



## International Journal of Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-9380

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 14 • Number 11 • 2017

# The Relationship Between Quality of Life And Tourism: The Case of Alanya Region

Volkan Altintas<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Woosong University, Sol International Hotel Management (SIHOM), South Korea

## ABSTRACT

Quality of life is a concept expressing the state of human life. In literature, this concept is referred as a blend defined with different terms which are affected by numerous situations and factors. Intention to develop tourism without appropriate planning and by ignoring local values would culturally, environmentally and economically harm local communities. Minimizing this harm and gaining maximum advantage from tourism by using accurate resources depends on the proper perception of touristic development by local people. Behaviors of local community based on this perception are of capital importance for continuity and sustainability of tourism in the region. The objective of this study is exposing the perception of tourism of local community in Alanya, one of the most important destinations for Turkish Tourism and determine the state of touristic development pursuant to their perceived quality of life.

**Keywords:** Quality of life, local people, Alanya, Turkey.

## 1. QUALITY OF LIFE

The phrase “quality of life” has been regarded as “living conditions” by scientists since 1960’s. Involving numerous subjects like transportation, hygienic conditions in cities and public health, the phrase was renamed as “quality of life” after the nineties and sociologists began using it in their researches. Nowadays, on the other hand, it became a concept having more than one definitions and meaning of which changes depending on different points of view (economic and social). Generally speaking, quality of life is explained as the ratio between the supply and demand of all services and conditions needed by humans and includes the factors below as a complicated list of indicators:

- Standards of outer and inner spaces (such as environmental pollution, qualities of natural environment, usage of green fields);

- Welfare of citizens (income level, unemployment rate, crime rate);
- Diversity and quality of services (education, entertainment, public health, public transport, municipal services, good governance) (Yıldız, 2007).

In a study conducted by World Health Organization in fifteen different countries aiming to assess the quality of life, it was aimed to develop an internationally measurable scale including 4500 different concepts. As a result of a test study, six dimensions and twenty-nine fields are determined. These six dimensions are physical, psychological, independence level, social relations, environment and personal beliefs respectively (WHOQOL, 2002, p.1569).

Generally, the concept of quality of life is trying to be explained with interchangeable concepts such as welfare, wealth, the standard of living, power, happiness, fulfillment of needs and development (Cascante, 2008, p.22). The quality of life is also regarded as a part of sustainable living. The concept of quality of life comes into prominence in efforts to present sustainability philosophy of life in every sense. The concept of quality of life is a source of inspiration for many types of research performed and takes an important place in local and national agendas. Having a profound effect on social and economic policies, the concept of quality of life is included within the scopes of many types of research and studies in many fields such as city planning, social and/or economic indicators, mental and physical health (Selma, 2004). While the quality of life can be expressed as contentment and happiness felt of life, it can also be described as the way individuals perceive their situation within a system of culture and values. The quality of life includes physical functions, psychological states, social relations within the family and outside, interaction with environment and beliefs of humans (WHOQOL, 2002, p.1574). Taillefer et al., (2003, s. 299) state that there are three different approaches to explain the concept of quality of life and establish relations between quality of life and other concepts (like a model): The first one is a conceptual model. The model in line with this approach should include dimensions and characteristics of quality of life. The second one is the conceptual frame. In this approach, direct relations between dimensions or elements of quality of life are estimates, explained or described. The third one is the theoretical frame. This model deals with the concept of quality of life by way of a theory explaining structures of elements and the relations between them. This model is regarded as the most complicated one. Felce and Perry (1995, p.55) approach the conceptualization of quality of life in four different ways: The concept of quality of life is defined as a combination of living conditions and personal satisfaction by considering living conditions, satisfaction with life, living conditions and personal fulfillment and the importance level of quality of life.

## **2. COMPONENTS OF QUALITY OF LIFE**

### **Economic Welfare Level**

Economic welfare level is the most important element argued in so many studies regarding standard of living, socio-economic status, financial status, personal assets, income, sheltering and employment (Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers, 1976; Sirgy, 1998; Cummins, 1997). It is believed in communities that people with more money happier than others. Campbell (1976) revealed that money is one of the most important components, if not the most important one, for the perception of quality of life. Veenhoven (1991, p.22) determined an important relation between income and happiness in a cross-cultural and cross-domain study he conducted. Beside this Diener and Suh (1997, p.192) found out that the happiness level in countries

which achieved a rapid economic growth after world war two didn't change at all. Lane (1991) concluded that successful people in the business world are proud of themselves due to their success and this feeling plays an important role in overall satisfaction with life.

### **Inherent Welfare Level**

Inherent welfare level is a concept mainly addressing one's inner world and including spare time activities, religion, recreation and hobbies (Cummins, 1997, p. 307). The concept of spare time is described with different phrases and measured by researchers of the quality of life. Spare time welfare level is argued about in the shape of spare time satisfaction, satisfaction when not working, family activities, spare time activities and spare time experience (Kim, 2002, p. 58). There are a lot of factors affecting spare time. Choice of activities in line with abilities, autonomy, and individual differences can become prominent (Argyle and Lu, 1990, p. 1257). Another prominent concept of inherent welfare level is religious or spiritual activities. This is also discussed in the literature as one of the important factors affecting the quality of life. While people's efforts to achieve their purposes of life, for example fighting against a disease positively affect spiritual welfare other factors connected with anxiety, depression, psychology, and health has negative impacts on human soul (Kim, 2002, p. 60).

