

## **A Study on Determining the Opinions of Those Living in Izmir Regarding the Impacts of Rural Tourism**

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Nükhet A. Akpulat

*Ege University Assoc.Prof.Dr. Mesut BOZKURT Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University*

---

**ABSTRACT:** *Rural tourism has come into prominence as a result of the urban dwellers' wish to be drawn to the nature in recent years. They participate in rural tourism for reasons such as experiencing and becoming a part of the country life style even for a short time, tasting the local food and drink, wandering around the natural vegetation, getting rid of the stress of urban life, etc. The fact that the interest in the rural tourism increases day by day also increases the economic, social and environmental impacts of rural tourism. This study has been carried out with the aim of determining the opinions of those living in Izmir regarding the impacts of rural tourism. The research population is those living in Izmir. The convenience sampling method have been used in this study. It has been revealed that 151 people, participating in the study, primarily prefer rural tourism activities such as going to picnic, guided tours, cycling and, going to festivals. In addition, it has been concluded that the opinions of the participants regarding the impacts of rural tourism do not vary based on gender, marital status, residence, age, educational status, income level in terms of participating in the rural tourism.*

**Key Words:** *Rural Tourism, Impacts of Rural Tourism, Izmir.*

---

Date of Submission: 27-05-2019

Date of acceptance:10-06-2019

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Today, millions of people travel to other places for temporary periods from the places they sustain their daily lives. During this change of place; the accommodation, foods, drinks and entertainment facilities in the transportation opportunities and the travelled places are benefited. Although it is seen as a modern concept peculiar to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, touristic translocation movement is as old as the human history (Kozak et.al., 2015:1). When considered generally, it is seen that the first touristic movement started in Hellenic Republic. Herodotus from Halicarnassus giving place to the information and memories related to his travels in his works and Homer, Solon from Athens and even Pausanias wandering around many places of Anatolia are counted as the first tourists (Usta, 2008:30). As specified by Kozak and Usta, tourism whose history goes back a very long way has turned into an important sector with economic, social and environment dimensions today. Participation to tourism has become a need for humans and the number of people participating in tourism is increasing day by day.

A continuous growth and an increasing acceleration are seen in tourism being one of the most rapidly growing sectors in the world despite the crises in the last 60 years. As a result of this development, tourism has become a financial and massive phenomenon today. The competence among the countries, regions, destinations and touristic goods and services increases in tourism gaining a continental property with the long-distance travels democratized by reaching large mass of people (Timur, 2014: 1). Travelling purposes of the people participating in the tourism phenomenon differentiates as days pass today. The efforts of the countries coming to the forefront in tourism recently for expanding tourism activities to all their regions and the idea of benefitting from four-season tourism have resulted in the variation of tourism. This situation causes the alternative tourism fact to gain importance in tourism industry. Alternative tourism is a new concept occurring in parallel to the changing travel understanding of the tourists and giving a new dimension to tourism with this respect. Today, the countries wanting to get more share from world tourism movements to be able to put alternative tourism in action by considering the potential they have is seen as an important element in terms of having superiority in competence (Karacan et.al., 2016:2). Rural tourism is a type of tourism which is in natural environment, whose structuring is little, in which outdoor activities and individual activities are densely seen, which consists of local and small businesses, in which holiday period is generally short, which develops in the places with intensive farms and forests, in which local architecture, traditional buildings and local atmosphere are intensive, which consists of the individual tourist relations and is generally affected by the seasonal factors (Ahipaşaoğlu and Çeltek, 2006). Although the tourist profile joining rural tourism varies a lot, it is understood that they are generally the people at a young and middle-age level, with high income levels and with high education (Çolak, 2009: 31). There are 30 districts in Izmir (<https://www.haritatr.com/izmir-ilceleri-s23>). When the districts except

