

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Heterogeneous community perspectives of emotional solidarity with tourists: Considering Antalya, Turkey

Kyle M. Woosnam¹  | Emrullah Erul² | Manuel A. Ribeiro³ 

¹Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA

²Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

³Department of Marketing Branding and Tourism, Middlesex University, London, UK

Correspondence

Kyle M. Woosnam, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Natural Resources Recreation & Tourism, University of Georgia, 180 East Green Street, Athens, GA 30602-2152, USA
Email: woosnam@gmail.com

Abstract

This work examines emotional solidarity to determine to what extent residents' perceptions are heterogeneous by considering a host of sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables. An on-site survey instrument was administered to 660 residents living in the popular Turkish tourism destination, Antalya. Psychometric results provide support for the employment of the *Emotional Solidarity Scale* and its factor structure in an international context. Significant differences in Emotional Solidarity Scale factor means were found across five variables (e.g., gender, age, education level, tourism employment status, and level of tourism dependence). Theoretical and practical implications are offered, as are the limitations and potential future research opportunities.

KEYWORDS

Antalya, cluster sampling, emotional solidarity scale, resident and tourist relationships, residents

1 | INTRODUCTION

Interactions and relationships between residents and tourists within destinations are highly individualistic, occurring oftentimes in environmental settings whereby the transaction or exchange is “one-on-one.” These interactions, as Wall and Mathieson (2006) contend, are marked by a transitory nature, constrained by temporal and spatial aspects, lack spontaneity, and are highlighted by unequal and unbalanced experiences. Exceptions, or course, to a mass tourism model (see Aramberri, 2010) considered by Wall and Mathieson's (2006) description, can be found among those individuals seeking intentional interactions with residents and striving to have limited impact on the community—for all intents and purposes—a more sustainable tourism model.

Although the work to date involving the interactions and relationships of residents and tourists in destinations pales in comparison to research focusing on key demand and visitor behavior aspects, the work has most recently gained some momentum (Bimonte & Punzo, 2016; Chen, 2016; Loi & Pearce, 2015; Yu & Lee, 2014). Such research is likely a function of the emerging interest in sustainable community tourism as destinations realize the ever-growing competition for resources and begin to proactively plan with sustainability in mind. As has been argued, a central tenet of sustainable tourism is the consideration of the relationship that exists between residents and tourists (Benckendorff & Lund-Durlacher, 2013). This is evidenced in the emerging emphasis placed on the social impacts of tourism within the “triple bottom line” framework of sustainable tourism.

One of the more popular means as of late by which to gauge the relationship between local residents and those visiting the community has been through the employment of the emotional solidarity framework (see Woosnam, Dudensing, & Walker, 2015 for most recent review). This work, however, has considered residents as part of a homogenous community, failing to recognize how the construct may differ across various sociodemographic and socioeconomic measures. Arguably, examination into how emotional solidarity varies among residents within a community needs to be undertaken before research on the topic can advance within the travel and tourism literature; otherwise, the proverbial “cart” will continue to be placed before the “horse.” Therefore, the purpose of this research is to consider to what extent a community may hold heterogeneous perspectives of emotional solidarity with tourists when considering key sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables, such as gender, age, annual household income, level of education, length of residence, level of household dependence on tourism, and household employment in the tourism industry.

2 | LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 | Emotional solidarity

Originating from the sociological works of Emile Durkheim (1995 [1915]) involving Aborigines in Australia, emotional solidarity is the affective nature of perceived closeness or identification that

individuals experience with one another. Durkheim's intentions were to study what he considered one of the most basic religious groups, in an effort to determine what forged the group's solidarity among its members. What he found was that solidarity arose from sacred beliefs and ritualistic behaviors. Woosnam, Norman, and Ying (2009) conceive of solidarity arising from the shared beliefs and behaviors (as well as interaction) among individuals. Wallace and Wolf (2006) considered emotional solidarity to be the "we togetherness" that binds people, as opposed to the notion of the "self versus other" dichotomy that has marked much of the tourism literature (see Caton & Santos, 2009). Emotional solidarity within the tourism literature was first operationalized as the *Emotional Solidarity Scale* (ESS) by Woosnam and Norman (2010), where the authors found three unique factors that comprised the scale: welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding. From this work, the stage was set to conceive of the concept from a community perspective, making the assumption that residents' perspectives of emotional solidarity did not differ on the basis of demographics, residential characteristics, spatial factors, and so forth.

Although research concerning emotional solidarity has largely focused only on residents (Woosnam, 2011a; Woosnam & Norman, 2010), some work has emphasized the concept exclusively from tourists' perspectives (Woosnam & Aleshinloye, 2013). Although these studies did not involve data collected from both residents and tourists, tourists have collectively indicated a higher degree of agreement with items in the ESS across the three factors. Such findings may be explained by tourists' interest in the local culture and openness toward local residents (Urry & Larsen, 2011), whereas residents can be more critical of tourists, especially if their quality of life is not respected by those visiting.

