

# Chapter 7

## Residents' Perception of Overtourism, Tourism Impacts and Economic Dependence in Gökceada Island



Neşe Kafa and Halil Korkmaz

**Abstract** The aim of this study is to identify and investigate local inhabitants' perceptions of tourism's socio-cultural effects in Gökceada, Turkey. A total of 273 Gökceada residents were included in the study. From June through December 2019, survey questionnaires were used to collect data for the study in Gökceada. Eight questions about tourism's contribution to Gökceada inhabitants, as well as a 23-item scale measuring residents' perceptions of tourist impacts, were included in the survey's 24 questions. According to the findings of the study, inhabitants of Gökceada see particular positive and bad consequences of tourism in their village. The supply of jobs, increased personal incomes, stimulation of the local economy, and better security in the destination region are only a few of the beneficial effects of tourism. The majority of inhabitants of Gökceada want to see development tourism grow in the future. As a result, the paper will aid local government and tourism planners in bolstering local support for tourism.

**Keywords** Overtourism · Residents' perception · Impacts · Economic dependence · Gökceada Island

### Introduction

Many visitors come to tourist areas in every country in the world. Thus, the increase of tourists causes more crowd in touristic places. This situation is seen as positive for tourist places. Nevertheless, once the destination's carrying capacity is

---

N. Kafa (✉)

Gökceada School of Applied Sciences, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University,  
Çanakkale, Turkey  
e-mail: [nesekafa@comu.edu.tr](mailto:nesekafa@comu.edu.tr)

H. Korkmaz

Faulty of Tourism, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2021

A. Hassan, A. Sharma (eds.), *Overtourism, Technology Solutions and Decimated Destinations*, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2474-2\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-2474-2_7)

surpassed, too many tourists might cause significant difficulties. This issue, which is frequently referred to as “overtourism“, appears to have increased in recent years (Weber et al., 2017). Overtourism was mentioned by UNWTO at World Travel Market “Ministerial Summit” in 2017 (Oklevik et al., 2019).

*“Overtourism describes destinations where hosts or guests, locals or visitors, feel that there are too many visitors and that the quality of life in the area or the quality of the experience has deteriorated unacceptably”* (Goodwin, 2017: 1). On the other hand, over-tourism is defined *“as the excessive growth of visitors leading to overcrowding in areas where residents suffer the consequences of temporary and seasonal tourism peaks, which have enforced permanent changes to their lifestyles, access to amenities and general well-being”* (Milano et al., 2018: 2).

The causes of overtourism are the falling cost of travel, affordable accommodation enabling more people to travel, the public realm is free, distribution strategies, whether the spreading of tourism impacts is a result of local government action, seasonality bunches tourism concentrates numbers, tourism creates jobs, new originating markets, successfully marketed, established destinations, which attract more tourists, destination marketing organizations, transport is a larger scale than it was ten years ago (Goodwin, 2017). Aside from that, cities are growing economically in order to fulfil the demands of tourists. As a result, local communities’ living costs rise (Milano et al., 2018). Residents find it impossible to do things like relax outside, go local shopping, use public transit, or just walk around the city due to the consequences of overtourism (Pearce, 2018). Locals have both good and negative opinions of tourism’s effects as a result of these factors (Jacobsen et al., 2019). As a result, residents’ support for tourism is contingent on how good and bad impacts are seen by locals (Park et al., 2012; Peric et al., 2016). Understanding locals’ opinions and attitudes is therefore critical for the long-term growth of tourism (Gutiérrez-Taño et al., 2019).

The quality of life is linked to how residents perceive tourism’s influence (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Shani & Pizam, 2012). Reduced life quality as a result of congestion, bad working conditions, excessive costs, or improper visitor behaviour, environmental consequences (trash, noise, pollution, etc.), leaks or unilateral benefits, and poor quality of life and security issues as a result of crime and corruption. Aesthetic degradation, misuse of infrastructure, traffic issues, and insufficient execution of tourist initiatives are all typical issues (Weber et al., 2017). Abdool (2002)’s study determined that there are three perceptions of the resident. The first perception is community attachment. This is a measure of residents’ sense of belonging to their community. The second one is personal and community benefits. It is an indication of the value residents attaches to the benefits of the tourism industry. The third one is socio-environmental impacts. This is an assessment of the consequences residents attribute to tourism development. Andereck and Vogt (2000) and Javari discussed these effects in three groups as social, economic, and environmental.