for those of Izmir city centrum are examined, Aliaga, Bayindir, Bergama, Beydag, Cesme Cumaovasi, Dikili, Foca, Karaburun, Kemalpaşa, Kinik, Kiraz, Odemis, Seferihisar, Selçuk, Tire Torbalı, Urla and Menemen are seen. Those living in Izmir could be considered to join the rural tourism opportunities in their one-day or 1-2-night accommodations in these districts. There are studies examining the presentation of the rural tourism in these districts from different points of view (Ataberk, 2017), (Çokişler, 2018), (Shafeei,2012), (Ataberk, 2010), (Aydemir, Uzun and Gökçen; 2016), (Ünal and Yücel; 2018), (Karaturhan, İssabek, Ünsal, Güler ;2017), (Metin, Erşen, Çabuk, Yüncü, Sarıçam, Çabuk;2017), (Akpulat; 2016) (Akpulat, 2015). These studies are on the development of the rural tourism supply resources or the products that could be presented in rural tourism. This study is different from other studies in terms of revealing the ideas of those living in Izmir in the issue of the impacts of the rural tourism and therefore, it has an importance for the city and districts of Izmir in terms of the development of the rural tourism.

### **Tourism and Rural Tourism**

Tourism is defined by United Nations dd. 1963 as “all the phenomena and relations of the individual as a result of his/her travel and/or accommodation on condition that it will not be less than 24 hours, it will not turn into permanent residence and no income-providing action will be taken”. Tourism is a phenomenon based on before common era within world history. It is cited by Kozak et.al. (2015:48) that the scientists conducting research in this issue have taken the historical past of tourism to Sumerians finding writing and wheel. Sumerians are told to be the first ones starting trade and Phoenicians are told to be the first travelers in current meaning. While most of these travels have had trade and religious purposes, some of them have had health purposes. In tourism dating back to before common era; a great tourism industry has appeared with transportation vehicles, highways, beaches, entertainment and sport areas, accommodation facilities and infrastructure opportunities especially after the Second World War (Usta, 2008: 34). Group travels have developed more when compared to the individual travels within the period passing until today. The reasons underlying this are the fact that the travel arrangers encourage group travels and the interest in the holiday tourism centers providing sea, sun and sand based services always remains at high levels (Kozak et.al. 2015:55). This movement called as mass tourism has increased the importance of tourism more and caused the concept of tourism variation to gain importance in time. Cosar has ordered the touristic product diversification reasons as follows: the increase in international tourism movement, technological developments, seasonal property of tourism, the special care tourism to gain importance, changes observed in the consumer profile, demand for changing brand and image, competence and increase in the environmental awareness (Coşar, 2014:124).

Touristic product diversification works have ensured different tourism types to take place in tourism market. Rural tourism is one of these tourism diversification types. According to Soykan, F., 2000 a, rural geographical areas are trying to meet the increasing recreation need of especially the urban people with their natural and cultural structures. While urban people go to rural areas mostly for the one-day trips with recreational purposes or relative-acquaintance visits; especially the attraction of the rural life style, the absence of the limitations and obligations that will have a pressure and stress, existence of the opportunities that will make the joining people feel themselves free have brought together the intensive visits to these places both at weekends and at seasonal and annual holidays and in this way, a tourism type called rural tourism has occurred. Rural tourism is a tourism type in which people go to a rural settlement for the purpose of resting in natural environments and being together with various cultures, accommodate there and watch or join the activities peculiar to that region (Çelik, A., Polat, T., 2002). According to Küçükaltan (1997), rural tourism is the whole of phenomena and relationships occurring from the temporary accommodations by demanding the goods and services produced by the local people and minimizing their desires to save money in the region during their visits to the rural areas out of their continuous residences. Here; three important points catch the attention. The first one is the occurrence of the visits in a rural area, the second one is the consumption of goods produced in that region and the final one is accommodation in the accommodation places peculiar to the region. As specified by Küçükaltan; Soykan (2013) has also clarified the concept of rural tourism using the expression “Because the meaning contained by rural in the concept of rural tourism in our country is directly understood as “rural areas”; tableland tourism, hunting tourism, speleological tourism, ecotourism and outdoor natural sports are kept equal to the rural tourism. Although not yet wrong; because the actual aim in rural tourism is to spend a holiday by staying at a village, a farm, a mountain hut and similar places, meeting rural culture and socializing, it is also a fact that there are some differences among them in terms of purpose and activities.” Rural tourism is shown as an important type of alternative tourism with its properties such as developing out of the urban settlements, small-scale production in wide areas, using rural, natural and cultural resources in various ways and contribution to the local development (Torre and Gutiérrez (2008: 114). Rural tourism is a type of tourism which is based on consuming the products in the region and accommodating in rural type accommodation facilities by traveling with touristic purposes to the rural areas and whose main purpose is to provide benefit for the local people in