### **Health and Security**

Being healthy is a natural, sustainable and improvable characteristic of humans. It is also a basic need and it is determinant in terms of quality of life. When human life is assessed in general, health is one of the important factors affecting human life. For example, an old but healthy person might be more pleased with life (Maddox and Douglass, 1978, p. 87). Sirgh, Gao, and Young (2008, p. 94) revealed that the satisfaction with personal health creates a pleasing impact throughout the society. While physical, psychological and social aspects are being focused in terms of health and security welfare, description and measurement by World Health Organization are taken into consideration more (Sirgy et. al., 2006, p. 403). A healthy person would work, fully benefit from their right of education, generate income, improve themselves by establishing social relations, feel secure, and be productive and fruitful. They would think, decide and behave more accurately. Consequently, they can participate social, economic and political life to the extent they can do these, be satisfied and happy and maintain a more quality life.

### **Welfare Level of Society**

Policy producers in societies have been focusing on regional economic development but now they also began emphasizing socio-economic concepts more and more. Therefore the welfare level of society has a very important impact on quality of life as a whole. When explaining welfare of society emphasis is laid on roles of education, infrastructural and superstructural services, social relations, measures to make people feel secure, media and local service providers (Cummins, 1997, p. 308). Studies conducted reveal that ensuring society's satisfaction leads the local community to positively contribute to their own quality of life (Kim, 2002, p. 57). Benefiting from work services and provision of non-profit and government services give satisfaction to society to a great extent (Sirgy and Cornwell, 2001, p. 127). Similarly, the quality of these services also an important factor affecting the welfare level of society.

### **3. STUDIES REGARDING TOURISM AND QUALITY OF LIFE**

Travels induce physical and spiritual relief in lives and quality of life of tourists. In certain circumstances perception of this relief by the local community is also stated as the experience of quality of life. Being an important part of the development of tourism local communities are sharers of tourism where all impacts of tourism can easily be recognized. Development of tourism should be directed towards converting economic, socio-cultural and environmental effects of tourism into a benefit for the local community and increase the quality of life (Latkova, 2008, p.28).

Tourism is an economic perception to increase the quality of life via employment opportunities, economic differences, festivals, restaurants, natural and cultural attractions and recreational opportunities (Andereck et. al., 2005, p.1062). Jurowski (1998, p.25) states that local communities which have more powerful feelings for communities would be more supportive for the development of tourism. He predicts that this consequence would make the local community to have more optimistic thoughts regarding tourism and quality of life. Van Kamp, Leidelmeijer, and Marsman (2003, p.9) approach to the concept of quality of life with an understanding that combines measurable spatial, physical and social components of environment and manner of perception of these components and accordingly assesses varying individual perceptions not only in terms of objective characteristics but also their individual impacts. Szalai (1980, p.11) associates quality of life with individual's existence, welfare and level of satisfaction with life and states that quality of life is shaped by objective realities and factors on one hand and subjective factors based on personal perception and assessment on the other.

Aspinall (2006, p.99) asserts that physical, social and individual capital are affected as external variables and at the end of the adaptation period to be revealed within the concept of sustainability, components of capital and naturally quality of life would enhance. In literature, there are so few studies regarding the impacts of development of tourism on the quality of life. Mostly perception of tourism by the local community and local community's perspective on tourism are examined. The most important difference between studies regarding quality of life and impacts of tourism is measurement. While it is predicted that tourism is affected by communities and environment in perception-perspective studies, impacts of tourism on communal, regional and individual satisfaction along with impacts on family or individual are measured in studies regarding quality of life. Behavioral and impact studies concentrate on changes in society and support to the development of tourism. It is assumed in these studies that there is a predicted relation between satisfaction with life and characteristics of the community (Allen, 1990, p. 184). It is observed that studies on quality of life are mostly discussed in social sciences and implemented in North America. Studies on quality of life are one of the important discussion topics especially in social sciences within the last twenty years in Europe and other continents. Numerous researchers studying quality of life tried to develop theories by taking impact fields in relation to quality of life such as health, employment, spare time, family, community into consideration. When we explore the relation between quality of life and tourism in literature, we see that studies on quality of life rather concentrate on business life, health, family, and individual and some studies regarding impacts of service quality in tourism, spare time and travel tendencies of tourists on quality of life are being made in recent years. Dalia and Juozas (2007, p.45) stated that the factors affecting quality of life are financial status (assets, service, economic quality, work and recreational activities, average income, purchasing power), environmental quality (level of benefiting from natural resources, sustainable development, quality of air, soil and water), quality of health of population