Continuing this line of research, Woosnam and colleagues (Woosnam, 2011b; Woosnam, Aleshinloye, & Maruyama, 2016) have considered the various perspectives that are at play in forging emotional solidarity. That is to say, both residents and tourists are considered within such work indicating a transactional approach to emotional solidarity; only one side of the proverbial "coin" is captured by focusing on either residents or tourists and not both. Woosnam (2011b) was first to note the divergent perceptions of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists, whereby the former indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement in the welcoming nature factor as the latter demonstrated a significantly higher degree of agreement in emotional closeness. Woosnam et al. (2016) found similar findings to Woosnam (2011b) in that tourists scored not only significantly higher on emotional closeness but also significantly higher on sympathetic understanding (which prior had not revealed statistically significant differences).

Although this extant research is an advancement over the initial work of Woosnam and Norman (2010), findings do not speak to variation in perceived emotional solidarity among community residents or tourists visiting the destination. In addition to this limitation, nearly all of the research surrounding emotional solidarity situates the concept squarely within the United States. Such limitations beg the questions of not only whether residents' perspectives of emotional solidarity differ according to various demographics but also if perspectives of emotional solidarity differ in a context outside of a traditional, westernized country.

2.2 | Demographic measures considered in residents' attitudes research

Those studies that have considered heterogeneity involving residents and community tourism have been largely centered within the work concerning residents' attitudes toward tourism and its accompanying development. Understanding residents' attitudes toward tourism development is necessary for successful, proactive planning, and management of tourism (Murphy, 1985). However, what complicates the matter is that no community is homogenous in its perspectives of tourism development (García, Vázquez, & Macías, 2015) largely due to diverse sociodemographic and socioeconomic residential compositions (Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2009; Harrill, 2004). With that said, such independent variables (e.g., age, income, gender, length of residency, ethnicity, and education level) have provided some insight into explaining the differing attitudes about tourism and tourism development (Huh & Vogt, 2008). Látková and Vogt (2012) found that when controlling for personal benefits from tourism, residents' sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics significantly explain perceived impacts of tourism. In applying the social exchange theory, Ward and Berno (2011) found that gender, age, and employment (i.e., tourism related vs. non-tourism related) were all significant in predicting residents' attitudes. Similarly, Woosnam and Erul (2017) revealed that older, less-educated men, who were employed in the tourism industry perceived the impacts of all-inclusive resorts more negatively than did their counterparts. To support these notions, García et al. (2015) argued that factors such as gender, age, annual household income, education level, and employment have received considerable attention as key variables serving to explain residents' perceptions of tourism impacts.

Not only are perspectives diverse across these variables but also attitudes toward tourism can even change across time within a person (Fredline, Deery, & Jago, 2013; Huh & Vogt, 2008). Oftentimes, in a rather simplistic fashion, research can reduce these diverse perspectives into individuals fitting into one of two camps: those that "support" and those that "oppose" existing and future tourism (Chen & Raab, 2012; Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012). What this does, of course, is disregard the great variation that potentially exists between diametric perspectives.

Both Huh and Vogt (2008) and McCool and Martin (1994) found that women had more favorable views toward the positive impacts of tourism. On the other hand, previous studies have found women to hold more negative views of tourism development than men (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987). Furthermore, Huh and Vogt (2008) found that age was a significant predictor of attitudes toward tourism development, with older residents perceiving tourism development more negatively than their younger counterparts. Contrary to these studies, Látková and Vogt (2012) found that older residents perceived impacts to be more positive than those younger. Hence, mixed findings have developed, as no one sociodemographic variable has consistently yielded significant results (Harrill, 2004; Woosnam & Erul, 2017). This is likely explained by the fact that resident attitudes studies are highly contextual, whereby not every community is homogenous in its composition of residents, exposed to the same phenomenon, and located in the same region across the globe (Draper, Woosnam, & Norman, 2011; Woosnam & Norman, 2010).

Similar to emotional solidarity, residents' attitudes of tourism have been treated as an outcome variable (Harrill, 2004) that can potentially be explained by sociodemographic and socioeconomic, spatial, and travel behavior variables. Most recently, the work of Woosnam and Erul (2017), Maruyama and Woosnam (2015), and Gursoy et al. (2009) has provided an extensive review of research concerning factors that influence residents' attitudes about tourism and accompanying development, citing a host of sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables. The work utilizing emotional solidarity to date, however, has neglected to consider the heterogeneous nature of residents' perceptions of the relationships with visitors in their community. Furthermore, consideration of emotional solidarity in a tourism context has largely been undertaken within one particular country.