economic meaning. It is seen necessary to assess the impacts of rural tourism by examining them under separate headlines.

### **Impacts of Rural Tourism**

It is possible to examine the impacts of the rural tourism as the impacts on economic and physical environment and social impacts.

### **Economic Impacts of Rural Tourism**

It is firstly necessary to handle the economic impacts of rural tourism while assessing its impacts. The main purpose of rural tourism is to develop a region falling behind in economic terms and with insufficient job opportunities in economic meaning. This condition has been expressed by Yang et.al. (2010, s.382) as “Rural tourism provides an option for the development of the life style of the rural areas by providing a flow of income from other regions to the regions falling behind”. Çeken, Dalgın and Çakır (2012) specify the economic impacts of rural tourism as follows:

- One of the most important problems of those living in rural regions is unemployment. Local people will be able to sustain their lives in the region they live without migrating to the city thanks to the development in rural regions. The solution of the employment problem in rural regions will also indirectly contribute to the decrease in the migrations to city from rural regions.
- The insufficiency and inconsistency of the incomes of the section dealing with agriculture in rural regions cause the rural poverty to affect wider social sections. The production capacity of the agriculture sector will increase in parallel to the development of the rural tourism in the region and the manufactured products will be able to be sold with higher prices. In this way, rural tourism will increase the income level of the rural region.
- The expenditures made by domestic and foreign tourists to meet their needs such as accommodation, foods, drinks, rural activities, transportation and shopping in the rural regions they have gone for traveling purposes will increase the income of those living in rural regions.
- Rural tourism will accelerate the rural development process; because, there is a direct relation between rural development and rural tourism.
- The increase in the tourism demand regarding the regions with rural tourism supply potential also causes to the increase in the touristic investments. These increases in the investments will ensure a pickup in the local economy.
- Physical infrastructure insufficiency will be terminated in time depending on the development of tourism in rural regions.
- The development of rural tourism will ensure the local people living in rural regions to increase their life standards.
- The local resources to form the main raw material of tourism in rural areas causes to the diversification of economic activities, local cooperation and fortification of development demands. This also paves the way for the development of the local entrepreneurship soul.
- The difference of development level between city and country will decrease a bit as a result of spending the incomes gained previously from big cities in rural regions.
- Depending on the development of rural tourism, work load increases also in other sectors manufacturing direct and indirect goods and services for tourism. Tourism indirectly contributes to the development of many sectors (construction, agriculture, industry, service).

### **The Impacts of Rural Tourism on Physical Environment**

It is a fact that tourism has positive or negative impacts on natural and socio-cultural environment. Rural tourism being one of those showing the highest care for protectionism among the tourism types has to use the whole environment in its authentic way. Therefore; all kinds of artificialities should not be included in the villages. On the other hand; rural tourism has undertaken a very important task in enlivening the values that will be lost and forgotten within natural flow (Soykan, 2003:3). Necessary attention is not paid in the protection of environmental quality and prevention of the deformation of the natural resources in mass tourism. Rural tourism is one of models most convenient for sustainable development by becoming a tourism type aiming to protecting the ecological balance and economic growth together as well as the protection of the local properties (Polat et.al.,2015: 2). It is a clear fact that tourism has negative impacts on natural environment. Forests are destroyed and turned into touristic facilities or houses not in accordance with natural environment are constructed in parallel to the tourism development. Because the infrastructure is insufficient in many touristic regions and especially with the impact of the increasing population during the tourism season, the seas and environment are polluted. Depending on these, the existence of plants and animals disappears. However; the protection of the region and natural beauties in rural tourism could primarily be considered by an assessment with the tourism dimension. For this reason; as specified by Soykan, the protection of the authenticity of the region is the

primarily important issue in the development of the rural tourism. Therefore; it is possible to say that rural tourism protects the physical environment.