(public health), quality of education, moral and psychological climate (in family, community, country, an organization), personal safety (physical, legal and social), self-expression. As a result of these factors, changes will occur in the quality of life based on health, financial life, mental life, business life, family life spare time and environment and overall level of quality of life will be determined. Cascante (2008, p.6) tried to reveal the relation between quality of life in rural areas and the relation between services and resources of communities in Liberia and Costa Rica, economies of which are mainly based on tourism. In accordance with results, it is emphasized that current organizational conditions and communal relations should be considered more to improve the quality of life of society. Moscardo (2009, p.159) tried to actualize the impacts of tourism on the quality of life to be discussed more openly via qualitative analysis by taking social representation to the forefront as the concept of quality of life is mostly discussed as one of the impacts of tourism. Benckendorff et. al., (2009, p.181) approached the relation between quality of life and tourism from different angles in the brainstorming they performed on the quality of life and stated that the new concepts and dimensions with the quality of life are argued on differently from the past. Standard of living, health, safety, sense of belonging to a community, success in life, relations, securing the future and spirituality are taken as dimensions of quality of life and brainstorming technique is used. Discussions about the quality of life showed that topics such as slow tourism (Mission to regain the naturalness and reality destroyed by technology) and health tourism are new subjects to discuss in the academic field. Andereck et. al., (2007, p.485) stated that it had been researched whether the local community acts basing on the sustainability concept regarding their decisions about development of tourism and quality of life or not in academic studies conducted within last twenty years but there are no studies with respect to ethnic groups and minorities are being affected differently by tourism. Therefore they have explored the perceptions of Latin America and Anglo-origin people of tourism and quality of life in terms of ethnic marginal theory. It is seen that both groups have differences in their perspectives of tourism.

Jurowski and Brown (2001, s.357) stated that tourism provides economic benefits to local communities and improves the quality of life. They revealed in their study that people related to tourism have a higher quality of life than the ones not related to. Even though there is no significant difference in terms of statistics, in a study conducted in Lexington, Kentucky showed that there are differences in the support of both groups to the development of cultural tourism's infrastructure. Moreover, it is seen that people dealing with tourism have important impacts on decision mechanisms and they affect public policies on the improvement of the quality of life. Cummins (1997, p.303) reported hundred and seventy-three different terms suggested with regard to satisfaction with life by assessing thirty-two different studies. Later on, these terms are classified and seven dimensions of quality of life are expressed. These dimensions are; the level of economic welfare, health, productivity, sincerity, welfare level of society and inherent welfare level. These dimensions are regarded as Com Qolin literature. Perdue, Long, and Kang (1999, p.173) approached to life curve of tourism in terms of sociology by considering the impacts of game tourism (gambling etc.) on the quality of life of the local community. In accordance with the results, while the quality of life of local people shows a positive improvement during the first periods of the development of tourism but as the bearing capacity is exceeded, this process enters in a negative process. Dillman and Tremblay (1977, p.126), tried to measure the quality of life in three processes in their study exploring rural areas of USA. They dealt with the level of economic welfare, objective indicators and subjective indicators and quality of life respectively. Even though it is assumed that objective conditions in certain fields such as level of economic welfare and benefiting from public services are not properly met for local people in rural areas

the study showed that people in rural areas have better conditions than local people in urban areas in terms of financial and social environment. Karnitis (2006, p.133) had the objective to improve the quality of life for the development of Latvia in his study. In this study, where it is stated that quality of life is important for Latvia due to numerous different components, it is demonstrated that participation of local people to the process is one of the most important conditions to improve the quality of life. Concepts like being informed, education, creativity, employment, financial welfare, environmental consciousness, infrastructure services, regional development, human resources, health, safety, domestic and family life, adaptation to community, democracy, domestic safety, private life, corporate administration, foreign relations, openness to information, involvement, legitimacy, balanced growth, national identity, culture, language and spare time are described as the prominent components of quality of life for Latvia.

Nichols, Stitt, and Giacomassi (2002, p.257) researched how local people perceive casinos which are important for regional development with regard to tourism and how casinos affect the quality of life of local people. In this study, a total of 2768 people have been reached by phone. The results show that local people find casinos favorable in terms of economy but casinos generally don't have any impacts on quality of life. When their impact on quality of life from the viewpoint of families is explored, it is found that negative and positive impacts of casinos are fifty-fifty. Perdue and Gustke (1991) tried to explain the relation between the objective measurement of local people's quality of life and tourism. In the study, the relation between the level of development in North Carolina, USA and objective measurements like health, murders, education, economy and level of welfare is considered. In accordance with the results, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the level of development of tourism and age, there is a very weak relation between income and development of tourism, educational expenses are much more in touristic regions and health care services become prominent in regions with intensive development of tourism. Another result of study is that there is no connection between the rate of murders and development of tourism. Baker and Palmer (2006, p.396) researched perception of recreational activities by local people and impacts of these activities on quality of life in their study. In accordance with the results obtained from three hundred and fifty-two questionnaires during this study conducted in South-West America, there is a negative relation between participation in recreational activities and local people's presence in region and quality of life.

