



Residents' perceived impacts of all-inclusive resorts in Antalya

Kyle M. Woosnam & Emrullah Erul

To cite this article: Kyle M. Woosnam & Emrullah Erul (2017) Residents' perceived impacts of all-inclusive resorts in Antalya, *Tourism Planning & Development*, 14:1, 65-86, DOI: [10.1080/21568316.2016.1183515](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2016.1183515)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2016.1183515>



Published online: 07 Jun 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 604



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 10 View citing articles [↗](#)

Residents' perceived impacts of all-inclusive resorts in Antalya

Kyle M. Woosnam^a and Emrullah Erul^b

^aWarnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources (Natural Resource, Recreation and Tourism Program), University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA; ^bRecreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

ABSTRACT

This study examined Antalya residents' perceptions of the impacts of all-inclusive resorts (AIRs) in the Turkish coastal destination. Perceptions were examined to determine if they significantly differed across residential demographics. All told, 660 residents completed the on-site, self-administered survey instrument. Exploratory factor analysis of the *Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts (PAIR) Scale* revealed four unique factors (e.g. three focused on negative impacts and one on positive impacts). In four of the five multiple analysis of variance models, significant differences in *PAIR* factors were found among residents. Results revealed that residents who were male, older, employed in the tourism industry and less educated perceived AIR impacts more negatively. Results are explained through the social exchange theory and practical implications, along with future research opportunities, are offered.

KEYWORDS

All-inclusive resorts (AIRs); Antalya; Turkey; resident attitudes; impacts; social exchange theory

Introduction

Tourism is now one of the largest and fastest growing industries in Turkey, having experienced considerable growth since the 1980s (Köseoglu, Topaloglu, Parnelld, & Lester, 2013). According to annual reports conducted by the Republic of Turkey's Ministry of Culture and Tourism (TMCT) office (2013), international tourist arrivals grew from 1.3 million individuals in 1980 to 34.9 million in 2013, with tourist receipts having increased exponentially from US\$326 million to US\$32.3 billion during that period. In 2013, Turkey was among the top six most-visited countries in the world, having attracted a total of 37.8 million visitors (UNWTO, 2013). Such growth is expected to continue as the TMCT office forecasted that by 2023, the country will see 63 million tourists, which could translate to US\$86 billion tourism earnings, with each tourist spending, on average US\$1,350.

The tourism industry within Turkey relies heavily on international tourists in search of sun and sea destinations, especially during the summer season (Koc, 2005). Antalya, the popular resort city in southwest Turkey on the Mediterranean Sea, has witnessed exponential growth in this form of tourism over the last 20 years, and is considered the leading tourism destination throughout the country (Ozdemir, Çizel, & Bato Cizel, 2012). According to the TMCT office, the city welcomed 11 million visitors in 2013 and the number continues to rise (Doganer, 2012). As a result, the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly,

with a majority of them falling into the all-inclusive resorts (hereafter abbreviated AIRs) categorization (Duman & Tosun, 2010). AIRs can be defined as: "A [product which includes a] trip planned and pre-paid with a single price, which covers a broad range of items from transport and accommodation to meals and sightseeing, sometimes accompanied with an escort or guide" (Sheldon & Mak, 1987, p. 13). Overall, AIRs may include all or at least most of the details of the vacation (i.e. transport, accommodation, food and drinks, baggage handling, government taxes, sightseeing, entertainment, etc.) and those details might be taken care of by travel intermediaries such as a travel agency after an initial payment (Ozdemir et al., 2012; Tiliute & Condratov, 2014). According to the Association of Turkish Travel Agencies, in 2009, Turkey ranked third in selling AIR package throughout Europe (Ozdemir et al., 2012).

Despite the positive economic impacts of AIR, the potential exists for local businesses and community residents to be negatively impacted from such resorts (Bahar, 2004). In fact, the involvement of these AIRs in Antalya can result in an unsustainably high level of tourism revenue leakage from the host economy, especially if such accommodations are foreign-owned. According to Dwyer and Thomas (2012), each form of leakage results in money leaving or bypassing the host economy. In addition, AIRs can fail to promote local development and can decrease the livelihood of residents, diverting guests away from local businesses and ultimately reducing the potential of tourists to spend locally (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). AIRs can actually discourage tourists from leaving their accommodations, which not only has implications for guests not patronizing local businesses but also truly experiencing the destination. Beyond the financial exchange, the potential for social exchange among residents and tourists is also potentially compromised (Doganer, 2012).

Currently, perceptions of residents of Turkey in general, and Antalya specifically, concerning AIRs and their impacts are largely unknown. While research on AIRs has received some attention in Turkey (see Duman & Tosun, 2010; Üner, Sökmen, & Birkan, 2006), only one work (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009), which employed the *Perceptions of All-Inclusive Resorts (PAIR) Scale*, has tangentially considered the local community's perceptions of AIR impacts. However, the sample from which data were collected was composed of individuals employed within the tourism sector, dependent on the industry. In addition to this, Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) only focused on Alanya, a considerably smaller coastal area with substantially fewer AIRs, relative to Antalya. It remains unclear how residents at-large (i.e. both those employed within tourism and those not employed within tourism) throughout Antalya perceive the impacts of AIRs.

With a growing concern placed on understanding residents' concerns with AIRs, tourism planning organizations and policy-makers can begin to acknowledge residents and their voices within the planning process and embrace a more sustainable approach to planning and development throughout Antalya and Turkey (Gürkan, 2002). As a result, this work has two distinct purposes: (1) to examine the factor structure of the recently formulated *PAIR Scale*, measuring the impacts of AIRs and (2) to determine whether impacts are perceived differently among Antalya residents across various socio-demographic and socio-economic variables (i.e. gender, age, annual household income, education level, and employment status). Given the fact that the line of research focusing on residents' perceived impacts of AIRs is developing, continued empirical

utilization of measures such as the *PAIR Scale* will potentially demonstrate greater usability of the measure in new contexts but also contribute to greater theoretical development.

Literature review

AIR concept

With international tourism demand ever-increasing, the AIR model has become a vital component in a growing number of tourist destinations (Ozdemir et al., 2012; Tiliute & Condratov, 2014). The original all-inclusive concept can be traced back to the 1930s in Great Britain's holiday camps that offered a full day of free entertainment (Rayna & Striukova, 2009). However, the camps were not completely all-inclusive because they did not include expenses for such things as alcohol (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003). Others have considered the Club Mediterranean (Club Med) to have first introduced the AIR model in the Balearic Islands, one of the most popular Mediterranean destinations in Spain, beginning in the 1950s (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003).

Package tours overall can be classified into two types: a basic package tour and an all-inclusive package tour (Wong & Kwong, 2004). While a basic package tour only includes transportation and accommodations (Armstrong & Mok, 1995), an AIR usually contains nearly all amenities such as travel, transfers, accommodation, foods, beverages, activities, and entertainment (Ozdemir et al., 2012). Some of the common reasons for purchasing AIRs include price, word-of-mouth recommendations, entertainment, availability of facilities, lack of familiarity with destinations, and convenience of departure dates (Quiroga, 1990). For instance, Wong and Kwong (2004) described AIRs as a relatively effective and safe way for tourists to travel to distant countries with different cultures while avoiding unreliable transportation and questionable standards of hygiene. In addition to this, AIRs provide safety by putting tourists in a group with others, especially those of a similar cultural background, and minimizing language and cultural differences (Armstrong & Mok, 1995; Lo & Lam, 2004). As Naidoo and Sharpley (2016) have claimed, these resorts are sought after by individuals engaging in enclave tourism pursuits as well.