### **The Impacts of Rural Tourism on Social Environment**

Tourists go to other places, contact new people and societies in these places and establish different social relations. Also; they affect the places they go in social terms and they are also affected by them. Tourism is a social and cultural trade as well as an economic one. The social and cultural impacts of tourism may result in negative or positive results. Tourism to have social impacts is very naturally reacted due to the social value and economic differences among the existent cultures because it is a human-interactive sector. Whether the social impacts are positive or negative could be advocated depending on who the interpreter about the subject is (Doğan,1987). There is mutual cultural exchange also in rural tourism similarly. Local people present goods and services to those coming with touristic purposes and as a result of this, a cultural exchange occurs. In both cultures, the cultural difference existent due to the rural and urban life style differences decreases at a certain scale. Urban people learn the rural life, foods and drinks, clothing styles and traditions and stay away from the city life and have a rest. As a result of meeting rural tourists, the socio-cultural impacts are observed in the local people living in rural regions such as changes in personal behaviors (clothing, speaking etc.), differences in family relations as a result of the participation of the women to the tourism, changes in ethical rules, especially the increase in educational and cultural level (foreign language learning, wish for continuing to education, wish to see the places where tourists actually live).

## **II. METHOD**

### **Aim of Study**

The main aim of this study is to reveal the thoughts of those living in Izmir regarding the impacts of rural tourism. Within the direction of this main aim, the main subject of the study is how the differences in the personal traits of those living in Izmir have affected their thoughts regarding the impacts of rural tourism. Gender, marital status, age, profession, educational status, income level, frequency of joining rural tourism and lifetime in Izmir have been assessed as the personal traits within the study.

### **Study Population and Sample**

The population of the study is those living in the city of Izmir. However; the study has been conducted in the park in which there is Ozdilek Shopping Mall taking place in Izmir Inciralti. The reason for the selection of this area is that this is a place visited by those living in different districts and streets. The number of the vehicles entering from the entrance door has been determined as 137 before the conduction of the study. It is not possible to reach the exact number of people. In the event that the population is 250 in the data of Sekaran; it is specified that the sample should be 152 people (Sekaran, 1998: 253). In this respect; the sample number to be 151 has been accepted as sufficient. The study was conducted on April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

### **Data Collection Tool and Data Analysis**

Questionnaire form has been used in the study as the data collection tool. The questionnaire form consists of two parts. In the first part, questions regarding the demographical properties of the participants are asked. In the second part, the studies conducted by Wang and Pfister (2008) and Park and Yoon (2009) and Ayaz, Yeşiltaş and Türkmen (2012) have been benefited for measuring the thoughts of participants regarding the impacts of the rural tourism. The applied scale consists of two dimensions and a total of 15 expressions are given place.

The data attained as a result of the study are assessed with computer program. The answers are assessed with Cronbach's Alpha reliability test for the purpose of testing the reliability of the research. Factor analysis has been applied to determine the validity level of the scales. Frequency and percentage values have been calculated for the purpose of revealing the demographical traits of the participants. Also; t-test and One-Way Variance ANOVA Analysis have been conducted for the unpaired samples.

## **III. FINDINGS**

### **Reliability Analysis**

Reliability is regarding at what degree a test or measurement tool has measured what it has measured correctly (Tekin, 1993). According to Büyüköztürk, the reliability coefficient of a test, namely Cronbach's alpha should be at least 0.70 (Büyüköztürk, 2010:170). It has been concluded that the answers given to the scale of the study have been assessed with Cronbach's alpha reliability test, the reliability coefficient is 0.83 and it is reliable.