A wide variety of destinations are now described as experiencing overtourism (Express Newspaper, 2017). Palma de Mallorca, Paris, Kyoto, Berlin, Reykjavik, Venice, Majorca, Barcelona, Boracay Island, Amsterdam, Angkor Wat Temple,

Galapagos Islands, Macchu Picchu Ancient City, Iceland, Santorini, Dubrovnik, Bali, some national parks in the USA, Thailand's Islands and Mount Everest are negatively affected by overtourism (Cnt Editors, 2018; Milano et al., 2018). Turkey's largest island of Gökçeada is an example of the tourist season for tourism because of the extreme intensity. Gökçeada is a lively place in terms of both internal and external migrations, and a number of national and international decisions have determined the population density of the island. The island has housed a large number of seafarers, invaders, and immigrants since hundreds of years ago. The dynamism in this population change continues today as a demographic feature of the island (Kahraman, 2005). Additionally, the population of the island has increased to 9440 (Gökçeada Municipality, 2020). Gökçeada is a place frequented by local and foreign tourists, especially during the summer months. Ancient Greek villages, organizing festivals in Tepeköy every year, benefiting from the Salt Lake in Aydıncık for health, cleaning the beaches, sea sports activities such as sailing, surfing, diving are among the interesting touristic opportunities of Gökçeada (<http://www.Gokceada.com>). Accordingly, the aim of this study is to determine the perceptions of the residents of Gökçeada towards the development of tourism.

## Literature Review

Many studies emphasize the concept of overtourism and examine different issues. These include spreading tourists to regions, measuring segment tourists according to their income, purpose, etc., measuring the perception of local people towards crowding, focusing on overtourism and alternative accommodation methods, and offering solutions (Bresson & Logossah, 2011; Duyar & Bayram, 2019; Gutiérrez-Taño et al., 2019; Kuščer & Mihalič, 2019; Oklevik et al., 2019; Panayiotopoulos & Pisano, 2019; Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019; Şahin, 2018). At the same time, the reaction of local people to tourists is a previously discussed topic in the literature (Jacobsen, 2000; Pinkster & Boterman, 2017; Rouleau, 2017; Sommer & Helbrecht, 2017; Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019).

According to many studies, local people who are disturbed by the negative consequences of excessive tourism, such as rising house rents, environmental pollution, and difficult daily life, organize mass protests (Alexis, 2017; Coldwell, 2017; Peter, 2017; Milano et al., 2018; Kuščer & Mihalič, 2019). Jacobsen (2000) focused on the "Anti-Tourist" behavior developed by the local people against the tourists concentrated in destinations such as Greece and Majorca. Some studies found that participants perceived the social effects of tourism negatively (Tatoglu et al., 2002; Öztürk et al., 2015; Boğan & Sarıışık, 2016; Rouleau, 2017; Koens et al., 2018; Martín et al., 2018; Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019). These effects are urban sprawl and population growth, development-land-use conflicts, availability of retail outlets, crowding and congestion, peace and quiet, and drug and alcohol addiction. The factors negatively evaluated by Barcelona's people are the deterioration in the quality of personal life due to tourism development, peace and tranquillity, and the protection of the

lifestyle (Martín et al., 2018:10). These are due to negative effects on the livelihood of citizens (Martín et al., 2018). Many studies found that participants perceived the economic effects of tourism negatively (Rouleau, 2017; Koens et al., 2018; Martín et al., 2018; Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019). These negative economic impacts increase in the price level of rental houses, taxis, shops, restaurants and cafes, public transportation, and entertainment facilities (UNWTO, 2018). Otherwise, in Boğan and Sarıışık (2016)'s study, it was determined that the participants have a positive view of the economic effects of tourism.

