THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIO-CULTURAL EFFECTS:THE CASE OF MANAVGAT, TURKEY

Volkan Altintas[*] Hayriye Ersoy[**] and Demet Tuzunkan[***]

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of tourism's socio-cultural influences on the local people of Manavgat and to determine the way in which the opinions and attitudes of the local people are related to the changes resulting therefrom. For this purpose, a survey was conducted in the Manavgat region which is an important mass tourism destination. Factor analysis was performed to determine the reliability, to be able to Rejectionuce the data and to ensure that the expressions were provided between meaningful groups.In the interpretation of the research findings, besides the percentage and frequency analyzes, the analysis of '' Independent Sampling T-Test '', '' Variance Analysis (ANOVA) '' Mann-Whitney U Test 'and' 'Post Hoc Test (LSD)' 'were used. As a result of the study, it was observed that local people perceived the socio-cultural effects of tourism differently.

Keywords: Manavgat, socio-cultural impact, tourism, tourism effects, local people.

INTRODUCTION

From the time they started to live together, communities have had to intercourse into various relationships. Individuals were interested in each other, interacting in various ways, influencing each other and seeking answers to the problems they encounte Rejection. This is reflected in the social structure of the people, their social lives, their behaviors, their habits and it has an effect on the formation of the socio-cultural identities of the societies by acting for many years (From Güve, Duran: 2011). The socio-cultural systems, which can be characterized as a living entity due to the fact that this socio-cultural system consists of living and non-living beings, is open to change and constantly subject to change by internal-external dynamics. Because tourism is a labor-intensive sector, human relations are very preliminary in terms of structure, and such changes are more obvious than other sectors in terms of both internal factors and external factors. Tourism provides interrelationships between different societies, social construction, social attitudes, behavior, social values and can cause some changes.This study was carried out in Manavgat where tourism phenomenon has been experienced intensely for many years and the effects of many aspects have been seen in order to examine the socio-cultural dimension of the sector on the local people. Factor analysis has been applied to determine variable clusters of tourism impacts on indigenous peoples. In this study, firstly, a literature study on the subject was taken up. The preparation and implementation

* Woosong University, Sol International Hotel Management (SIHOM), South Korea.
** MSc, Turkey
*** Woosong College, South Korea

of the questionnaire used as a data collection method in the field research has been mentioned. In the findings and discussion section, the data obtained by the questionnaire were examined. The findings were interpreted in the conclusions and suggestions and some suggestions were tried to be made.

LITERATURE

Undoubtedly the region most affected by the positive and negative changes in tourism is the local population living in that region. Measuring the positive-negative aspects of the effects of tourism on a developing tourism region is very important in terms of tourism development in the region. Because the industry is labor intensive and can not go to automation, many needs are provided through local people. According to Gürsoy and Rurtherfort (2004: 495), it is important for local governments, politicians and employers to understand the support provided by the local people in the development of tourism. Because the success of something depends on the support of the local people. A counter-situation prevents or completely stops development. According to Dyer et al. (2007: 414), ensuring community involvement in the development and planning of tourist areas is important for the sustainability of tourism development. The perception of social responsibility and social influences in the development of tourism is closely related to the involvement of local people in the planning process (Robson and Robson Act. Ko and Stewart, 2002: 522). The views and perceptions of the local community on tourism development, employment opportunities, and community participation in a dynamic and active manner will be positive. With tourism planning and tourism development, economic, social and environmental perceptions will start to change in the society (Jamel and Getz, 1995: 194).Many factors that influence the behavioral patterns of local people have shown that there is a theoretical need for a combination of research outcomes. As a result, it will be easier to see how the local people behave positively or negatively with the tourists who originated from them (Altıntaş, 2010: 5). In this respect, the models that show how the local people are following the process of tourism development are examined under three headings:

1. **Doxey's Discomfort Index Model:** In Doxey's model (1975) it is defined that parallel to the development of tourism, the local people in a region have been increasingly showing negative attitudes towards tourists. There are four stages in the model: euphoria, apathy, annoyance and antagonism (Roney, 2011: 110).

   Butler's Tourist Center Process Model: Butler has shaped tourism development as a seven-stage life cycle model. These are: exploration, involment, development, consolidation, stagnation, decline, rejuvenation. This life cycle shows that the negative effects of decreasing the support

of the local people for the development of tourism in the tourist areas are natural. The use of this model in the planning and management of tourism resources shows the gradual decrease in environmental quality in many touristic regions (Butler, 1980: 5-7).

2. **Social Responses to the Impacts of Dogan's Model-Tourism:** This model of tourism has been used as resistance, retreatism, boundary maintenance, revitalization, and adoption as social responses revealed as a result of various influences. (Doğan, 2004).