### Results of the Factor Analysis

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample convenience test and Bartlett's sphericity test results are examined for the purpose of assessing the convenience of the data structure of the sample size for factor analysis. It is cited by Tatlıdil (2002) that the data should firstly be tested in terms of convenience for factor analysis and if the sphericity test is found statistically meaningful, at this situation, factor analysis will be passed. Nakip (2003,409) says that KMO test result should be above 0.60. KMO test result of this study has been 0.87.7. Bartlett's Sphericity test meaningfulness level is 0.000. The fact that this test is not meaningful shows that there is no relation between the variables. The result of Bartlett's test is 0.000 and meaningful. This result means that the data come from multivariable normal distribution and therefore, it is convenient for conducting factor analysis (Çokluk et.al., 2010:169).

Eigenvalue shows the total variance explained by every factor. However; only those of eigenvalue above one (1) are respected (Nakip, 2003:410-412). The reason for suggesting two factors in Table 1 is that there are two compounds whose eigenvalues are above 1. It is seen that the first factor contributes to the variance by 43,8% and the second one by 15,9%. The variance explained in multi-factor scales to be between 40-60% is accepted as sufficient in social sciences (Çokluk et.al., 2010:176). Within this frame, it is seen that the contribution it makes to the total variance is sufficient with a total explained variance of 60,08%.

**Table 1: The Average, Standard Deviation Values and Factor Analysis Findings of the Research Items of the Scale for the Opinions of Those Living in Izmir in the Issue of the Impacts of Rural Tourism**

| Factor  | Item   | $\bar{x}$ | Ss     | F1     | F2    |
|---|--|-----------|--------|--------|-------|
| Positive Impacts of Rural Tourism               | Rural tourism increases the life quality of the local people.  | 4,04      | ,88    | ,805   | ,014  |
|   | Rural tourism increases the local partners and cooperation.  | 3,95      | ,904   | ,789   | -,007 |
|   | Rural tourism ensures women to get in the business life.   | 4,25      | ,761   | ,777   | ,216  |
|   | Rural tourism increases the job opportunities.   | 4,03      | ,847   | ,769   | ,140  |
|   | The development of rural tourism ensures more investments to the regions.  | 3,99      | ,860   | 753    | ,156  |
|   | Rural tourism encourages the local people to assess the culture and environment.                                 | 3,97      | ,871   | 743    | -,033 |
|   | Rural tourism ensures the development of the transportation services.  | 3,98      | ,832   | 742    | ,175  |
|   | Rural tourism supports the protection and development of natural environment.                                    | 3,78      | 1,22   | 710    | -,260 |
|   | Green areas and forestation works are increased thanks to the development of rural tourism.                      | 3,64      | 1,22   | 659    | -,179 |
| Negative Impacts of Rural Tourism               | Rural tourism causes to the distortion and pollution of the natural environment.                                 | 3,26      | 1,41   | -142   | ,833  |
|   | Rural tourism causes to the exploitation of the rural regions by the rich entrepreneurs coming from the outside. | 3,68      | 1,12   | -009   | ,812  |
|   | Rural tourism increases the real estate prices in the regions.   | 3,99      | ,962   | 441    | ,609  |
| Eigenvalue                                      |  |           | 5,294  | 1,915  |       |
| The explained variance belonging to the factors |  |           | 44,119 | 15,961 |       |
| Total Explained Variance* (%)                   |  |           | 60,08  |        |       |
| KMO   |  |           | ,87,7  |        |       |
| Barlett's Sphericity Test Value                 |  |           | 0,000  |        |       |
| Cronbach's alpha                                |  |           | 83,2   |        |       |

### Findings Regarding the Personal Traits of the Participants

67,5% of the participants are women, 32,5% are men, 58,9% are married and 60,3% have 1 or 2 children. 41,1% of the participants live in Izmir city centrum, 58,9% live in districts and also 73,5% have been living in Izmir for 11 and more years. When assessed in terms of education, age and income, it is seen that 55% of them have bachelor/associate degree, 43,7% are between 36-54 years old and 43% have an income between 2000-4000 TL.