In many studies, the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics of local people and the effects of perceived tourism has been examined. Several studies have discovered a link between gender and perceptions of tourism's effects (Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Harvey et al., 1995; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Ritchie & Inkari, 2006). Many research have found that women have more unfavourable opinions regarding tourism's influence than men (Harvey et al., 1995; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Ritchie & Inkari, 2006). Tourism, according to women, has a detrimental influence on leisure options (Harvey et al., 1995), entertainment opportunities, and infrastructure issues (Mason & Cheyne, 2000). On the other hand, Korça (1998) and Akdu and Ödemiş (2018) could not find a significant difference in the participants' attitudes towards tourism according to their gender. Some researchers discovered age-related variations in impact perception (Smith & Krannich, 1998; Teye et al., 2002). King et al. (1993) found that older participants had a more positive opinion of tourism impacts than younger participants Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), Weaver and Lawton (2001), and Martín et al. (2018) found that young people perceive the effects of tourism more positively than the elderly. Otherwise, Korça (1998) and Akdu and Ödemiş (2018) could not find a substantial difference in the attitudes of the participants towards tourism according to their ages. Several studies determined that individuals with higher education levels have more positive attitudes towards tourism (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Korça, 1998; Teye et al., 2002; Kuvan & Akan, 2005). Teye et al. (2002) discovered that when people' educational levels improved, so did their opinions regarding cultural influences. In contrast, Martín et al. (2018) did not found the difference between the effects of tourism and the education level of residents. Teye et al. (2002)'s study indicated a positive relationship between income and attitude scores. Martín et al. (2018) found that low and middle-income residents are more negatively view of the tourism impacts. On the other hand, Korça (1998) could not find a significant difference in the participants' attitudes towards tourism according to their income.

Korça (1998) could not find a significant difference in the participants' attitudes towards tourism according to their professions. Korça (1998) could not find a significant difference between resident's marital status and perceptions of tourism impacts.

Many studies accepted that perceived personal benefits from tourism are positively associated with an attitude that supports additional tourism development (Lankford & Howard, 1994; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2018). Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) found that

the employed residents supported more arrivals and further development. On the other hand, Martín et al. (2018) found that the local people reject tourism due to the economic effects of tourism. Additionally, Ritchie and Inkari (2006)'s study determined that there were not any significant results in impact perception relate to the willingness to accept more tourism. Additionally, residents, who participate in tourism-related decisions, perceive the effects of tourism more positively (Choi & Murray, 2010).

Many studies determined that residents who benefit economically from tourism perceive the effects of tourism more positively. (Korça, 1998; Andereck et al., 2005; Kuvan & Akan, 2005; Inbakaran & Jackson, 2006; Sharma & Dyer, 2009; Ward & Berno, 2011; Garcia et al., 2015). Additionally, many studies have also confirmed that the employed residents in tourism had positive perceptions of tourism impact. (Williams & Lawson, 2001; Gursoy et al., 2002; Brent & Incari, 2006; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2018). Martín et al. (2018) found that the differences between the social and economic impacts of tourism and residents who earn income from tourism.

## Research Methodology

The main population of this research is the individuals living in Gökceada. Gökceada's population is approximately 9780 people, according to 2018 figures. In addition, it is known that the population on the island decreases in winter due to the difficulty of transportation from the mainland to the island and the difficult living standards in winter participants.

The survey method was determined as a data collection technique. The convenience sampling method was used in the study. A questionnaire was applied to 276 local people who wanted to participate in the survey between June 2019 and December 2019. Due to the fact that 3 questionnaires were left blank among the surveys, they were excluded from the sample. So that, the sample of the research consists of 273 people. Attitudes toward tourism development scale were used in the study. Twenty expressions of attitudes toward tourism development scale were adapted from the study of Wang and Pfister (2008). The two expressions about overall impact were adopted from Andriotis and Vaughan (2003), and one expression about grand satisfaction was gotten from Jani (2018). The statements to measure Attitudes toward tourism development statements were measured with five-point Likert scale (1: strongly disagree and 5: totally agree). Before starting the data analysis, the skewness and kurtosis values were checked to determine whether the data showed normal distribution. In social sciences, when exceeding 30 samples, it is assumed that the data approach to a normal distribution. Also, it has been accepted that the data used in the study show a normal distribution since the skewness level is between  $\pm 2$  and the kurtosis level is between  $\pm 7$  (West et al., 1995; Kline, 1998).

In the research, data were obtained with the help of the questionnaire, the SPSS 21 package program, which is used in the analysis of quantitative research in the

field of social sciences. In this context, explanatory factor analysis, independent sample t-test, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and linear regression analysis were performed.

## Results

As seen in Table 7.1, the descriptive characteristics of the participants included in the study were evaluated using the statistics of frequency and percentage values. Approximately 57% of the 273 respondents are male, and approximately 43% are women. It is seen that approximately one-third of the participants are between the ages of 18–24. Approximately 29% of the people participating in the research are from the private sector. It was determined that the majority (55.6%) of the subjects in the study were married. More than one-third of the participants (35.2%) reported that they were high school graduates. The majority of the respondents (56.4%) stated that they earned less than 2500 TL. Again, it is seen that the majority of the participants (53.4%) have lived in Gökceada for more than ten years (Table 7.1).