Beyond concerns for safety and comfort, motivations for selecting AIRs are abundant in the literature. Some tourists select AIRs for a high-quality product at reduced rates (Karamustafa, 2000; Wong & Kwong, 2004) with minimum risk (Rayna & Striukova, 2009; Tiliute & Condratov, 2014). According to Anderson (2008), Anderson, Juaneda, and Sastre (2009) and Heung and Chu (2000), convenience and expense are the most important reasons for choosing AIRs. Less planning and reduced unanticipated expenses are two other motivations behind travelers selecting AIRs (Anderson, 2008; Issa & Jayawardena, 2003; Tiliute & Condratov, 2014). Similarly, Valhouli (2003) claims that efficiency and value are significant determinants in contributing to travelers' selection of AIRs.

On the other hand, AIRs foster minimal interaction between tourists and locals, with the former often being discouraged from leaving their accommodations given the provision of amenities on-hand (Issa & Jayawardena, 2003), and can contribute to reduced spending outside of the resort (Anderson, 2008). Tourists do not have to leave their accommodations because so much is offered and provided by the accommodations (Yarcan & Ertuna, 2002). A great potential exists for service workers in restaurants and taxi drivers to lose business because AIRs capture most if not all services (Anderson, 2008). While

AIRs contribute to increasing tourist numbers, local workforce and earnings are highly compromised, especially within Turkey (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009).

AIR research in Turkey

During the 1990s, Turkey experienced three main crises (i.e. the Gulf War in the early years of the decade, the Partiya Karkerên Kurdistanê (The Kurdistan Workers' Party) targeting of tourism destinations in 1993 and 1994, and a major earthquake in 1999). According to Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), such crises not only damaged Turkish economies, but also fostered a negative destination image for potential tourists. As a result, numerous hotels throughout the country began to offer AIRs in an effort to overcome economic loss, alter the negative destination image, and provide a competitive advantage (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009).

The Marco Polo has been widely accepted as the first introducer of the AIR model in Turkey, dating back to the beginning of the 1990s. However, according to Alaeddinoglu and Can (2009), the popularity of AIRs in Turkey began at the turn of the twenty-first century due to the increasing demand for international tourism. Largely a result of the proliferation of AIRs throughout Turkey, the total number of inbound international tourists has increased rapidly, from 104 million in 2000 to 34.9 million in 2013, with Antalya accounting for 32% of total arrivals during that year (Turkish Statistical Institute [TSI], 2013).

Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) highlight that the Öger Tour Company conducted a survey in 2007 of 90,000 German tourists and found that 85% indicated they had selected Turkey as a destination because of the appeal of AIRs throughout the country. During that same year, 7.3 million tourists had visited Antalya with 68% claiming they preferred AIRs (TMCT, 2013). As Ozdemir et al. (2012) claims, AIR is arguably the most popular traveling mode for tourists visiting Antalya, which speaks volumes given approximately 11 million individuals visited the city in 2013.

So as to keep its position in the top 10 most-visited countries in the world and remain competitive in attracting inbound international travelers, it is argued that Turkey should continue to rely on the AIR model as a tourism strategy. However, Erkuş-Öztürk and Terhorst (2010) indicated that AIRs have drawn the attention of lower middle-class tourists and have contributed to a cheapened destination image. Such a finding is in keeping with what Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) found, in that local workers viewed AIR as a short-term marketing strategy, which can result in discouraging higher middle-class tourists from potentially visiting. Yarcın and Ertuna (2002) indicate that despite an increase in the supply of beds throughout Turkey, the per capita expenditure of foreign tourists has fallen because all-inclusive holiday packages have been sold for very low prices.

To date, work measuring residents' perceived impacts of AIRs in Turkey has been limited to the study undertaken by Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009). Based on the research put forth by Barak (2006) and Menekşe (2005), Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) created a 25-item scale, referred to as the *PAIR Scale*, whereby 280 local workers employed within the tourism sector were asked their impressions of AIRs in one coastal city, Alanya (roughly 150 km east of Antalya). This work was limited in its sample size, its focus only on those residents dependent on tourism for income, and in its application within one destination with considerably fewer AIRs than other coastal locations in Turkey (i.e. Antalya). From factor analysis of the *PAIR Scale*, Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) reported seven resulting

factors (*AIR impacts on nature-services-tourists; AIR impacts on profits of local businesses; AIR impacts on scope of local businesses; AIR impacts on Turkey tourism; AIR impacts on local businesses; AIR impacts on regional tourism and AIR impacts on local business sales*), explaining 61.2% of the variance in perceptions of AIRs. While Cronbach's α of .71 was presented for the *PAIR Scale* overall, no mention was made of each factor's reliability.

AIR research in Antalya

It is apparent that AIRs are thriving throughout Antalya. Despite this, research concerning the impacts of AIRs in the region has been slow to materialize (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). Tangential evidence of potential and extant impacts, however, has been noted. Ozdemir et al. (2012) and Duman and Tosun (2010) found that AIR guests tend to remain in their accommodations and are not aware of the historical background and social structure of the region. In addition, AIRs can decrease the quality of tourism services so as to increase profitability. Üner et al. (2006) conceded that AIRs are largely responsible for an increase in the number of tourists, yet at the cost of compromising quality of services for visitors. The researchers also claimed that AIRs can provide most, if not all services to tourists, which results in individuals not spending money outside of the resort and not recognizing the attractions and culture of the destination. Erdinc (2011) conducted a survey of Antalya visitors and found that nearly three in four individuals preferred AIRs as upwards of 65% stayed in their resorts, electing not to visit the city center. Concerning visitor spending, Gülbahar (2002) found that local employees in Antalya faced issues of potentially losing their jobs given decreased tourist spending in some parts of the city. It comes as no surprise that local workers would not support AIR given the potential to decrease tourist spending outside the resorts, as Gürkan (2002) found. Given the size of Antalya and its reputation as a tourist hub throughout Turkey, a great likelihood exists that its residents do not perceive the impacts of AIRs in the same manner. As García, Vázquez, and Macías (2015) indicate, no community is homogenous in its composition or its perspectives of the impacts of tourism. The social exchange theory and its application within the fields of travel and tourism have revealed such heterogeneity in residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development.

Social exchange theory

Few theories have received as much attention as the social exchange theory regarding residents' attitudes toward tourism, tourism development, and its consequential impacts (Ward & Berno, 2011). Social exchange theory is based on the premise that human behavior or social interaction is an exchange of activity—tangible and intangible—particularly of rewards and costs (Homans, 1961). Ap (1992) describes the theory as “a general sociological theory concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation” (p. 668). According to Ander-eck, Valentine, Knopf, and Vogt (2005), the overarching idea behind the social exchange theory in the context of tourism is that perceived personal and community outcomes from tourism (and potential tourism development) determine individuals' perceptions of tourism and levels of support for the industry. Implicit in this notion is the idea that constant comparisons are always being drawn concerning existing and potential situations

(Ward & Berno, 2011; Woosnam & Norman, 2010). If something is not beneficial, support will be lacking.