**Table 2: Findings Regarding the Personal Traits of the Participants**

|                | Variables | Frequency | Percentage% |                      |           | Frequency | Percentage% |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Gender         | Female    | 102       | 67.5        | Place lived in Izmir | Centrum   | 62        | 41.1        |
|                | Male      | 49        | 32.5        |                      | District  | 89        | 58.9        |
|                | Total     | 151       | 100         |                      | Total     | 151       | 100         |
| Marital Status | Married   | 89        | 58.9        | Lifetime in Izmir    | 0-5 years | 31        | 10.5        |
|                | Bachelor  | 62        | 35.1        |                      | 6-10      | 9         | 6           |
|                | Total     | 151       | 100         |                      | 11+       | 111       | 73.5        |
|                |           |           |             |                      | Total     | 151       | 100         |

|                    |                     |     |      |           |                    |     |      |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----|------|-----------|--------------------|-----|------|
| Number of Children | 0                   | 58  | 38.4 | Education | Primary/middle     | 3   | 2    |
|                    | 1                   | 46  | 30.5 |           | High School        | 25  | 16.6 |
|                    | 2                   | 45  | 29.8 |           | Associate/Bachelor | 83  | 55   |
|                    | 3 and more          | 2   | 1.3  |           | Graduate           | 40  | 26.5 |
|                    | Total               | 151 | 100  |           | Total              | 100 | 100  |
| Income             | 0-2000              | 41  | 27.2 | Age       | 18-25              | 19. | 12.6 |
|                    | 2001-3000           | 26  | 17.2 |           | 26-35              | 21  | 13.9 |
|                    | 3001-4000           | 39  | 25.8 |           | 36-45              | 38  | 25.2 |
|                    | 40001-5000          | 8   | 5,3  |           | 46-54              | 43  | 18.5 |
|                    | 5001-6000           | 20  | 13,2 |           | 54-64              | 20  | 13.2 |
|                    | 6001and above       | 17  | 11,3 |           | 65+                | 10  | 6.6  |
|                    | Total               | 151 | 100  |           | Total              | 151 | 100  |
| Job                | Instructor          | 17  | 11.3 |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Doctor              | 3   | 2    |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Engineer            | 4   | 2.6  |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Teacher             | 18  | 11.9 |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Other state officer | 21  | 13.9 |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Other               | 9   | 6    |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Private Sector      | 9   | 6    |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Own Business        | 42  | 27.8 |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Student             | 13  | 8.9  |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Retired             | 15  | 9.9  |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Housewife           | 151 | 100  |           |                    |     |      |
|                    | Total               |     |      |           |                    |     |      |

**Table 3: The Status of Participants for Joining Rural Tourism**

|                                     | Variables   | F.  | %    |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----|------|
| The status of joining rural tourism | I have never joined.                                    | 41  | 27,2 |
|                                     | I join 1-2 times a year                                 | 63  | 41,7 |
|                                     | I join 3-5 times a year                                 | 32  | 21,2 |
|                                     | 6 and more a year                                       | 15  | 9,3  |
|                                     | Total   | 151 | 100  |
| Reason for not joining/less joining | I do not find rural life attractive.                    | 5   | 3,3  |
|                                     | I prefer other tourism types rather than rural tourism. | 20  | 13,2 |
|                                     | Other   | 26  | 17,2 |
|                                     | Total   | 51  | 33,7 |

As specified in Table 3; 27,2% of the participants have never joined rural tourism and 41% join 1-2 times a year. Also; 33% of the participants have answered the question of the reason for not joining/less joining as “I prefer other tourism types rather than rural tourism” and 26% have chosen “other” option.