Participants were asked about their views on the development of tourism in Gökceada, and the answers are given in Table 7.2. According to this Table, approximately two-thirds of the participants think that tourism has developed in Gökceada in the last 5 years. Again, the vast majority of the participants (73.6%) stated that tourism in Gökceada should develop further in the future.

An explanatory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to determine the construct validity of the Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale used in the study. KMO value (0.801) Bartlett's Sphericity test results were found as significant ( $\chi^2 = 931.431$ ;  $p < 0.000$ ). When looking at the chi-square and KMO values, it can be said that the sample is suitable and sufficient for factor analysis.

During the analysis, three expressions with common variance values below 0.50 were removed from the scale. In addition, four expressions with factor load less than 0.5 were not included in the analysis result Tables. As a result of the explanatory factor analysis, it was seen that 16 expressions for Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale were grouped under four dimensions and explained 52.28% of the total variance (Table 7.3).

The first dimension, called "support for tourism development", has 2.67 eigenvalues and explains 16.7% of the variance. The second dimension, called "Contributions to community", has an eigenvalue of 2.07 and explains 12.9% of the variance. The third dimension, called "destination living standards" and the fourth dimension, called "Grand satisfaction" have each eigenvalues of 1.81 and explain 11.3% of the variance.

In addition, reliability analysis for the scale was made. Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be moderately reliable as 0.793. Considering the results of the reliability analysis regarding the dimensions, the Support for the tourism development dimension was found to be reliable at a medium level. Other dimensions were found

**Table 7.1** Demographic profile of respondents

Variables		n	Sample %
Gender	Female	117	42.86
	Male	156	57.14
Age	18–24 years	85	31.14
	25–34 years	68	24.91
	35–44 years	54	19.78
	45–54 years	36	13.19
	55 or older	30	10.99
Occupation	Private sector	79	28.94
	Self-employed	49	17.95
	Public services	40	14.65
	Student	37	13.55
	Retired & housewife	35	12.82
	Unemployed	33	12.09
Marital status	Single	152	55.68
	Married	121	44.32
Education level	Elementary school	60	21.98
	High school	96	35.16
	Associate degree	56	20.51
	Undergraduate	48	17.58
	Graduate	13	4.76
Monthly income	Less than 2500 TL	154	56.41
	2500–5000 TL	84	30.77
	Over than 5000 TL	35	12.82
Duration of residence	Not a resident	30	10.99
	Less than 5 years	63	23.08
	5–10 years	34	12.45
	More than 10 years	146	53.48
<i>Total</i>		273	100.00

**Table 7.2** Respondents' opinion about improvement of tourism in Gökceada

Variables		n	Sample %
Has tourism in Gökceada improved in the last five years?	Yes	185	67.77
	No	88	32.23
How would you like tourism in Gökceada to change in the future?	Remain the same	72	26.37
	Increase	201	73.63
<i>Total</i>		273	100.00

**Table 7.3** Dimensions of residents' attitudes toward tourism development

Dimension/Items	$\bar{x}$	Factor loadings	Eigen value	Variances explained (%)	Cronbach's alpha
Support for the growth of tourism ( $\bar{x} = 3.89$ )					
Tourism should be extensively promoted in Gökceada, in my opinion	3.80	0.774	2.67	16.69	0.756
Tourism should be aggressively promoted in my neighbourhood, in my opinion	4.01	0.703			
It is critical to create plans to control tourism expansion.	3.89	0.673			
I support tourism and want to see it grow into a significant component of my town.	4.12	0.658			
The local administration was proper in its support for tourism development.	3.75	0.585			
Contributions to community ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ )					
As a result of increased tourism in my community, the quality of public services has improved.	3.09	0.805	2.07	12.94	0.644
Because of the inflow of tourists in my neighbourhood, local recreation activities have grown.	3.20	0.696			
Since the arrival of tourists, I have had additional recreational options.	3.00	0.606			
The tourist amenities in my community have enhanced the quality of life in my community.	3.26	0.579			
Destination living standards ( $\bar{x} = 3.55$ )					
Long-term planning by local leaders can mitigate the harmful environmental effects of tourism.	3.70	0.781	1.81	11.34	0.616
Because of the money spent by tourists, our household quality of living has improved.	3.42	0.563			
One of the most significant advantages of tourism is how it may raise local living standards.	3.63	0.545			
My neighborhood should become more of a tourism attraction.	3.53	0.533			
Grand satisfaction ( $\bar{x} = 3.41$ )					
Overall, the tourist advantages outweigh the expenses to Gökceada as a whole.	3.38	0.782	1.81	11.32	0.656

