SEÇÃO / SECTION / SECCIÓN
ESTUDO DE CASO / CASE STUDY / ESTUDIO DE CASO

PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDES OF RESIDENTS TOWARDS IMPACTS OF TOURISM: A RESEARCH ON ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE REGION*

Gizem ŞAHİN**
Orhan AKOVA***

Abstract

Tourism has a social, cultural, economic and environmental impact on destinations. The positive or negative perception of these effects by residents has great importance for the continuation of tourism activities in one region. The aim of this study is to determine the perception and attitude of local people towards tourism and tourism support who have a great interest in nature-based tourism and who demonstrate a great reaction to the projects they believe will harm the nature such as hydroelectric power plants projects, Cerattepe Project and Green Road Project. A total of 449 data from residents living in Arhavi, Borçka, Artvin (Center) and Hopa districts were analyzed in the survey. In the course of testing hypotheses, variables such as age group, marital status, education status, working status, survival time in Artvin and county living in Artvin was evaluated by the Kruskal-Wallis H Test; the gender factor was evaluated by the Mann Whitney test and the correlation analysis was made to determine tourism support. As a result of these analyzes, significant differences were found between demographic factors and the perception of tourism effects and tourism support. In addition, it has been determined that the people living in Artvin find favorable the economic, social, cultural and environmental effects of tourism and they support tourism.

Keywords: Resident. Perception. Attitudes. Tourism Impact.

PERCEPÇÃO E ATITUDES DE RESIDENTES EM RELAÇÃO AOS IMPACTOS DO TURISMO: UMA PESQUISA SOBRE UMA REGIÃO AMBIENTALMENTE SENSÍVEL

Resumo

O turismo gera impactos sociais, culturais, econômicos e ambientais sobre os destinos. A percepção positiva ou negativa desses efeitos pela população local tem grande importância para a continuação das atividades turísticas em uma região. O objetivo deste estudo é determinar a percepção e a atitude das pessoas locais em relação ao turismo e ao apoio ao turismo que têm grande interesse no turismo baseado na natureza e que demonstram uma grande reação aos projetos que acreditam prejudicar a natureza, como usinas hidrelétricas projetos Cerattepe e Green Road Project. Um total de 449 dados de moradores residentes nos distritos de Arhavi, Borçka, Artvin (Centro) e Hopa foram analisados na pesquisa. No curso das hipóteses de teste, variáveis como faixa etária, estado civil, escolaridade, status de trabalho, tempo de sobrevivência em Artvin e município de Artvin foram avaliadas pelo teste H de Kruskal-Wallis; o fator sexo foi avaliado pelo teste de Mann Whitney e a análise de correlação foi feita para determinar o apoio ao turismo. Como resultado dessas análises, foram encontradas diferenças significativas entre os fatores demográficos e a percepção dos efeitos do turismo e do apoio ao turismo. Além disso, foi determinado que as pessoas que vivem em Artvin consideram favoráveis os efeitos econômicos, sociais, culturais e ambientais do turismo e apóiam o turismo.

Palavras chave: Residente. Percepção. Atitudes. Impacto turístico.

PERCEPCIÓN Y ACTITUDES DE LOS RESIDENTES HACIA LOS IMPACTOS DEL TURISMO: UNA INVESTIGACIÓN SOBRE LA REGIÓN DE MEDIO AMBIENTE SENSIBLE

Resumen

El turismo genera impactos sociales, culturales, económicos y ambientales en un destino. La percepción positiva o negativa de estos efectos por parte de los residentes tiene gran importancia para la continuación de las actividades turísticas en la región. El objetivo de este estudio es determinar la percepción y la actitud de las personas locales hacia el turismo y el apoyo turístico que tienen un gran interés en el turismo basado en la naturaleza y que demuestran una gran reacción a los proyectos que creen que dañarán la naturaleza, como las centrales hidroeléctricas. proyectos, Proyecto Cerattepe y Proyecto Green Road. En la encuesta se analizaron un total de 449 datos de residentes que viven en los distritos de Arhavi, Borçka, Artvin (Centro) y Hopa. En el curso de las hipótesis de prueba, la prueba Kruskal-Wallis H evaluó variables como el grupo de edad, el estado civil, el estado educativo, el estado laboral, el tiempo de supervivencia en Artvin y el condado que viven en Artvin. El factor de género se evaluó mediante la prueba de Mann Whitney y se realizó el análisis de correlación para determinar el apoyo turístico. Como resultado de estos análisis, se encontraron diferencias significativas entre los factores demográficos y la percepción de los efectos del turismo y el apoyo turístico. Además, se ha determinado que las personas que viven en Artvin encuentran favorables los efectos económicos, sociales, culturales y ambientales del turismo y apoyan el turismo.

Palabras clave: Residentes. Percepción. Actitudes. Impacto Turístico.

* This article was compiled from a postgraduate thesis, which written by Gizem ŞAHİN, with the support from Prof. Dr. Orhan AKOVA, titled "A Study on Perception and Attitudes of Local People Living in Artvin for Tourism".

** Ph.D. Student in Tourism Administration at İstanbul University. She is lecturer at the Vocational High School in Department of Tourism and Hotel Administration at Istanbul Yeni Yuzyil University. Her research interests are tourism management, tourism and sociology and tourism and anthropology. Adress: Maltepe Mahallesi, Yılanlı Ayazma Caddesi, No: 26 P.K. 34010 Cevizlibağ / Zeytinburnu / İstanbul Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6184-8350 [gizem.sahin@yeniyuzyil.edu.tr]

*** Ph.D. in International Business (1998) at İstanbul University. He is professor at the Department of Tourism Administration at Istanbul University. His research interests include hospitality, leisure, sport and tourism, tourism management, organizational behavior, tourism and ethics. Adress: İstanbul Üniversitesi, İktisat Fakültesi, Ek Bina II 34452 Fatih-İSTANBUL Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7740-2938 [oakova@istanbul.edu.tr]

1 INTRODUCTION

The number of tourists who visits different places have been increasing for a long time. It means that tourists interact with residents who live in different areas when they participate tourism activities. Tourism has social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts. Jafari (1986) observed that the positive effects of tourism were mentioned in the 1960s, that a balanced and systematic approach was adopted against these effects in the 1970s and that in the 1980s, it focused on the negative impact (Akova, 2006).

The Bruntland Commission, which took place in 1987, aimed that ecological responsibility for growth, respect for the needs of future generations and aims to achieve a better balance between economic efficiency and social equality (Schmandt, 2010). The principles in line with these objectives were discussed at the Rio Summit, which is one of the important summits for tourism. The intensive growth of the tourism sector along with the large volume of foreign exchange inflows makes a significant contribution to the economy (Thomas, 2013).

In addition, it has positive effects social, cultural and environmental impacts. The impacts of tourism effects perception and attitudes of residents towards tourism. Wang and Pfister (2008) studied in a small rural community in Washington. It was conducted that the residents living in the regions where tourism has developed have carefully evaluated the demographic and socio-economic changes created by the tourism.

Residents have taken a positive approach towards tourism as the effects started to benefit. Also, residents perceive some impacts of tourism are negative. If the negative effects increase, residents do not support tourism. Generally, the most visible impact of tourism is on environmental impacts. When the environment is damaged, the quality of life in the region begins to decrease and this situation has a negative impact on residents. In this point, the sensitivity to the environment and the protection of the environment may arise in residents.

The term of environmental sensitivity is an important phenomenon for tourism. When the residents living in a region notice that negative effects of tourism about environment, they may react negatively to tourism development. It is important to take into account the opinions of the residents in order to be able to carry out and sustain tourism activities in a region. Perceptions and attitudes of residents should be measured and evaluated at regular intervals in order to realize environment-friendly and sustainable tourism development (Akova, 2006). A disapproved idea by residents will create problems in the region.