3 | METHODS

3.1 | Antalya as study site

Known for its beautiful weather and coastline along with a rich history and cultural assets, and high quality tourism facilities, Antalya is the leading tourism destination in Turkey (Yilmaz, Yilmaz, Icigen, Ekin, & Utku, 2009). Located along the Mediterranean coast of southwestern Turkey, the city boasts a population of slightly more than 2.2 million individuals (TSI, 2014), providing hot and dry summers and mild and rainy winters for its visitors. With key tourism centers such as Belek, Kemer, Side-Manavgat, and Alanya within Antalya, the area ranked as the top tourism destination throughout Turkey welcoming 11.5 million international visitors in 2014 and was second (behind Istanbul) in 2015 with 10.8 million international arrivals (TMCT, 2015). These figures articulate the potential for various forms of interaction to occur between local residents and tourists. As Woosnam and Norman (2010) have found, interaction was a significant predictor of emotional solidarity. With that said, Antalya appears an ideal location to assess the levels of emotional solidarity residents possess with tourists, the factor structure of the ESS in an international context, and of course, whether emotional solidarity differs across numerous measures.

3.2 | Sampling and data collection

The sample population for this study was composed of local residents living in Antalya. Following a multistage sampling strategy (see McKercher & Du Cros, 2003; Woosnam, 2011a), Antalya was reduced to 15 districts as determined by the Turkish Statistical Institute classifications, from which Kemer, Antalya city center, Serik and Manavgat were randomly selected. Within each district, streets were randomly selected by using city maps. On each of the randomly selected streets, every fourth home or business was visited, with the head of household or store employee contacted and asked to participate. When the residents (who were at least 18 years of age) agreed to participate, a questionnaire was left at the home or business and retrieved by a member of the research team later that day. Data collection occurred over a 3-month period (February, March, and April of 2014). Questionnaires were translated initially from English to Turkish and then from Turkish

back to English by different translators (i.e., back translation) to verify the quality of translation (Brislin, 1970).

The research team ultimately visited 1003 households and businesses, with approximately 5% ($n = 53$) yielding "no answer" responses. From the remaining 950 individuals, 660 surveys were completed (overall response rate of 69.5%). Response rates were slightly higher in Kemer and Manavgat (71%) than in Antalya city center and Serik (68%).

3.3 | Measures and analysis

Residents were asked about their level of agreement (on a 5-point Likert-type scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*) with the 10-item ESS developed by Woosnam and Norman (2010). This scale presented respondents with items concerning their perceptions of Antalya visitors. From the ESS, three factors have resulted: *welcoming nature*, *emotional closeness*, and *sympathetic understanding*. A confirmatory factor analysis was undertaken to determine the factor structure of the scale.

Additionally, categorical variables (each with between two and five levels) involving residents' gender, age, annual household income, level of education, length of residence, household level of tourism dependence, and whether someone in the household was employed within the tourism industry were utilized. These seven demographic measures were selected given their noted importance in examining whether differences existed in emotional solidarity across sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables (see Harrill, 2004; Maruyama & Woosnam, 2015; Ward & Berno, 2011). Furthermore, the measures were presented to survey participants as categorical to increase the likelihood of responding.

Following this, a series of multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests were employed, which provided an opportunity to determine whether differences existed in emotional solidarity across sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables. According to Green and Salkind (2011), use of MANOVA is appropriate when we are concerned with examining differences between independent groups on more than one continuous dependent variable.

4 | RESULTS

4.1 | Resident profile

Most individuals within the sample (Table 1) were men (61.8%). A preponderance (67.8%) of participants comprised the two youngest age categories (i.e., 18 to 29 years and 30 to 39 years). As far as length of residence was concerned, most (66.2%) had lived in Antalya for at least 11 years. In the way of socioeconomic measures, a majority had at least an undergraduate degree (55.5%). Despite this high level of education, very few (6.2%) participants claimed to have made at least 72,000 Turkish Lira per year. This household income translated to slightly more than half of the sample having someone in the household employed within the tourism industry (51.1%). As such, a small majority (52.1%) claimed that their household earned at least 16% of their income from tourism.

TABLE 1 Descriptive summary of Antalya respondents ($n = 660$)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	408	61.8
Female	252	38.2
Age (<i>Median</i> = 30–39 years of age)		
18–29	271	41.1
30–39	176	26.7
40–49	164	24.8
50–59	46	7.0
60 and over	3	0.4
Length of residence		
0–10 years lived in community	223	33.8
11–20 years lived in community	215	32.6
21 or more years lived in community	222	33.6
Level of education (<i>Median</i> = undergraduate degree)		
Less than high school	46	7.0
High school	177	26.8
Technical or vocational school	71	10.7
Undergraduate degree	343	52.0
Graduate degree	23	3.5
Annual household income (<i>Median</i> = Less than 36,000 Turkish Lira ^a)		
Less than 36,000 Turkish Lira	435	65.9
36,000–72,000 Turkish Lira	184	27.9
More than 72,000 Turkish Lira	41	6.2
Household employment status		
Tourism-related employment	337	51.1
Not tourism-related employment	323	48.9
Household tourism dependence		
0% income from tourism	217	32.9
1–15% income from tourism	99	15.0
16% or more income from tourism	343	52.1

^aTwo Turkish Lira is approximately the equivalent of US\$1.