(continued)



**Table 7.3** (continued)

Dimension/Items	$\bar{x}$	Factor loadings	Eigen value	Variances explained (%)	Cronbach's alpha
Overall, I am satisfied with Gökceada's tourism.	3.48	0.748			
Overall, the advantages of tourism outweigh the costs to the local community.	3.42	0.665			

KMO sampling adequacy: 0.801 Barlett Chi-Square: 931.431 p: 0.000 Total variances explained: 52.28%

to be acceptably reliable as contributions to community (0.644), destination living standards (0.616), and grand satisfaction (0.656).

The overall average of the Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale was determined to be 3.53. As the averages of the dimensions are examined, above average participation has been observed support for tourism development ( $\bar{x} = 3.89$ ), contributions to community ( $\bar{x} = 3.14$ ), destination living standards ( $\bar{x} = 3.55$ ), and grand satisfaction ( $\bar{x} = 3.41$ ) (Table 7.3).

Independent sample t-test and one-way analysis of variance were used to test the differences of dimensions' mean between demographic groups. As a result of the t-test conducted in terms of gender, it was not determined ( $p > 0.05$ ) that any mean of dimension is different. In other words, it can be said that the attitudes of male and female towards the development of tourism in Gökceada are similar.

An Independent sample t-test was conducted to determine whether the averages of dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development differed in terms of marital status. Again, it was determined that the dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development did not differ statistically ( $p > 0.05$ ) in terms of marital status. In other words, married and single participants exhibit similar attitudes to tourism development in Gökceada.

One way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the averages of dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development differed in terms of respondents' age. Again, it was determined that the dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development did not differ statistically ( $p > 0.05$ ) in terms of age group. From here, it can be concluded that the attitude of tourism to development in Gökceada does not change according to age.

One way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the averages of dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development differed in terms of respondents' professions. Again, it was determined that "Support for tourism development", "Destination living standards", and "grand satisfaction" dimensions did not statistically vary ( $p > 0.05$ ) in terms of professions. On the other hand, it is seen that the average of contributions to community dimension differed statistically in terms of profession. LSD test from post hoc tests was used to find the source of the difference in mean. While private sector and self-employed people are found to have a higher average than retired and housewives, the unemployed and public employees have higher average participation than all other groups (Table 7.4).

**Table 7.4** Comparison of contribution to community dimension means in terms of the profession

Factor	Group	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	F	p.	Source of difference
Contributions to community	1 Private sector	79	3.08	0.804	2.392	0.038	5 < 1-2 < 3-6
	2 Self-employed	49	3.03	0.823			
	3 Public services	40	3.40	0.921			
	4 Student	37	3.09	0.908			
	5 Retired&Housewife	35	2.90	0.767			
	6 Unemployed	33	3.42	0.754			
	Total	273	3.14	0.840			

**Table 7.5** Comparison of contribution to community scale means in terms of education level

Factor	Grup	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	F	p.	Source of difference
Contributions to community	1 Primary school	60	3,28	0,797	2940	0,021	4 < 3 < 2 < 1
	2 High school	96	3,15	0,777			
	3 Associate degree	56	3,03	0,803			
	4 Undergraduate	48	2,91	0,842			
	5 Graduate	13	3,67	1305			
		Total	273	3,14			

One way analysis of variance was conducted to determine whether the averages of dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development differed in terms of respondents' education. Also, it was determined that "support for tourism development", "destination living standards", and "grand satisfaction" dimensions did not statistically differ ( $p > 0.05$ ) in terms of professions. Moreover, it is seen that the average of contributions to community dimension differed statistically in terms of respondents' education. LSD test from post hoc tests was used to find the source of the difference in mean. The average of attitudes by education level are listed statistically as follows: undergraduate, associate degree, high school, and primary education graduates. It is seen that as education increases, the positive perspective towards the development of tourism in Gökceada decreases (Table 7.5).

One way ANOVA analysis was conducted to determine whether the averages of dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development differed in terms of respondents' monthly income. Again, it was determined that the dimensions of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development did not differ statistically ( $p > 0.05$ ) in terms of respondents' monthly income. Based on this, it can be concluded that people's attitudes towards the development of tourism in Gökceada do not change according to their income groups.

In order to determine whether the averages of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development dimensions differed in terms of residence duration, one way ANOVA analysis was conducted. The attitude averages of the respondents who resided for different periods were not found statistically different.