Michalko et al., (2009, p.122) explored impacts of tourism on subjective quality of life of Hungarians. Pursuant to the National Development of Tourism Strategy implemented by the government of Hungary between the years of 2005 and 2013, it is assumed that there were positive changes in quality of life of people of Hungary as a result of their travels. A survey was conducted in 2007 with 11.500 households to reveal the relation between tourism and quality of life. Accordingly, even though traveling is seen as a factor which doesn't cause a significant change in the quality of life of Hungarians it is stated that traveling is a satisfactory factor more than average level of satisfaction. Two third of participating Hungarians believe that tourism has no effect on their quality of life. Bowling and Windsor (2001, p.57) conducted a study to explain subjective and objective components of quality of life and its premises in England by reaching to 2033 persons via survey. According to the results, it is stated that objective indicators, socio-demographic indicators, and health-based indicators don't have an important impact on the explanation of quality of life but subjective indicators are important. In a study conducted by Iwasaki (2007, p.244) concept of spare time involved in tourism is taken as a concept contributing to the quality of life in the international and

multi-cultural arena. In order to reveal the intercommunal differences Asian, Middle Eastern and local cultures are taken into consideration. The confidence given by spare time to people and the flexibility it creates along with its contributions to the quality of life and impacts on local people are discussed. It is also stated that spare time activities are shaped by social and cultural structures and unequal conditions in the community make us see this structure more clearly. It is also predicted in this study that this imbalance should be eliminated jointly by cultural, social and political parties and efforts aiming to provide more spare time activities to least privileged people would improve the quality of life. Jeffres and Dobos (1993, p.210) stated that quality of life and spare time concepts are directly related to the environment of people as a result of their study regarding quality of life and perception of spare time opportunities in metropolis and found out that media and mutual interaction have great importance in terms of perception of individuals. In this study, surveys are made in three different time intervals in Midwest metropolis, USA. The objective was revealing the relation between how local community makes use of spare time opportunities and quality of life. Accordingly, spare time values are important and it provides a perception which affects local community's quality of life positively.

Sirgy et al., (2009, p. 314) explained quality life with "bottom up spill over theory" and tried to set forth community welfare with impacts of various fields of life. Pursuant to this theory satisfaction with life is revealed depending on fields and sub-fields of life. In satisfaction sequence, satisfaction with life is placed at the top level. Satisfaction with life is affected by satisfaction with family, health, community, social life and business. Satisfaction in certain fields is affected by the living conditions of and services given to society. Individual assessments are determinative in this process. In brief satisfaction with individual community services along with the improvement of communal conditions brings together more satisfaction in communal life. Auhand Cook (2009, p.279) tried to measure the devotion of local people to the community in rural areas, their satisfaction with the community and with domestic life. The survey was sent to 974 individuals by mail and questions were asked to the household. In accordance with results, devotion to community and satisfaction with domestic life are factors to estimate the satisfaction level of community. By supporting "bottom up spill over theory" this study leads to the conclusion that improvements in certain fields of life affect the communal quality of life.

#### **4. RESEARCH METHOD**

##### **Universe of Research and Sample Group**

Tourism has been intensively developing as of the 1980s in Alanya, one of the important destinations of Turkish tourism. As direct and indirect employment opportunities are provided in the region along with employment in the agricultural sector, Alanya became one of the most attractive places for settlement. Total bed amount throughout the county is 149.717 in 668 facilities certificated either by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism or Municipality. While the number of foreign tourists visiting the region was approximately 1.000.000 at the beginning of the 2000s, it increased to 1.715.000 as of 2008. This figure shows that Alanya's contribution rate to Turkish tourism is 5% (www.altso.org, 09.02.2010).

The universe of research includes local population over the age of 18 living in central Alanya and within nine municipal borders located at a distance of 30 km. west and east of Alanya. The main reason to select this region is due to the placement of settlements in this area as the tourism is mostly intensified on-shore.

In this study, a survey is conducted with 777 individuals which is more than five-fold of the number of proposition stated in literature. Thus the number of samples was sufficient. The stratified sampling method is applied in research and number of participants in each municipal border is determined in proportion to the population in the area. At the beginning the municipal borders are determined and then, sample distribution is made by considering the residential areas within these municipal borders.

### **Data Collection Tools and Techniques**

Questionnaire forms are preferred as data collection tool in research. Surveys are a frequently preferred method as they make it possible to obtain opinions of a large number of people within a short period of time. It is possible to say that survey method is selected because it is appropriate for individuals of all ages, can be applicable to large groups, enables numerical expression of the collected data, economic in terms of cost and provides rapid access to data (Baş, 2001, p: 44). During the constitution of sections literature is raked around and also opinions and recommendations of five Turkish and foreign academicians from Akdeniz University, South Carolina University, and Virginia University are taken. While propositions are constituted scales in the literature the validity and reliability of which have been analyzed are taken into consideration.

Propositions regarding perceived quality of life and including four dimensions are compiled via studies of Cummins (1997), Sirgy (2001) and Cicerchia (1996) were applied to the local community in Alanya region.

### **Data Collection Process**

Surveys were conducted in Alanya before the beginning of tourism season by six interviewers who were trained beforehand. A survey study was conducted by taking workload and working hours on weekdays and weekends into consideration in March, April and May 2010. In accordance with male-female population distribution obtained via secondary data, layering method is used in the sample group.

### **Data Analysis**

SPSS 19.0 package program developed for social sciences is used to analyze the data obtained from questionnaire forms. Percentages and frequency values of socio-demographic characteristics of the participants are included. Validity and reliability analyses have been made by using data related to research. Furthermore, a correlation analysis was made in order to determine if there is a relation between research variables and to what extent dependent variable is able to explain independent variable.