The residents think that tourists cause damage and they do not want tourists to visit the region again. Residents are one of the key factors at this point. Activities carried out with the approval of the local people ensure that tourism develops in a sustainable manner. Lots of studies have evaluated that environment impacts and tourism (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Yoon, Gürsoy and Chen, 2001; Andereck, et al, 2005; Bujosa and Rosselló, 2007; Oviedo, Castellanos and Martin, 2008). However, tourism impacts and tourism support have not been evaluated on the residents who have high environmental awareness.

This study investigates if the residents with high environmental awareness living in a destination with a low level of tourism development has the same sensibility on the tourism impacts and if they support tourism development. The residents of Artvin, Turkey showed an exaggerated sensibility to projects that they believe to damage the nature such as hydroelectric power plants projects, Cerattepe Project and Green Road Project. For this reason, this study is important to understand the residents' perceptions and attitudes towards tourism and tourism development. Previous studies have emphasized environmental effects.

However, there has not been a sufficient level of studies on residents with great environmental awareness. In this study, it is aimed to determine the residents' perception and attitudes towards tourism and their support for tourism in Artvin that the residen ts overreacted to environmental projects that has been constructed in the region. In addition, it is investigated whether there is a correlation between demographic variables, living conditions, working in tourism sector, district of residence and economic, social, cultural, environmental effects of tourism and tourism support.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many researches in the literature investigated the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism effects. Lots of them demonstrate that the residents' attitudes towards tourism is caused by the perceived effect of tourism (Liu and Var, 1986; Ap, 1992; Lankford, 1994; Akis, et al, 1996; Lindberg and Johnson, 1997; Yoon, et al, 2001).

A number of different tourism effects have emerged that affect residents and it has been claimed that residents have positive or negative perceptions. The perceptions evaluated as positive economic impact (Liu and Var, 1986; Ritchie; 1988; R.Perdue, et al, 1990; McCool and Martin, 1994; Johnson, Snepenger and Akis, 1994; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Akis, et al, 1996; Gilbert and Clark, 1997; Dyer, et al, 2007) , negative economic impact (Sheldon and Var, 1984; Husbands, 1989; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Voltes, Jiménez and Suárez, 2014),

positive social impact (Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Brunt andCourtney, 1999; Kim, Uysal and Sirgy, 2013), negative social impact (Rothman, 1978; Tyrrel, 1984; Long, Perdue and Allen, 1990; Smith, 1992; Prentice, 1993; King, Pizam and Milman, 1993; Andereck, et al, 2005), positive cultural impact (Liu and Var, 1986; Yoon, et al, 2001; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Oviedo, Castellanos and Martin, 2008; Andereck, et al, 2005), negative cultural impact (Mbaiwa, 2005), positive environmental effect (Andereck, et al, 2005; Oviedo, Castellanos and Martin, 2008) and negative environmental effect (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Yoon, Gürsoy and Chen, 2001; Andereck, et al, 2005; Bujosa and Rosselló, 2007).

There is a significant relationship between environmental and social impacts. Environmental degradation is a reflection of social degradation, which may cause a drop-in visitation (Araújo, 2007). The main objectives of sustainable tourism is also examined to reduce the negative effects of tourism on society and the environment and to maximize the positive and creative contribution of tourism to local economies, the protection of natural and cultural heritage and the quality of life of the hosts and visitors (UNEP and UNWTO, 2005). On the other hand, commercialization and commodification in tourism creates limited social interaction between host and visitors.

Several theories such as the Butler's (1980) tourist area life cycle, Doxey's (1975) Irridex model and the social exchange theory (SET) (Ap, 1992) have been used for explaining host perceptions toward tourism. It has been observed that the theory of social change has been taken up mainly in the studies of Ap, 1992; Andereck, et al, 2005; Gursoy, Chi and Dyer, 2009; Lee, et al, 2010; Ward and Berno, 2011; Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2012 and Nunkoo, 2016. Social Exchange Theory is based on the relationship between at least two individuals and deals with the way in which individuals reward each other. Social Change Theory suggests some economic concepts accepted by the behaviorist approach to assess interpersonal relationships (Hogg and Vaughan, 2014: 553).

According to Ap (1992), social change theory is a logical and intuitive issue that can be used to explain why local people have developed positive or negative perceptions about tourism impacts. Resource exchange between residents and tourism (when expressed in terms of power) is an unbalanced relationship. When it is high and balanced for the host actor, the tourism effects are positively received by the residents. When resource change is low, it is seen as negative. Residents' support for tourism is one of the most important issue for improving tourism activities. Generally, residents evaluate tourism activities based on expected benefits and costs. Tourism activities seems like a means for fulling economic, social, and psychological needs and raising public welfare by residents (Ap, 1992: 669). If the benefits higher than the costs, residents are supposed to assist to tourism development (Ko and Stewart, 2002; Dyer, et al, 2007; Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008; Gursoy, Chi and Dyer, 2010; Stylidis, et al, 2014; Nunkoo and So, 2016).

Demografic variables such as age (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Allen, et al, 1993; Jones, Jurowski and Uysal, 2000; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaya, 2002; Huh and Vogt, 2008), sex/gender (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Allen, et al, 1993; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Jones, Jurowski and Uysal, 2000; Mason and Cheyne, 2000; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaya, 2002; Huh and Vogt, 2008; Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012), marital status (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Allen, et al, 1993), education level (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Allen, et al, 1993; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Jones, Jurowski and Uysal, 2000; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaya, 2002; Huh and Vogt, 2008; Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012), occupation (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Allen, et al, 1993; Jones, Jurowski and Uysal, 2000) and length of residence (Liu and Var, 1986; Um and Crompton, 1987; Allen, et al, 1993; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaya, 2002; Huh and Vogt, 2008) are used for evaluating residents attitudes and their supports. Some researches show that young people are more likely to support than old people (Ritchie, 1988; Huh and Vogt, 2008) On the other hand, some researches find out that old people are more likely to support than young people (Tomljenovic and Faulkner, 2000; McGehee and Andereck, 2004).

Sex/Gender is one of the significant variable. Mason and Cheyne (2000) find out that females in proportion to males more contrary to tourism development. In addition, education and occupation are also significative variables. Some researches show that the residents that higher educational level support to tourism and find favourable to tourists (Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaya, 2002). In addition, the variable of occupation is significant to identify attitudes and supports. Generally, it is stated that residents with tourism-related jobs has more positive attitudes in proportion to residents who do not have jobs associated with the tourism sector (Pizam, 1978; Teye, Sönmez, and Sirakaya, 2002; Kuvan and Akan, 2005). All attributes are most important for residents who maintain regular contact with tourists in the region, as well as those who are somewhat economically dependent on tourism (Guerreiro, 2008). However, Milman and Pizam (1988) pointed out that tourism-related jobs do not appear to be a significant factor. Apart from these factors, length of residency is a useful determinant to evaluate residents' attitudes to tourism

(Huh and Vogt, 2008). Long-term residents are more reluctant to tourism (Um and Crompton, 1987; Girard and Gartner, 1993; McCool and Martin, 1994; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Snaith and Haley, 1999; Haley, Snaith and Miller, 2005).

An empathetic perspective toward the environment is explained as environmental sensitivity (Hungerford and Volk, 1990: 11). Peterson (1982), who picked up Tanner's approach, was done the first research about environmental sensitivity (Chawla, 1998: 12; Sward, 1999: 202). Environmental sensitivity was evaluated as "significant life experiences" by some researchers. Meantime, other researchers attempted to correlate between outdoor participation and environmental concern (Bustam, Young and Todd, 2004: 270).

Environmental sensitivity like a term was used in later studies (Sia, et al, 1985-1986; Chawla, 1998; Sward, 1999). Xiao and Hong (2010) emphasized the importance of gender differences in the determination of environmental behaviors and environmental impacts of people living in China. Mccright (2010)'s study in the United States in general on the knowledge and thoughts about climate change in the gender differences (men and women) tried to examine the connection. As a result of the research, it has been concluded that women are less concerned about climate change than men. Cheng and Wu (2015) was found out that environmental sensitivity which tourists have for island tourism is positively associated with place attachment.

