

THE ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL POPULATION'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE EFFECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF AMASYA

Serif Baldiran

Amasya University,
Akbilek Mah. Muhsin Yazıcıoğlu Cad. No:7,
Turkey

Abstract:

In recent years, tourism has become one of the regional development tools because due to its high impact on other sectors, the ability of enhancing employment rates and adaptability to the peculiarities of the region. Sustainable tourism development depends on the regional tourism policies that consider the impact of tourism on the local population and their approach to tourism.

Amasya is a city in Turkey with a very rich cultural heritage and 7,500 years long history. In Amasya, tourism comes to everybody's mind when development and growth are mentioned. To that end, significant investments have recently been made in tourism infrastructure and promotion of Amasya. However, the impact of tourism on the local communities and their approaches is not clear.

This study is aimed at elaborating the issue of tourism development impact on the local people, the local people's approach to tourism and the regional people's attitudes towards tourists. After the literature research and theoretical background, a questionnaire was applied to a randomly selected sample of 420 individuals. Five-point Likert scale was used and the obtained data was analyzed using the SPSS software. The results are descriptive and inferential statistics. The data was tested with Cronbach's Alpha test for calculating confidence. Principal component analysis (PCA) was applied to determine the data validity.

Keywords:

tourism impact, regional development, tourism development, cultural destination, city tourism.

INTRODUCTION

Although tourism is a social activity, its results are visible in economic terms. Tourism is one of the most important tools used in regional development and has a high impact on other sectors and easily adapts to their unique properties. However, large investments in tourism and tourism infrastructure development, determining the angle of view of local communities for tourism development in the region, are important for encouraging healthy tourism-oriented development and sustainability of the policies.

The impact of tourism development on the local community in the region is of paramount importance and is reflected in three different ways, including environmental, socio-cultural and general economic aspect (Andereck *et al.*, 2005). However, these effects can be perceived as positive or negative on the local population (Upchurch and Teiva, 2000).

Correspondence:
Serif Baldiran

e-mail:
baldiran@hotmail.com



For the economic purposes, tourism development aims at controlling their effects on the local community as much as possible.

The economic impact of tourism is composed of factors such as inflation, jobs creation, tax revenues and local government spending. The regions with not so many alternatives prefer to use their local socio-cultural and natural differences in tourism development. Besides that, high multiplier effects of tourism development on other sectors create a positive impact on tourism development in other sectors and fulfil the role of locomotive for regional development.

Economic benefits are expected to increase the impact of tourism on local communities in a positive way. The view of the groups having more benefits from tourism may be more favourable to the sectors than fewer benefits from tourism (Claudia and Gursoy, 2004). According to Andrew Lepp, the main factor of the local people in being positive to tourism is tourism contribution to regional development, creation of new income source and regional expectations for better future with tourism (Andrew, 2007).

However, negative effects of tourism on the region are described as increasing prices and asset values related to economic factors, as well as crowding, increased pollution and social disadvantages such as increased crime rate and a growing number of undesirable activities such as gambling and alcohol (Upchurch and Teiva, 2000). The negative thoughts of local residents toward tourism are directly related to how they were disturbed by the tourism development and how they perceived threat against its own value.

The negative socio-cultural impacts of tourism are the increased crime rates, cultural interaction, exchange created in the traditions and customs. However, the socio-cultural effects of tourism are two-sided. First, the landlord is able to influence other cultures, and as a result, emerges intercultural understanding and tolerance between cultures. The second is to provide other people their own culture, to live in a community, increase the sense of cohesion and belonging (Besculides and McCormick, 2002). Research has shown that tourism development in the region increases interest in local crafts, cultural identity expressing values, ideas and related increases in their own culture. At the same time, tourism development increases cultural exchange opportunities for the local people and feeling of identity and belonging to the region (Claudia and Gursoy, 2004). The negative impact on tourism in the social structure could be due to traffic issues leading to different social problems.