4.2 | Factor structure of ESS and psychometrics

Confirmatory factor analysis (Table 2) was undertaken on the ESS items to determine the scale's factor structure. Each factor was added incrementally through LaGrange multiplier tests in the structural equation modeling program, EQS v6.3 to identify cross-loading items (three of which existed) and error covariances (eight of which were found). Using Wald tests to trim the model, all but one error term was successfully removed without compromising the $\Delta\chi^2/df$ critical value of 3.84 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The item, "I understand Antalya visitors," was removed from the final measurement model, Satorra–Bentler χ^2 (25, $n = 660$) = 43.90, $p < .01$, comparative fit index = 0.99, root mean square error of approximation = 0.03.

The resulting three factors comprising the nine items revealed maximal weighted alphas ranging from .77 to .84 as each of the standardized factor loadings exceeded a threshold of 0.50. Corresponding t values for each loading were significant ($p < .001$), indicating convergent validity as Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) and Kline (2015) have suggested. Average variances extracted surpassed a 0.50 value and were greater than squared correlations between factors, which,

according to Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010), demonstrate discriminant validity.

4.3 | ESS factors across sociodemographics and socioeconomics

Prior to assessing whether differences existed in emotional solidarity across sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables, composite means for ESS factors were calculated (see Table 2). In addressing the second purpose of this paper, MANOVA analyses with Wilks's Λ were performed to examine mean differences in each of the three ESS factors across gender, age, length of residence, level of education, annual household income, employment status, and level of tourism dependence. Differing perceptions of emotional solidarity were found in the gender MANOVA, Wilks's $\Lambda = .98$, $F(3,656) = 5.10$, and $p < .01$. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs; using the Bonferroni method to control for Type 1 errors) on each factor were then conducted as post hoc tests to the MANOVA, revealing that men perceived a higher degree of emotional solidarity than of women on *welcoming nature*, *emotional closeness*, and *sympathetic understanding* (Table 3).

The next MANOVA addressed whether emotional solidarity differed across five age categories for the sample. Significant differences were found on all three ESS factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4,653) = 2.00$, and $p = .02$ (Table 4). However, only the ANOVA concerning *emotional closeness* was significant ($p < .01$), with individuals between the ages of 40 and 49 years indicating a significantly lower level of emotional closeness with tourists than did individuals within the 18–29 and 30–39 years age groups. The third MANOVA, examining differences in ESS perceptions across length of residence, was not significant (Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(3,655) = 1.63$, and $p = .14$); therefore, post hoc ANOVA tests were not considered (Table 5).

For education level, significant differences were found on all three ESS factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4,653) = 2.33$, and $p < .01$ (Table 6). Those individuals with less than a high school diploma indicated feeling a significantly higher degree of *welcoming nature*, *emotional closeness*, and *sympathetic understanding* with tourists than did those with either a technical/vocational or undergraduate degree. The MANOVA for the closely related variable, annual household income was not significant (Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(2,655) = 1.17$, and $p = .32$); therefore, post hoc ANOVA tests were not considered (Table 7).

The MANOVA (Wilks's $\Lambda = .86$, $F(3,656) = 35.82$, and $p < .001$) examining responses across household employment status within the tourism industry (i.e., non-tourism related vs. tourism related) was significant with households having someone employed within the tourism industry indicating a higher level of agreement with *welcoming*, feeling emotionally close to, and possessing a sympathetic understanding with tourists (Table 8).

The final MANOVA addressed whether emotional solidarity differed across participants' level of household dependence on tourism. Significant differences were found on all three ESS factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = .79$, $F(3,654) = 26.99$, and $p < .001$ (Table 9). Each ANOVA post hoc model revealed significant pairwise comparisons in that those with the highest level of household tourism dependence indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with each emotional solidarity factor than in those with lower levels of dependence.

TABLE 2 Confirmatory factor analysis^a of ESS items

Factor and corresponding item	Mean ^b	Standardized factor Loading (t value ^c)	Maximal weighted alpha	AVE ^d
Welcoming nature	4.02		.77	.52
I treat Antalya visitors fairly	4.13	.51 (10.17)		
I feel community benefits from having visitors in Antalya	4.02	.71 (15.21)		
I am proud to have visitors come to Antalya	4.00	.76 (17.34)		
I appreciate visitors for contribution they make to economy	3.93	.65 (13.43)		
Emotional closeness	3.43		.84	.73
I have made friends with some Antalya visitors	3.49	.86 (33.94)		
I feel close to some visitors I have met in Antalya	3.37	.84 (29.87)		
Sympathetic understanding	3.02		.83	.53
I identify with Antalya visitors	3.08	.83 (26.14)		
I have a lot in common with Antalya visitors	2.99	.67 (17.54)		
I feel affection toward Antalya visitors	2.98	.76 (22.89)		

Note. AVE = average variance extracted; CFI = comparative fit index; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

^aSatorra–Bentler χ^2 (25, $n = 660$) = 43.90, $p < .01$, CFI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.03.

^bItems were rated on a 5-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cAll t tests were significant at $p < .001$.

^dAverage variance extracted, or AVE, is the square root of the variance shared between factors and their measures; each reported exceeded squared factor correlation estimates.