In additon, Soares, Júnior and Chagas (2018), was indicated that the cognitive variables have a greater explanatory power on the intent and environmental behavior of residents in the destination analyzed than on affective variables. In previous studies, although the environmental sensitivities of people are evaluated, the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism and tourism support who has environmental sensitivity have not been studied.

3 METODOLOGY

In this study survey data collection method was used. It was used "perceived tourism impacts" scale which was developed by Yoon et.al (2001) to measure perceived tourism impacts. The first part of the survey, there are eight proposals for economic impacts, six proposals for social impacts, five proposals for tourism support, four proposals for cultural impacts, five proposals for environmental impacts and two proposals for total impacts.

The proposals were set up for each criteria, as it follows:

- economic impacts aim to determine creating more job opportunities, attracting more investment, leddig to more spending, increasing to living standarts, increasing to the prices of goods and services, giving economic benefits to residents and small businesses and the he importance of tourism revenues.
- social impacts aim to determine the effects of high-spending tourists, changing traditional culture, suffering from living destination area, the use of taxes, ledding to more vandalism and increasing crime rate.
- supports for tourism aim to determine developing nature-based tourism, building places that interest to tourists, arranging cultural and historical attractions, arranging events and operating service businesses in tourism.
- cultural effects aim to determine encouring a variety of cultural activities, resulting more cultural exchange, experiencing about other cultures and resulting positive impacts on cultural identity.
- environmental effects aim to determine resulting in traffic congestion, noise and pollution, destroying by constructioning of hotels and resulting in unpleasantly overcrowded beaches, hiking trails, parks and ther outdoor places.

In order to determine the environmental sensitivity, the proposal that "I think that the projects related to tourism (Like Green Road Project) will damage to Artvin." was added to the scale. The Likert scale was used ranging from, "5" (Absolutely Agree), "4" (Agree), "3" (Undecided), "2" (Disagree) and "1" (Absolutely Disagree). The whole of the people who live in the eight districts of Artvin (Ardanuç, Arhavi, Artvin (Center), Borçka, Murgul, Hopa, Yusufeli, Savsat) constitute the universe of the research.

The population of Artvin is 168,068 in 2016. The study was made in four of the eight districts in Artvin. It was of the opinion that the perceptions and attitudes towards tourism could be determined more accurately in the regions that has more tourism activities and the residents have a great environmental sensitivity.

Only participants with environmental sensitivities are included in the survey. Some of the 600 questionnaires were conducted face to face with easy sampling and the remaining questionnaires were distributed to participants afterwards they were collected. However, 449 questionnaires were evaluated, because of the fact that the other ones were filled in incorrectly or incompletely within the questionnaires. The data obtained from Arhavi (126), Borcka (108), Artvin (100) and Hopa (115) were analyzed. It was stated that the ideal number for the

sample size would be 383-384 if it is between 100,000 and 500,000 (Kozak, 2017).

In this study, it was determined that there is a relationship between the residents' perception of tourism effect, whether they support tourism; the relationship between economic, cultural, social and environmental variables and the perception of the effects of tourism by demographic variables.

4 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Study Area: Artvin Province

Artvin is one of the city that is located in North-East in Turkey. Ardahan (Turkey) is in the east, Erzurum (Turkey) is in the South, Rize (Turkey) is in the West and Georgia is in the North of Artvin. Black Sea, which is 34 kilometres long, is also in the North-West of Artvin (Artvin's Governorship).

Figure 1. The Map of Artvin.

Source: https://www.worldmap1.com/map/artvin-map

Artvin has warm and rainy climatic type dominates the center and coastal areas. The high sections of the city are snowy in the winter months (Artvin Governorship Provincial Directorate of Immigration). Artvin has a mountainous and rugged structure. For this reason, it is difficult to benefit from cultivated areas. Local residents living in the interior of Artvin make agricultural activities at a level that can fulfill their needs. Artvin has an important potential in tourism with its natural, cultural and historical beauties.

Although the city is mainly referred to as ecotourism activities, there are also various tourism activities besides this tourism type. These tourism types are sport fishing, tableland tourism, camp and caravan tourism, trekking, botanical tourism, bird and butterfly watching, jeep and safari tourism, sea tourism, agriculture tourism, medical tourism, festival tourism, cultural and historical tourism, congress tourism, *cittaslow tourism*. According to March 2018 Report, 5477 people are stayed in the accommodation facilities that has tourism operation certificate in Artvin (YİGM, 2018). In this case, it shows that Artvin does not have high tourist potential.

According to 2016 data, one of the cities that the unemployment rate is low is Artvin (Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK), 2014). Artvin also has an important place in women's employment. According to the data obtained from NKA (Population Housing Survey) which was made in 2011, Artvin is the highest female labor force participation rate (43.5%). In addition, the ratio of employer and self-employed women is the highest (25.5%). The literacy rate in Artvin is 95.4%; the rate of illiterates 4.6% (Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK), 2013).

The residents of Artvin generally has a sensitive about environmental issue. They react some projects in Artvin that they think that damage the environment. One of this projects is The Green Road Project. The Green Road project is one of the projects in which the residents in Artvin have significant disagreements. One part of the people in the target area supports the Green Road project, while the other part doesn't support.

According to the residents who support the Green Road the duration of stay in the area will increase and that the tourism potentials can be utilized well. They also think that this project will be carried out without damage to the region, preserving the natural structure and resources (Kavalci, 2014). Those who oppose this project say the opposite of these views. The opponents argue that the Green Road project will increase construction and the construction will harm the natural structure of the region and it won't be a contribution to the tourism (Turkey Forestry Association, 2018).

Other project that is contradictive in Artvin is Cerattepe Project. It has been one of the most thing that react by the residents and these reactions were fundamentally sound throughout Turkey. The residents in Artvin are fighting against these activities over 20 years old. The first permit on mining activities was issued in 1992 and was granted a license to mine a Canadian company.

Due to the fact that the public opposes this situation, permission for mining has been removed. In 2005, the case for cancellation of the license was filed and this case resulted in the cancellation of the license. In 2011, Genya Mountain places was added to the places to be licensed through tenders. Thus, the continuity of the natural life has been more endangered. In 2012, the tender was awarded in two fields and transferred one year later. The case opened due to the work without an EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) Report ensured the suspension of the works. In this process, the EIA report of the company

undertaking the project was approved by the ministry. The court was subsequently reinstated by the 2009/7 circular, although the EIA decision was cancelled (TEMA, 2018). On September 19, 2016, the case of Cerattepe was reheard and recusation was requested. This request was not accepted by the Rize Administrative Court in accordance with Article 41 of the Law on Civil Courts on the grounds that it was made to extend the case.

For the cancellation of the EIA positive report, the court expert report on the case opened against the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization; he stated that mining activities in Cerattepe were not contrary to the legislation and that mining activities could be carried out even in touristic places when necessary permits were obtained. As a result of this report, EIA Positive report, which is numbered 3882 dated 02.06.2015, is considered to be in compliance with the laws and regulations (Milliyet, 2016).

The last projects that were reacted by residents are HES (Hydroelectric Power Plant) Projects. In general, the people of Artvin don't have a positive approach to HES (Hydroelectric Power Plant) projects. Some towns and villages in Artvin reacted to HES Projects like 28 villages of Savsat district (Evrensel, 2014), Akarsu Village in Ardanuc district (CNN TURK, 2016) and Arhavi district. HES Projects aren't approved by the public because they cause problems such as damage to vegetation, difficulty in plant growth, pollution of water and landscaping problems (Ozalp, et al, 2010).

4.2 Data Description

Table 1 indicates that respondents were 291 males and 158 females and they were categorized into five age groups: Under 18 (43), 18-30 (233), 31-45 (100), 46-64 (63) and 65+ (10). Participants are mostly between the age of "18-30". The number of men participating in the survey is more than the number of women, and mostly married people have participated the survey. Participants education level is high. They are mostly private sector employees, public sector employee and unemployed. Most of the participants live in Artvin for "21 and over years" and the most participation is from Arhavi.

