed in many tourism planning approaches: First, in many tourism development strategies, the plan was designed by the central governmental organizations. To achieve the planning objectives, the central governmental organizations took mainly a one-fits-all (P. Burns, 2004) and top-to-down approach (Ghaderi, Fakhari, Shekari, & Saberi, 2024). Secondly, the lack of awareness of socioeconomic, cultural, and environmental resources, which would be vulnerable if not preserved through controlled planning efforts, led to the neglect of local community participation. Thirdly, the relationships between power and status holders posed serious challenges in achieving sustainable goals for all parties involved in the tourism development process.

Overall prosperity and welfare of a community are profound life indicators of living in a quality social environment. As people's lives improve by being involved in tourism activities, then one can expect them to be more motivated and encouraged to sustain higher life standards. Tourism necessitates the presence of staff who possess pleasant, kind, and positive attitudes. These attitudes not only enhance customer satisfaction and organizational productivity, but also foster a sense of attachment and destination loyalty among visitors (Stylos & Bellou).

2.10. The Effects of Tourism on Inequality in Social Class Groups

The economic policies of the 1980s not only sought to address the country's poverty but also aimed to enhance the welfare and prosperity of the nation, thereby fostering a robust economic development that would benefit every citizen. However, the development's primary focus on economic growth and infrastructure led to the neglect of natural and sociocultural resources (Yolal, 2016).

The fulfillment of justice and equality standards creates a sense of control, predictability, satisfaction, and trust in the complexity of social interaction; hence, it enhances mental and physical well-being (Costa-Lopes, Dovidio, Pereira, & Jost, 2013). The aforementioned statement holds true and valid across all sectors of tourism, adding an additional dimension. Social equality is also crucial for the entire community's welfare, prosperity, and productivity. Ensuring fair treatment and equitable benefits from economic growth is crucial. If the industry fails to achieve fairness, the entire society does not reap the benefits.

One of the biggest paradoxes of tourism development is the creation of social inequality, despite the fact that tourism promotes and offers certain opportunities to all the shareholders in the community (P. Burns, 1999). Some ideological approaches, such as neoliberal policy-oriented free market philosophy and so-called globalization, play a significant role in this major challenge that many destinations face (P. Burns, 1999; Rosenmann, Reese, & Cameron, 2016). Therefore, tourism planners involved all stakeholders in the redesign of tourism plans to ensure that the entire society can reap the benefits of tourism development without restricting the benefits to those who invest significant amounts of capital.

2.11. Social Identity

An individual inherits their social identity from generation to generation and must preserve it to distinguish it from other societies. When scholars highlight the importance of social values, they also view identity as a crucial value in answering the question, "Who am I?" (P. M. Burns & Novelli, 2006). Even though tourism development plans prioritize economic growth over social values, the constant interaction with foreigners from different cultures, societies, and nations does not lead to people, whether local or seasonal, losing their identity. However, one cannot ignore the fact that the foreign lifestyle did not impact on the local people at the destination.

Lastly, interactions with others shape an individual's social identity. Since tourism heavily relies on human interaction, its influence on social identity is greater than that of many other industries. Members of a particular society share numerous commonalities, including their faith, traditions, rituals, and homeland. In order to maintain self-esteem, members must fulfill their physical, mental, and spiritual needs through active and direct communication and affiliations within their society (Costa-Lopes et al., 2013). This interaction strengthens their connections with each other. As they interact with foreigners, this tie may weaken. Therefore, it will be worthwhile investigating this relationship and/or its impact in greater detail.

2.12. Evaluation of the Characteristics of Employment in Tourism

Tourism creates employment opportunities for people with or without sufficient skills. As tourism reports indicate, the tourism industry helps Turkish people obtain jobs, in particular during the peak tourist seasons. But the majority of these employees do not have any previous tourism-related job experience. Therefore, training the young people for the tourism industry is crucial for the industry. However, despite all the state policies and training efforts, there were serious shortages of qualified workers during the 1980s and 1990s.

Due to seasonality, tourism employees have to ensure that they survive financially throughout the year. Furthermore, they frequently fail to register with the social security system. Hence, they lack health insurance and/or any other income to cope with their daily lives (Çalışkan & Özkoç, 2020). Therefore, the government policies should also provide some incentives for the seasonal employees to keep motivated and trained so that the industry will have qualified and efficient employees for the upcoming years/seasons. This is a highly efficient solution that one can anticipate from the public authorities.