## **5. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS OF RESEARCH**

### **Demographic Features in Relation with Survey**

777 questionnaire forms were collected in a survey conducted in Alanya and its counties. 68.2% of participants was young people within the age range of 18-33. 52% of participants were males and 41% were single. 72.8% of them were primary and high school graduates and only 27.2% were graduates of higher education. When monthly income levels of participants were examined it is found out that monthly income of 72.5% was TL1000 or lower and 3.6% had a monthly income of TL3000 or more. 15.3% were self-employed, 6.4% were tradesmen, 37.8% were tourism professionals and 7.2% were public workers.



When the tourism-related professions of participants were examined, it was seen that 66.8% of them believe that they are directly or indirectly employed in the tourism sector and 25% are employed out of tourism sector. When the relation levels with tourists visiting the region is questioned, it is found out that 74.8% of participants are partially or continuously in relation with tourists. Furthermore, is found out that 62.5% of participants are living in the region for the last 11 or more years. In brief, it is seen that participants of the survey were male-based, single, young, primary school and high school graduates, have TL1000 or less monthly income, tourism professionals-based, more than half of them are directly or indirectly employed in the tourism sector and most of them interact with tourists visiting the region.

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Results**

<i>AGE</i>			<i>GENDER</i>		
<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>			<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>		
18-25 ages	268	35%	Male	405	52%
26 – 33 ages	254	33,2%	Female	372	48%
34 – 41 ages	130	17%	Total	777	
42 -49 ages	67	8,8%	<i>MARITAL STATUS</i>		
50 ages and older	46	6%	<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>		
Total	765		Single	412	55,2%
<i>MONTHLY INCOME</i>			Divorced/ Widowed	22	2,9%
<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>			Married	312	41,8%
Minimum wage	252	34,8%	Total	746	
Minimum wage - TL100	273	37,7%	<i>EMPLOYMENT IN TOURISM SECTOR</i>		
TL 1001-2000	131	18,1%	<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>		
TL 2001-3000	43	5,9%	Directly employed	388	51,1%
TL 3001 and higher	26	3,6%	Indirectly employed	119	15,7%
Total	725		None	190	25,0%
<i>STATE OF EDUCATION</i>			Unemployed	62	8,2%
<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>			Total	759	
Primary School	144	19,2%	<i>OCCUPATION</i>		
Middle School	106	14,2%	<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>		
High School	295	39,4%	Student	43	7,2%
2 year	96	12,8%	Self-employed	91	15,3%
4 year	97	13,0%	Worker	68	11,4%
Master/Doctorate	11	1,5%	Tradesman	38	6,4%
Total	749		Tourism Professional	225	37,8%
<i>RELATION LEVEL WITH TOURISTS</i>			Housewife	18	3,0%
<i>Count Percentage (%)</i>			Retired	17	2,9%
No relation	196	25,3%	Public Worker	43	7,2%
Partially in relation	304	39,2%	Other	52	8,8%
Continuously in relation	274	35,6%	Total	595	
Total	775				

### Reliability Analysis of Quality of Life Scale

In order to scale quality of life 31 propositions comprised of four dimensions (inherent welfare level, welfare level of society, health and safety) compiled from studies of Cummins (1997), Sirgy (2001) and Cicerchia (1996). 5-Point Likert Scale is used in propositions (1 = not satisfied at all, 2 = not satisfied, 3 = indecisive, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied). In order to test reliability, the propositions are evaluated by Cronbach's alpha, the internal consistency measurement tool in surveys. Accordingly, Alpha value of quality of life scale is determined as 0.9046. Even when items in scale were eliminated it is seen that this rate will not get significantly higher, so no questions were created out of this scale at this stage. It is observed that propositions in the scale of quality of life have correlation varying between 0.771 and -0.132 in a significance level of 0.01 and 0.05.

### Validity Analysis of Quality of Life Scale

It is understood that the sample of the scale is sufficient as the rates of KMO, Sample Sufficiency Test (852) and of Bartlett test ( $\chi^2 = 2640,697$ ;  $P_{\text{sign}} = 0,000$ ;  $p < 0,05$ ) are as requested. By way of obtaining factorability via principal components analysis and Varimax spinning method, quality of life scale reduced to 23 propositions from 31 and quality of life stayed below three dimensions. All factors explain 52.6% of the variance. Structural reliability of dimension of society's and inherent welfare in the scale is 0.90 which is the desired rate. Structural reliability of dimension of economic welfare is relieved as 0.87 in preliminary test and it is also as the desired rate. The structural validity rate of other sub-dimension of the quality of life, environmental health is 0.50 and it is lower than other two dimensions. But when it is considered that this rate is higher than the acceptable rate of 0.40 (Scherer et. al., 1988) it is observed that all three important factors came to the forefront in analysis jointly constitute the majority of total variance in items and variance related to scale.