Before the tests are applied to the questionnaire data, the analytical suitability of the data must be determined. The analytical suitability of the questionnaire data with Bartlett Test of Sphericity and KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) sample adequacy tests was determined. Analysis suitability was evaluated with thirty expressions.

Table 1. The Frequency Distributions and Percentage Rates of Demographic Informations of the Participants in the Survey.

Age Range	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Under 18	43	9,6
18-30	233	51,9
31-45	100	22,3
46-64	63	14,0
65+	10	2,2
Gender	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Woman	158	35,2
Man	291	64,8
Marital Status	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Married	308	68,6
Single	135	30,1
Divorced	2	0,4
Widow	4	0,9
Educational Status	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Illiterate	12	2,7
Elementary School	47	10,5
Secondary School	100	22,3
High School	129	28,7
College or Faculty	154	34,3
Post Graduate or PhD	7	1,6
Working Status	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Unemployed	51	11,4
Employer	52	11,6
Student	57	12,7
Farmer	28	6,2
Retired or Leaving the Job	25	5,6
Housewife	27	6,0
Merchant	12	2,7
Tourism	34	7,6
Employee	51	11,4
Public Employee	48	10,7
Other	64	14,3
Lifetime in Artvin	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Under 5 years	44	9,8
5-10 Years	36	8,0
11-15 Years	65	14,5
16-20 Years	58	12,9
21 + Years	246	54,8
District	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
Artvin (Central)	100	22,3
Hopa	115	25,6
Arhavi	126	28,1
Borçka	108	24,1

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 2. Factor Analysis.

Factors Name	Expressions	Factor Load	Factor's Explanatoriness (%)	Reliability
Economic	Tourism has created more job opportunities in Artvin.	,715	14,252	0,743
	Tourism has attracted more investment to Artvin.	,767		
	Tourism has led to more spending in Artvin.	,588		
	Standard of living in Artvin has increased considerably because of tourism.	,686		
	The prices of goods and services have increased because of tourism in Artvin.	,395		
	Tourism has given economic benefits to residents and small businesses in Artvin.	,526		
	Tourism revenues are more important than revenues from the other industries in Artvin for local government.	,479		
Social	High-spending tourists have negatively affected the life in Artvin.	,702	11,983	0,850
	Tourism has changed precious traditional culture in Artvin.	,683		
	Residents in Artvin have suffered from living in a tourism destination area.	,675		
	Improving public tourist facilities is a waste of tax-payer money in Artvin.	,781		
	Tourism has led to more vandalism in Artvin.	,720		
	Tourism has increased the crime rate in Artvin.	,744		
Supports for Tourism	I support nature-based tourism' development like camping site, park and climbing.	,491	11,639	0,846
	I support to built the places like resort and park that interest to tourists.	,411		
	I support tours that arrange to cultural and historical attractions in Artvin.	,870		
	I support events like recreational, exhibition, festival and sports for tourists.	,885		
	I support operations in service businesses like hotel, travel agency and restaurant for increasing to service quality	,870		
Cultural	Tourism has encouraged a variety of cultural activities by residents in Artvin.	,628	11,416	0,839
	Tourism has resulted in more cultural exchange between tourists and residents in Artvin.	,722		
	Meeting tourists from other regions is a valuable experience to better understand their culture and society in Artvin.	,797		
	Tourism has resulted in positive impacts on the cultural identity in Artvin.	,747		
Environmental	Tourism has resulted in traffic congestion, noise and pollution in Artvin.	,696	9,460	0,787
	Construction of hotels and other tourist facilities have destroyed the natural environment in Artvin.	,801		
	Tourism has resulted in unpleasantly overcrowded beaches, hiking trails, parks and other outdoor places in Artvin.	,705		
	I think that the projects related to tourism (Like Green Road Project) will damage to Artvin.	,672		
				Total: 58,749
				Kaiser Meyer Olkin: 0,875
			Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	**Chi-square:** 5294,865
				sd: 325
				p value: 0,000

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Four expressions that were not suitable for analysis were removed from thirty expressions. The expressions was removed from the analysis are: "The cost of developing tourist facilities in Artvin is very high." "Tourism has provided more parking and recreation areas for the residents living in Artvin." "Tourism benefits are more than their damages." and "Tourism is generally useful for Artvin." The two of four removed expressions are included in the total influence factors. Therefore, the six-dimensional scale has been reduced to five dimensions. The value (0,875) obtained from the KMO test is greater than 0,80. It shows that factor analysis is very good level and the sample is adequate. The Bartlett value was examined, it was seen that the value obtained (0) is less than 0,05. In addition, the expressions forming each factor were subjected to the reliability analysis and the reliability analysis resulted in 0,780. According to this result, the scale is very reliable.

Table 3. Mean and Standart Deviation of Economic, Social, Cultural, Environmental Effects of Tourism and Supports for Tourism.

Economic Effects	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Tourism has created more job opportunities in Artvin.	3,8285	1,27458
Tourism has attracted more investment to Artvin.	3,7684	1,24455
Tourism has led to more spending in Artvin.	3,3675	1,30278
Standard of living in Artvin has increased considerably because of tourism.	3,5100	1,18039
The prices of goods and services have increased because of tourism in Artvin.	3,2918	1,27193
Tourism has given economic benefits to residents and small businesses in Artvin.	3,8085	1,17785
Tourism revenues are more important than revenues from the other industries in Artvin for local government.	3,2918	1,20525
Social Effects	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
High-spending tourists have negatively affected the life in Artvin.	2,4499	1,25989
Tourism has changed precious traditional culture in Artvin.	2,5612	1,28397
Local residents in Artvin have suffered from living in a tourism destination area.	2,2428	1,25048
Improving public tourist facilities is a waste of tax-payer money in Artvin.	2,3318	1,23523
Tourism has led to more vandalism in Artvin.	2,2272	1,28940
Tourism has increased the crime rate in Artvin.	2,2272	1,28420
Supports For Tourism	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
I support nature-based tourism' development like camping site, park and climbing.	4,1559	1,13889
I support to built the places like resort and park that interest to tourists.	4,1626	1,15644
I support tours that arrange to cultural and historical attractions in Artvin.	3,9287	1,38206
I support events like recreational, exhibition, festival and sports for tourists.	4,0423	1,23942
I support operations in service businesses like hotel, travel agency and restaurant for increasing to service quality	4,0200	1,21818
Cultural Effects	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Tourism has encouraged a variety of cultural activities by residents in Artvin.	3,8463	1,11042
Tourism has resulted in more cultural exchange between tourists and residents in Artvin.	3,9065	1,10404
Meeting tourists from other regions is a valuable experience to better understand their culture and society in Artvin.	3,9310	1,08239
Tourism has resulted in positive impacts on the cultural identity in Artvin.	3,8040	1,09865
Environmental Effects	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Tourism has resulted in traffic congestion, noise and pollution in Artvin.	2,5724	1,35447
Construction of hotels and other tourist facilities have destroyed the natural environment in Artvin.	2,7572	1,34342
Tourism has resulted in unpleasantly overcrowded beaches, hiking trails, parks and other outdoor places in Artvin.	2,5100	1,35472
I think that the projects related to tourism (Like Green Road Project) will damage to Artvin.	3,0045	1,48804

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 3 indicates that the participation rate of the residents especially to the positive economic and cultural effects of tourism are high. On the other hand, the participation rate of the residents to the negative social effects of tourism is low. In addition, the participation rate of the residents to the negative environmental effects of tourism is low. The participation rate of the proposition that "I think that tourism-based infrastructure projects (such as the Green Road) will harm Artvin's nature" is high. However, the participation rate of residents to tourism support is high.