At the same time, there is evidence that tourism causes smuggling, gambling and drug use in addition to the community's traditional spoilage in tourism development areas (Kim, Uysal and Sirg, 2013).

Tourism has both positive and negative effects on the environmental factors. The most important positive impact of tourism on the environment is the increasing awareness of environmental protection with the conservation of wildlife and national parks. However, most research on the effects of facing the pressure and protection of the environment in tourism is focused on the environmental impact of tourism (Kim *et al.*, 2013). Again, on the basis of the economic behaviour of the local population towards tourism development, there may be social and environmental aspects (Kuvana and Akan, 2005). The potential environmental impact of tourism is seen as air pollution, waste water, fertilizer spill, destruction of wildlife, degradation of natural habitats, destruction of forests and vegetation, and degradation of wetlands and beaches (Andereck *et al.*, 2005).

The planned development of tourism at the regional level is to ensure significant contribution of tourism to the region and the highest level of participation of the local people in tourism development (Caliskan and Tutuncu, 2008). However, this process in most developed regions where tourism is developing is occurring in an uncontrolled and unplanned manner. However, there are still questions to be answered to understand the behaviour of the local people in regional tourism development. One of the most relevant questions for this situation refers to the kind of tourist behavior that ensures the formation of attitudes and tolerance of local people towards tourists.

It is not possible to easily understand tourism regional development and behaviour of local communities towards tourism development in the region. However, according to the development of the region's tourism, certain patterns of behaviour towards tourism development can be developed. In most research on tourism development, the behaviour developed by the local community illustrates the level of tourism development in the region. Butler's "Tourism Regions Development Life Cycle" is one of the most important studies on this matter. According to Butler's hypothesis, an increasing number of tourists visiting a particular area, local people approaching tolerance to the tourist at the beginning can have a more negative direction and be more sceptical about the long term benefits for social, economic and environmental aspects (Caliskan and Tutuncu, 2008).



RESEARCH METHOD

Region Covered by the Research

Amasya is a historic city located in the Central Black Sea area of Turkey, between Tokat province on its east and south, Corum province on its west, and Samsun province on its north. According to the population census in 2013, Amasya province's population amounts to about 321,977 and its city centre population is about 96,220. Amasya's seasonal specialties seem to be determined by an intermediate climate between continental climate and climate in the Black Sea region.



Figure 1. Location of Amasya in Turkey

The history of Amasya covers a period of 7500 years and is located in Amasya various civilizations during this period. Amasya's name dates back to the Hittites Empire. Amasya historian Strabo (M.Ö.60-M.S.19) stated that the city's name is Amasia.

Amasya, one of the brands in Turkey, has undergone significant development of tourism infrastructure and has achieved a significant increase in the number of tourists in recent years due to this development. However, we do not dispose of the exact data on whether the local people are prepared for such development, how they perceive tourism and how tourism-oriented approach and behaviour are important for tourism development.

Indicators of Tourism Development in Amasya Province

Tourists largely come to Amasya for cultural tourism, health tourism, religious tourism and hunting tourism. Amasya is especially described by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey, as a city among the cultural tourism brand cities that should be developed. The tourists visiting Amasya are observed as a daily structure when they travel to Black Sea or casually. However, the number of accommodation facilities in Amasya is increasing.

Accommodation Facilities

The majority of accommodation establishments have the municipal certificate. That is why Amasya has got historical homes and mansion and they are used as hostels by the local people. Tourism businesses located in Amasya are predominately small businesses and historical hostels.

Table 1. Accommodation facilities (2012)

Facilities	Number of Facility	Number of Rooms	Number of Bedrooms
Tourism Investment Licenced	4	220	502
Tourism Operation Licenced	15	427	852
Certified Municipal	34	618	1,462

Source: Turkish Culture and Tourism Ministry (2015)

In 2012, there were four facilities with tourism investment certificate and 15 licensed tourism businesses. In that year, the number of municipalities certified accommodation facilities was 34. Over a ten-year period, the number of tourism operation licenced facilities has remained relatively the same, but the number of municipalities with certified accommodation facilities has increased. This leads to the discussion on the quality issues in tourism development in Amasya.