Social exchange theory has provided a conceptual basis for the examination of the inter-relationships among perceptions of costs and benefits (i.e. positive and negative impacts) and support for tourism (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012). Several researchers have found that people who perceive exchange benefits tend to have positive attitudes toward tourism and tend to support tourism development, but those who recognize exchange costs are more likely to have negative attitudes toward tourism and tend to oppose tourism development (Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Látková & Vogt, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Wang & Pfister, 2008). The majority of studies have shown that the potential benefit from an exchange can create positive perceptions of tourism and tolerance of negative impacts of tourism (Harrill, 2004; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Ward & Berno, 2011). Although social exchange theory (SET) has not been applied to research focusing on perceptions of AIRs, it has been extensively applied in the study of residents' perceptions and attitudes concerning tourism. Overall, scholars have found that residents' perceived positive impacts of tourism can positively influence their attitudes toward tourism (i.e. residents' perception that the positive impacts of tourism outweigh negative factors), and contribute to further support of tourism development (Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma, & Carter, 2007; Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2010; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002; Gursoy & Kendall, 2006; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Lee, Kang, Long, & Reisinger, 2010; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010; Vargas-Sánchez, Porrás-Bueno, & Plaza-Mejía, 2011).

Furthermore, SET has been utilized as a framework in explaining that residents who are economically dependent on tourism (i.e. employed in a tourism-related industry) tend to support tourism development (Haley, Snaith, & Miller, 2005; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Korça, 1996; Pizam, 1978). In a similar vein, it has been shown that residents who perceive personal economic benefits from tourism view the industry more positively and support its further development (Chen & Raab, 2012; Harrill, 2004; Korça, 1996; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011; Ward & Berno, 2011). As Látková and Vogt (2012) found, when personal benefits from tourism are controlled for, residents' socio-demographic and socio-economic characteristics are able to significantly explain perceived impacts of tourism. The literature is replete with evidence indicating how socio-demographic variables have been used as independent variables to explain residents' perceptions of tourism and tourism development (see García et al., 2015; Harrill, 2004; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Ward & Berno, 2011). However, mixed findings have developed, as no one socio-demographic variable has consistently yielded significant results (Harrill, 2004). 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, 2009; Woosnam & Norman, 2010). In applying the social exchange theory, Ward and Berno (2011) found that gender, age, and employment (i.e. tourism-related versus non-tourism-related) were all significant in predicting residents' attitudes. García et al. (2015) (in their most recently published extensive review of residents' attitudes toward the impacts of tourism) reveal that gender, age, annual household income, education level, and employment have received considerable

attention as key variables serving to explain residents' perceptions of tourism impacts, albeit with mixed results as Harrill (2004) noted.

The current study adopted the social exchange theory as a conceptual framework to explain residents' perceptions of the impacts of AIRs. While studies concerning residents' attitudes within the travel and tourism literature have relied extensively upon the employment of social exchange theory (see Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Ward & Berno, 2011) a dearth of work exists in applying the theory in the context of AIRs. Furthermore, no one has considered how such perceptions may differ across various socio-demographic and -economic variables. By adopting the social exchange theory as a conceptual framework, the current work seeks to do just that by building on the efforts of Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) to examine Antalya residents' perceptions of AIRs throughout the city known for such resorts. Such work can potentially demonstrate the continued usability of the *PAIR Scale* in various contexts but also contribute to theoretical development from empirical support revealed through inferential analysis involving the scale. As Pearce and Moscardo (2005) contend, building on empirical support for particular measures within the field of travel and tourism will serve to aid in our theoretical development.

Study methods

Antalya as a study site

The city of Antalya is located on the Mediterranean coast of southwest Turkey, and is home to approximately 2 million residents (TSI, 2013). With a Mediterranean climate consisting of hot and dry summers and mild and rainy winters, Antalya is rich in cultural, historical, and natural amenities—making it a destination appealing to many potential travelers.

In addition to the wide selection of hotels, restaurants, bars, nightclubs, and shops, the city also plays host to a number of sporting events throughout the year, such as international beach volleyball, triathlons, golf tournaments, archery, tennis, and canoeing competitions. With Belek, Kemer, Side-Manavgat, Alanya, and Kaş tourism centers, Antalya hosts more than 9 million international visitors every year (Antalya Tourism Information, 2009). According to the TMCT (2013), the total bed supply in Turkey was 532,262 in 2007. Of those, Antalya had 44% of the market share. According to Ozdemir et al. (2012), the number of hotels in Antalya has increased rapidly, with a majority having adopted an AIR model.

Sampling and data collection

The sample population for this study consisted of local residents living in Antalya. Questionnaires were distributed door-to-door following a multi-stage random cluster sampling strategy (Babbie, 2014) in an effort to capture a representative sample of Antalya residents. This strategy began by initially dividing Antalya into 15 geographic areas based on the Turkish Statistical Institute classification scheme. From the list of districts, Kemer (98% AIRs), Antalya city center (79% AIRs), Serik (98% AIRs) and Manavgat (94% AIRs) were randomly selected. At that point, streets were randomly selected by using city maps. On each of the randomly selected streets, every fourth home or business was randomly selected, 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. Only one individual with the latest birthday was asked to participate from either household or business. Data collection occurred over a three-month period (i.e. February, March, and April of 2014) on weekdays and weekends. 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). Back translations were performed to ensure translational/linguistic equivalence (Malhotra, Agarwal, & Peterson, 1996).

The research team ultimately visited 1,003 households and businesses, with approximately 5% ($n = 53$) yielding “no answer” responses. At the remaining 950 homes and businesses, heads of households (or spouses) or business employee were contacted and asked to participate, of whom 223 declined (an acceptance rate of 76.5%). Of the 727 surveys that were distributed, 660 were completed by residents (a completion rate of 90.8%). According to Creative Research Systems (2015), with a population of 2,000,000 individuals, 384 individuals would be needed for a sample size with a 95% confidence level and a confidence interval of 5. The margin of error for a sample size of 660 was 3.81%, considering a 95% confidence level (Raosoft, 2015). The overall response rate (i.e. 660 completed and usable survey instruments from 950 individuals that were contacted) was 69.5%. Response rates for each specific district were as follows: Kemer ($n = 165$), 71.1%; Antalya City Center ($n = 160$), 67.5%; Serik ($n = 165$), 68.5%; and Manavgat ($n = 170$), 70.8%.