Socio-cultural factors are one of the three (natural and technical factors) factors that make up the basis of the tourist product (Usta, 2001: 109). Beliefs, institutions, relationships between values and social relations cause the ties to intertwine in social and cultural terms. Some authors advocate socio-cultural coexistence as a socio-cultural structure (Demircan, 2011) rather than talking about social structure and cultural structure. Due to the tourism structure, it is inevitable for the people of the region to visit the region where they live, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly from socio-economic, socio-cultural interactions. The adverse effects that occur in the development stages of tourism also arise from the targeting of a wide mass market. According to Tuna (2007: 25), The traditional structure of traditional sources that began to grow in the XIX. Century has adapted itself to the tourism model. The local culture, however, is either a tourist culture or a tourist culture itself. With the development of the tourism industry, the modern life style is becoming increasingly widespread, the modernity of the city is transformed into the non-modern countries and the traditional structures and relations are transformed into an authentic touristic object. At this point, we can say that the producer countries and societies are in conflict with the protection of traditions and self-esteem and the economic opportunities that tourism can provide. It is not impossible to get rid of these dilemmas, but getting rid of it is quite complicated. Because it is difficult to distinguish tourist products from socio-economic and socio-cultural factors.The positive and negative effects of the social dimension of tourism, human relations emerging during tourism activities, tourist satisfaction, socio-cultural changes and the social structure of these changes are quite high (Tuna, 2007: 5) as the tourism movement has a great influence on national and international relations. According to Demircan (2010), tourism and local people involvement as a result of tourism movements involve personal influences or interaction between tourists and local people. Many researchers have noted that tourism affects society in a multifaceted way, and it is often difficult to distinguish these effects (Özmen, 2007). It seems that tourism has influenced basic values (community, private life issues, conservatism) in the first stage of development. Because as tourism develops, it is seen that people have the life style more compulsively. In other words, it seems that an oppressive process has been happen into overcoming the basic values of individuals (Altıntaş,

2010). Moreover tourism is an economic event and phenomenon it is a social event and event (Tuna, 2007: 5). Social structure is a product of the coexistence of people and is expressed as regulated human relations (Güdü, 2011). In general, the social impacts in places where tourism is available can be listed as follows:

1. Tourism causes social structure changes in the countries visited.
2. Tourism is changing its value judgments.
3. Tourism causes a variety of changes in another cultural environment.
4. Tourism is influential in changing the traditions and customs of local people.
5. Tourism changes the social fabric.

The impacts of tourism on the social structure could vary depending on factors such as the growth rate and variety of tourism, population and population of the locals, seasonal trends and socio-cultural flexibility of the local community. The effects of tourism on the social structure are covered by the dimensions of individual, family, society, education, life standards and community classes (Avcıkurt, 2007: 63).Culture is a lifestyle and tradition that is made up of material and moral values that a society possesses and carries its own identity. In this direction, a society is a form of society such as language, religion, morality, law, tradition, behavior, pleasures, art, economic, philosophical education. All these values that make culture are also factors that are making tourist attraction (Usta, 2001: 87,165). Thanks to tourism, tourists who go anywhere can be influenced by local behavior and share what they have experienced when they return home. The development of tourism has enabled the local community to become more aware of the culture of the local people to learn about the culture of the foreigners and to increase their knowledge (Rızaoğlu akt, Avcıkurt, 2009: 66). It is inevitable that the two cultures that face each other will resemble each other as a result of mutual influenc. The interaction between cultures is often seen unidirectionally, not bi-directionally. For example, consumption- western culture often affects the cultures of underdeveloped countries, in relation to people of undeveloped countries that host tourists and developed Western tourists (Roney, 2011: 105-106). Cultural expansion is more likely to take place among tourists to the local community. As a result, tourism culture is affected both positively and negatively. In many countries, it has been observed that, with the arrival of tourists, the traditional meaning and importance of values and belief changes, the traditional patterns in clothing and lifestyle are abandoned, the foreigners are imitated in eating and drinking habits, the traditional family structure and value judgments are changed, (1987: 156, Baykan, 2007: 118). However, it is difficult to determine how much of these changes are due to tourism, and to what extent the effects of various mass media such as industrialization, urbanization, radio and television are the consequences (Doğan, 1987: 156-157). According to

Tuna (2007: 15), tourism can be defined as the interaction with the visitor cultures in the case of cultural influences, culture production of the community (authentic arts) and culture consumption (changes in customs related to life).These are:

1. The changes seen in the norms, changes in the social taste of traditional cultures, and the acceptance of the formerly accepted behavior,

2. Cultural consumption can be defined as changes in weddings, festivals, religious ceremonies, local arts and literature, which take place within the frame of traditions and customs.

    As the differences between the culture in which the tourists come from and the culture they g oto experince increases, there is also an increase in tourism demand in the region attracting tourists (Demircan, 2010). According to the World Tourism Organization, 37% of international tourists who travel for culture show a tendency towards discrimination against different cultures of individuals. In addition, as a general theme, culture can attract a certain share from all tourist groups (Öter and Özdoğan, 2005: 129). In general, cultural spreading is more likely to happen to tourists than to the local population. As a result, tourism culture is affected both positively and negatively. The effects of tourism on the cultural structure are addressed by the dimensions of culture dissemination, cultural discovery, culture pollution, cultural degeneration and cultural change.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research aiming to determine the socio-cultural effects of the tourism movement on indigenous people, questionnaire was used as data collection method. A literature survey was conducted in the socio-cultural study, and a questionnaire was used for the questionnaire in which Demircan's (2010) Tourism Socio-Cultural Effects: Antalya / Muratpaşa District sample was validated. The questionnaire was revised by consulting the opinions of academicians to make some changes. A questionnaire was applied in the province of Manavgat, taking into account the places where locals communicate with tourists.The universe of the study is the people living in the district of Manavgat. Sampling method was used easily in order to determine the sampling within the universe.To determine the demographic characteristics of the participants; six closed-ended questions about gender, age, education, occupation, income level and period of living in the region have been asked in the first part. The other part of the questionnaire consists of thirty closed-ended proposals to determine the socio-cultural effects of tourism on the local people. The judgments stated in the questionnaire are rated with a 5-point Likert type scale (I definitely do not agree with).The demographic characteristics of the