An independent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether the averages of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development between those who think there is an improvement in Gökceada since the last 5 years and do not. According to the t-test results, there is not a statistical difference between these two groups.

An independent sample t-test was conducted in order to determine whether the averages of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development in terms of respondents' future wishes about tourism in Gökceada. According to the t-test results, there is a statistical difference ( $p < 0.05$ ) between these two groups for all four dimensions. Those who want tourism to develop in Gökceada have a statistically higher average on Support For Tourism Development dimension ( $4.11 > 3.11$ ), Contributions To Community dimension ( $3.20 > 2.95$ ), Destination Living Standards dimension ( $3.76 > 2.95$ ), and Grand Satisfaction dimension ( $3.53 > 3.07$ ) than those who want tourism to remain the same in Gökceada (Table 7.6).

A regression analysis was conducted for the effect of Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale dimensions on Grand satisfaction. The established model was found to be statistically significant and explains approximately 21% of grand satisfaction. According to results, Contributions to the community ( $\beta = 0.268$ ) and Destination living standards ( $\beta = 0.261$ ) have statistically positive significant effects on grand satisfaction. On the other hand, Support for the tourism development dimension has no significant effect on grand satisfaction (Table 7.7).

**Table 7.6** Residents' attitudes toward tourism development means in terms of respondents' future wishes about tourism in Gökceada

Factors	Would tourism change in Gökceada for the future?	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	t	p (two-tailed)
<i>Support for tourism development</i>	Remain the same	72	3.11	0.93	-2.192	0.000
	Increase	201	4.17	0.67		
<i>Contributions to community</i>	Remain the same	72	2.95	0.86	-2.152	0.029
	Increase	201	3.20	0.83		
<i>Destination living standards</i>	Remain the same	72	2.95	0.82	-7.242	0.000
	Increase	201	3.76	0.79		
<i>Grand satisfaction</i>	Remain the same	72	3.07	0.95	-3.491	0.000
	Increase	201	3.53	0.91		

**Table 7.7** Regression analysis for the effect of grand satisfaction

Variables	Beta	t value	Sig.
Constant	1.102	3.838	0.000
Support for tourism development	0.087	1.349	0.178
Contributions to community	0.268	4.813	0.000
Destination living standards	0.261	4.052	0.000
$R^2 = 0.212$ $F = 24.097$ $p = 0.000$			

## Conclusion and Discussion

This study aims to identify and examine residents' perceptions of tourism's socio-cultural impacts in Gökceada, Turkey. The study sample consisted of 273 residents of Gökceada. It has been determined that Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale average is above the average. It can be concluded that the local people living in Gökceada are generally satisfied with the development of tourism in the region.

In general, it was found that the levels of participation in the Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development scale did not differ in terms of demographic variables. Some studies support these results (Akdu and Ödemiş, 2018; Korça, 1998) and are conflicted by some studies (Ritchie & Inkari, 2006; Williams & Lawson, 2001; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Harvey et al., 1995). On the other hand, it has been determined that the level of participation in the scale of contribution of tourism development to the community varies by participants' profession. This result contradicts the research of Korça (1998). This may be due to the higher expectations of tourism-related private sector employees and self-employed participants. The opinion that the tourism season on the island is short and that there is not enough economic benefit may have been considered by the respondents.

Similarly, it has been determined that the contribution to the community dimension differs in terms of the participants' education level. Accordingly, it has been determined that as the education level of the participants' increases, the contribution of tourism to society is perceived less. This result contradicts Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Kuvan & Akan, 2005; Korça, 1998 and Teye et al., 2002. This may be due to the increase in expectations from the tourism sector as education increases and fewer socio-economic opportunities due to public transportation difficulty with the mainland.

It is seen that the participants who want the development of tourism have more positive responses contributions of tourism to the society, the effect of tourism on living standards, the tourism development until now, and the higher satisfaction with tourism in general. Many studies accepted that perceived personal benefits from tourism are positively associated with an attitude that supports additional tourism development (Lankford & Howard, 1994; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Gonzalez et al., 2018; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011).

Lastly, it is founded that people who think tourism contributes to the community and increases destination living standards are more satisfied. Logically, individuals are satisfied with tourism development, as it contributes to the society they live in and increases their living standards.