TABLE 3 ESS factors across gender^a

ESS factor	Means ^b		ANOVA results ^c	
	Female	Male	F	p
Welcoming nature	3.91	4.10	9.22	.002
Emotional closeness	3.24	3.54	11.59	.001
Sympathetic understanding	2.86	3.11	10.43	.001

Note. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .98$, $F(3,656) = 5.10$, and $p < .01$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cSignificance determined at .025 level.

5 | DISCUSSION

5.1 | Conclusion

Despite more than 5 years passing since Woosnam et al. (2009) first conceived of emotional solidarity in a tourism context, no work has been undertaken to consider divergent perspectives of solidarity,

among residents or tourists. The current work sought to fill this gap by examining residents' potential heterogeneous attitudes regarding tourists in their community. In so doing, level of solidarity was considered across seven sociodemographic or socioeconomic variables. Five of the seven models yielded significant findings. Emotional solidarity did not differ with respect to residents' length of residency or annual household income. Similar parallels can be drawn from work pertaining to the literature on residents' attitudes concerning tourism. Allen, Hafer, Long, and Perdue (1993) also found similar results, whereby length of residency did not differ with respect to tourism attitudes. Contrary to this, Bujosa and Rosselló (2007) found that perceptions of impacts did significantly differ across length of residency. García et al. (2015) assert that the variable length of residency is not always a consistent predictor of perceived impacts due to the contextual nature of residents' attitudes studies and its impact is confounded by other variables. Similar conflicting results have been revealed when considering annual household income. Although research has demonstrated that wealthier residents are more supportive of tourism development (especially those who gain from the industry), Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) and McMinn and Cater (1998) found those individuals with lower incomes indicated more support for the industry. Our results contribute to such

TABLE 4 ESS factors across age^a

ESS factor	Means ^b					ANOVA results ^c	
	18–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50–59 years	≥60 years	F	p
Welcoming nature	4.05	4.02	3.93	4.20	3.83	1.34	.253
Emotional closeness	3.56d	3.52e	3.13de	3.33	3.00	4.45	.001
Sympathetic understanding	3.10	3.03	2.84	3.09	3.00	1.79	.128

Note. Same lowercase letters in row indicate significant mean difference at the 0.01 level within the ANOVA model. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4,653) = 2.00$, and $p = .02$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cSignificance determined at .01 level.

TABLE 5 ESS factors across length of residence^a

ESS factor	Means ^b			ANOVA results	
	0–10 years	11–20 years	21+ years	F	p
Welcoming nature	3.91	4.06	4.10	3.80	.023
Emotional closeness	3.36	3.51	3.41	1.02	.360
Sympathetic understanding	2.95	3.04	3.06	0.75	.473

Note. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(3,655) = 1.63$, and $p = .14$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

inconclusiveness regarding income. One explanation for this may be that the relationship between income and support for tourism may actually be curvilinear (i.e., hyperbolic); that those falling within the middle-income categories support it less than both those in lower and higher income categories.

Parallels can also be drawn with resident attitudes literature for the five significant models. The results of this study found that men perceived a higher level of solidarity with tourists than did women. Sheldon and Var (1984), Um and Crompton (1987), and Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012) each found that women had more negative views of tourism development than men. Our findings speak to the importance that men place on relationships, which is counter to views held in Western cultures. Of the five significant models, age produced the weakest results; only level of *emotional closeness* was significant

TABLE 8 ESS factors across employment^a

ESS factor	Means ^b		ANOVA results ^c	
	Non-tourism related	Tourism related	F	p
Welcoming nature	3.80	4.23	57.28	.001
Emotional closeness	3.03	3.81	89.30	.001
Sympathetic understanding	2.72	3.30	59.89	.001

Note. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .86$, $F(3,656) = 35.82$, and $p < .001$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cSignificance determined at .025 level.

revealing that the younger residents felt the strongest degree of solidarity with tourists. This finding can potentially be explained by receptivity and openness to interacting with others as exhibited traits of members of younger generations. Work focusing on personality types (see Ying & Norman, 2014) such as high degrees of openness and agreeableness (as two of the “Big Five” personality types) may aid in explaining the relationship (as either a moderating or mediating variable) between age and degree of closeness. Similar findings concerning age have been found concerning attitudes toward tourism, whereby younger residents have perceived tourism development more favorably than did their older counterparts (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Huh & Vogt, 2008 and Woosnam & Erul, 2017).

Although income did not reveal statistically significant differences in forms of solidarity, a closely related variable, education level, did.

TABLE 6 ESS factors across education level^a

ESS factor	Means ^b					ANOVA results ^c	
	<High school	High school	Tech/voc school	Undergrad	Graduate	F	p
Welcoming nature	4.33de	4.13	3.89d	3.95e	3.96	4.04	.003
Emotional closeness	3.90fg	3.56	3.31f	3.31g	3.63	4.10	.003
Sympathetic understanding	3.38h	3.11	3.09	2.90h	3.09	3.38	.009

Note. Same lowercase letters in row indicate significant mean difference at the .017 level within the ANOVA model. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .96$, $F(4,653) = 2.33$, and $p < .01$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cSignificance determined at .01 level.