Table 4. Table of Correlation Analysis for Determining the Relationship Between Factors.

			1	2	3	4	5
1.	Economic	r	-				
		p	-				
2.	Social	r	-0,131**	-			
		p	,005	-			
3.	Supports for Tourism	r	,319**	-0,209**	-		
		p	,000	,000	-		
4.	Cultural	r	,489**	,396**	,523**	-	
		p	,000	,000	,000	-	
5.	Environmental	r	-0,086	,505**	-0,104*	-,234**	-
		p	,068	,000	,028	,000	-

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.
**. Significance at the level of 0,01
*. Significance at the level of 0,05

There is a negative correlation between tourism economic impacts and social and environmental impacts at a weak level (r=-0,131, r=-0,131); a positive correlation between tourism economic impacts and supporting tourism and cultural impacts at a weak level (r=0,319, r=0,489); a negative correlation between tourism social impacts and supporting tourism and cultural impacts at a weak level (r=-0,209, r=-0,396); a positive correlation between tourism social impacts and environmental impacts at a mid-level (r=0,505); a positive correlation between supporting tourism and cultural impacts at a mid-level (r=0,523); a negative correlation between supporting tourism and environmental impacts at a weak level (r=-0,104) and a negative correlation between cultural impacts and environmental impacts at a weak level (r=-0,234).

Table 5 indicates that there are significant differences between age variable and tourism economic, social, environmental, cultural effects and tourism support (p <0,05).

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Age Range.

Factors	Age Range	N	Mean	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Impacts	Under 18	43	204,13	4	12,295	,015
	18-30	233	219,33			
	31-45	100	226,61			
	46-64	63	236,94			
	65+	10	355,65			
Social Impacts	Under 18	43	259,56	4	11,964	,018
	18-30	233	212,33			
	31-45	100	224,52			
	46-64	63	258,93			
	65+	10	162,65			
Supports for Tourism	Under 18	43	174,63	4	12,207	,016
	18-30	233	226,26			
	31-45	100	232,08			
	46-64	63	252,97			
	65+	10	165,20			
Cultural Impacts	Under 18	43	170,33	4	12,974	,011
	18-30	233	228,69			
	31-45	100	228,61			
	46-64	63	228,66			
	65+	10	314,85			
Environmental Impacts	Under 18	43	235,52	4	9,982	,041
	18-30	233	219,57			
	31-45	100	223,80			
	46-64	63	255,42			
	65+	10	126,60			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test was Applied Between Age Groups.

	Age Range	n	Mean	Rank Sum	U	P
Economic Impacts	Under 18	43	23,84	1025,00		
	65+	10	40,60	406,00		
	Total	53			79	0,002
Social Impacts	Under 18	43	29,21	1256,00		
	65+	10	17,50	175,00		
	Total	53			120	0,03
Supports for Tourism	Under 18	43	27,57	1185,50		
	65+	10	24,55	245,50		
	Total	53			190,5	0,046
Cultural Impacts	Under 18	43	24,31	1045,50		
	65+	10	38,55	385,50		
	Total	53			99,5	0,008
Environmental Impacts	Under 18	43	29,47	1267,00		
	65+	10	16,40	164,00		
	Total	53			109	0,016

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 6 indicates that a significant difference under 18 and 65+ among all age groups (p <0,05). The cultural and economic impacts score' average of those 65+ are higher than under 18 score' average.

Table 7. Mann-Whitney U Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Gender.

Factors	Gender	Sample Number	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	Mann-Whitney U	P
Economic Impacts	Woman	158	209,86	33158,00	20597,000	,068
	Man	291	233,22	67867,00		
Social Impacts	Woman	158	207,99	32863,00	20302,000	,040
	Man	291	234,23	68162,00		
Supports for Tourism	Woman	158	215,90	34111,50	21550,500	,266
	Man	291	229,94	66913,50		
Cultural Impacts	Woman	158	225,95	35700,50	22838,500	,908
	Man	291	224,48	65324,50		
Environmental Impacts	Woman	158	226,72	35822,00	22717,000	,835
	Man	291	224,07	65203,00		

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 7 indicates that there were no significant differences between gender variables and tourism economic, cultural, environmental effects and tourism support (p> 0,05). There is a significant difference in terms of tourism social effects (p <0,05). Men's social effects average score is higher than women.

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Marital Status.

Factors	Marital Status	N	Mean	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Impacts	Married	308	227,52	3	2,512	,473
	Single	135	220,18			
	Divorced	2	97,00			
	Widow	4	257,63			
Social Impacts	Married	308	225,39	3	2,359	,501
	Single	135	220,63			
	Divorced	2	293,75			
	Widow	4	307,75			
	Married	308	229,81			

Supports for Tourism	Single	135	216,44	3	2,158	,540
	Divorced	2	185,00			
	Widow	4	163,63			
Cultural Impacts	Married	308	228,74	3	2,719	,437
	Single	135	218,56			
	Divorced	2	92,75			
	Widow	4	220,63			
Environmental Impacts	Married	308	227,18	3	,537	,911
	Single	135	219,22			
	Divorced	2	224,75			
	Widow	4	252,38			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 8 indicates that there were no significant differences between marital status variable and tourism economic, social, cultural, environmental effects and tourism support (p> 0,05).

Table 9. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Educational Status.

Factors	Educational Status	n	Mean	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Impacts	Illiterate	12	191,42	5	7,730	,172
	Elementary School	47	267,46			
	Secondary School	100	234,18			
	High School	129	214,71			
	College or Faculty	154	217,24			
	Post Graduate or PhD	7	226,64			
Social Impacts	Illiterate	12	215,79	5	13,386	,020
	Elementary School	47	269,76			
	Secondary School	100	248,67			
	High School	129	215,53			
	College or Faculty	154	205,55			
	Post Graduate or PhD	7	204,57			
Supports for Tourism	Illiterate	12	173,79	5	7,009	,220
	Elementary School	47	242,21			
	Secondary School	100	205,98			
	High School	129	223,55			
	College or Faculty	154	235,05			
	Post Graduate or PhD	7	274,50			
Cultural Impacts	Illiterate	12	216,96	5	3,327	,650
	Elementary School	47	209,54			
	Secondary School	100	211,92			
	High School	129	227,82			
	College or Faculty	154	237,22			
	Post Graduate or PhD	7	208,57			
Environmental Impacts	Illiterate	12	239,08	5	4,325	,504
	Elementary School	47	247,71			
	Secondary School	100	222,72			
	High School	129	226,48			
	College or Faculty	154	214,37			
	Post Graduate or PhD	7	287,64			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 9 indicates that there were significant differences between educational status variables and tourism social effects (p <0.05). There was not significant differences between educational status variables and tourism economic effects, environmental effects, cultural effects and tourism support (p> 0,05). There was a significant difference between the social impact scores of those who illiterate and postgraduate or doctoral degree (p <0,05). The average social impact of masters or doctoral degrees is higher than illiterate.

Table 10. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Working Status.