**Table 2**  
**Factor Analysis**

<i>Factors of Scale and Related Propositions</i>	<i>Load Values</i>	<i>Eigen Value</i>	<i>Rate of Explaining Variance (%)</i>
Social and Inherent Welfare	,90*	6,213	27,011
My cultural life	,774		
My spare time activities	,773		
Social status	,756		
My spare time	,753		
Moral life	,732		
My entertainment life	,714		
My life with other people	,671		
Especially happy with protection ways of our own culture	,632		
My domestic life (life with children and spouse)	,613		
Municipal services and activities	,610		
Number of tourists from many countries	,550		
I feel as if I spread my culture to the world when I talk to tourists.	,530		

<i>Factors of Scale and Related Propositions</i>	<i>Load Values</i>	<i>Eigen Value</i>	<i>Rate of Explaining Variance (%)</i>
People I live together	,475		
Economic Welfare	,877*	4,064	17,670
Payments and social rights	,822		
My social security at work	,806		
My income status at work	,771		
My family income	,757		
Taxes I pay	,718		
Expenses necessary to survive	,654		
Cost of my basic needs like food and beverages	,578		
Environmental Health	,503*	1,829	7,954
Environmental pollution threatens safety of society and causes harmful health problems. (**)	,759		
I feel bad about tourism when I see trash left around by tourists.(**)	,718		
I think tap water is not clean and prefer drinking bottled water.(**)	,542		
<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)</b>	,852		
<b>Bartlett's Test (<math>\chi^2</math>)</b>	2640,697		
<i>Df</i>	,253		
<i>Sig.</i>	,000		

\*Cronbach's Alpha

\*\*Reverse coding

### Other Findings and Analyses

Whether independent variables of scale such as gender, employment in tourism (permanent-seasonal), relation level with tourists (available/none), income from tourism (50% and lower/51% and higher) and employed sector (public-private sector) have an impact on quality of life or not is explored by using T-Test in independent samples. Some significant results have been reached via statistical findings. The first noticeable results are that males have more interaction with tourists as against females, permanent employees in the tourism sector as against seasonal employees, private sector employees as against public workers and the ones who are in relation with tourists as against the ones who don't interact with tourists. Perceived quality of life by people whose income via tourism is equal to or more than 51% of their total income and private sector employees is more than the perceptions of other groups. Local people who interact with tourists and employed in private sector are more devoted to their communities. Similarly, sustainable tourism attitude of local people who interact with tourists and employed in private sector is being actualized in a more positive way. Another attention-grabbing point here is that gender and permanent or seasonal employment in tourism sector don't have any impact at all on the quality of life perceived by local people. Nevertheless, the percentage of income earned via tourism has an impact on perceived quality of life.

**Table 3**  
**T-test results**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Significance Level</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
Gender-independent variable Quality of life-dependent variable	0,288	There is no certain difference between male and female locals in Alanya regarding the perceived quality of life in terms of statistics.
Employment in sector (permanent-seasonal)-independent variable Quality of life-dependent variable	0,192	There is no statistical difference between directly or indirectly employed in tourism sector and seasonal or permanent employees in Alanya regarding the perceived quality of life.
Interaction with tourists-independent variable Quality of life- dependent variable	0,09	There is no statistical difference between the locals who interact with tourists (partially and continuously together) and who don't regard the perceived quality of life in Alanya.
Income from tourism (in percentage)-independent variable Quality of life-dependent variable	0,000	There is no statistical difference between the locals who are directly or indirectly employed in the tourism sector and earns 50% or less of their income from tourism and the ones who earn 51% or more of their income from tourism regarding the perceived quality of life. The quality of life perceived by locals who earn 51% or more of their income from tourism is higher in Alanya.
Employed sector (public-private sector)-independent variable Quality of life-dependent variable	0,004	When locals of Alanya are assessed in groups employed in private sector and public sector, da it is observed that occupation creates a statistical difference in quality of life. Accordingly perception of quality of life by locals who work/activate in private sector is higher than the ones who work in public sector.

**Table 4**  
**Anova results**

<i>Dependent Var.</i>	<i>Independent Var.</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>			
<i>Quality of Life</i>	<i>State of Education</i>		5,392	0,00	<i>Differences of Averages</i>		
		Primary school	144				
		Middle school	106	Primary school		Middle school	,2464(*)
		High school	295	school		High school	,1278
		2-year	96			2-year	,2241
		4-year	97			4-year	,3152(*)
		Master/doctorate	11			Master/doctorate	,2877
<i>Quality of Life</i>	<i>Employment in Tourism</i>		11,777	0,00	<i>Differences of Averages</i>		
		Directly working	388				
		Indirectly working	119	Directly working		Indirectly working	,0649
		I don't work in tourism sector	190			I don't work in tourism sector	,2663(*)
		Currently unemployed	62			Currently unemployed	,2120(*)
<i>Devotion to Community</i>	<i>Employment in Tourism</i>		4,043	0,07	<i>Differences of Averages</i>		
		Directly working	388				
		Indirectly working	119	Directly working		Indirectly working	,0067
		I don't work in tourism sector	190			I don't work in tourism sector	,2141(*)
		Currently unemployed	62			Currently unemployed	,2334

Whether income level, the state of education, settlement period in region and employment in tourism create a difference in terms of devotion to community, interaction with tourists, sustainable touristic attitude and perceived quality of life or not is measured by variance analysis (ANOVA). In case there is a difference, the source of and the groups having this difference are determined by using Post Hoc test (Scheffe). When the relation between quality of life and state of education is examined, it is observed that there is a significant difference between graduates of primary school-middle school-high school and graduates of four-year universities. In accordance with results, perceived quality of life by primary school graduates is higher than the middle school and 4-year university graduates. It is seen that 4-year university graduates have the lowest quality of life. There is a significant statistical difference in the relation between employment in tourism and quality of life. There is also a difference between people who directly or indirectly employed in tourism and who are currently unemployed. The quality of life perceived by locals who directly work in the tourism sector is higher than the ones who don't work in the tourism sector and who are currently unemployed.