TABLE 7 ESS factors across annual household income^a

ESS factor	Means ^b			ANOVA results	
	<36,000 Turkish Lira ^c	36,000–72,000 Turkish Lira	>72,000 Turkish Lira	F	p
Welcoming nature	4.02	3.99	4.19	1.14	.320
Emotional closeness	3.39	3.43	3.83	2.91	.055
Sympathetic understanding	3.02	2.98	3.17	0.63	.533

Note. Same lowercase letters in row indicate significant mean difference at the .017 level within the ANOVA model. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .99$, $F(2,655) = 1.17$, and $p = .32$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cTwo Turkish Lira is the equivalent of US\$1.

TABLE 9 ESS factors across level of dependence on tourism^a

ESS factor	Means ^b			ANOVA results ^c	
	0% income from tourism	1–15% income from tourism	>15% income from tourism	F	p
Welcoming nature	3.66de	3.99df	4.26ef	46.69	.001
Emotional closeness	2.78gh	3.37gi	3.84hi	72.03	.001
Sympathetic understanding	2.59jk	2.97jl	3.30kl	37.74	.001

Note. Same lowercase letters in row indicate significant mean difference at the .017 level within the ANOVA model. ANOVA = analysis of variance; ESS = Emotional Solidarity Scale; MANOVA = multiple analysis of variance.

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .79$, $F(3, 654) = 26.99$, and $p < .001$.

^bESS items were asked on a 5-point scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

^cSignificance determined at the .017 level.

Those with less than a high school diploma indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with all three ESS factors than those with more advanced levels of education. This may be explained by the similarity in perceived education levels between residents and tourists (as they interacted). Arguably, the sample participants may have perceived a higher degree of solidarity with those they felt had comparable levels of education, which is supported by Reisinger, Kozak, and Visser's (2013) work that focused on the host gaze in Turkey. Others (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Látková & Vogt, 2012) have also demonstrated that education level can significantly contribute to residents' perspectives of tourism.

Household employment status in the tourism industry and level of household dependence on tourism revealed the strongest degree of differences in perceptions of emotional solidarity. Overall, those households with someone working in tourism-related positions and those reporting the highest level of tourism dependence indicated the highest level of agreement with the three ESS factors. Such findings are not supported by the work of Weaver and Lawton (2013) who found that those employed within the tourism industry were less likely to have positive attitudes regarding tourism development. However, the role of dependency stands in stark contrast to what other researchers have found pertaining to resident attitudes toward tourism (see Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Huh & Vogt, 2008). The majority of studies have shown that the potential benefit (in this case, dependency on the industry for income) from an exchange can create positive perceptions of tourism and tolerance of the negative impacts of tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

5.2 | Implications

Findings from this work have both theoretical and practical implications for the field of travel and tourism. Results demonstrate that a community and its members' perspectives should not be considered collectively when assessing relationships with destination visitors; that a community is composed of numerous individuals with various attitudes about tourism and its accompanying development. Similar notions have been echoed within the literature surrounding residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development for the last three decades (García et al., 2015; Gursoy et al., 2009; Harrill, 2004).

Of the seven models examined, emotional solidarity differences were most pronounced among the variables concerning tourism

employment status and dependence on tourism. Although Woosnam and colleagues have been adamant in divorcing financial exchanges from those of cross-cultural interactions (Maruyama & Woosnam, 2015; Woosnam & Erul, 2017; Woosnam et al., 2015), the time may have arrived when employment within the tourism sector and dependence on the tourism industry should be factored into how residents conceive of their individual relationships with visitors to the community. Given that mean differences were pronounced for these two variables, their impacts when considering level of predictability may significantly improve upon existing models (Woosnam, 2011a, 2011b; Woosnam et al., 2009), which have explained a considerable level of variance in emotional solidarity. Findings from this study provide justification for the inclusion of household employment within the tourism industry and degree of household tourism dependence (as well as gender, age, and education level) within future models involving emotional solidarity as the dependent variable. As such, the degree of variance explained in emotional solidarity may increase beyond what Woosnam (2011a) and Woosnam and Aleshinloye (2013) found in their work.

Psychometric results reveal support for the continued use of the ESS in contexts outside of the United States. Not only were reliabilities (as demonstrated through maximal weighted alphas) high for each factor within the scale but also were coefficients for each of the convergent and discriminant validities as well. On the basis of results from this study, the groundwork has been established to look at predictive validity of the ESS considering these sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables. To date, no one has examined predictive validity of the ESS in a tourism context. According to Churchill (1979), few other forms of validity are more difficult to demonstrate than predictive validity.