Human capital refers to qualified employees who possess knowledge, sufficient awareness, and ethical values, which enhance internal business operations and increase the productivity of organizations (Kasa, Kho, Yong, Hussain, & Lau, 2020). Hence, retention of human capital as the core pillar of the organization is one of the most challenging duties of the tourism industry. There are numerous benefits to having qualified human capital, such as cost savings due to reduced employment turnover and achieving sustainability goals for the organization. Tourism relies on the human capital, primarily employment opportunities created by the tourism industry. The creation of employment opportunities has a significant economic impact on both the supply and demand sides of tourism activities (Balaguer & Cantavella-Jorda, 2002). Local, regional, and national tourism planners should evaluate all these opportunities to better plan and implement policies, minimizing the negative impacts of tourism and maximizing the benefits of qualified employees.

2.13. Generation of Tourist Foreign Exchange

Foreign exchange revenues are a primary motivator for the development policies of Turkish tourism. The nation urgently need foreign exchange for international trade, servicing loans from global institutions, addressing unemployment, enhancing infrastructure, and resolving the macroeconomic issues of the 1970s and 1980s (Nohutçu, 2002). The issue was acquiring foreign cash from overseas entities and allocating it according to relationships among political factions and capital proprietors. A tourism development plan necessitates a cost-benefit analysis to guarantee substantial profitability from the investment (Nohutçu, 2002; Tosun & Jenkins, 1996). The neoliberal strategy, which prioritized financial outcomes in development, resulted in significant impediments, including environmental degradation and the exacerbation of social class disparities.

2.14. From the Environmental Perspective

Sustainable tourism development requires all tourism shareholders to ensure that they are concerned about the vitality of the finite natural resources and balance of the ecosystem. However, even the largest international institutions and national governments, who play major roles in the tourism industry, struggle to determine how to measure the detrimental effects of tourism activities. As previously mentioned, most of them are primarily focused on gathering numerical data for their economic barometer. However, none of them have developed a scale to measure the extent to which a destination or facility produces greenhouse gas emissions that harm the atmosphere and threaten the lives of all living things, including the loss of rivers, lands, forests, biodiversity, and more (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019). Whether through leftist or rightist approaches, current strategies, including Turkish tourism development plans, have irreparably and irreversibly damaged the environment. Therefore, it would be prudent to consider creating new tourism development plans that prioritize environmental sustainability.

3. Conclusion and Recommendations

Despite the sophisticated ideologies, novel ideas, and state-of-the-art digital age we live in, along with extensive experiences from history, it appears that humans continue to “saw off the branch on which they are sitting.” A development plan, whether it is tourism-related or not, should compromise not only the current generations' needs and expectations but also the generations to come. Regardless of the management of the tourism development process, certain essential issues and fundamental objectives remain paramount in the tourism development approach. A primary objective of tourism is to establish a sustainable and amicable socio-economic enterprise that aligns with the environmental, social, and cultural values of the local population. The influx of international visitors to destinations creates numerous opportunities for local populations. Local communities have new sources of income, either through the production of goods or the provision of labor resulting from tourism activities. Increased local involvement correlates with heightened income in their hometown. Each destination has its own unique characteristics—natural, cultural, historical, and ecological values—that cannot be replaced or traded off with any quantitative value, such as the high number of visitors or maximized tourism receipts.

As previously discussed, the implementation of laissez-faire-oriented, so-called neoliberalism-based tourism approaches has dramatically failed. This approach prioritized tourism organizations and international corporations in development plans, disregarding the needs of residents and the significance of maintaining ecosystem balance. On the other hand, the second approach highlighted the needs of society and aimed at improving the life standards of the citizens in certain territories. From the perspective of tourism development in Turkey, the country has implemented both top-down approaches. However, these approaches have failed to foster sustainable tourism, achieve universal values, or generate balanced and significant economic growth equally across the country. Hence, the country must convene stakeholders, including experts from each region, to formulate destination-oriented development plans aimed at achieving objectives and resolving the issue of income inequality among the regions.

Therefore, this review paper suggests that it is the responsibility of planners, investors, and public authorities to consider the most crucial aspects of the tourism development process to achieve the goals and objectives of sustainable tourism development at all levels. People with poor quality of life may not exhibit positive attitudes during social interactions with visitors, whether foreign or domestic, due to unequal income levels, unfair life opportunities, and environmental degradation. Therefore, influential parties such as policymakers, developers, and authorities, in alignment with social scientists, should consider the prosperity and welfare of society with utmost attention. This review paper recommends the scholars investigate the major development ideologies with concrete evidence. We also recommend using comparison analyses to better understand each ideological perspective from various angles.

3.1 Limitation of Research

Every study may possess certain limitations. This study has limitations, including the absence of quantitative data from primary sources due to reliance on the theoretical framework of existing studies.