## References

- Abdool, A. (2002). *Residents' perceptions of tourism: A comparative study of two Caribbean communities*, PhD thesis. Bournemouth University, England.
- Akdu, U., & Ödemiş, M. (2018). Examining the impacts of tourism on Gümüşhane residents according to the Doxey index. *Turizm Akademik Dergisi*, 5(2), 33–45.
- Alexis, P. (2017). Over-tourism and anti-tourist sentiment: An exploratory analysis and discussion. "Ovidius" *University Annals*, 17(2), 288–293.
- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248–260.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes towards tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27–36.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perception of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172–185.
- Boğan, E., & Sarıışık, M. (2016). Yerel halkın turizm faaliyetine yönelik görüş ve algılamalarının belirlenmesi üzerine Alanya'da bir araştırma. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12, 325–342.
- Brent, R., & Incari, M. (2006). Host community attitudes toward tourism and cultural tourism development: The case of the Lewes District, southern England. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 8(1), 27–44.
- Bresson, G., & Logossah, K. (2011). Crowding-out effects of cruise tourism on stay-over tourism in the Caribbean: Non-parametric panel data evidence. *Tourism Economics*, 17(1), 127–158.
- Choi, H., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 575–594.
- Cnt Editors. (2018) 15 Beloved places struggling with overtourism. *CN Traveler*. Retrieved from <https://www.cntraveler.com/galleries/2015-06-19/barcelona-bhutan-places-that-limit-tourist-numbers/>, Accessed: 26 Oct 2020.
- Coldwell, W. (2017). First Venice and Barcelona: Now anti-tourism marches spread across Europe. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2017/aug/10/anti-tourism-marches-spread-across-europe-venice-barcelona/>, Accessed: 26 Oct 2020.
- Duyar, M., & Bayram, M. (2019). Overtourism and tourismphobia: Evolution of host and tourism relationship. *International Journal of Geography and Geography Education*, 40, 347–362.
- Express Newspaper. (2017). WATCH: Shocking moment Spanish anti-tourism activists hit big Brit tourist destination. Retrieved from <https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/836224/Anti-tourist-protests-violent-British-tourist-destination-attack-Spain-Majorca-Palma>. Downloaded: 20/09/2020.
- Garcia, F. A., Vazquez, A. B., & Macias, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33–40.
- Gökçeada Municipality. (2020). 2019 Gökçeada Nüfus İstatistikleri. Gökçeada: İlçe Nüfus Müdürlüğü. <http://www.gokceada.com/turizm.html>. Accessed 21 Sept 2020.
- Gonzalez, V. M., Coromina, L., & Galí, N. (2018). Overtourism: Residents' perceptions of tourism impact as an indicator of resident social carrying capacity – Case study of a Spanish heritage town. *Tourism Review*, 73(3), 277–296.
- Goodwin, H. (2017, October). *The challenge of overtourism, responsible tourism partnership* (Working Paper 4, pp. 1–19).
- Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79–105.
- Gutiérrez-Taño, D., Garau-Vadell, J., & Díaz-Armas, R. (2019). The influence of knowledge on residents' perceptions of the impacts of overtourism in P2P accommodation rental. *Sustainability*, 11(4), 1043.

- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503–526.
- Harvey, M. J., Hunt, J., & Harris, C. C. (1995). Gender and community tourism dependence level. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 349–366.
- Inbakaran, R., & Jackson, M. (2006). Resident attitudes inside Victoria's tourism product regions: A cluster analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 13(1), 59–74.
- Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2000). Anti-Tourist attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 284–300.
- Jacobsen, J. K. S., Iversen, N. M., & Hem, L. E. (2019). Hotspot crowding and over-tourism: Antecedents of destination attractiveness. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76, 53–66.
- Jani, D. (2018). Residents' perception of tourism impacts in Kilimanjaro: An integration of the social exchange theory. *Tourism (Turizam): An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 66(2), 148–160.
- Kahraman, S. (2005). Gökçeada'da göçlerin nüfus gelişimi ve değişimi üzerine etkileri. *Coğrafi Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(2), 39–53.
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650–665.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Guilford.
- Koens, K., Postma, A., & Papp, B. (2018). Is overtourism overused? Understanding the impact of tourism in a city context. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 1–15.
- Korça, P. (1998). Resident perceptions of tourism in a resort town. *Leisure Sciences*, 20(3), 193–212.
- Kuščer, K., & Mihalič, T. (2019). Residents' attitudes towards overtourism from the perspective of tourism impacts and cooperation—the case of Ljubljana. *Sustainability*, 11(6), 1823.
- Kuvan, 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.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121–139.
- Martín, J. M., Guaita Martínez, J. M., & Salinas Fernández, J. A. (2018). An analysis of the factors behind the citizen's attitude of rejection towards tourism in a context of overtourism and economic dependence on this activity. *Sustainability*, 10(8), 1–18.
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391–411.
- Milano, C., Cheer, J., & Novelli, M. (2018). Overtourism: A growing global problem. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/overtourism-a-growing-global-problem-100029>, Downloaded: 26/ 11/2020.
- Oklevik, O., Gössling, S., Michael Hall, C., Jens Kristian, S. J., Ivar Petter, G., & McCabe, S. (2019). Overtourism, optimisation, and destination performance indicators: A case study of activities in fjord Norway. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(12), 1804–1824.
- Öztürk, A. B., Özer, Ö., & Çalışkan, U. (2015). The relationship between local residents' perceptions of tourism and their happiness: A case of Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Review*, 70(3), 232–242.
- Panayiotopoulos, A., & Pisano, C. (2019). Overtourism dystopias and socialist utopias: Towards an urban armature for Dubrovnik. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 16(4), 393–410.
- Park, D. B., Lee, K. W., Choi, H. S., & Yoon, Y. (2012). Factors influencing social capital in rural tourism communities in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 33, 1511–1520.
- Pearce, P. L. (2018, 11–14 March). Limiting overtourism; the desirable new behaviours of the smart tourist. *The Tourism Intelligence Forum*, Palma, Spain.
- Peric, M., Durkin, J., & Wise, N. (2016). Leveraging small-scale sport events: Challenges of organising, delivering and managing sustainable outcomes in rural communities, the case of Gorski Kotar, Croatia. *Sustainability*, 8(12), 1337.
- Peter, L. (2017) 'Tourists go home': Leftists resist Spain influx. *BBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-40826257>. Downloaded: 26/11/2020.

- Pinke-Sziva, I., Smith, M., Olt, G., & Berezvai, Z. (2019). Overtourism and the night-time economy: A case study of Budapest. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 5(1), 1–16.
- Pinkster, F. M., & Boterman, W. R. (2017). When the spell is broken: Gentrification, urban tourism and privileged discontent in the Amsterdam canal district. *Cultural Geographies*, 24(3), 457–472.
- Ritchie, B. W., & Inkari, M. (2006). Host community attitudes toward tourism and cultural tourism development: The case of the Lewes District, southern England. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 8(1), 27–44.
- Rouleau, J. (2017). Every (nocturnal) tourist leaves a trace: Urban tourism, nighttime landscape, and public places in Ciutat Vella, Barcelona. *Imaginations*, 7(2), 58–71.
- Şahin, Ö. (2018, 21–23 December). An analysis of the impacts of overtourism (overcrowding in tourism destinations) on culture and heritage, 4. *International Culture and Civilization Congress*, Mardin, Turkey.
- Shani, A., & Pizam, A. (2012). Community participation in tourism planning and development. In M. Uysal, R. R. Purdue, & M. J. Sirgy (Eds.), *Handbook of tourism and quality-of-life research: Enhancing the lives of tourists and residents of host communities* (pp. 547–564). Springer.
- Sharma, B., & Dyer, P. (2009). Residents' involvement in tourism and their perceptions of tourism impacts. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 16(3), 351–371.
- Smith, M. D., & Krannich, R. S. (1998). Tourism dependence and resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 783–802.
- Sommer, C., & Helbrecht, I. (2017). Seeing like a tourist city: How administrative constructions of conflictive urban tourism shape its future. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3(2), 157–170.
- Tatoglu, E., Erdal, F., Ozgur, H., & Azakli, S. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts: The case of Kusadasi in Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 3(3), 79–100.
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S. F. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668–688.
- United Nation World Tourism Organization. (2018). *Overtourism? Understanding and managing urban tourism growth beyond perceptions*. UNWTO.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & Plaza-Mejía, M. D. L. Á. (2011). Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism: Is a universal model possible? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 460–480.
- Wang, Y., & Pfister, R. E. (2008). Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 84–93.
- Ward, C., & Berno, T. (2011). Beyond social exchange theory: Attitudes towards tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1556–1569.
- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban–rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 439–458.
- Weber, F., Stettler, J., Priskin, J., Rosenberg-Taufer, B., Ponnappureddy, S., Fux, S., Camp, M., & Barth, M. (2017). *Tourism destinations under pressure* (Working paper) (pp. 1–214). Institute of Tourism ITW, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts.
- West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues and applications* (pp. 56–75). Sage.
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269–290.