participants (gender, age, education, occupation, level of income, and duration of life in the region) were given primarily by taking the distribution of frequencies and percentages. In the other part, there are 30 questions developed to determine the socio-cultural effects of tourism on the people living in the region. Factor analysis was performed to determine the reliability, to be able to perform data rejection, to determine the internal validity, and to ensure that the expressions were between meaningful groups. In order to determine the applicability of factor analysis to the data, 6 analyzes with a co-origin less than 0.05 in the analysis were excluded from the analysis. By repeating the analysis, 7 factors were obtained. These seven factors are grouped under adverse effect, interaction, positive effect, disruption of communication, cultural effect, effect on conventions, social effect.Hypotheses have been developed to statistically test the relationship between the independent sample t-test and the ANOVA tested variables. The hypotheses that will be examined in the theoretical section to answer research questions and the relationships between these variables are as follows:

H1: The opinions of the local people regarding the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a significant difference according to the genders of the participants.

H2: The opinions of local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a meaningful difference according to the ages of the participants.

H3: The opinions of local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a meaningful difference according to the educational status of the participants.

H4: The opinions of the local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism are significantly different from those of the participants.

H5: The opinions of the local people regarding the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a significant difference according to the monthly income levels of the participants.

H6: The opinions of the local people on the socio-cultural effects of tourism show a meaningful difference according to the duration of the residents living in the region.

Besides the percentage and frequency analyzes, to interpret the research findings, '' Independent Sampling T-Test '', '' Variance Analysis (ANOVA) '', '' Mann Whitney U Test '' and '' Post Hoc Test (LSD) '' has been used. The general reliability of the questions asked on the Likert type scale was determined by reliability analysis. According to this, the general reliability of the expressions in which the socio-cultural effects of tourism are determined is determined as Cronbach Alpha = 0.72. This survey shows that the reliability is adequate. The data obtained in the study were analyzed by the SPSS program.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 400 respondents were able to answer the questionnaire in full. Some of the surveys have been excluded from the assessment because they are not filled out properly. Analysis was also made on 400 questionnaires. Demographic distributions of local people in Manavgat are shown in Table 1. 45.8% of the respondents who fill out the questionnaire form male, and 54.3% female participants. The majority of the respondents pointed out that 40.3% ($f = 161$) were participants between 20 and 30 years of age, while 2.3% ($f = 9$) were 60 years and over. When the educational status is assessed; 34.3% ($f = 137$) of the participants had education at the high school level and 0.3% (f = 1) at the doctoral level. While 29% of the respondents ($f = 116$) are tourism sector employees, 0.8% ($f = 3$) are traders. When income level distribution is consideRejection; It is seen that 36.8% ($f = 147$) of the participants have monthly income between 1001-1500, with a rate of 5% ($f = 20$) at 4001 and above. When the percentage of the respondents living in that area is examined; 48% ($f = 192$) live 21 years and over there, and 6.5% ($f = 26$) live less than 1 year.

**TABLE 1: FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS RESULTS
RELATED TO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS**

Demographical Factors		*f*	*%*
Gender	Man	183	45,8
	Woman	217	54,3
Age	20-30	161	40,3
	31-40	143	35,8
	41-50	68	17
	51-60	19	4,8
	60 and over	9	2,3
Education	Primary School	98	24,5
	High School	137	34,3
	Higher Education	47	11,8
	Undergraduate Study	104	26
	Graduate Study	13	3,3
	PhD	1	0,3

Demographical Factors		*f*	*%*
	Tourism Sector	116	29
	Farmer	6	1,5
	Merchant	3	0,8
	Artisan	38	9,5
Occupation	Self Employment	30	7,5
	Employee	34	8,5
	State Officer	71	17,8
	Reti Rejection	11	2,8
	House wife	36	9
	Other	55	13,8
	Below 500	36	9
	551-1000	25	6,3
	1001-1500	147	36,8
Monthly Income	1501-2000	69	17,3
	2001-3000	70	17,5
	3001-4000	33	8,3
	4001 and over	20	5
	Less than a year	26	6,5
	1-5 years	47	11,8
Life Time in the region	6-10 years	55	13,8
	11-15 years	36	9
	16-20 years	44	11
	21 years and over	192	48