Tourist Numbers in Amasya Province

The most important indicator of tourism development in Amasya is the number of tourists coming to the province. Table 2 and 3 show the number of tourists according to the number of arrivals, overnights spent, average length of stay and occupancy rate in establishments in Amasya Province. Table 2 shows the number of changes occurring in a 10-year period for the certified tourism facilities, while Table 3 shows the number of changes occurring in a 10-year period for the certified municipal facilities. According to the data in the tourism certified facilities, there are not any pivotal changes in the number of tourists staying in certified tourism facilities for the decade. That means that the number of certified tourism facilities has been the same in the decade. At the same time, tourism development in the city has started with governmental structure and the development continues in the manner of locality.



In Table 2, the number of tourists staying in the municipal certified business is given. The number of tourists staying in municipalities certified facilities increased by 100 % over a ten-year period. However, the occupancy rate did not increase so much in the observed period. The reason can be argued, which means that the number of certified municipal facilities has increased as much as the number of tourists. It also shows that the accommodations facilities are increasing as certified municipal facilities.

According to the data given in Table 2, the number of tourists accommodated in certified tourism facilities has remained the same of the years. However, occupancy rate is falling slightly. The number of tourists accommodated in municipalities (Table 3) in accommodations certified is increasing but the occupancy rate is staying same in this duration. During this time, the number of certified municipal accommodations shows that the increasing number of facilities is increasing at same rate as the number of tourist arrivals.

Research Method

Research was applied to local communities of Amasya, living within the borders of the region for at least five years, between the ages of 18-65. In the study, after the literature review and theoretical background, the survey was applied to 546 people selected by means of a random method. The survey confidence level is 95% (1.96) and the confidence interval is 3.5. Five-point Likert method used for data collection was analysed by the SPSS software. The data were based on the descriptive and inferential statistics and the reliability analysis of survey questions (Cronbach's alpha). At the same time, the factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis) was applied to determine the validity of the variables and regression analysis was performed to examine the effects of independent variables on the dependent variables.

Table 2. The number of tourists in Amasya province(certified tourism facilities)

Years	Number of Arrivals			Nights Spent			Average Length of Stay			Occupancy Rate		
	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total
2006	4.675	58.595	63.270	6.442	88.857	95.299	1,38	1,52	1,51	2,97	41,01	43,99
2007	3.342	47.105	50.447	4.618	69.627	74.245	1,40	1,50	1,50	2,38	35,91	38,29
2008	4.681	39.465	44.146	6.427	55.884	62.311	1,40	1,40	1,40	2,73	23,70	26,42
2009	3.553	42.100	45.653	5.685	54.386	60.071	1,60	1,29	1,32	2,23	21,29	23,51
2010	2.087	25.302	27.389	2.747	29.201	31.948	1,32	1,15	1,17	1,28	13,56	14,84
2011	6.801	54.200	61.001	9.893	78.666	88.559	1,45	1,45	1,45	3,47	27,60	31,07
2012	5.716	58.427	64.143	8.985	86.322	95.307	1,57	1,48	1,49	2,83	27,17	30,00
2013	5.206	56.065	61.271	8.519	82.036	90.555	1,64	1,46	1,48	2,75	26,48	29,23
2014	4.399	55.163	59.562	7.456	82.515	89.971	1,69	1,50	1,51	2,58	28,56	31,14
2015	3.607	59.639	63.246	5.801	89.311	95.112	1,61	1,50	1,50	1,85	28,42	30,27

Source: Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Republic of Turkey (2015)

Table 3. The number of tourisms in Amasya (certified municipal facilities)