Measures and data analysis

While this study is part of a larger research project, not all measures employed in the questionnaire (e.g. residents’ attitudes about existing tourism development, future development, development options, community attachment, and emotional solidarity with tourists) were used in analysis. For the purposes of this paper, 20 of the 25 items (asked on an agreement scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) from the *PAIR Scale* developed by Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) were utilized. For consistency purposes, the 5-point scale was in keeping with the way in which Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) presented each of the scale-item statements. The five items from the *PAIR Scale* that were not included in the data collection were excluded given redundancy and considerations for parsimony—ultimately to reduce respondents’ burden of time in completing the questionnaire. Those five items pertained to quality of services, application of AIRs, reduction in local sales, impact of local businesses, and number of customers in local businesses—each of which were assessed in the remaining 20 items. This scale was determined to be most appropriate for the current study given the diversity of items; however, psychometric properties (i.e. reliability coefficients) of the scale remain largely unknown. Additionally, categorical variables involving residents’ gender, age, annual household income, education level, and employment status were utilized. These five demographic measures were selected given their noted importance in examining perceptions of tourism and its development (see Harrill, 2004; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Ward & Berno, 2011).

To examine data for potential outliers, raw data (from the responses to the *PAIR Scale* as well as the five socio-demographic and -economic measures used in analysis) were standardized using z-scores and examined to ensure they did not exceed the absolute value of

3.29 (indicating non-normalized data) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). No outliers were identified. Missing data were then addressed by employing the estimation maximization technique within the EQS 6.2 statistical program (see Woosnam & Aleshinloye, 2013). Thirty-two cases had some form of data missing within the *PAIR Scale* and had to be imputed.

To address the first purpose of this paper, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with varimax rotation (using SPSS v.22), was undertaken that would allow for greater examination of the factor structure of the *PAIR Scale*. Following this, a series of multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) tests were employed that provided an opportunity to determine if Antalya residents' perceptions of the scale (measured from the resulting EFA factors) differed significantly across a host of socio-demographic and -economic variables (e.g. gender, age, annual household income, education level, and employment status). 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. A description of the sample can be found in Table 1.

Results

EFA findings for perceived impacts

Given the relative novelty of the *PAIR Scale* and the fact that factor structure psychometrics were not clear concerning the scale, EFA was conducted. Items were retained based on

Table 1. Descriptive summary of Antalya respondents.

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Gender (<i>n</i> = 660)		
Male	408	61.8
Female	252	38.2
Age (<i>n</i> = 660, median = 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	0.5
Marital status (<i>n</i> = 660)		
Married	367	55.6
Single	277	42.0
Divorced or separated	10	1.5
Widowed	6	0.9
Level of education (<i>n</i> = 660, median = undergraduate degree)		
Less than high school	46	7.0
High school	177	26.8
Technical or vocational school	71	10.8
Undergraduate degree	343	52.0
Graduate degree	23	3.5
Employment status (<i>n</i> = 660)		
Tourism-related employment	337	51.1
Not tourism-related employment	191	28.9
Student	104	15.8
Homemaker	19	2.9
Retired or unemployed	9	1.4
Annual household income (<i>n</i> = 660, median = 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

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

two criteria: scree plot examination and eigenvalues exceeding a value of 1.0 (Woosnam, Norman, & Ying, 2009). Only items with factor loadings of at least .50 were retained for EFA and subsequent analysis (Costello & Osborne, 2005). However, items that cross-loaded onto multiple factors (i.e. those whose values exceeded .32) were removed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

In the initial analysis, five factors were identified; however, four items had to be removed (two as low-loaders and two as cross-loaders). Those items were: "AIRs attract more lower middle class tourists", "AIRs should be abolished", "AIRs reduce the sale prices of the local businesses" and "Tourists are unaware of the beauty of the region due to AIRs." A second EFA was run and Cronbach's α was examined for each factor. From the results, two items (i.e. "AIRs contribute positively to suppliers" and "AIRs lead tourists to consume excessive food and alcohol") were then removed in an effort to not compromise internal consistencies of factors.

The third and final EFA yielded satisfactory loadings, however, modest reliabilities in two of the four resulting factors. The four factors accounted for 68% of the total variance in the construct and yielded factor loadings between .62 and .90 with an overall Cronbach α for the scale of .75 and factor Cronbach α values ranging from .60 to .91. The first factor was labeled *AIRs negative economic impacts on local businesses* (five items) and pertained to AIRs contributing to decreased sales in and profitability for local businesses, reduced numbers of visitors frequenting local businesses, and a weakening of the competitive power of local businesses. The second factor, *AIRs positive impacts* (four items), contained items concerning the positive benefits (i.e. applying it in less-than-desirable locations, applying it everywhere, increasing hotel occupancy rates, and in general, AIRs being a good idea). *AIRs negative impacts on quality* (three items) was the third factor and included items that related to AIRs appealing to a lower socio-economic group of tourists, compromising service quality, and being a short-term solution. The final factor, *AIRs negative impacts on population* (two items), concerned AIRs decreasing workforce for local businesses and reducing the number of tourists in the area. Overall, residents indicated the highest level of agreement with negative impacts of AIR (i.e. $M_{AIR \text{ negative economic impacts on local businesses}} = 4.22$; $M_{AIR \text{ negative impacts on quality}} = 3.66$; and $M_{AIR \text{ negative impacts on population}} = 3.51$). Similarly, residents reported the lowest level of agreement with positive impacts of AIR (i.e. $M_{AIR \text{ positive impacts}} = 3.02$). These results can be found in Table 2.

Perceptions of AIR across socio-demographic variables

Composite means were calculated for each factor within the *PAIR Scale* based on EFA results and can be found in Table 2. To examine whether AIRs were perceived differently across residents' gender, age, annual household income, level of education, and employment status, a series of MANOVA analyses with Wilks's Λ were conducted. The only model that was not significant involved annual household income.

Significant differences were found between genders on all four *PAIR Scale* factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = .97$, $F(4,655) = 4.86$, $p < .01$ (Table 3). ANOVAs on each factor (as the dependent variable) were then conducted as *post hoc* tests to the MANOVA. Using the Bonferroni method (to control for type 1 errors), each ANOVA was examined at the .0125 α -level (i.e. .05 divided by four—as number of *PAIR* factors) per Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). ANOVAs for *AIRs negative impacts on local businesses* ($F(1,659) = 6.91$, $p < .01$), *AIRs negative*

Table 2. EFA of PAIR Scale items.

Total						
Factor	Factor loading	Mean ^a	Eigen-value	Rotated SS ^b	Variance explained (%)	Cronbach α reliability
<i>AIRs negative economic impacts on local businesses^c</i>		4.22	5.06	3.83	27.35	.91
AIRs cause decrease in local business owner sales	.90	4.28				
AIRs reduce profitability of local businesses	.90	4.26				
AIRs weaken competitive power of local business owners	.82	4.16				
AIRs affect adversely the local business owners	.81	4.31				
AIRs reduce the number of customers in local businesses	.74	4.08				
<i>AIRs positive impacts^c</i>		3.02	1.95	2.12	15.11	.71
AIRs should be applied in unattractive tourism regions as an alternative strategy	.72	3.49				
AIRs contribute positively to tourism in Turkey	.70	2.52				
AIRs should be applied everywhere tourism exists	.68	2.35				
AIRs increase occupancy rates of hotels and businesses	.67	3.71				
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality^c</i>		3.66	1.42	2.06	14.70	.66
AIRs impair quality of tourist and service	.79	3.72				
AIRs discourage higher middle-class tourists from visiting	.74	3.86				
AIRs is a short-term marketing strategy in the industry	.62	3.39				
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population^c</i>		3.51	1.03	1.47	10.48	.60
AIRs has lessened the number of staff members in the local businesses	.76	3.64				
The number of tourists will increase once the AIRs system is abolished	.75	3.38				
Total variance explained					67.64	
Cronbach α reliability for overall scale						.75

Note: KMO, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin; SS, sum of squares.