Destination marketing organizations can also glean managerial insight from findings within this study. It is clear from the findings that lower levels of emotional solidarity with tourists were perceived by female residents that were older, well educated, and not employed in (and by default, not dependent) the tourism industry. This study signifies a positive step for government officials to target educational efforts toward specific demographic groups in conveying the positive aspects of tourism. Government officials, policy makers, managers, and planners in Antalya should make a concerted effort to groom and foster positive relationships between those residents who potentially do not feel as close with visitors. Increasing opportunities for interaction at key attractions and planning special events and festivals

are two ways to do this. By fostering dialogue between these demographic groups (i.e., older, well educated, women not employed within the tourism industry) and visitors, opportunities for greater cross-cultural exchange and understanding may occur.

Additionally, tourism planners can utilize those individuals who indicated higher degrees of emotional solidarity with tourists in advertisement campaigns that showcase the welcoming environment of Antalya to existing and potential tourists. The utilization of testimonials in written media (e.g., on billboards and in travel magazines) as well as online (i.e., online forums, travel blogs, and destination marketing organizations websites) may be viable options, for Antalya and for other destinations. Such efforts could showcase social, cultural, natural, and historical resources within the community that serve to define local culture and explain why tourists visit. Of course, future research would need to be conducted in additional locations to determine if such demographic differences concerning perceptions of emotional solidarity with tourists exist. Such work would add greater credence to our current findings. Ultimately, residents have a significant influence not only in shaping tourists' decisions to visit but also in the experiences formed on-site. These endeavors could go far in fostering sustainable tourism within Antalya.

5.3 | Limitations and future research opportunities

Every study is limited in some capacity. One of the most apparent in ours is that despite trying to select districts in Antalya where residents would have the most experience and knowledge of tourists, data were collected in four of the potential 15 districts. The selection of such districts was fortuitous given the proximity of each to tourist centers throughout Antalya. Although the sample from which data were collected is likely representative of residents within those four districts (given the degree of randomness in selecting homes), it is uncertain as to whether the sample mirrors residents within the other 11 districts. With that said, future work could incorporate a similar multi-stage cluster sampling strategy so as to represent more than the four districts here. One approach could be to randomly sample from each of the 15 districts in an effort to secure a more fully representative sample of Antalya residents.

Another limitation of the current work was that residents were not asked the degree to which they interact with tourists and furthermore how they view such exchanges. It would have been interesting to see how level of emotional solidarity varied across degrees of interaction. As Woosnam and Norman (2010) first revealed, a direct relationship would be expected between interaction and solidarity. Future work should consider whether frequency or extent of interaction between residents and tourists is more crucial in impacting the perceived relationship between members of each group.

Even though absolute and incremental model fit index coefficients from the confirmatory factor analysis indicated good fit, one ESS item had to be removed as it would have compromised overall model fit. Such an approach is relatively standard (Kline, 2015) yet questions can be raised as to whether the existing items are capturing the variance within the construct intended. Moving forward, more items should be added to the ESS so that the robustness of the scale is improved. Items for potential inclusion may pertain to level of trust,

feeling comfortable, getting along, and so forth. Of course, the addition of new items to the ESS should be done with great care in pilot testing the modified scale to assess its psychometric properties as well as ensuring the burden of time is not increased significantly for participants in responding to the new scale.

Although the aim of this study was to perform analyses that were largely descriptive in nature (i.e., the MANOVA models involving sociodemographic and socioeconomic variables) so as to determine degree of heterogeneous perspectives of emotional solidarity, predictive models were not considered in explaining residents' degree of such solidarity. Future work should consider the role that numerous additional variables such as residents' place attachment, sense of community, and quality of life may serve to explain both residents' and tourists' emotional solidarity with one another. Variables should be presented as continuous (i.e., scalar in nature) to potential respondents to capture variance in responses and ultimately conduct inferential statistical analyses using such measures.

Most logically, a line of research progresses from exploratory and descriptive to more correlational and causal (Bernard, 2012). In knowing this, the current research arguably should have preceded much of the existing work concerning emotional solidarity within the tourism literature. Be that as it may, findings indicating that significant differences were found in five of the seven models concerning sociodemographic and sociodemographic variables have great potential to contribute to the amendment of Woosnam's (2011a) original Durkheimian model. Future research should include gender, age, education level, household employment within the tourism industry, and degree of household dependence on tourism as predictors of emotional solidarity. Nested structural equation models should be tested, whereby the inclusion of such variables is compared against Woosnam's (2011a) original model to see if variance explained in emotional solidarity increases with the addition of these five variables. Similar work by Gursoy et al. (2009) has yielded improved model fit and increased variance explained in comparable dependent variables.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. L., Hafer, H. R., Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 27–33.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward 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' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076.
- Aramberri, J. (2010). *Modern mass tourism*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Benckendorff, P., & Lund-Durlacher, D. (Eds) (2013). *International cases in sustainable travel & tourism*. Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.
- Bernard, H. R. (2012). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bimonte, S., & Punzo, L. F. (2016). Tourist development and host-guest interaction: An economic exchange theory. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58, 128–139.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216.
- Bujosa, A., & Rosselló, J. (2007). Modelling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28, 688–695.