Years	Number of Arrivals			Nights Spent			Average Length of Stay			Occupancy Rate		
	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total	Foreigner	Citizen	Total
2006	661	40.020	40.681	894	55.276	56.170	1,35	1,38	1,38	0,32	19,95	20,28
2007	2.979	55.703	58.682	4.223	68.891	73.114	1,42	1,24	1,25	1,11	18,10	19,21
2008	1 826	44 650	46 476	2 855	65 719	68 574	1,60	1,50	1,50	0,75	17,22	17,96
2009	1.553	58.728	60.281	2.732	77.666	80.398	1,76	1,32	1,33	0,67	19,14	19,81
2010	1.881	70.750	72.631	3.326	105.979	109.305	1,77	1,50	1,50	0,69	21,93	22,62
2011	1.239	56.700	57.939	2.371	100.447	102.818	1,91	1,77	1,77	0,46	19,53	19,99
2012	3.255	52.649	55.904	4.995	105.677	110.672	1,53	2,01	1,98	0,94	19,91	20,85
2013	2.241	62.886	65.127	3.205	108.504	111.709	1,43	1,73	1,72	0,59	19,96	20,55
2014	11.334	59.227	70.561	22.769	106.240	129.009	2,01	1,79	1,83	4,19	19,55	23,74
2015	5.837	89.466	95.303	11.852	133.655	145.507	2,03	1,49	1,53	2,20	24,78	26,98

Source: Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Republic of Turkey (2015)



RESEARCH RESULTS

Feeling of Belonging to Amasya

Demographic Breakdown of Participants

The survey included the questions related to respondents' gender, age, their education, occupation and income level to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants. The multiple-choice questions have already been given to participants to choose only one set as optional.

Table 4 shows that the overall sample of respondents (N = 536) included 45.7% of male and 54.5% of women participants. 39% of 536 participants seem to possess a university degree. The participants in the survey are aged between 36-50 years.

In the second part of the questionnaire, multiple-choice questions were used to determine the feeling of belonging to Amasya with the questions "How many years have you lived in Amasya?" and "How would you describe yourself in terms of Amasya?"

As regards the participants' sense of belonging to Amasya, 73.3% of respondents are described as natives of Amasya. Accordingly, it is understood that the participants are largely composed of residents of Amasya. Namely, 80% of respondents seem to have been living in Amasya for more than 5 years, while 90.4% of respondents stated that their job is not connected to tourism.

Table 4. Demographic characteristics of the participants

	N			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
	Valid	Missing				
Gender	536	0	Male	245	45.7	45.7
			Woman	291	54.3	54.3
			Total	536	100.0	100.0
Educational Background	531	5	Primary school	68	12.7	12.8
			Middle School	57	10.6	10.7
			High school	175	32.6	33.0
			University	207	38.6	39.0
			Graduate	24	4.5	4.5
			Total	531	99.1	100.0
Age	534	2	18-25	131	24.4	24.5
			26-35	188	35.1	35.2
			36-50	192	35.8	36.0
			51-65	23	4.3	4.3
			Total	534	99.6	100.0

Table 5. Feeling of belonging to Amasya of the participants

	N			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
	Valid	Missing				
How would you describe yourself in terms of Amasya?	532	4	Not Native	142	26.5	26.7
			Native	390	72.8	73.3
			Total	532	99.3	100.0
How many years have you lived in Amasya?	532	4	Less than 1 year	17	3.2	3.2
			1-5 Years	47	8.8	8.8
			6-10 Years	66	12.3	12.4
			21-30 Years	115	21.5	21.6
			11-20 Years	133	24.8	25.0
			More than 20 Years	154	28.7	28.9
Is your job somehow related to tourism?	522	14	Total	532	99.3	100.0
			Yes	50	9.3	9.6
			No	472	88.1	90.4
			Total	522	97.4	100.0