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

^bSum of squares.

^cKMO was .86, and Barlett's test of sphericity was .000.

impacts on quality ($F(1,659) = 8.57, p < .01$) and *AIRs negative impacts on population* ($F(1,659) = 13.39, p < .001$) were all significant with men indicating a higher degree of agreement with each factor, whereas they had a significantly lower degree of agreement with the only positive factor, *AIRs positive impacts* ($F(1,659) = 7.49, p < .01$).

Table 3. PAIR Scale factors across gender.^a

PAIR Scale factor	Means (SD) ^b		ANOVA results ^c	
	Female	Male	F	p
<i>AIRs negative impacts on local businesses</i>	4.10(0.88)	4.29(0.85)	6.91	.009
<i>AIRs positive impacts</i>	3.14(0.96)	2.94(0.93)	7.49	.006
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality</i>	3.51(0.98)	3.75(0.99)	8.57	.004
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population</i>	3.34(0.91)	3.62(1.00)	13.39	.000

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .97, F(4,655) = 4.86, p < .01$.

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

^cSignificance determined at the .0125 level.

Table 4. PAIR Scale factors across age.^a

PAIR Scale factor	Means (SD) ^b					ANOVA results ^c	
	18–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	≥60	F	p
<i>AIRs negative impacts on local businesses</i>	4.16(0.84)	4.29(0.85)	4.24(0.90)	4.17(0.98)	4.67(0.58)	0.89	.468
<i>AIRs positive impacts</i>	3.27(0.89) ^{d,e}	2.80(0.98) ^d	2.90(0.93) ^e	2.81(0.85)	2.75(0.66)	8.57	.000
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality</i>	3.56(1.00)	3.71(1.00)	3.76(0.97)	3.62(1.02)	4.00(0.33)	1.32	.260
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population</i>	3.34(0.94) ^f	3.66(0.98) ^g	3.61(0.99)	3.60(0.96)	4.17(0.76) ^{f,g}	4.16	.002

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(4,655) = 2.66$, $p < .001$.

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

^cSignificance determined at the .0125 level.

^{d–g}The same letter indicates significant mean difference at the .0125 level within the ANOVA model.

The MANOVA model for *PAIR Scale* factors across age categories was also significant, Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(4,655) = 2.66$, $p < .001$ (Table 4). Considering the same Bonferroni method and .0125 α level, two of the ANOVA models were found to be significant: *AIRs positive impacts*, $F(1,659) = 8.57$, $p < .001$ and *AIRs negative impacts on population*, $F(1,659) = 4.16$, $p < .01$. As can be seen from the first ANOVA, the youngest age category (i.e. 18–29 year olds) indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with perceptions of positive impacts of AIRs than the older age categories. Similar to this, the oldest group of residents (as opposed to the younger age categories) claimed to agree most with items comprising the factor concerning the negative impacts AIRs have on population.

The third MANOVA, examining differences in AIRs perceptions across annual household income, was not significant; therefore *post hoc* ANOVA tests were not considered (Table 5). Level of education (a closely related variable to income), however, did yield significant findings (Table 6). The MANOVA model was significant, Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(4,655) = 2.41$, $p < .01$. As with the model concerning age, the same two factors were found to yield differences across the independent variable: *AIRs positive impacts*, $F(1,659) = 4.30$, $p < .01$ and *AIRs negative impacts on population*, $F(1,659) = 4.77$, $p < .01$. In both instances, individuals with a technical or a vocational-school-level of education indicated a significantly different level of agreement with items in the two factors (i.e. higher level of agreement for *AIRs positive impacts* and lower level of agreement with *AIRs negative impacts on population*) than did those with either a high school diploma or less.

The final MANOVA addressed whether perceptions of AIRs differed across employment in the tourism industry versus another industry. Significant differences were found on all

Table 5. PAIR Scale factors across annual household income.^a

PAIR Scale factor	Means (SD) ^b			ANOVA results	
	<36,000 Turkish Lira ^c	36,000–72,000 Turkish Lira	>72,000 Turkish Lira	F	p
<i>AIRs negative impacts on local businesses</i>	4.19(0.87)	4.26(0.85)	4.32(0.88)	0.71	.491
<i>AIRs positive impacts</i>	3.03(0.97)	3.05(0.91)	2.73(0.76)	2.14	.119
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality</i>	3.64(1.03)	3.68(0.92)	3.74(0.99)	0.25	.782
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population</i>	3.54(0.99)	3.39(0.91)	3.79(1.07)	3.20	.041

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .98$, $F(4,655) = 1.48$, $p = .16$.

^bAIRs 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 6. PAIR Scale factors across education level.^a

PAIR Scale factor	Means (SD) ^b					ANOVA results ^c	
	<High school	High school	Technical/vocational school	Undergrad	Graduate	F	p
<i>AIRs negative impacts on local businesses</i>	4.15(1.10)	4.29(0.81)	4.11(0.66)	4.21(0.88)	4.25(1.16)	0.64	.632
<i>AIRs positive impacts</i>	2.70(1.05) ^d	2.87(0.97) ^e	3.23(0.83) ^{d,e}	3.10(0.94)	2.84(0.68)	4.30	.002
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality</i>	3.82(1.08)	3.70(1.03)	3.58(0.95)	3.60(0.98)	4.06(0.77)	1.68	.153
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population</i>	3.88(1.15) ^f	3.64(1.01) ^g	3.18(0.92) ^{f,g}	3.47(0.92)	3.41(0.89)	4.77	.001

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(4,655) = 2.41$, $p < .01$.

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

^cSignificance determined at the .0125 level.

^{d–g}The same letter indicates significant mean difference at the .0125 level within the ANOVA model.

Table 7. PAIR Scale factors across employment.^a

PAIR Scale factor	Means (SD) ^b		ANOVA results ^c	
	Non-tourism-related	Tourism-related	F	p
<i>AIRs negative impacts on local businesses</i>	4.05(0.87)	4.38(0.84)	25.19	.000
<i>AIRs positive impacts</i>	3.20(0.97)	2.84(0.88)	24.60	.000
<i>AIRs negative impacts on quality</i>	3.39(0.97)	3.91(0.95)	47.14	.000
<i>AIRs negative impacts on population</i>	3.33(0.93)	3.68(0.98)	21.74	.000

^aMANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = .91$, $F(4,655) = 16.98$, $p < .001$.