Factor analysis was used to determine the structural validity of the study after descriptive statistics were identified for the participants. Firstly, 30 items on the scale were subjected to explanatory factor analysis by the Varimax rotation method in order to obtain the dimensions of the socio-cultural impact elements of

the participants and to provide survey validity, followed by reliability analyzes. Seven factors were obtained by repeating the analysis by subtracting from the 6 expression analysis that had a co-origin less than 0.05 in the analysis.In this context, 7 dimensions were obtained in the factor analysis applied to determine the dimensions of the factors affecting the opinions of the participants on tourism socio-cultural effects. According to the results of factor analysis, "negative effect, interaction, positive effect, disruption of communication, cultural effect, effect on customs, social impact" subscales were formed and dimensions were thought to be beneficial in relation to the demographic factors affecting participation.Whether or not the independent variable "gender" in the questionnaire was influenced by tourism socio-cultural effect (7 factor dimension) was investigated at the level of p <0,05 significance by independent t test under the assumption of normal distribution. The results of the analysis are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2: THE IMPACT OF SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS ON THE GENDER STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS (T-TEST ANALYSIS)

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Levene Test Value	t valuei	p value	df value
	Negative Effect	0,287	-1,751	0,840	
	Interaction	0,157	-1,546	0,123	
	Positive effect	0,381	-0,64	0,521	
Gender	Communication obstructed	0,909	-1,395	0,162	398
	Cultural Influnce	0,723	0,02	0,984	
	Effect on Conventions	7,229	-2,566	0,012	
	Social relations	4,345	-1,385	0,161	

When the table is examined; socio-cultural influences in terms of gender variations appear to be a significant difference only in the point of factor dimensions in the effect variable. In the next part of the analysis, it was investigated at the level of p <0.05 significance level by Variance Analysis (ANOVA), under the assumption of normal distribution, whether the age variable makes a significant difference on the socio-cultural impact dimensions. The results are shown in Table 3.

**TABLE 3: THE IMPACT OF SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS ON THE
AGE STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS (ANOVA ANALYSIS)**

Dependent Variable	Age	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Negative effect	20-30	0,433	1,035	0,389
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			
Interaction	20-30	1,869	0,784	0,536
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			
Positive effect	20-30	1,221	4,646	0,001
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			
Communication obstructed	20-30	2,845	1,828	0,123
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			
Cultural influence	20-30	1,28	1,642	0,163
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			
Effect on conventions	20-30	0,827	0,752	0,557
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			

Dependent Variable	Age	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Social relations	20-30	0,733	1,072	0,37
	31-40			
	41-50			
	51-60			
	61 and over			

*p < 0,05 $df\,1\,=\,4\;df\,2 = 395$

The ANOVA analysis showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the positive effect variable according to the resultant age variable, but no difference in negative effect, interaction, communication obstructed, cultural influence, Effect on conventions, social effect variables. The Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to examine the groups from which the difference was born in the positive effector variable. Test results are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4: POST HOC TEST VALUE (LSD)

Dependent Variable	Age Group		Avarage Differencce	p value	% 95 Güven Aralığı	
	I	II			Bottom value	Top value
Positive effect	20-30	31-40	-0,23138	0,018	-0,4224	-0,0403
		60 and over	-73591	0,011	-1,3053	-0,1665

As seen in Tablo, the positive effect perceptions of 20-30 age participants are different from the participants in the 31-40 and 60 age and over age groups. Age group 20-30 ($\overline{X}$ = 2,11) were found to be higher than those of age group 31-40 ($\overline{X}$ = 2.34) and 60 and over ($\overline{X}$ = 2.85) .

Whether or not the education level variable has a significant difference on the socio-cultural influence dimensions was investigated with the Variance Analysis (ANOVA) at the level of p <0,05 significance under the assumption of normal distribution. The results are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: THE IMPACT OF DIMENSIONS ON SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON EDUCATIONAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS (ANOVA ANALYSIS)

Dependent Variable	Education	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Negative Effects	Primary school			
	High school			
	Higher education	1,383	1,381	0,231
	Under graduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			
Interaction	Primary school			
	High school			
	Higher education	3,116	0,769	0,573
	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			
Dependent Variable	Primary school			
	High school			
	Higher education	1,197	1,199	0,309
	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			
Communication Obstructed	Primary school			
	High school			
	higher education	2,522	1,425	0,214
	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			
Cultural Influence	Primary school			
	High school			
	Higher education	0,708	1,72	0,129
	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			

Dependent Variable	Education	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Effect on conventions	Primary school	2,399	1,262	0,28
	High school			
	Higher education			
	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			
Social Relations	Primary school	0,807	1,901	0,93
	High school			
	Higher education			
	Under graduate			
	Graduate			
	PhD			

*p < 0,05 $df\ 1\ =\ 4$

$df\ 2\ =\ 394$

According to the results shown in the table, negative effects, positive effects, communication obstructed, cultural influence, effect on conventions, social effect variables were not found to be significant according to education variable.