Types of indigenous behaviour against tourists in Amasya

In this part, Likert scale questions were posed to reveal how the local people living in Amasya perceive and behave towards tourists. Propositions with respect to the questions in this part of the study have been subjected to the factor analysis and reliability statistics.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Different questions created by the five-point Likert scale to measure the local people's behaviour towards tourists in Amasya were used. Factor analysis was performed based on the data obtained from the questions delivered. It was decided that some of the propositions were not suitable and were excluded from the list, according to the results of the factor analysis. The remaining four factors have emerged about the concept. These are the local people's threat perception for tourists to the socio-cultural values (FK1), being in negative thoughts against tourists (FK2), positive thoughts for tourists (FK3) and the way to communicate with tourists (FK4). When the KMO test sample size (0.841) is observed, the factor analysis can be used for these data. However, $\sigma = 0.000 < p$ seems to be 0:05.

Four factors were determined according to the results of the factor analysis. The first factor, Threat Perception (FK1), is aimed at testing whether there is any threat perception of the local population from tourists. This factor is intended to test the local people feeling of threat. This factor is aimed at testing whether there is any feeling of threat in the subjects of religious values, traditions and customs, sex life perception and the local population's native language.

The second factor, Negative Thoughts (FK2), is intended to test whether there are any negative thoughts of the local population for tourists. This factor aims to test whether the native people are somehow disturbed by tourists coming to Amasya. In this factor, there are religious beliefs, dressing, money spending, the diversity of languages and behaviour contrary to the traditions of the local people.

The third factor, Positive Thoughts against Tourists (FK3), is intended to test the presence of any admiration thoughts for tourists. The third factor positive thoughts (FK3) are also intended to test whether there is any admiration expressed by the locals for tourists.

The last factor, Contact Forms (FK4), is intended to test whether the local people make connection with tourists. This factor includes how the local population communicates with tourists.

Table 6. Rotated component matrix(a)

Variables	1	2	3	4
Change of religious values	0.807			
Change of customs and tradition	0.834			
Change of the principle of solidarity that allows the society's unity	0.813			
Change in the value related to sexual life	0.832			
Change of language	0.751			
Change of attitudes about family	0.846			
The differences in their religion		0.622		
Have different dressed		0.687		
Spending less money		0.628		
Have different languages		0.697		
Free behavior		0.672		
Different clothing		0.732		
Good Humored			0.822	
Modernity			0.816	
Being polite			0.863	
Keep the environment clean			0.701	
Random conversations				0.669
Sitting down to talk				0.851
Business talk				0.679
Seeing as Guest				0.656
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.				
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.				



Reliability Statistics

The value of Cronbach's Alpha was obtained by the reliability test for 4 factors that has got 20 questions in the survey to demonstrate the local people's perception of the tourist and how they treat the tourist seems to be 0.838.

Table 7. Reliability statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
0.838	0.829	20

It is understood that the reliability of the survey questions is 83%, as shown in Table 4.

Local People's Threat Perception for Tourists to the Socio-Cultural Values (FK1)

It is possible that the local people can see the tourist as a threat to their own values to certain extent. This situation can be the result of the regional tourism development and the local people feel some negative perception from the tourists. Cronbach's alpha values of factors were found to be 0.926. That means the factor's reliability percent is about 92 %.

In this section of the study, some proposition was offered to test whether they feel any threat related to tourists. It seems that there is no exact threat perception for Amasya's local people from tourist. That means

that tourism development doesn't seem to reach certain saturation. However, the results give some tips about the local people threat perception from the tourist. According to the variables, they firstly feel the threat in the change of values related to sexual life (Mean=2.80) and secondly, change in the tradition and customs. It seems that they do not participate in changing the principle of solidarity that allows the society's unity (Mean=2.52). According to the results, the threat perception is for family structure more than for social structure.

Native people's perception of tourist behaviour (FK2).

In this factor, some questions such as "religion differences", "different clothing", "spending less money", "The differences in their language" were asked to the native people to test whether they were disturbed by tourist behaviour. Cronbach's alpha values of factors were found to be 0.851.