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

^cSignificance determined at the .0125 level.

four PAIR Scale factors, Wilks's $\Lambda = .91$, $F(4,655) = 16.98$, $p < .001$ (Table 7). ANOVAs for AIRs negative impacts on local businesses ($F(1,659) = 25.19$, $p < .001$), AIRs negative impacts on quality ($F(1,659) = 47.14$, $p < .001$) and AIRs negative impacts on population ($F(1,659) = 21.74$, $p < .001$) were all significant with those employed in a tourism-related industry indicating a higher degree of agreement with each factor, whereas they had a significantly lower degree of agreement with the only positive factor, AIRs positive impacts ($F(1,659) = 24.60$, $p < .001$).

Conclusion

In examining the psychometric properties of the PAIR Scale, factor structure as well as reliability of each factor was assessed. Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), first employing the scale, found seven unique factors (six of which were negative in nature), which explained 61.2% of the variance in the scale. All told, the authors reported a Cronbach α of .71, yet neglected to indicate reliability coefficients for each factor. The current study revealed a nearly similar factor structure (i.e. having only one factor that was positive in nature) with overlapping factors concerning impacts on local businesses and impacts on the quality of services. Furthermore, variance explained in the modified scale was 67.6% for the current study. Considering the removal of four overlapping items and following a similar analytical technique to Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), the current work marks an improvement to the existing PAIR Scale. In addition to this, previous work has only considered the impacts of AIR from 280 industry employees and in one uniquely smaller

coastal city (i.e. Alanya). Our study is the first to consider 660 local residents (i.e. those not employed and those employed within the tourism sector) conducted across multiple districts within a city boasting the most AIRs throughout all of Turkey.

At the core of the social exchange theory is the idea that individuals' perceptions of tourism and future support of tourism development come about based on perceived personal and community benefits from and negative consequences of the industry (Andereck et al., 2005). As evidenced from means of the resulting *PAIR Scale* factors, it is clear that residents collectively perceive AIR impacts as largely negative. With that said however, given the nature of differences in opinion (especially concerning impacts of tourism), no community will possess residents of one unified voice; no community is homogenous in its perspective of tourism and its accompanying development (Woosnam, Van Winkle, & An, 2013). Despite criticisms of the social exchange theory (see Ward & Berno, 2011; Woosnam et al., 2009), the framework can serve to explain differing perspectives (as shown through the MANOVA analyses) that resulted within this study. As a tenet of the theory, according to Kuvan and Akan (2005), based on Ap (1992), "if the perceived cost involved can be offset by the expected gain, the exchange will transpire and continue as long as such a balance can be sustained" (p. 703). According to SET, people who perceive exchange benefits would have positive attitudes toward tourism, but people who recognize exchange costs would have negative attitudes toward tourism (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; Korça, 1996; Kwon & Vogt, 2010; Long, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010, 2011, 2012; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Sirakaya, Teye, & Sönmez, 2002).

The results of this study revealed that women indicated a significantly higher level of agreement with items comprising the *AIRs positive impact* factor, while also a lower level of agreement with items on the remaining three negative factors. From this, one can deduce that female residents tended to perceive impacts of AIR more positively than male residents in Antalya. Such a finding is consistent with studies conducted by Huh and Vogt (2008), McCool and Martin (1994), and Wang and Pfister (2008), where females were more favorable toward the positive impacts of tourism. Similarly, Heung and Chu (2000) found significant mean differences among men and women on three of six factors from their scale concerning selection of AIRs. In contrast to findings in the current study, previous work has shown that women in some cases hold more negative views of tourism development than men (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987).

The results also indicated that older residents, especially over the age of 60, tended to agree more with the items comprising the factor, *AIRs negative impacts on population*, than younger residents in Antalya. This finding is in keeping with the work of Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2003), Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), Huh and Vogt (2008), and Wang and Pfister (2008), which showed a significant relationship between age and attitude toward tourism development. The authors found that older residents perceived tourism development more negatively than did the younger residents. However, contrary to this study, McGehee and Andereck (2004), and Látková and Vogt (2012) found that older residents perceived impacts of tourism more positively than younger residents.

No significant differences existing in perceptions of AIRs across household income level. This is consistent with what Kuvan and Akan (2005) found in a similar study concerning residents of Belek, Turkey. A closely aligned variable, education level, however, did

reveal significant differences. Residents with less than a high school diploma indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with *AIRs negative impacts on population* items than either those with a high school or a technical/vocational school diploma. This result is in accordance with many previous studies (i.e. Gümüş & Özüpekçe, 2009; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Tatoglu, Erdal, Ozgur, & Azakli, 2002) revealing significant differences across education level. For instance, Korça (1996) and Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) found that the higher educated residents were more supportive and had positive attitudes concerning tourism and its corresponding development. Furthermore, these results are consistent with the social exchange theory that when controlling for personal benefits from tourism, residents' characteristics can predict perceived impacts of tourism.

Finally, employment status (i.e. employed in a tourism-related industry versus non-tourism-related industry) revealed the strongest degree of differences in perceptions of *AIRs* impacts. Overall, those working in a tourism-related position indicated a significantly higher degree of agreement with each of the negative impact factors while a significantly lower degree of agreement with the positive factor. Such a finding is supported by the work of Martin, McGuire, and Allen (1998) and 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 several other researchers have found pertaining to resident attitudes toward tourism (Andereck, Valentine, Vogt, & Knopf, 2007; Haley et al., 2005; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Korça, 1996; Kuvan & Akan, 2005; Pizam, 1978). 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; Chuang, 2010; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Kwon & Vogt, 2010).

Implications

From this work, both theoretical and practical implications can be drawn. Having formulated and applied the initial *PAIR Scale* in only one district of Antalya, Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009) did not report any reliabilities for the resulting factor structure. While the current study yielded internal consistency measures, coefficients were collectively low. This may be due in part to the novelty of the scale and its limited application up to this point (Nunnally, Bernstein, & Berge, 1967). We would expect these coefficients to increase through subsequent modifications made to particular items.

While the application of the *PAIR Scale* is indeed in its infancy, further inferential statistics in the way of revealing significant differences in responses across various socio-demographic and socio-economic variables yielded fruitful results. In four of the five MANOVA models (with the exclusion of the household income variable), significant findings were presented. This stands in stark contrast to the work of Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), which did not reveal any significant differences in perceptions of *AIRs* across local business owners' type of business, length of time business had been in existence, number of employees, time of year business operates, or clientele base. Such findings with little variation made have been due to a small sample size, focusing only on one district in Antalya, and surveying primarily men. Current study findings

however, provide promise for not only the usability of the *PAIR Scale* but also its application.

This study also has several practical implications for policy-makers, government officials, managers, and planners in Antalya and other destinations with AIRs in order to sustainably plan for tourism and tourism development. First, governing bodies must consider residents' opinions and perceptions about AIRs so as to reduce perceived negative impacts. It is clear from the findings that residents, by and large, have negative impressions of AIRs. In an effort to address this, residents should be involved in each stage of developing AIRs, from planning to implementation through monitoring. Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2003) have supported this idea by claiming that key officials should pay more attention to the problems of locals and should try to train locals about costs and benefits of tourism. In addition, if residents' needs and demands are not considered in tourism development, residents will view tourism negatively and potentially act hostile toward tourists, which can ultimately damage tourism (Harrill, 2004; Kwon & Vogt, 2010). Policy-makers, government officials, and planners need to actively convey (through non-regulatory, educational means) to AIR investors and managers, the potential for backlash from residents if their concerns are not addressed. If however, residents' issues with AIRs are not considered, more regulatory action would need to be proposed that would seek to minimize negative impacts and maximize positive impacts of the resorts. Given the push by the Turkish government through its Ministry of Tourism office to increase AIRs development, it is unlikely regulatory action would be developed.