The absence of primary data constrains the generalizability of the findings of this significant work. It is therefore advisable for future studies to undertake quantitative research to mitigate such difficulties.

Finansman/ Grant Support

Yazar(lar) bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

The author(s) declared that this study has received no financial support.

Çıkar Çatışması/ Conflict of Interest

Yazar(lar) çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Açık Erişim Lisansı/ Open Access License

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY NC).

Bu makale, Creative Commons Atıf-GayriTicari 4.0 Uluslararası Lisansı (CC BY NC) ile lisanslanmıştır.

References

- Akkemik, K. A. (2012). Assessing The Importance Of International Tourism For The Turkish Economy: A Social Accounting Matrix Analysis. *Tourism management*, 33(4), pp. 790-801.
- Akova, O., & Atsız, O. (2019). Sociocultural Impacts Of Tourism Development On Heritage Sites. In *The Routledge handbook of tourism impacts* (pp. 252-264): Routledge.
- Alam, M. S., & Paramati, S. R. (2016). The impact Of Tourism On Income Inequality In Developing Economies: Does Kuznets Curve Hypothesis Exist? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, pp. 111-126.
- Alipour, H. (1996). Tourism Development Within Planning Paradigms: The Case Of Turkey. *Tourism management*, 17(5), pp. 367-377.
- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2011). Exploring The Nature Of Tourism And Quality Of Life Perceptions Among Residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), pp. 248-260.
- Asmelash, A. G., & Kumar, S. (2019). Assessing Progress Of Tourism Sustainability: Developing And Validating Sustainability Indicators. *Tourism management*, 71, pp. 67-83.
- Bahar, O. (2006). Turizm Sektörünün Türkiye'nin Ekonomik Büyümesi Üzerindeki Etkisi: Var Analizi Yaklaşımı. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(2), pp. 137-150.
- Balaguer, J., & Cantavella-Jorda, M. (2002). Tourism As A Long-Run Economic Growth Factor: The Spanish Case. *Applied economics*, 34(7), pp. 877-884.
- Bianchi, R. (2018). The Political Economy Of Tourism Development: A Critical Review. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 70, pp. 88-102.
- Burns, P. (1999). Paradoxes In Planning Tourism Elitism Or Brutalism? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), pp. 329-348.
- Burns, P. M. (2004). Tourism Planning: A Third Way? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1), pp. 24-43.
- Burns, P. M., & Novelli, M. (2006). *Tourism and social identities*: Routledge.
- Comer, D. C. (2014). Threats To The Archaeological Heritage In The Laissez-Faire World Of Tourism: The Need For Global Standards As A Global Public Good. *Public Archaeology*, 13(1-3), pp. 123-134.
- Costa-Lopes, R., Dovidio, J. F., Pereira, C. R., & Jost, J. T. (2013). Social Psychological Perspectives On The Legitimation Of Social Inequality: Past, Present And Future. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(4), pp. 229-237.
- Çalışkan, N., & Özkoç, A. G. (2020). Turizm Sektöründe Algılanan İş Güvencesizliği Ve İstihdam Edilebilirlik: Konaklama İşletmeleri Örneği. *Alanya Akademik Bakış*, 4(3), pp. 683-711.
- Dwyer, L. (2023). Tourism Development And Sustainable Well-Being: A Beyond GDP Perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(10), pp. 2399-2416.