## **6. RESULT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

When the development of tourism in Alanya since the 1980s till today is examined, it is seen that this region also experienced the problems of Turkish tourism in general sense. The rapid development of tourism in the region and local people's direct involvement in tourism caused some impacts in time. This fact should be taken as a basic phenomenon in the perception of quality of life by the local community.

In the light of all these results, it is understood that there is no direct relation between the development of tourism for local people in Alanya and their current perception of quality of life. It could be stated that many shares of tourism in the region should fulfill their responsibilities in the light of these results. Recommendations for the region are as follows:

- If we predict that the current tourism potential in Alanya region would maintain similarly in the future, the local people who keep a neutral attitude towards the development of sustainable tourism should be urgently informed about positive and negative aspects of tourism in order to gain maximum benefit from the long-term development of tourism. While performing this, the concept of “sustainability” should be underlined as it is done in numerous other sectors and it should be emphasized that the community would obtain maximum benefit from tourism with minimum loss. The prediction that the positive atmosphere to be constituted regarding attitude towards sustainable tourism would have a significant impact on quality of life of individuals will hold good.
- Perceived quality of life is a subjective concept. Therefore the quality of life is conceptually rather complicated. There is an interesting point among the dimensions generated in accordance with answers to local people. Unification of personal and social values of the local population is seen as a cultural difference in the concept of quality of life. This is to say that the local people in Alanya prefer to handle their emotional aspect as individuals along with value judgments of society. Actually, this is a frequently seen aspect of traditional Turkish society but it recently acquired a new dimension due to a bit more different angles. If the differentiation of this size increases more or grows in a more balanced way, an opportunity for a platform to arise would be provided, where the ones who think individually instead of complying with group psychology

would also join the debate. This will enable individuals to express their expectations from life more easily. The coinciding of individual welfare level with social welfare shows how big of an importance has the society on values to become internalised. This attitude would cause a result in the way that intervention of community to an individual in case there is a difference between how individuals perceive tourism and the perception of society in Alanya region, where tourism is so intense. It is thought that efforts to expand individual freedoms would positively affect the quality of life of individuals.

This study is implemented within municipal borders included in the sample in Alanya region. Implementation of study at the beginning of tourism season created a time constraint for the participants of the survey. Therefore it is thought that this study would be repeated within certain time intervals so that the quality of life would be subjectively observed and a prediction would be possible. Similarly, if a number of samples would be expanded to inland regions of Alanya within the current bounds of possibility and the scope of the study is enlarged, impacts of tourism on the quality of life would be discussed in a different dimension.

### References

- \_\_\_\_\_ (SELMA) Spatial Deconcentration of Economic Land Use and Quality of Life in European Metropolitan Areas (2004), *Quality of Life Indicators*, Deliverable D02 WP2.
- \_\_\_\_\_ WHOQOL (2002), "The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL): Development and General Psychometric Properties", *Social Science and Medicine*, 46(12), 1569–1585.
- Allen, L.R. (1990), "Benefits of Leisure Attributes to Community Satisfaction", *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22(2), 183-196.
- Andereck, K., Valentine, K.M., Vogt, C.A. and Knopf R.C. (2007), "A Cross Cultural Analysis of Tourism and Quality of Life Perceptions", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 483-502.
- Argyle, M. and Lu, L. (1990). "Happiness and Social Skills", *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 1255-1261.
- Aspinall, A.J. (2006), "Communities in Change: Social Sustainability and Tourism Development", *Master Thesis*, Waterloo, Canada.
- Auh, S. and Cook, C.C. (2009), "Quality of Community Life among Rural Residents: An Integrated Model", *Social Indicators Research*, 94, 377-389.
- Baker, D.A. and Palmer, R.J. (2006), "Examining the Effects of Perceptions of Community and Recreation Participation on Quality of Life", *Social Indicators Research*, 75, 395-418.
- Baş, T. (2001), *Anket*, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Benckendorff, P., Edwards, D., Jurowski, C., Liburd, J.J., Miller, G. and Moscardo, G. (2009), "Exploring the Future of Tourism and Quality of Life", *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2), 171-183.
- Bowling, A. and Windsor, J. (2001), "Towards the Good Life: A Population Survey of Dimensions of Quality of Life", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 2, 55-81.
- Campbell, A. C., Converse, P. E. and Rodgers, W. L. (1976). "The Quality of American Life", The Russel Sage Foundation, New York, USA.
- Cascante, D.M. (2008), "Consequences of Tourism Based Growth on Rural Communities' Quality of Life: A Comparative Study of Liberia and La Fortuna, Costarica ", *PhD Thesis*, The Pennsylvania State University, USA.