Furthermore, policy-makers, government officials, and planners should seek to increase per capita expenditures rather than increase the absolute number of foreign tourists. Such a focus may serve as a shift away from AIRs to more locally owned hotels with immediate access to local artisans and craftspeople. Finally, as a form of corporate social responsibility, managers of AIRs in Antalya need to consider financially supporting local parks, schools, civic centers, etc. as an act of showing they do indeed care about local communities and their residents. Such an approach can be viewed as a win-win situation, where AIRs benefit from positive marketing publicity and residents gain from having improved quality of life amenities.

Limitations and future research recommendations

Like any research project, this work is no different in having limitations. Representativeness of the sample is one concern of the study. As indicated, only four districts were included in the sample of Antalya residents (based on the concentration of AIRs in the area). While this is advancement beyond the work of Çevirgen and Üngüren (2009), it is recommended that work linking AIRs and residents' attitudes should be done in more than four districts, so as to replicate findings. Additionally, the sample included a considerably large percentage of individuals who derive income from tourists. Such an oversampling may have implications for findings, as degree of tourism dependence could potentially contribute to significant differences. Future studies should intentionally collect data from business owners and non-business owners as a means to compare attitudes regarding AIRs and how such perceptions impact attitudes of tourism development in general.

Analysis within this work focused exclusively on initial inferential statistics. As a result, future research using the scale factors as both independent and dependent variables

should be conducted. For instance, measures such as sense of community, place attachment, interaction with AIR guests, etc. should be considered in conjunction with the scale factors in regression analyses. Such work will contribute greatly in demonstrating construct validity of the *PAIR Scale* and its corresponding factors.

Additionally, while the current research was conducted to utilize the existing *PAIR Scale* and modify it sparingly (i.e. removing superfluous items), this study suggests a potential modification of the scale. Those items, which have low standardized factor loadings, may be considered for exclusion (Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009). The rationale for this is that such items are unclear and likely do not contribute significantly to the variance explained in the construct factors. Of course, assessing reliability of the factor with such items removed will also be of importance. A reduction in the size of scale will make the measure more parsimonious and reduce the potential for confusion and cognitive overload experienced by participants, potentially improving response rates in subsequent research (Woosnam & Aleshinloye, 2013; Woosnam et al., 2009). Of course, once reliable results are consistently found utilizing a modified scale, future research at that point should involve the employment of confirmatory factor analysis to further examine factor structure and psychometrics, most notably forms of validity as Boley, McGehee, Perdue, and Long (2014) and Woosnam and Aleshinloye (2013) have done most recently.

While findings from the current study reveal continued support for the application of the *PAIR Scale* in various contexts where AIRs are found (i.e. other regions of Turkey and throughout the world), modifications need to be made to account for potential semantic concerns. Most noticeably is that the word “local” only appears in negatively worded items (as Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009 had designed), which may have had impacted the factor structure and its corresponding factor reliabilities. In an effort to not only potentially increase reliability of factors but also aid in greater clarification of items, future research should modify such wording issues by making sure all items are written in a general context by removing the word “local” from each item. Two other limitations exist regarding the *PAIR Scale*. First, a preponderance of items was worded in a negative direction, which could have impacted how participants responded. Second, a majority of items focused on perceptions of economic impacts. To address these concerns, future work with the scale should involve a balance between positively and negatively worded items and include more items that address perceptions of social–cultural impacts of AIRs.

The current study reveals (as previous studies have) that tourism dependency may not only play a significant role in shaping residents’ attitudes toward tourism, but also have an important effect on changing residents’ perceptions about impacts of tourism in general and AIRs specifically. While the current study only ascertained dependence from asking whether residents were employed in a tourism-related job or not, future studies should seek to determine a more robust measure of dependency (i.e. percentage of income derived from tourism). Furthermore, future studies should consider the role tourism dependency (i.e. as a local business owner, employee of a local business, or owner/employee of AIRs) may potentially play in individuals’ reporting perceptions of existing tourism development, potential tourism development options (e.g. including greater AIRs), and impacts of AIRs. Structural models, like those of Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012) and Vargas-Sánchez et al. (2011) concerning resident attitudes should be considered in the context of AIRs, especially including measures of dependency as a covariate to examine its mediating effect within subsequent models.

Additionally, as previous research concerning AIRs has purported, that such accommodations reduce the potential interaction and cross-cultural exchanges between those residents and tourists (Barak, 2006; Çevirgen & Üngüren, 2009; Yarcın & Ertuna, 2002), the current study did not determine from residents their level of interest in interacting with tourists. Not only should future research seek to ascertain residents' desire to interact with tourists staying at AIRs but also the tourists' interest in reciprocating with residents. If findings reveal that neither value such interaction or a disparity exists, additional implications (i.e. should strategies be implemented to encourage greater interactions between residents and tourists) could be drawn. Such research would contribute significantly to this line of research in either validating this assumption that interaction is desired or aid in providing additional measures (i.e. serving as independent variables) that can explain variance in perceptions of AIR impacts through the *PAIR Scale*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Alaeddinoglu, F., & Can, A. S. (2009). Developing international market entry strategy for cultural tourism of Turkey. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6(1), 509–527.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 1056–1076.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Vogt, C. A., & Knopf, R. C. (2007). A cross-cultural analysis of tourism and quality of life perceptions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 483–502.
- 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.
- Anderson, W. (2008). *Analysis of all-inclusive travel mode: Demand and supply perspectives in the Balearic Islands* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of the Balearic Islands, Palma de Mallorca.
- Anderson, W., Juaneda, C., & Sastre, F. (2009). Influences of pro-all-inclusive travel decisions. *Tourism Review*, 64(2), 4–18.
- Antalya Tourism Information Office. (2009). *Foreign travelers' statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.antalyakultur.gov.tr/belge/1-70672/2008-yili.html>
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions: On tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.
- Armstrong, R. W., & Mok, C. (1995). Leisure travel destination choice criteria of Hong Kong residents. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 4(1), 99–104.
- Babbie, E. (2014). *The basics of social research* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bahar, O. (2004). *Turkiyedeki turizm sektorunun rekabet gucune etkisi uzerine bir arastima: Mugla ornegi* [An empirical investigation of the competitive position of the tourism sector in Turkey: A case study of Mugla] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Mugla, Mugla.
- Barak, H. (2006). *Turizm sektorunde uygulanan her sey dahil tatil sisteminin bolgedeki isletmeler uzerindeki etkisi: Bodrum ornegi* [The effect of an all-inclusive resort system on local businesses: A case study of Bodrum] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Dokuz Eylul, Izmir.
- Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. R., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33–50.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216.
- Cavus, S., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2003). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study in Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis*, 7(3–4), 259–269.