TABLE 6: THE IMPACT OF SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON THE OCCUPATIONAL SITUATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS (ANOVA ANALYSIS)

Dependent variable	Occupation	Levene Test Value	F Value	p value
Negative effect	Tourism Sector	0,89	2,058	0,032
	Farmer			
	Merchant			
	Artisan			
	Self employed			
	Worker			
	State officer			
	Reti Rejection			
	House Wife			
	Other			

Dependent variable	Occupation	Levene Test Value	F Value	p value
Communication	Tourism Sector Farmer Merchant Artisan Self employed Worker State officer Reti Rejection House Wife Other	2,62	1,727	0,081
Positive effect	Tourism Sector Farmer Merchant Artisan Self employed Worker State officer Reti Rejection House Wife Other	1,276	2,661	0,005
Communication obstructed	Tourism Sector Farmer Merchant Artisan Self employed Worker State officer Reti Rejection House Wife Other	1,677	0,776	0,638

Dependent variable	Occupation	Levene Test Value	F Value	p value
Cultural influence	Tourism Sector	0,875	1,893	0,52
	Farmer			
	Merchant			
	Artisan			
	Self employed			
	Worker			
	State officer			
	RetiRejection			
	House Wife			
	Other			
Effect on conventions	Tourism Sector	3,856	1,584	0,118
	Farmer			
	Merchant			
	Artisan			
	Self employed			
	Worker			
	State officer			
	RetiRejection			
	House Wife			
	Other			
Social Relations	Tourism Sector	0,446	1,583	0,118
	Farmer			
	Merchant			
	Artisan			
	Self employed			
	Worker			
	State officer			
	RetiRejection			
	House Wife			
	Other			

*p < 0,05 $df\ 19 = df\ 2$
$= 390$

The results of the ANOVA analysis showed that there were statistically significant differences in the negative and positive effect variables according to Occupation variable. The Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to examine the difference in the negative effect variable from which groups. The test results are given in Table 7 and Table 8.

TABLE 7: NEGATIVE EFFECT POSTC TEST (LSD)

Dependent Variable	Occupation Group		Avarage Difference	p value	% 95 Confidence Interval	
	I	*II*			*Bottom value*	*Top value*
Negative effect	Tourism Sector	Merchant	-1,38752	0,030	-2,6433	-0,1317
		State Officer	0,40859	0,013	0,085	0,7322

According to the results in the Table 9, the negative effect perceptions of participants who are tourism sector employees are different from participants who work as merchant and state officer. Participants with Occupation Tourism Sector ($\overline{X}$ = 3,23) were found to have a higher rate of participation in negative effects than Merchant ($\overline{X}$ = 4.61) and state officer ($\overline{X}$ = 2.82).

In Table 8, the Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to examine the groups in which the difference in the positive effect variable was. Test results are given in Table 9.

TABLE 8: POSITIVE EFFECT POSTC TEST (LSD)

Dependent variable	Occupation		Average difference	p value	%95 Confidence Interval	
	I	*II*			*Bottom value*	*Top value*
Positive effect	Worker	Tourism Sector	0,47295	0,004	0,1489	0,797
		Other	0,36292	0,05	0,0004	0,7255

P < 0,05

According to the results in the table, the negative effect perceptions of the participants indicating Occupation worker is different from the participants grouped as Tourism Sector and Other. Participants with Occupations worker ($\overline{X}$ = 2,49) were found to have a higher rate of participation in positive effect than the participants in Tourism Sector ($\overline{X}$ = 2,01) and Other ($\overline{X}$ = 2,12).

TABLE 9: IMPACT OF DIMENSIONS OF TOURISM SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCE ON MONTHLY INCOME SITUATION OF PARTICIPANTS (ANOVA ANALYSIS)

Dependent variable	Monthly Income	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Negative effect	550 less than	0,747	0,251	0,959
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000			
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			
Interactions	550 less than	1,101	4,367	,000
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000			
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			
Positive effect	550 less than	1,015	1,097	0,363
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000			
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			

Dependent variable	Monthly Income	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Communication obstructed	550 less than			
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000	1,457	1,927	0,075
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			
Cultural influence	550 less than			
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000	0,297	1,242	0,284
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			
Effect on conventions	550 less than			
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
	1501-2000	1,557	6,34	0,703
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			

Dependent variable	Monthly Income	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
	550 less than			
	551-1000			
	1001-1500			
Social Relations	1501-2000	1,081	4,394	,000
	2001-3000			
	3001-4000			
	4001 and over			

*p < 0,05

As seen in the table, there is a significant difference in the interaction and social relations variables according to the income variable. The Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to determine the level at which they originated. Test results are given in Table 10 and Table 11.

TABLE 10: POST HOC TEST VALUES (LSD) FOR INCOME VARIABLES (INTERACTION)

Dependent variable	Monthly Income		Avarage Difference	p value	%95 Confidence Interval	
	I	II			Bottom value	Top value
Interaction	1001-1500	550 less than	-0,28571	,034	-0,5500	-0,0214
		1501-2000	0,37612	,000	0,1687	0,5835

According to the results of the table, the perception of interaction of the participants with 1001-1500 TL monthly income level is different from the participants with the income level of 550 TL less than and 15001-2000 TL. It was found that the participation rates of the participants with monthly average income levels of 1001-1500 TL ($\overline{X}$ = 2,04) were higher than the participants with monthly average income levels 550 less than ($\overline{X}$ = 2,33) and 1501-2000 ($\overline{X}$ = 1,67). In Table 11, the Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to examine which groups differ in the social relations variable.