Factors	Working Status	N	Mean	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Impacts	Unemployed	51	238,72	10	29,821	,001
	Employer	52	209,23			
	Student	57	209,74			
	Farmer	28	288,82			
	Retired or Leaving the Job	25	301,54			
	Housewife	27	248,70			
	Merchant	12	238,88			
	Tourism	34	259,25			
	Employee	51	208,83			
	Public Employee	48	192,33			
	Other	64	189,24			
Social Impacts	Unemployed	51	216,96	10	9,618	,475
	Employer	52	230,78			
	Student	57	259,38			
	Farmer	28	244,43			
	Retired or Leaving the Job	25	178,38			
	Housewife	27	219,00			
	Merchant	12	187,42			
	Tourism	34	214,40			
	Employee	51	226,45			
	Public Employee	48	225,19			
	Other	64	219,72			
Supports for Tourism	Unemployed	51	194,05	10	12,981	,225
	Employer	52	225,54			
	Student	57	202,90			
	Farmer	28	268,95			
	Retired or Leaving the Job	25	258,64			
	Housewife	27	203,02			
	Merchant	12	239,17			
	Tourism	34	249,91			
	Employee	51	223,40			
	Public Employee	48	215,17			
	Other	64	238,57			
Cultural Impacts	Unemployed	51	209,38	10	22,532	,013
	Employer	52	199,66			
	Student	57	190,10			
	Farmer	28	241,30			
	Retired or Leaving the Job	25	312,32			
	Housewife	27	251,43			
	Merchant	12	263,42			
	Tourism	34	242,53			
	Employee	51	223,94			
	Public Employee	48	234,57			
	Other	64	213,88			
Environmental Impacts	Unemployed	51	237,72	10	18,110	,053
	Employer	52	216,41			
	Student	57	260,97			
	Farmer	28	236,14			
	Retired or Leaving the Job	25	188,90			
	Housewife	27	212,85			
	Merchant	12	177,63			
	Tourism	34	167,68			
	Employee	51	212,30			
	Public Employee	48	240,18			
	Other	64	242,23			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 10 indicates that there were significant differences between the working status variables and economic and cultural effects of tourism (p <0.05). There were not significant differences between the working status and tourism's social effects, environmental effects and tourism support (p> 0,05). When evaluating the significant difference between the variables; a significant difference was found between economic and cultural impact scores of unemployed and other variables (p <0.05). Unemployed's economic impact and cultural impact scores average rank are higher than for the other categories.

Table 11. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by Lifetime in Artvin.

Factors	Lifetime in Artvin	Sample Number	Mean Rank	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Factors	Under 5 years	44	205,78	4	1,709	,789
	5-10 Years	36	226,67			
	11-15 Years	65	234,83			
	16-20 Years	58	216,37			
	21 + Years	246	227,63			
Social Factors	Under 5 years	44	211,97	4	14,841	,005
	5-10 Years	36	229,67			
	11-15 Years	65	275,52			
	16-20 Years	58	241,13			
	21 + Years	246	209,50			
Supports for Tourism	Under 5 years	44	233,78	4	1,465	,833
	5-10 Years	36	219,76			
	11-15 Years	65	239,72			
	16-20 Years	58	225,13			
	21 + Years	246	220,28			
Cultural Impacts	Under 5 years	44	198,56	4	5,575	,233
	5-10 Years	36	212,81			
	11-15 Years	65	206,32			
	16-20 Years	58	224,16			
	21 + Years	246	236,65			
Environmental Impacts	Under 5 years	44	198,34	4	16,929	,002
	5-10 Years	36	253,39			
	11-15 Years	65	270,55			
	16-20 Years	58	245,15			
	21 + Years	246	208,83			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 11 indicates that there were significant differences between lifetime in Artvin variable and tourism social and environmental effects (p <0,05). There were no significant differences in tourism economic effects, cultural effects and tourism support (p> 0,05). There was a significant difference between the social and environmental impact scores of those living in Artvin for 21 years + and those living under 5 years (p <0,05). The social and environmental impact scores of those living 21 years + are higher than those living under 5 years.

Table 12. Kruskal-Wallis H Test for Measuring Relation of Participants' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts and Tourism Support by District.

Factors	District	Sample Number	Mean Rank	Df	χ^2	P
Economic Impacts	Artvin (Center)	100	213,16	3	8,165	,043
	Hopa	115	215,01			
	Arhavi	126	217,00			
	Borçka	108	255,94			
Social Impacts	Artvin (Center)	100	194,23	3	19,701	,000
	Hopa	115	257,76			
	Arhavi	126	242,08			
	Borçka	108	198,68			
	Artvin (Center)	100	249,80			

Supports for Tourism	Hopa	115	225,25	3	17,261	,001
	Arhavi	126	240,92			
	Borçka	108	183,20			
Cultural Impacts	Artvin (Center)	100	217,33	3	3,364	,339
	Hopa	115	211,06			
	Arhavi	126	231,62			
	Borçka	108	239,24			
Environmental Impacts	Artvin (Center)	100	177,66	3	41,517	,000
	Hopa	115	257,45			
	Arhavi	126	264,81			
	Borçka	108	187,83			

Source: proper elaboration form the empirical research.

Table 12 indicates that there were significant differences between the district and the tourism economic, social, environmental effects and tourism support (p <0,05). There were not significant differences in tourism cultural effects (p> 0,05). A significant difference was found in social, environmental, tourism support and environmental impact score of the residents living in the center of Artvin and Borcka (p <0,05). The economic, social and environmental impact scores of the people living in Borcka are higher than those living in the center. The average number of residents living in the center of Artvin is higher than those living in Borcka for supporting to tourism.

4.3 Data Discussion

According to results, there are significant differences between tourism effects and tourism support and demographic variables such as age, educational status, working status, lifetime in Artvin and living district. These differences are also important to assess the perception and attitude of residents towards tourism and their support for tourism. The perception of the residents to positive economic and cultural effects of tourism are high.

Positive economic and cultural impacts are also high in previous studies (Liu and Var, 1986; Ritchie; 1988; R.Perdue, et al, 1990; McCool and Martin, 1994; Johnson, Snepenger and Akis, 1994; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Akis, et al, 1996; Gilbert and Clark, 1997; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Yoon, et al, 2001; Andereck, et al, 2005; Dyer, et al, 2007; Oviedo, Castellanos and Martin, 2008).

On the other hand, the perception of the residents to the negative social effects and environmental effects of tourism is low. The perceptions of the residents towards the effects of tourism are generally positive. The findings of this study support similar results with previous studies (Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Guerreiro et al., 2008; Ribeiro, Valle and Silva, 2013)

The expression that "I think that the projects related to tourism (Like Green Road Project) will damage to Artvin." has high participation rate compared to other expressions.

The study revealed that residents think the projects related to tourism can harm the nature of the region, despite the general perception of the residents to tourism is positive in general. This finding displays the sensitivity of the residents in Artvin to the projects affecting the environment. In the study of Yıldız (2017), it indicates that the residents of Yavuzkemal believe that the existing tourism opportunities in the area will be developed further with the Green Road Project.

The two results are not similar in the issue. However, as economic impacts increase in Artvin, the perceptions for environmental impacts decrease. This finding may signify that economic impacts affect the perception of environmental impacts. The finding also indicates that residents evaluate tourism activities based on expected benefits and costs. Mccright (2010)'s study shows that women are less concerned about climate change than men. However, there are not significant differences between gender variables environmental effects in this study.

Residents living in Artvin for more than 21 years are more sensitive to environmental impacts. In previous studies, long-term residents are more reluctant to tourism (Um and Crompton, 1987; Girard and Gartner, 1993; McCool and Martin, 1994; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Snaith and Haley, 1999; Haley, Snaith and Miller, 2005).

In this study it is revealed that residents living in the city for a long time have high sensitivity to environmental impacts and it affect their tourism perceptions. The economic, social and environmental impact scores of the residents living in Borcka are higher than those living in the center. The average number of residents living in the center of Artvin is higher than those living in Borcka for supporting to tourism. There is no significant differences between educational status and tourism economic effects, environmental effects, cultural effects and tourism support.

Kuvan and Akan (2005) pointed out that residents with tourism-related jobs has more positive attitudes in

proportion to residents who do not have jobs associated with the tourism sector towards tourism.

However, in this study any evidence has not been found that tourism workers are different from other professional groups in the support of tourism and the perception of tourism. Similarly, Liu and Var (1986) indicated that tourism-related jobs does not appear to be a significant factor. Alrwajfah, Almeida-García and Cortés-Macías (2019) revealed that residents who have tourism related jobs do not have favorable perceptions toward tourism impacts. In this research, it is seen that economic effects of tourism especially on the job seekers is high.

This can be explained in the context of social change theory. If tourism contribute to residents in terms of employment and become an important source of income, residents have a positive approach to tourism. Because tourism benefits the region and it creates positive effects on the perception of residents.