Statistical data for the factor (FK2) and reliability values were given in Table 8. When we look at the reliability of the data analysis, overall average reliability rate seems about 0.851. Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted value for spending less money is 0.855. This proposition seems not to be fully understood by respondents.

The native people seem to be indecisive about which tourists can bother them. This situation is due to the local people not having enough information about tourism and also the lack of contact with tourists and the tourism industry. However, they seem not to think that the tourists' religious affiliations and dressing disturb them. It shows that local people tolerate different religions and beliefs.

Table 8. Descriptive statistical data about the threat related to tourists

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Changes in the value related to sexual life	461	1	5	2.80	1.267	0.914
Change of Customs and Tradition	473	1	5	2.73	1.278	0.908
The changes of attitudes about family	460	1	5	2.71	1.273	0.907
The change of language	470	1	5	2.62	1.224	0.918
Change of religious values	487	1	5	2.62	1.312	0.913
Change the principle of solidarity that allows the society's unity	453	1	5	2.52	1.189	0.912
Valid N (listwise)	426					



Admiration of Local People against Tourists (FK3)

In the first years of tourism development in the area, general admiration against tourists is in the foreground. At this stage, it is aimed to put positive thoughts of the local people about tourists. To determine the most popular behaviour of the tourist for native people, propositions “friendly become”, “to be modern”, “to be polite” and “the keeping environment clean” were asked to the participants. Cronbach’s alpha values of factors were found to be 0.799. FK3 reliability rate seems to be about 79% and it is understood to be of medium rate.

According to the data, the native people living in Amasya consider tourists sensitive to the environment and good humoured as those with most favourite behav-

iour. At the same time, modernity and being polite were also appreciated by the respondents. The native people seem to like tourists and it shows that the development is at early stage in the region.

Communication Forms with Tourists (FK4)

The question, “How do you communicate with tourists coming to Amasya?”, was asked to local people in order to test their communication forms with tourists and the propositions such as “Randomly conversations”, “Sitting down to talk”, “Business talk” and “Seeing as Guest” were offered to the participants. FK4 reliability ratio is 53%. It can be said that the FK4 reliability ratio is at a low rate.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics on the tourist factors disturbing the local population

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Spending less money	443	1	5	3.00	1.357	0.855
Free behavior	448	1	5	2.96	1.451	0.819
Have different languages	430	1	5	2.75	1.323	0.831
Clothing	444	1	5	2.67	1.402	0.811
Differences in their religion	428	1	5	2.48	1.344	0.815
Different clothing	413	1	5	2.42	1.229	0.834
Valid N (listwise)	386					

Table 10. Descriptive statistics about the behavior of their favorite (positive thoughts)

Variables	Statistics					
	N Valid	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Good Humoured	472	1	5	4.27	0.851	0.735
Modernity	431	1	5	3.99	1.011	0.711
Being polite	442	1	5	4.16	0.919	0.724
Keep the environment clean	466	1	5	4.21	0.914	0.783
Valid N (listwise)	418					

Table 11. Descriptive statistical data related to the communication form with tourists (contact form)

Variables	N Valid	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Randomly conversations	456	3.71	1.100	1	5	0.454
Sitting down to talk	424	3.25	1.240	1	5	0.362
Business talk	418	2.51	1.210	1	5	0.325
Seeing as Guest	412	2.72	1.294	1	5	0.399
Valid N (listwise)	410					



Amasya's local people seem to communicate with tourists largely in the street. Besides, that business communication while serving tourists is the second most common type of communication. That means that the local people communication with tourists is weak and is not sufficiently developed in the tourism sector.

CONCLUSION

Tourism development exerts positive or negative effects on the local population in the areas of tourism development. These effects can be described as economic, socio-cultural and environmental. As with any developing industry, it is aimed at understanding the impact of tourism on the local population. The local community can develop behavioural models according to the level of tourism development in the region. The local community models formed by the tourism development can indicate the level of tourism development of the region.