**Table 4: The Activities Preferred to be Conducted in Rural Tourism**

|    | Activity                 | Number of Selections |
|----|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 1  | Picnic                   | 82                   |
| 2  | Guided tour              | 62                   |
| 3  | Cycling                  | 48                   |
| 4  | Joining festivals        | 46                   |
| 5  | Swimming                 | 41                   |
| 6  | Picking fruits           | 41                   |
| 7  | Picking flowers          | 39                   |
| 8  | Sport activities         | 33                   |
| 9  | Sunbath                  | 31                   |
| 10 | Picking stone, leaf etc. | 22                   |
| 11 | Working in farm          | 18                   |
| 12 | Picking mushrooms        | 16                   |

The answers given to the question “Which activities do you prefer doing in rural tourism?” are also seen in Table 4. It is seen that the given answers are respectively picnic (82), guided tour (62), cycling (48), joining festivals (46), swimming and picking fruits (41), picking flowers (39), sport activities (33), sunbath (31), picking stone, leaf etc. (22), working in farm (18) and picking mushrooms (16). The results of the conducted t-test are shown in Table 5. When the averages are assessed, it is seen that the highest participation is above 4.00 with “Rural tourism ensures women to get in business life” (4,25) and “Rural tourism increases the life quality of the local people” (4,04) and “Rural tourism increases the job opportunities” (4,3). “The development of rural tourism ensures more investments to the regions”, “Rural tourism increases the real estate prices in regions” are

other expressions with high average with 3,99. It could be expressed that the expressions with the highest average are on the economic impacts. It catches the attention that the lowest participation is “Rural tourism causes to the distortion and pollution of natural environment” (3,26).

**Table 4: The Related T-Test Results Regarding the Scale of the Ideas of Those Living in Izmir on the Impacts of Rural Tourism**

| Gender         | N   | Mean | Sd   | df  | T     | Mng. |
|----------------|-----|------|------|-----|-------|------|
| Female         | 102 | 46,7 | 7,15 | 149 | 235   | ,814 |
| Male           | 49  | 46,4 | 6,70 |     |       |      |
| Marital Status | N   | Mean | Ss   | Sd  | T     | Mng. |
| Married        | 89  | 46,6 | 7,69 | 149 | 108   | ,914 |
| Bachelor       | 49  | 46,5 | 5,90 |     |       |      |
| Lived Place    | N   | Mean | Ss   | Sd  | T     | Mng. |
| Centrum        | 62  | 46,3 | 5,26 | 149 | -,462 | ,645 |
| Districts      | 89  | 46,8 | 8,00 |     |       |      |

P<0.01, Sd.: Standard Deviation, df.: degree of freedom, Mng.: Meaningfulness

No meaningful difference could be found among the gender, marital status and lived place in the answers given by the participants as a result of the t-test taking place in Table 4.

**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and Anova Results Regarding the Scale of the Ideas of Those Living in Izmir on the Impacts of Rural Tourism**

| Age                                | N   | Mean    | SD      | F     | Mng. |
|------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|------|
| 18-25                              | 19  | 45,1    | 7,80    | 1,480 | ,200 |
| 26-35                              | 21  | 46,3    | 3,82    |       |      |
| 36-45                              | 38  | 45,2    | 7,39    |       |      |
| 46-54                              | 43  | 46,9    | 7,75    |       |      |
| 55-64                              | 20  | 50,1    | 6,52    |       |      |
| 65+                                | 10  | 46,6    | 5,10    |       |      |
| Total                              | 151 | 46,6    | 6,99    |       |      |
| Educational Status                 | N   | Mean    | SD      | F     | Mng. |
| Graduate/Doctorate                 | 40  | 44,3    | 8,53    | 2,297 | ,080 |
| Undergraduate/Associate            | 83  | 47,2    | 6,05    |       |      |
| High School                        | 25  | 47,4    | 6,65    |       |      |
| Middle school-Primary school       | 3   | 51,3    | 7,02    |       |      |
| Total                              | 151 | 46,6    | 6,99    |       |      |
| Income Level                       | N   | Mean    | SD      | F     | Mng. |
| 0-2000                             | 41  | 44,7561 | 9,68    | 1,558 | ,176 |
| 2001-3000                          | 26  | 46,3846 | 4,95643 |       |      |
| 3001-4000                          | 39  | 47,7949 | 5,31720 |       |      |
| 40001-5000                         | 8   | 51,2500 | 6,43095 |       |      |
| 5001-6000                          | 20  | 46,9500 | 6,25321 |       |      |
| 6001 veuzeri                       | 17  | 46,2353 | 5,50601 |       |      |
| Total                              | 151 | 46,6225 | 6,99308 |       |      |
| Frequency of Joining Rural Tourism | N   | Mean    | SD      |       |      |
| Never                              | 41  | 46,9756 | 5,37349 | 1,546 | ,205 |
| 1-2 times a year                   | 63  | 45,4603 | 8,14946 |       |      |
| 3-5 times a year                   | 32  | 47,0938 | 6,99474 |       |      |
| 6+ a year                          | 15  | 49,5333 | 4,79385 |       |      |
| Total                              | 151 | 46,6225 | 6,99308 |       |      |
| Lifetime in Izmir                  | N   | Mean    | SD      | F     | Mng. |
| 0-5 years                          | 31  | 45,3548 | 6,34848 | ,646  | ,526 |
| 6-10 years                         | 9   | 46,6667 | 5,74456 |       |      |
| 11+                                | 111 | 46,9730 | 7,26068 |       |      |
| Total                              | 151 | 46,6225 | 6,99308 |       |      |