- Elmo, G. C., Arcese, G., Valeri, M., Poponi, S., & Pacchera, F. (2020). Sustainability In Tourism As An Innovation Driver: An Analysis Of Family Business Reality. *Sustainability*, 12(15), p. 6149.
- Ghaderi, Z., Fakhari, S., Shekari, F., & Saberi, M. (2024). Community Capacity Building And Indigenous Tourism In Iran. *Anatolia*, pp. 1-16.
- Giddens, A. (2003). *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*: Taylor & Francis.
- Gunn, C. A. (1988). *Tourism Planning*. (No. Ed. 2, p. 357).
- Hajian, M., & Kashani, S. J. (2021). Evolution of the Concept of Sustainability. From Brundtland Report to Sustainable Development Goals. In *Sustainable resource management* (pp. 1-24): Elsevier.
- Hughes, E., & Scheyvens, R. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility In Tourism Post-2015: A Development First Approach. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(5), pp. 469-482.
- Inskip, E. (1988). Tourism Planning: An Emerging Specialization. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 54(3), pp. 360-372.
- Kasa, M., Kho, J., Yong, D., Hussain, K., & Lau, P. (2020). Competently Skilled Human Capital Through Education For The Hospitality And Tourism Industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 12(2), pp. 175-184.
- Katircioglu, S. T. (2009). Revisiting The Tourism-Led-Growth Hypothesis For Turkey Using The Bounds Test And Johansen Approach For Cointegration. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), pp. 17-20.
- Katircioglu, S. T. (2010). International Tourism, Higher Education And Economic Growth: The Case Of North Cyprus. *The World Economy*, 33(12), pp. 1955-1972.
- Kosmas, P., & Vatikioti, A. (2024). Beyond Neoliberal Tourism: A Critical Review. *Managing Natural and Cultural Heritage for a Durable Tourism*, pp. 85-97.
- Moyle, B. D., Weiler, B., & Croy, G. (2013). Visitors' Perceptions Of Tourism Impacts: Bruny And Magnetic Islands, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(3), pp. 392-406.
- Nguyen, C. P., Schinckus, C., Su, T. D., & Chong, F. H. L. (2021). The Influence Of Tourism On Income Inequality. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(7), pp. 1426-1444.
- Nohutçu, A. (2002). Development Of Tourism Policies In Turkey Throughout The Republican Period In Socio-Political, Economic And Administrative Perspective: From State-Sponsored Development To Various Forms Of Cooperation. *Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9, pp. 1-25.
- Okuyucu, A. (2013). Tourism Development In Turkey: Development Process, Challenges, And Patterns. *International Journal of Social Science*, 6(7), pp. 815-827.
- Olssen, M. (2020). Globalisation, Neoliberalism And Laissez-Faire: The Retreat From Naturalism. *Globalisation, Ideology and Neo-Liberal Higher Education Reforms*, pp. 121-140.
- Pearce, P. L. (2011). Relationships And The Tourism Experience: Challenges For Quality-Of-Life Assessments. *Handbook of tourism and quality-of-life research: Enhancing the lives of tourists and residents of host communities*, pp. 9-29.
- Pratt, S. (2015). The Economic Impact Of Tourism In SIDS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, pp. 148-160.
- Rosenmann, A., Reese, G., & Cameron, J. E. (2016). Social Identities In A Globalized World: Challenges And Opportunities For Collective Action. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11(2), pp. 202-221.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring The Tourism-Poverty Nexus. *Current issues in tourism*, 10(2-3), pp. 231-254.
- Seckelmann, A. (2002). Domestic Tourism—A Chance For Regional Development In Turkey? *Tourism Management*, 23(1), pp. 85-92.

- Song, H., Li, G., & Cao, Z. (2017). Tourism And Economic Globalization: An Emerging Research Agenda. *Journal of Travel Research*, 0047287517734943.
- Stylos, N., & Bellou, V. (2019). Investigating Tourists' Revisit Proxies: The Key Role Of Destination Loyalty And Its Dimensions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(7), pp.1123-1145.
- Su, L., Huang, S., & Huang, J. (2018). Effects Of Destination Social Responsibility And Tourism Impacts On Residents' Support For Tourism And Perceived Quality Of Life. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42(7), pp.1039-1057.
- Tosun, C. (1998). Roots Of Unsustainable Tourism Development At The Local Level: The Case Of Urgup In Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 19(6), pp. 595-610.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host Perceptions Of Impacts: A Comparative Tourism Study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), pp. 231-253.
- Tosun, C., & Jenkins, C. L. (1996). Regional Planning Approaches To Tourism Development: The Case Of Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 17(7), pp. 519-531.
- Tosun, C., & Timothy, D. J. (2001). Shortcomings In Planning Approaches To Tourism Development In Developing Countries: The Case Of Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(7), pp. 352-359.
- Tribe, J. (2009). *Philosophical Issues In Tourism* (Vol. 37): Channel view publications Bristol.
- Uralovich, K. S., Toshmamatovich, T. U., Kubayevich, K. F., Sapaev, I., Saylaubaevna, S. S., Beknazarova, Z., & Khurramov, A. (2023). A Primary Factor In Sustainable Development And Environmental Sustainability Is Environmental Education. *Caspian Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 21(4), pp. 965-975.
- Wced, U. (1987). Our Common Future. In: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Wu, T.-P., Wu, H.-C., Liu, S.-B., & Hsueh, S.-J. (2018). The Relationship Between International Tourism Activities And Economic Growth: Evidence From China's Economy. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 15(4), p. 365-381.
- Yolal, M. (2016). History Of Tourism Development In Turkey. In *Alternative Tourism in Turkey* (pp. 23-33): Springer.
- Zhang, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Tourism, Transport Infrastructure And Income Inequality: A Panel Data Analysis Of China. *Current issues in tourism*, 25(10), pp. 1607-1626.
- Zvaigzne, A., Litavniece, L., & Dembovska, I. (2022). Tourism Seasonality: The Causes And Effects. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 14(5), pp. 421-430.