If the benefits higher than the costs, residents are supposed to assist to tourism development (Ko and Stewart, 2002; Dyer, et al, 2007; Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008; Gursoy, Chi and Dyer, 2010; Stylidis, et al, 2014; Nunkoo and So, 2016). Mason and Cheyne (2000) found that the creation of job opportunities are perceived positive tourism influences. Dyer, Gürsoy, Sharma and Carter (2007) indicated that positive economic impacts have an important influence in supporting the development of tourism by the residents.

5 CONCLUSIONS

In this study, the perception and attitudes of the residents towards tourism who are sensitive about the environmental issues were examined. Residents' approach to tourism is important for the development of tourism activities. It is significant that residents are involved in tourism activities and that tourism contributes to residents. In this context, basing on residents is an initiative that increases the positive aspects of tourism and contributes to the sustainable development of the activity (Pinheiro, 2014). It is mostly established on sustainable development of residents and alternative initiatives aiming at integration and empowerment ideas (Lamnadi, 2017).

As a result of the study, it is seen that the residents in Artvin are sensitive to the environment. However, as the economic benefit of tourism increases, the negative perception of environmental impacts of tourism decreases. It can be explained with social exchange theory. When the benefits are high, residents are supposed to assist to tourism development (Ko and Stewart, 2002; Dyer, et al, 2007; Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008; Gursoy, Chi and Dyer, 2010; Stylidis, et al, 2014; Nunkoo and So, 2016). It is important to develop tourism projects that the residents will benefit and take part in the planning procces of this projects.

At the same time, supporting residents by training and encouraging them for entrepreneurship. So this may increase contribution of economic benefits for residents. The study area has low tourism activities so the negative effects of tourism have not been observed yet. This might effect the results.

In future studies, destinations with different levels of tourism development in terms of enviromental sensitive region can be examined. In addition, enviromentally sensibility can be studied in the perspective of destination stakeholders.

REFERENCES

Akis, S., Peristians, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' Attitudes to Tourism Development: The Case Of Cyprus. Tourism Management, 17(7), 481-494.

Akova, O. (2006), „Yerel Halkın Turizmin Etkilerini Algılamalarına ve Tutumlarına Yönelik Bir Araştırma", Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi, 2 (1), ss. 1-33.

Allen, L. R., 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., & Vogt, C. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. Journal of Travel Research, 39, 27–36.

Andereck, K., Valentine, K., Knopf, R., & Vogt, C. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. Annals of Tourism Research, 32(4), 1056–1076.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' Perceptions On Tourism Impacts. Annals of Tourism Research, 19, 665-690.

Araújo, C. (2007). Degradação ambiental e hospitalidade: apontamentos sobre a intensificação do turismo na Vila do Abraão Ilha Grande - RJ, Brasil. Revista Turismo Em Análise, 18(1), 52-65. https://doi.org/10.11606/issn.1984-4867.v18i1p52-65

Ardanuç'ta HES Gerginliği. (2016, March 28).CNN Turk: http://www.cnnturk.com/turkiye/ardanucta-hes-gerginligi (accessed September 17, 2018)

Artvin Map. (No Date). World Map 1: https://www.worldmap1.com/map/artvin-map (accessed October 20, 2019)

Artvin Cerattepe Ankara'dan Destek İstiyor. (No Date). TEMA: http://www.tema.org.tr/web_149662_1/entitialfocus.aspx?primary_id=1469&target=categorial1&type=2&detail=single (accessed September 17,2018)

Artvin Tanıtım-Artvin İklimi. (No Date). T.C. Artvin Valiliği İl Göç İdaresi Müdürlüğü: http://artvin.goc.gov.tr/tr/page/guncel-ilimizitaniyalim-artvin-tanitim (accessed September 14, 2018).

Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host Perceptions of Sociocultural Impacts. Annals of Tourism Research, 26(3), 493-515.

Bujosa, A., & Rosselló, J. (2007). Modelling environmental

attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management,* 28, 688-695.

Bustam, T., Young, A., & Todd, S. (2004). *Envıronmental Sensıtıvıty And Youthful Partıcıpatıon In Outdoor Recreatıon.* Proceedings of the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium (s. 270-275). PA: U.S Department of Agriculture, Forest Service: Northeastern Research Station.

Cerattepe İçin Karar Çıktı! .2016, October 3. Milliyet: http://www.milliyet.com.tr/cerattepe-icin-karar-cikti--gundem-2320979 (accessed September 17, 2018)

Chawla, L. (1998). Significant Life Experiences Revisited: A Review of Research on Sources of Environmental Sensitivity. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 29(3), 11-21.

Cheng, T.-M., & Wu, H. C. (2015). How do environmental knowledge, environmental sensitivity, and place attachment affect environmentally responsible behavior? An integrated approach for sustainable island tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 23(4), 557-576.

Coğrafi Durum. (No Date). *T.C. Artvin Valiliği:* http://www.artvin.gov.tr/cografi-durum (accessed September 14, 2018)

Doğu Karadeniz'de Evlenme Ve Boşanma İstatistikleri Açıklandı. (2017, March 2). Milliyet: http://www.milliyet.com.tr/dogu-karadeniz-de-evlenme-ve-bosanma-trabzon-yerelhaber-1877347/(accessed September 14, 2018)

Dyer, P., Gürsoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural Modeling of Resident Perceptions of Tourism and Associated Development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. Tourism Management, 28(2), 409-422.

Gilbert, D., & Clark, M. (1997). An Exploratory Examination of Urban Tourism Impact, with Reference to Residents Attitudes in the Cities of Canterbury and Guildford. Cities, 14, 343-352.

Girard, T. C., & Gartner, W. C. (1993). Second Home Second View: Host Community Perceptions. Annals of Tourism Research, 20(4), 685–700.

Guerreiro, M.M., Mendes, J., Vale, P. and Silva, J.A. (2008) Análise da Satisfação dos Residentes com o Turismo: o caso de uma área destino no Algarve, Turismo Em Analise, Portugal, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.488–504.

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2009). Locals' Attitudes toward Mass and Alternative Tourism: The Case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. Journal of Travel Research, 1-14.

Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Locals' Attitudes Toward Mass and Alternative Tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. Journal of Travel Research, 49(3), 381-394.

Haley, A., 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.

Hogg, M. A., & Vaughan, G. M. (2014). Sosyal Psikoloji. (İ. Yıldız, & A. Gelmez, Çev.) Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.

Huh, C., & Vogt, C. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 446–455.

Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2007). Changes in Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism over Time: A Cohort Analytical Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446–455.

Hungerford, H. R., & Volk, T. L. (1990). Changing Learner Behavior Through Environmental Education. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 21(3), 8-21.

Husbands, W. (1989). Social Status and Perception of Tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 16(2), 237-253.

İstatistiklerle Kadın, 2013. (2014, March 5). *Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TUIK):* http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=16056 (September 14, 2018)

Johnson, J., Snepenger, D., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' Perceptons of Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism,* 21, 629-642.

Jones, D. L., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2000). Host community residents' attitudes: A comparison of environmental viewpoints. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(2), 129-156.

Kavalcı, B. A. (2014, May 7). *Karadeniz Yeşil Yol Projesi Nedir?* Rizenin Adi: http://www.rizeninsesi.net/2014/05/07/karadeniz-yesil-yol-projesi-nedir/ (September 14, 2018)

Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management,* 36, 527-540.

King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 20, 650-665.

Kitnuntaviwat, V., & Tang, J. C. (2008). Residents' Attitudes, Perception and Support for Sustainable Tourism Development. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development,* 5(1), 45-60.

Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A Structural Equation Model of Residents' Attitudes for Tourism Development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521-530.

Kultur ve Turizm Bakanlığı (March 2018). http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR-207868/2018-aylik-bultenler.html (November 5, 2018)

Kozak, M. (2017) *Bilimsel Araştırma:* Tasarım, Yazım ve Yayım Teknikleri, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık

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.