- Çevirgen, A., & Üngüren, E. (2009). Yöre esnafının her şey dahil sistemine yönelik tutumları. *Ege Academic Review*, 9(2), 637–658.
- 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.
- Chuang, S. T. (2010). Rural tourism: Perspectives from social exchange theory. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(10), 1313–1322.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1–7.
- Creative Research Systems. (2015). *Sample size calculator*. Retrieved from <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>
- Doganer, S. (2012). Resort hotel transition: Antalya, Turkey. *The proceedings of 5th international conference on sustainable tourism was held in A Coruña, Spain*. Organised by the Wessex Institute, UK and the Complutense University of Madrid, Spain. Vol. 161, pp. 331–342.
- Draper, J., Woosnam, K. M., & Norman, W. C. (2009). Tourism use history: Exploring a new framework for understanding residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 64–77.
- Duman, T., & Tosun, C. (2010). Current developments in Turkish tourism. *Anatolia*, 21(1), 5–9.
- Dwyer, L., & Thomas, F. (2012). Tourism yield measures for Cambodia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(4), 303–328.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409–422.
- Erdinc, B. S. (2011). *Antalya yoresi turist profil arastirmasi 2011*. Antalya: Akdeniz Universitesi.
- Erkuş-Öztürk, H., & Terhorst, P. (2010). Variety of modes of governance of a global value chain: The case of tourism from Holland to Turkey. *Tourism Geographies*, 12(2), 217–245.
- 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.
- Gülbahar, M. (2002). *Turizmde Her Şey Dahil (all inclusive) Tur Satış Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi/Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Gümüş, N., & Özüpekçe, S. (2009). The opinions of residents towards economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of tourism in Foça. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 6(2), 398–417.
- Gürkan, T. (2002). *Her Şey Dahil (all inclusive) Sisteminin Türk Turizmi Açısından İncelenmesi: Antalya-Kemer Örneği* [The search of effects of all inclusive system on Turkish tourism sector: Sample region Antalya-Kemer] (Unpublished Master's thesis). Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Local's attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49, 381–394.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79–105.
- Gursoy, D., & Kendall, K. W. (2006). Hosting mega events: Modeling locals' support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 603–623.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495–516.
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism: A case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647–668.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 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.
- Heung, V. C., & Chu, R. (2000). Important factors affecting Hong Kong consumers' choice of a travel agency for all-inclusive package tours. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 52–59.
- Homans, G. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

- 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.
- Issa, J., & Jayawardena, C. (2003). The "all-inclusive" concept in the Caribbean. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15*(3), 167–171.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 36*(2), 3–11.
- Karamustafa, K. (2000). Marketing-channel relationships: Turkey's resort purveyors' interactions with international tour operators. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 41*(4), 21–31.
- Koc, E. (2005). New product development in the Turkish tourism market: The case of football tourism. *Journal of Sport Tourism, 10*(3), 165–173.
- Korça, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Antalya, Turkey. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(3), 695–697.
- Köseoglu, M. A., Topaloglu, C., Parnell, J. A., & Lester, D. L. (2013). Linkages among business strategy, uncertainty and performance in the hospitality industry: Evidence from an emerging economy. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 34*, 81–91.
- 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.
- 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.
- Lee, C., Kang, S. K., Long, P., & Reisinger, Y. (2010). Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: A comparative study. *Tourism Management, 31*, 189–201.
- Lo, A., & Lam, T. (2004). Long-haul and short-haul outbound all-inclusive package tours. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 9*(2), 161–176.
- Long, P. H. (2012). Tourism impacts and support for tourism development in Ha Long Bay, Vietnam: An examination of residents' perceptions. *Asian Social Science, 8*(8), 28–39.
- Malhotra, N. K., Agarwal, J., & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research: A state-of-the-art review. *International Marketing Review, 13*(5), 7–43.
- Martin, B., McGuire, F., & Allen, L. (1998). Retirees' attitudes toward tourism: Implications for sustainable development. *Tourism Analysis, 3*(1), 43–51.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(3), 29–34.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*(2), 131–140.
- Menekşe, R. (2005). Her şey dâhil sisteminin ve sistemden faydalananlar açısından etkilerinin otel yöneticilerinin gözünden değerlendirilmesi (Marmaris örneği). *AlBÜ-İİBF Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 1*, 97–124.
- Naidoo, P., & Sharpley, R. (2016). Local perceptions of the relative contributions of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 5*, 16–25.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(1), 243–268.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Modeling community support for a proposed integrated resort project. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(2), 257–277.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(3), 964–988.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(2), 997–1023.
- Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Ozdemir, B., Çizel, B., & Bato Cizel, R. (2012). Satisfaction with all-inclusive tourism resorts: The effects of satisfaction with destination and destination loyalty. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 13(2), 109–130.
- Pearce, P. L., & Moscardo, G. (2005). Tourism community analysis: Asking the right questions. In D. G. Pearce & R. W. Butler (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in tourism development* (pp. 31–51). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586–599.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8–12.
- Quiroga, I. (1990). Characteristics of package tours in Europe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(1), 185–207.
- Raosoft. (2015). *Sample size calculator*. Retrieved from <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>
- Rayna, T., & Striukova, L. (2009). Luxury without guilt: Service innovation in the all-inclusive hotel industry. *Service Business*, 3(4), 359–372.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Mak, J. (1987). The demand for package tours: A mode choice model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(3), 13–17.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40–47.
- Sirakaya, E., Teye, V., & Sönmez, S. (2002). Understanding residents' support for tourism development in the central region of Ghana. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 57–67.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tatoglu, E., Erdal, F., Ozgur, H., & Azakli, S. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts: The case of Kusadasi, Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 3(3), 79–100.
- Tiliute, D. E., & Condratov, I. (2014). Informatic system for tracking guests' access to the hotel services and resource planning in "all-inclusive" tourism resorts. *Journal of Tourism—Studies and Research in Tourism* 7, 37–41.
- Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2013). *Tourism statistics, foreign travelers' in 2007, 2008, 2011, 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.kultur.gov.tr/EN,36568/number-of-arriving-departing-visitors-foreigners-and-ci.html>
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2013). *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.
- Üner, M. M., Sökmen, A., & Birkan, İ. (2006). Influence of all-inclusive system in the Turkish hospitality industry. *Anatolia: Turizm Arastirmalari Dergisi*, 17(1), 35–50.
- United Nations World Tourism Organizations. (2013). *Tourism statistics, foreign travelers' in 2013*. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Tourism_rankings
- Valhouli, C. (2003). *Best all-inclusive resorts*. Retrieved October 16, 2003, from http://www.forbes.com/2003/10/16/cx_cv_1016feat.html
- 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 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.
- Wong, C. S., & Kwong, W. Y. (2004). Outbound tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours. *Tourism Management*, 25(5), 581–592.



- 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., & 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., Van Winkle, C. M., & An, S. (2013). Confirming the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale in the context of a rural Texas cultural festival. *Event Management, 17*(3), 257–270.
- Yarcan, S., & Ertuna, B. (2002). What you encourage is what you get: The case of Turkish inbound international tourism. *Anatolia, 13*(2), 159–183.