TABLE 11: POST HOC TEST VALUES (LSD) FOR INCOME VARIABLES (SOCIAL RELATIONS)

Dependent variable	Monthly Income I	Monthly Income II	Avarage Difference	p value	%95 Confidence Interval Bottom value	%95 Confidence Interval Top value
Social Relations	550 less than	1501-2000	0,14094	0,010	0,0881	0,6422
		4001 and over	0,19118	0,025	-0,8073	-0,0556

According to the results on the Table, the participants with 550 TL less than monthly income differ in their social impact perceptions from those with 1501-2000 and 4001 TL and over income levels. The monthly average income levels were found to be higher than those of the participants with 550 TL less than ($\overline{X}$ = 2,26) than those with monthly average income levels of 1501-2000 TL ($\overline{X}$ = 1.90) and TL and over ($\overline{X}$ = 2.70) .

TABLE 12: THE DIMENSIONS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON PARTICIPANTS EFFECT OF THE PARTICIPANTS ON THE STATUS OF AGE SPACES (ANOVA ANALYSIS)

Dependent Variable	Libing in the region	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Negative effect	Less than 1 year	0,674	0,575	0,72
	1-5 year			
	6-10 year			
	11-15 year			
	16-20 year			
	21 year and over			
Etkileşim	Less than 1 year	2,283	3,052	0,01
	1-5 year			
	6-10 year			
	11-15 year			
	16-20 year			
	21 year and over			
Positive effect	Less than 1 year	0,75	1,436	0,21
	1-5 year			
	6-10 year			
	11-15 year			
	16-20 year			
	21 year and over			

Dependent Variable	Libing in the region	Levene Test Value	F value	p value
Communication obstructed	Less than 1 year 1-5 year 6-10 year 11-15 year 16-20 year 21 year and over	0,621	3,626	0,003
Cultural influence	Less than 1 year 1-5 year 6-10 year 11-15 year 16-20 year 21 year and over	2,209	1,357	0,24
Effect on Conventions	Less than 1 year 1-5 year 6-10 year 11-15 year 16-20 year 21 year and over	0,329	0,174	0,972
Social Relations	Less than 1 year 1-5 year 6-10 year 11-15 year 16-20 year 21 year and over	2,184	1,151	0,333

*p < 0,05

According to the results on the table, the participants with 550 TL less than monthly income differ in their social impact perceptions from those with 1501-2000 and 4001 and over income levels. The monthly average income levels were found to be higher than those of the participants with 550 TL less than ($\overline{X} = 2{,}26$) than those with monthly average income levels of 1501-200 ($\overline{X} = 1.90$) and 4001 and over ($\overline{X} = 2.70$) .

TABLE 13: THE DIMENSIONS OF THE SOCIO-CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON PARTICIPANTS EFFECT OF THE PARTICIPANTS ON THE STATUS OF AGE SPACES (ANOVA ANALYSIS)

Dependent variable	Living in the region		Average difference	p value	%95 Confidence Interval	
	I	II			Bottom value	Top value
Interaction	1 year less than	1-5 year	-0,49318	0,006	-0,8448	-0,1416
		11-15 year	-0,47151	0,013	-0,8417	-0,1013

Participants who did not live in the area for less than 1 yeild, as in the case of tabloda, differ in their perception of the interaction dimension from 1-5 year and 11-15 year aged participants. Participants with a mean age of less than 1 yr ($\overline{X} = 1.76$) had a participation participation rate of 1-5 years ($\overline{X} = 2,26$) and 11-15 years ($\overline{X} = 2.88$) according to the duration of living in the region were found to be higher. In Table 14, the Post Hoc Test (LSD) was applied to examine the difference in the communication obstructed variable.

TABLE 14: LIVING IN THE REGION POST-HOC TEST VALUES (LSD) FOR COMMUNICATION OBSTRUCTED

Dependent variable	Living in the region		Average difference	p value	% 95 Confidence Interval	
	I	II			Bottom value	Top value
Communication obstructed	21 year and over	Less than a year	0,65331	0,001	0,2756	1,031
		11-15 year	0,4375	0,009	0,1092	0,7658

*p < 0,05

As seen in the table, the participants who reported 21 year and over age differed from the participants in the perception of the communication obstructed dimension by less than 1 yeild and 11 to 15 years. Participants with 21 years of life (X = 3,57) were more likely to participate in the communication format than those living in the region with less than 1 year ($\overline{X} = 2.92$) and 11-15 years ($\overline{X} = 3,13$) Respectively. According to the results obtained hypothesis results are as follows:

H1: The opinions of the local people on the tourism socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to the genders of the participants.		
H1*a*	The opinions of the local people on the 'negative effect' of tourism socio-cultural influencers show a meaningful difference according to their gender.	Rejection
H1*b*	The opinions of the local people regarding the 'interaction' of tourism with socio-cultural influences show a meaningful difference according to their gender.	Rejection
H1*c*	The opinions of the local people on the 'positive effect' of tourism socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to their gender.	Rejection
H1*d*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, and communication obstructed differ significantly from their genders.	Rejection
H1*e*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences '' cultural influence '' show a meaningful difference according to gender.	Rejection
H1*f*	The opinions of the local people on tourism-socio-cultural influences '' Effect on conventions '' show a significant difference from their genders	Accept
H1*g*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, and 'social relations' show a significant difference according to gender.	Rejection
H2: The opinions of the local people on the tourism socio-cultural influencers show a meaningful difference according to the agenda of the participants.		
H2*a*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism effect of the socio-cultural influencelerine show a meaningful difference according to their agendas.	Rejection
H2*b*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences '' interaction '' show a meaningful difference according to their agendas.	Rejection
H2*c*	The opinions of the local people on the 'positive effect' of tourism socio-cultural influencers show a meaningful difference according to their agenda.	Accept
H2I	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences, and communication obstructed differ considerably according to their agendas.	Rejection
H2*e*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism influence of socio-cultural influences on the 'cultural influence' show a meaningful difference according to the agendas.	Rejection