- Caton, K., & Santos, C. A. (2009). Images of the other selling study abroad in a postcolonial world. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(2), 191–204.
- Chen, L. J. (2016). Intercultural interactions among different roles: A case study of an international volunteer tourism project in Shaanxi, China. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(5), 458–476.
- Chen, S., & Raab, C. (2012). Predicting resident intentions to support community tourism: Toward an integration of two theories. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(3), 270–294.
- Churchill, G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(February), 64–73.
- Draper, J., Woosnam, K. M., & Norman, W. C. (2011). Tourism use history: Exploring a new framework for understanding residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 64–77.
- Durkheim, E. (1995[1915]). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. New York: Free Press.
- Fredline, L., Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2013). A longitudinal study of the impacts of an annual event on local residents. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 10(4), 416–432.
- García, F. A., Vázquez, A. B., & Macías, R. C. (2015). Residents' attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33–40.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2011). *Using SPSS for windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2009). An examination of locals' attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4), 723–726.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*. Upper Saddle River.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 503–526.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18(3), 251–266.
- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446–455.
- Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford publications.
- Kwon, J., & Vogt, C. A. (2010). Identifying the role of cognitive, affective, and behavioral components in understanding residents' attitudes toward place marketing. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(4), 423–435.
- Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 50–67.
- Loi, K. I., & Pearce, P. L. (2015). Exploring perceived tensions arising from tourist behavior in a Chinese context. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(1–2), 65–79.
- Maruyama, N., & Woosnam, K. M. (2015). Residents' ethnic attitudes and support for ethnic neighborhood tourism: The case of a Brazilian town in Japan. *Tourism Management*, 50, 225–237.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29–34.
- McKercher, B., & Du Cros, H. (2003). Testing a cultural tourism typology. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(1), 45–58.
- McMinn, S., & Cater, E. (1998). Tourist typology: Observations from Belize. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(3), 675–699.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. New York, NY: Methuen.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243–268.
- Reisinger, Y., Kozak, M., & Visser, E. (2013). Turkish host gaze at Russian tourists: A cultural perspective. In O. Moufakkir, & Y. Reisinger (Eds.), *The host gaze in global tourism* (pp. 47–66). Oxfordshire, UK: CABI.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40–47.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism [TMCT]. (2015). Tourism Statistics, Foreign Travelers' in 2007, 2009, 2013, 2014, 2015. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,36568/number-of-arriving-departing-visitors-foreigners-and-ci-.html>
- Turkish Statistical Institute. 2014. Population statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.turkstat.gov.tr/UstMenu.do?metod=temelist>
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27–29.
- Urry, J., & Larsen, J. (2011). *The tourist gaze 3.0*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism: Change, impacts, and opportunities*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Wallace, R. A., & Wolf, A. (2006). *Contemporary sociological theory: Expanding the classical tradition* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Ward, C., & Berno, T. (2011). Beyond social exchange theory: Attitudes toward tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1556–1569.
- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2013). Resident perceptions of a contentious tourism event. *Tourism Management*, 37, 165–175.
- Woosnam, K. M. (2011a). Testing a model of Durkheim's theory of emotional solidarity among residents of a tourism community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(5), 546–558.
- Woosnam, K. M. (2011b). Comparing residents' and tourists' emotional solidarity with one another an extension of Durkheim's model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(6), 615–626.
- Woosnam, K. M., & Aleshinloye, K. D. (2013). Can tourists experience emotional solidarity with residents? Testing Durkheim's model from a new perspective. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(4), 494–505.
- Woosnam, K. M., & Erul, E. (2017). Residents' perceived impacts of all-inclusive resorts in Antalya. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 14(1), 65–86.
- Woosnam, K. M., & Norman, W. C. (2010). Measuring residents' emotional solidarity with tourists: Scale development of Durkheim's theoretical constructs. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 365–380.
- Woosnam, K. M., Norman, W. C., & Ying, T. (2009). Exploring the theoretical framework of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(2), 245–258.
- Woosnam, K. M., Dudensing, R. M., & Walker, J. R. (2015). How does emotional solidarity factor into visitor spending among birders in the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas? *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(5), 645–658.
- Woosnam, K. M., Aleshinloye, K. D., & Maruyama, N. (2016). Solidarity at the Osun Osogbo Sacred Grove—A UNESCO world heritage site. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 13(3), 274–291.
- Yilmaz, Y., Yilmaz, Y., Icigen, E. T., Ekin, Y., & Utku, B. D. (2009). Destination image: A comparative study on pre and post trip image variations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18(5), 461–479.
- Ying, T., & Norman, W. C. (2014). Personality effects on the social network structure of boundary-spanning personnel in the tourism industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348014538047>.
- Yu, J., & Lee, T. J. (2014). Impact of tourists' intercultural interactions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(2), 225–238.

How to cite this article: Woosnam KM, Erul E, Ribeiro MA. Heterogeneous community perspectives of emotional solidarity with tourists: Considering Antalya, Turkey. *Int J Tourism Res*. 2017;19:639–647. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2136>