This study aims to determine how the local people develop an attitude towards tourists. At the same time, tourism development level in Amasya region can be predicted according to the result of the study. Below are given the results of the study.

The local people in Amasya are unstable in terms of threat perception of socio-cultural values by tourism. This is due to a large proportion of the local population, lack of interest in tourism or lack of direct contact with tourism activities in Amasya. At the same time, it can be said that tourism development in the region seems insufficient. It also shows the development politics in the region due to the lack of social tourism awareness.

For the local people's negative attitudes toward tourists, there is no exact and very evident attitude that disturbs the native people. It shows that the native people in the region don't have enough information about regional tourism activities and have little contact with tourists. This shows two results for the region. One of them is tourism development and the activities stay in the too narrow area. Another one is that tourism development in the region is not adequate. However, the idea that tourists can disturb them by being of different religious affiliations seems to oppose. This shows that they are tolerant towards the people of different religions and beliefs.

Admiration of the local people for the tourist seems high. They like when tourists are sensitive to the environment, being nice and modern. This means the crime against the tourist would be low. It also shows that Amasya seems a safe place for tourists.

When the communication mode of the local population in Amasya with tourists is observed, it takes place as incidental and communication predominately occurs in the street. Besides, it is understood that secondly communication type is the business communication while serving tourists. The local people communication with tourists seems to be weak. That means that the local people confrontation with tourists is non-existent or very low. It can be understood that the tourism development is insufficient in the region and also not common.

According to the obtained data, the local people of Amasya do not perceive any threat from the tourists. However, it is understood that they feel a certain level of admiration towards the tourists. It is understood that there is no expected level of contact with tourists. This can be based on the local people's language differences and/or tourists do not stay enough in the region. The statistics show that the accommodation rate in the region is rather low.

According to Butle's theory, it is understood that tourism in the region is at development stage. In this respect, taking account of local people's perspective is of paramount importance. For healthy tourism development, the local people participation in the tourism sector should be encouraged and social activities can be increased to give a chance to the local people to communicate with tourists. At the same time, tourism development effort and politics should be to spread tourism to the locals. Tourism and regional tourism research can be planned at the secondary school level, while vocational tourism training can be applied at the public level.

REFERENCES

- Andereck, K., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R., & Vogt, C. (2005). Residents' Perceptions Of Community Tourism Impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andrew, L. (2007). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi village, Uganda. *Tourism Management*, 28(3) 876-885. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2006.03.004
- Besculides, A., Lee, M., & McCormick P.J. (2002). Residents' Perceptions Of The Cultural Benefits Of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303-319.
- Butler, R.W. (2011). *Tourism Area Life Cycle*. Retrieved September 21, 2016, from <http://www.goodfellowpublishers.com/academic-publishing.php?content=home>
- Çalışkan, U., & Tütüncü, Ö. (2008). Turizmin Yerel Halk Üzerindeki Etkileri ve Kuşadası İlçesi Uygulaması, Tourism's Effects on Local People and Kuşadası Pattern, IV. Lisansüstü Turizm Öğrencileri Araştırma Kongresi, 23-27 Nisan 2008, Belek, Antalya



- Claudia, J., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance Effects on Residents' attitudes Toward Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296-312.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D.G. (2004). Host Attitudes Toward Tourism An Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirg, M.J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36(2013), 527-540. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2012.09.005
- Kuvana, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism Management*, 26(5) 691-706. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2004.02.019
- Turkish Culture and Tourism Ministry. (2015). *Statistics*. Retrieved September 21, 2016, from <http://www.ktbayatirimisletmeler.gov.tr/TR,9853/istatistikler.html>
- Upchurch, R. S., & Teivane, U. (2000). Resident perceptions of tourism development in Riga, Latvia. *Tourism Management*, 21(5), 499-507. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00104-1