H2*f*	The opinions of the local people on tourism-socio-cultural influences 'Effect on conventions' show a meaningful difference according to their agendas.	Rejection
H2*g*	The views of local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences and social relations' show a meaningful difference according to their agendas.	Rejection
H3: The opinions of the local people on the tourism socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to the educational status of the participants.		
H3*a*	The opinions of the local people on the 'negative effect' of tourism socio-cultural influencers show a meaningful difference according to the education situation.	Rejection
H3*b*	The opinions of the local people regarding the 'interaction' of tourism, socio-cultural influences show a meaningful difference according to education status.	Rejection
H3*c*	The opinions of the local people on the 'positive effect' of tourism socio-cultural influences show a meaningful difference according to the education situation.	Rejection
H3*d*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, and communication obstructed differ significantly according to education status.	Rejection
H3*e*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences '' cultural influence '' show a significant difference according to the education situation.	Rejection
H3*f*	The opinions of the local people on tourism-socio-cultural influences (Effect on conventions) show a meaningful difference according to the educational situation.	Rejection
H3*g*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences, and '' social relations '' show a meaningful difference according to education status.	Rejection
H4: The opinions of the local people on the tourism socio-cultural influences differ significantly from the Occupations of the participants.		
H4*a*	The opinions of local people on the 'negative effect' of tourism on socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to Occupations.	Accept
H4*b*	The opinions of the local people on tourism "interaction" of socio-cultural influences show a meaningful difference according to Occupations.	Accept
H4*c*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism-socio-cultural influencerine''positive effect 'show a significant difference according to Occupations.	Rejection

H4*d*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, communication obstructed differ significantly from Occupations.	REJECTİON
H4*e*	The opinions of local people on tourism influences on socio-cultural influences are significantly different according to Occupations.	REJECTİON
H4*f*	The opinions of the local people on tourism-socio-cultural influences «Effect on conventions» show a significant difference according to Occupations.	REJECTİON
H4*g*	The opinions of local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences on '' social relations '' - the findings are significantly different from Occupations.	REJECTİON

H5: Opinions of local people about tourism socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to the monthly income levels of the participants.

H5*a*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism effect of socio-cultural influencelerine are significantly different from the monthly income levels.	REJECTİON
H5*b*	The opinions of the local people on the 'interaction' of tourism, socio-cultural influences show a significant difference according to monthly income levels.	ACCEPT
H5*c*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism effect of socio-cultural influencelerine are significantly different from the monthly income levels.	REJECTİON
H5*d*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, and communication obstructed differ significantly from monthly income levels.	REJECTİON
H5*e*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism-socio-cultural influencerine''cultural influence 'show a meaningful difference according to the monthly income levels.	REJECTİON
H5*f*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences, '' Effective on conventions '' are significantly different from monthly income levels.	REJECTİON
H5*g*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences and '' social relations '' show a significant difference according to monthly income levels.	ACCEPT

H6: The opinions of local people on tourism socio-cultural influences differ significantly from those of Living in the region of participants.

H6*a*	The opinions of the local people on the tourism effect of 'socio-cultural influencelerine' show a significant difference compared to the duration of Living in the region.	Rejection
H6*b*	The opinions of the local people on the interaction with tourism socio-cultural influences show a meaningful difference compared to the duration of Living in the region.	Accept
H6c	The opinions of the local people on the 'positive effect' of tourism socio-cultural influences differ significantly from those of Living in the region.	Rejection
H6*d*	Opinions of local people about tourism, socio-cultural influences and communication obstructed differ significantly from those of Living in the region.	Accept
H6*e*	The opinions of the local people on tourism, socio-cultural influencelerine, '' cultural impact '' differ significantly from those of Living in the region.	Rejection
H6*f*	The opinions of the local people on the 'effect on conventions' of tourism socio-cultural influencers differ significantly from those of Living in the region.	Rejection
H6*g*	The opinions of local people on tourism, socio-cultural influences, and social relations differ significantly from those of Living in the region.	Rejection