- Cicerchia, A. (1996), "Indicators for The Measurement of The Quality of Urban Life -What is The Appropriate Territorial Dimension?", *Social Indicator Research*, 39(3), 321-358.
- Cummins, R. A. (1997), "The Domain of Life Satisfaction: An Attempt to Order Chaos", *Social Indicator Research*, 38, 303-328.
- Dalia, A. and Juozas, R. (2007), "Quality of Life and Its Components' Measurement", *Engineering Economics*, 52 (22), 43-48.
- Diener, E.D. and Suh, E. (1997), "Measuring Quality of Life: Economic, Social, and Subjective Indicators", *Indicator Research*, 40, 189-216.
- Dillman, D.A. and Tremblay, K.R. (1977), "The Quality of Life in Rural America", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 429, 115-129.
- Felce, D. and Perry, J. (1995), "Quality of Life: Its Definition and Measurement", *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 16(1), 51-74.
- Iwasaki, Y. (2007), "Leisure and Quality of Life in an International and Multicultural Context: What are Major Pathways Linking Leisure to Quality of Life", *Social Indicators Research*, 82, 233-264.
- Jeffres, L.W. and Dobos, J. (1993), "Perceptions of Leisure Opportunities and the Quality of Life in a Metropolitan Area", *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 203-217.
- Jurowski, C. (1998), "A Study of Community Sentiments in Relation to Attitudes Toward Tourism Development", *Tourism Analysis*, 3, 17-34.
- Jurowski, C. and Brown, D.O. (2001), "A Comparison of the Views of Involved Versus Noninvolved Citizens on Quality of Life and Tourism Development Issues", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 25(4), 355-370.
- Kartinis, E. (2006), "Increasing Quality of Life as the Goal for Development of Latvia", *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 1, 125-138.
- Kim, K. (2002), "The Effects of Tourism Impacts Upon Quality of Life of Residents in the Community", *Phd. Thesis*, The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.
- Lane, R. E. (1991). *The Market Experience*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Pres, England.
- Latkova, P. (2008), "An Examination of Factors Predicting Residents' Support for Tourism Development", *PhD. Thesis*, Michigan State University, USA.
- Maddox, G. L., and Douglass, E. B. (1978), "Self-Assessment of Health: A Longitudinal Study of Elderly Subjects", *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 14, 87-92.
- Michalko, G., Kiss, K., Kovacs, B. and Sulyok, J. (2009), "The Impact of Tourism on Subjective Quality of Life among Hungarian Population", *Hungarian Geographical Bulletin*, 58(2), 121-136.
- Moscardo, G. (2009), "Tourism and Quality of Life: Towards A More Critical Approach", *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2), 159-170.
- Nichols, M., Stitt, B.G. and Giacomassi, D. (2002), "Community Assessment of the Effects of Casinos on Quality of Life", *Social Indicators Research*, 57, 229-262.
- Perdue, R.R. and Gustke, L.D. (1991), "The Effects of Tourism Development on Objective Indicators of Local Quality of Life", *Proceedings of the Travel and Tourism Research Association twenty-second annual conference*, Hyatt Regency Hotel, Long Beach, California, USA.
- Perdue, R.R., Long, P.T. and Kang, Y.S. (1999), "Boomtown Tourism and Resident Quality of Life -The Marketing of Gaming to Host Community Residents", *Journal of Business Research*, 44, 165-178.

- Sirgy, M. J. (1998). "Materialism and Quality of Life", *Social Indicators Research*, 43, 227-260.
- Sirgy, M. J. (2001), *Handbook of Quality-Of-Life Research: An Ethical Marketing Perspective*, Social Indicators Research Series, Kluwer Academic Publishers, the Netherlands.
- Sirgy, M. J., and Cornwell, T. (2001). "Further Validation of the Sirgy et. al.'s Measure of Community Quality of Life". *Social Indicators Research*, 56, 125-143.
- Sirgy, M. J., Michalos, A. C., Ferriss, A. L., Easterlin, R. A., Patrick, D. and Pavot, W. (2006), "The Quality of Life (QOL) Research Movement: Past, Present, and Future", *Social Indicators Research*, 76, 343-466.
- Sirgy, J. M., Gao, T. and Young, R. (2008), "How Does Resident's Satisfaction with Community Services Influence Quality of Life (QOL) Outcomes?", *Social Indicators Research*, 3, 81-105.
- Szalai, A. (1980), "The Meaning of Comparative Research on the Quality of Life", in *The Quality of Life*, ed: Szalai, A. and Andrews F., Sage Beverly Hills, CA, USA.
- Taillefer, M.C., Dupuis, G., Roberge, M.A. and Lemay, S. (2003), "Health-Related Quality of Life Models: Systematic Review of the Literature", *Social Indicators Research*, 64, 293-323.
- Van Kamp, I., Leidelmeijer, K. and Marsman, G.A.D.H. (2003), "Urban Environmental Quality and Human Well-Being. Towards A Conceptual Framework and Demarcation of Concepts; A Literature Study". *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 65, 5-18.
- Veenhoven, R. (1991). "Is Happiness Relative?", *Social Indicators Research*, 24, 1-34.
- Yıldız, H.T. (2007), "Kentsel Yaşam Kalitesi: Kuram, Politika ve Uygulamalar", *Mimarlık Dergisi*, 335, 29-42.
- www.altso.org.tr, Erişim Tarihi: 10.02.2010