Lamnadi, Y. (Jan./Jun. 2017). Ecolodges as a Community-Based Tourism Development Strategy: The Case of Chaouen in Morocco. *Revısta Latino Americana de Turismologia / Relat,* Juiz de Fora, 3(1), 37 –47.

Lankford, S. (1994). Attitudes and Perceptions Toward Tourism and Rural Regional Development. *Journal of Travel Research,* 32(3), 35-43.

Lankford, S., & Howard, D. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 21(1), 121–139.

Lee, C., Kang, S. K., Long, P., & Reisinger, Y. (2010). Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: A comparative study. *Tourism Management,* 31, 189–201.

Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. (1997). Modeling Resident Attitudes Toward Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424.

Liu, J., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193-214.

Long, P. T., Perdue, R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research,* 28, 3-9.

Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' Attitudes To Proposed Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391-411.

Mbaiwa, J. E. (2005). The Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism Development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 2(3), 163-185.

McCool, S., & Martin, S. (1994). Community Attachment and Attitudes Towards Tourism Development. *Journal of Travel Research,* 32(3), 29-34.

McCright, A. M. (2010). The effects of gender on climate change knowledge and concern in the American. *Population & Environment,* 32, 66-87.

McGehee, N., & Andereck, K. (2004). Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research,* 43(2), 131–140.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Socıal Impacts Of Tourısm On Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 15(2), 191-204.

Nunkoo, R. (2016). Toward a More Comprehensive Use of Social Exchange Theory to Study Residents' Attitudes to Tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance,* 39, 588-596.

Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Resıdents' Support For Tourism An Identity Perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 39(1), 243–268.

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (April 2012). Power, Trust, Social Exchange and Community Support. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 39(2), 997-1023.

Nunkoo, R., & So, K. K. (2016). Residents' Support for Tourism: Testing Alternative Structural Models. *Journal of Travel Research,* 55(7), 847–861.

Oviedo, M., Castellanos, M., & Martin, D. (2008). Gaining residents' support for tourism and planning. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 10, 95–109.

Özalp, M., Kurdoğlu, O., Yüksel, E. E., & Yıldırımer, S. (20-22 May 2010). Artvin'de Nehir Tipi Hidroelektrik Santrallerin Neden Olduğu/Olacağı Ekolojik Ve Sosyal Sorunlar. III. *Ulusal Karadeniz Ormancılık Kongresi*, 2, s. 677-687.

Pinheiro, T. R. (jan./abr. 2014). Indicadores para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável do Turismo de Base Comunitária: Um Estudo de Caso da Comunidade do Quilombo do Campinho da Independência, Paraty, Rio de Janeiro. *Revista Anais Brasileiros de Estudos Turísticos - ABET*, Juız de Fora, 4(1), 62 -71.

Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by Its Residents. *Journal of Travel Research,* 16(8), 8-12.

Prentice, R. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management,* 14(2), 218-227.

R. Perdue, R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident Support for Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 586-599.

Ribeiro, M. A., Valle, P. O., & Silva, J. A. (2013). Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism Development in Cape Verde Islands. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 20, 1-26.

Ritchie, J. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism: Measuring resident views via survey research. *Tourism Management*, 9(3), 199–212.

Rothman, R. A. (1978). Residents and transients: community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research,* 16(3), 8-13.

Schmandt, J. (2010). *George Mitchell and the idea of sustainability* (Cilt 1). Texas: College Station : Texas A & M University Press.

Seçilmiş Göstergelerle Artvin 2013. Ankara: Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TUIK). (accessed September 14, 2018)

Sheldon, P., & Var, T. (1984). Residents Attitudes to Tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management,* 5(1), 40-48.

Sia, A. P., Hungerford, H. R., & Tomera, A. N. (1985-1986). Selected Predictors of Responsible Environmental Behavior: An Analysis. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 17(2), 31-40.

Smith, R. A. (1992). Beach resort evolution: Implications for planning. Annals of Tourism Research, 19, 304-322.

Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' Opinions of Tourism Development in the Historic City of York, England. *Tourism Management,* 20(5), 595–603.

Soares, Amanda Mirely Cipriano; Marques, Sérgio, Júnior; das Chagas, Márcio Marreiro. *Revista Turismo em Análise;* São Paulo Vol. 29, Iss. 2, (May-Aug 2018): 196-215. DOI:10.11606/issn.1984-4868.v29i2p196-215

Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J., & Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' Support for Tourism Development: The Role of Residents' Place Image and Perceived Tourism Impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.

Sward, L. L. (1999). Significant Life Experiences Affecting the Environmental Sensitivity of El Salvadoran Environmental Professionals. *Environmental Education Research,* 5(2), 201-206.

Şavşat'ta *28 köy 'HES'lere hayır' dedi.* (2014, September 4). Evrensel: https://www.evrensel.net/haber/91251/savsatta-28-koy-heslere-hayir-dedi (September 17, 2018)

Teye, V., Sönmez, S. F., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). Residents' Attıtudes Toward Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.

Thomas Asha E. (2013). Impact of Tourism on Environment: Responding to Global Challenges. *Pauline Journal of Research and Studies,* 1, (1), 169-182. ISSN:2347-3843

Tichaawa, T. M., & Mhlanga, O. (2015). Residents' perceptions towards the impacts of tourism development: the case of Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe. *African Journal of Hospitality,* 4(1), 1-15.

Tomljenovic, R., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a Sunbelt Resort. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 27(1), 93–114.

Tosun, C. (2002). Host Perceptions of Impacts: A Comparative Tourism Study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29, 231-253.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TUIK). (2017, March 9). *Basın Odası Haberleri:* http://www.tuik.gov.tr/basinOdasi/haberler/2017_14_20170309.pdf (accessed September 8, 2018)

Türkiye Ormancılar Derneği'nin Yeşil Yol Projesi Hakkındaki Görüşleri. (No Date). *Türkiye Ormancılar Derneği:* http://www.ormancilardernegi.org/dosyalar/files/yesil_yol_hak_gorusler.pdf (September 14, 2018)

Tyrrel, T. &. (1984). A survey of attitudes toward tourism growth in Rhode Island. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal,* 8(1), 22-23.

Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring Resident's Attachment Levels in a Host Community. *Journal of Travel Research,* 25(3), 27-29.

UNEP and UNWTO. (2005). Making Tourism more Sustainable. *A Guide for Policy Makers.* United Nations Environment Programme and World Tourism Organization.

Voltes-Dorta, A., Jiménez, J. L., & Suárez-Alemán, A. (2014). An Initial Investigation into the Impact of Tourism on Local Budgets: A Comparative Analysis of Spanish Municipalities. *Tourism Management,* 45(1), 124-133.

Wang, Y. ve Pfister, R. E. (2008), "Residents Attitudes Toward Tourism and Perceived Personal Benefits in a Rural Community", *Journal of Travel Research*, (47), ss. 84-93.

Ward, C., & Berno, T. (2011). Beyond Social Exchange Theory: Attitudes Toward Tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 38(4), 1556–1569.

Xiao, C., & Hong, D. (2010). Gender differences in environmental behaviors in China. *Population & Environment,* 32, 88-104.

Yıldız, S. (2017). Yerel Halkın Bölgesel Kalkınma Açısından Yeşil Yol Projesine ve Turizme Bakışı: Yavuzkemal Belde Merkezi Örneği. *Seyahat ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dergisi,* 14 (2) , 110-125 . DOI: 10.24010/soid.335095

Yoon, Y., Gürsoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a Tourism Development Theory with Structural Equation Modeling. *Tourism Management*, 22(4), 363-372.

Processo Editorial / Editorial Process
Editor Chefe/Editor-in-chief: PhD Thiago D. Pimentel (UFJF).
Recebido/ Received: September 11, 2019; Aceito/Accepted: November 2, 2019; Publicado/Published online: December 4, 2019.
Artigo original / Original paper. Seção revisada por pares / Double blind review section.