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, a survey was conducted in Manavgat, one of the regions where tourism has been intensively conducted for many years, to learn about the opinions of local people about tourism's socio-cultural influences. The demographic conditions of the local people are examined here. The selected region is a place that can be preferred in all seasons of the year with its historical, natural beauties and climate. The data obtained in the research were analyzed with the SPSS program. In the interpretation of the research findings, in addition to the percentage and frequency analyzes of the first section of the questionnaire, '' Independent Sample T-Test '', '' Variance Analysis (ANOVA) '' Mann- Whitney U Test 'and' 'Post Hoc Test (LSD) 'Analysis of the data and the distribution of the data reached are given.In the results of the study, it is observed that in Manavgat region, where tourism has been taking place for many years, there are positive and negative reactions to the factors dimensioned by the opinions of the indigenous people about tourism socio-cultural influences. It is seen that the participants especially stated that they have been living in the region for long years and they are in a more economic relationship with the

tourists. In addition, it is thought that local people in the region have started to make some changes in their behaviors against tourists in parallel with the sector development. In this respect, it is thought that the dimension of the behavior of the local people against the tourists in the region is in the "indifference" phase of the Doxey 's Disability Index Model in the theoretical part of the study. Because of the development of tourism in the region, the rapid increase in the number of tourists has begun to be met naturally. There has been a rapid increase in the number of tourist enterprises in the region and foreign investors have controlled a significant part of the region. Local residents are more likely to be in service. This is thought to be an important reason why some people have been treated irrelevant especially to the tourists in recent years.

In the study it was observed that participants' opinion on the social and cultural influences that may occur as a result of the tourism event is changing according to the perception of the economic benefits that the industry in general has achieved. Local people in this region are aware of the consequences of positive and negative effects from tourism. But with the region's tourism incomes on the frontline, the negative effects are somewhat backwards. It is thought that these reasons may be effective in some of the questions that are made in the study, especially when some participants respond negatively. In addition, it was observed that a bad year pass, due to various reasons in general, in terms of our tourism country during the course of this study (August-September-October (2016)) led to changes in the opinions of local people and they participated in this direction. Especially in the Manavgat region, where the economy is largely due to tourism, it has been observed that the people are affected from these negativities in a big way. In Manavgat, it is considered that local people should be educated and various education and seminars should be given in order to reduce the negative tourism socio-cultural influences. Local governments and tourism investors are also thought to be more productive in working with local communities.

It is a significant limitation of working with hotel employees or travel agent employees who are directly related to the tourism event of the employee. It is thought that the re-construction of this work with the direct sector employees in the other researches can increase the generalization level of the research results and give better results. In future studies it is thought that this can be done by interviewing the direct contacts and how the solution proposal might be (trying to increase the positive effects of tourism, socio-cultural aspects, reducing negative effects) and trying to get the answers from the local people themselves.

References

Altıntaş, V. (2010). *Turizmin Gelişminin Yerel Halkın Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerine Etkileri:Alanya Modeli Örneği.* Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doktora Tezi, Antalya.

Avcıkurt, C. (2007). *Turizm Sosyolojisi.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Avcıkurt, C. (2009). *Turizm Sosyolojisi Genel ve Yapısal Yaklaşım.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Baykan, E. (2007). *Turizmin Yerel Kültür Üzerine Etkilerinin Yöre Halkı Tarafından Algılanması (Ürgüp Yöresinde Bir Uygulama).* Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Bitirme Tezi, Ankara.

Butler, R. W. (1980). The Concept of Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *Canada Geographer* , 24(I),5-12.

Demircan, Ş. (2010). *Turizmin Sosyo Kültürel Etkileri: Antalya/Muratpaşa İlçesi Örneği.* Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Graduate Tezi, Antalya.

Doğan, H. Z. (1987). *Turizmin Sosyo Kültürel Temelleri.* İzmir: Uğur Ofset Matbacılık ve Ticaret.

Doğan, H. Z. (2004). *Turizmin Sosyo Kültürel Temelleri.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Dyer, P. G. (2007). Structural Modelling of Resident Perceptions of Tourism and Associated Developmet on the Sunshine Coast, Australia . *Tourism Managment* , 28,409-422.

Gursoy, D., & Rutherfort, D. G. (2004). Host Attitudes Toward Tourism an Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Resarch* , 31(3),495-516.

Duran. E. (2011), Turizm, Kültür ve Kimlik İlişkisi; Turizmde Toplumsal ve Kültürel Kimliğin Sürdürülebilirliği, *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 19:291-313.

Güdü, Ö. (2011). *Turizmin Sosyo-Kültürel Etkilerinin Turist Rehberleri Tarafından Algılanması: Trabzon'da Bir Uygulama.* Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,Graduate Tezi, Balıkesir.

Jawal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration Theory and Community Tourim Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* , 22 (1), 186-204.

Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A Structural Equation Modal of Resident' Attitudes for Tourism Development. *Tourism Management* , 23,521-530.

Öter, Z., & Özdoğan, O. N. (2005). Kültür Amaçlı Seyahat Eden Turistlerde Destinasyon İmajı: Selçuk-Efes Örneği,. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* , 16 (2), 127-138 .

Özmen, M. (2007). *Turizmin Sosyo-Cultural influenceleri Akçakoca Örneği.* Abant İzzet Baysal Ünüversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitisü, Bitirme Tezi, Akçakoca.

Roney Akış, S. (2011). *Turizim Bir Sistemin Analizi.* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Tuna, M. (2007). *Turizm Çevre ve Toplum (Marmaris Örneği).* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Usta, Ö. (2001). *Genel Turizm.* İzmir: Anadolu Matbacılık.