Sd: Standard deviation Mng: Meaningfulness

Descriptive statistics and Anova results regarding the scale of the ideas of those living in Izmir on the impacts of rural tourism are shown in tables. According to the results of the analysis; in the given answers, no meaningful difference could be found according to the frequency of joining rural tourism, age, educational status, income level and lifetime in Izmir.

## **Evaluation**

In the study conducted for the Determination of the Opinions of Those Living in Izmir on Rural Tourism; the statements whose mean value is above 4.00, namely in which there is a highly positive participation are “Rural tourism ensures women to get in business life”, “Rural tourism increases the life quality of the local people” and “Rural tourism increases the job opportunities”. Other statements whose mean value change between 3,95-3,99 and in which there is highly positive participation are “The development of rural tourism ensures more investments to the regions”, “Rural tourism ensures the development of the transportation services”, “Rural tourism encourages the local people to assess the culture and environment” and “Rural tourism increases local partners and cooperation”. It is understood that the participants show high participation in the statements regarding the fact that rural tourism positively supports the economic development of the regions. The other two statements taking place in the factor of the positive impacts of rural tourism are “Rural tourism supports the protection and development of natural environment” (3,78) and “Green areas and forestation works are increased due to the development of rural tourism” (3,64). The fact that the participation in these statements is lower than the positive economic-based statements is another result catching the attention.

There are three statements within the factor of the negative impacts of rural tourism. The one with the highest participation is “Rural tourism increases real estate prices in regions” (3,99). There has also been a high participation to the statement “Rural tourism causes to the exploitation of the rural regions by the rich entrepreneurs coming from the outside” (3,68). The statement “Rural tourism causes to the distortion and pollution of natural environment” (3,26) has come out above 3,00.

## **IV. RESULT**

72,8% (110 people) of 151 people participating in the study joins rural tourism 1-2 times and 6 and more times a year. This situation shows that the participants consider the issue of joining rural tourism positively. According to the answers given to the question “Which activities do you prefer joining in rural tourism?”; the participants have preferred primarily picnic, guided tour, cycling, joining festivals, swimming and picking fruits. Increasing the participation to rural tourism is possible with introducing and increasing the presentation of these activities especially in the regions providing rural tourism in the surroundings of the city of Izmir.

According to the statistical results; no meaningful difference could be observed in the answers given by the participants in terms of gender, marital status, lived place, age, educational status, income level, frequency of joining rural tourism and lifetime in Izmir. It will be beneficial to assess the results in terms of the selected factors, namely in terms of the answers given by the participants for the positive and negative impacts of rural tourism. Participants think that rural tourism contributes to the economic development of the regions, but they participate too little in the impacts of the rural tourism on the protection and development of natural environment. According to this result; participants think that natural environment may be damaged or natural environmental development will not be sufficiently supported although rural tourism provides economic development in the region. Other negative statements are the increases in the real estate prices in rural areas and the exploitation of the rural regions by rich entrepreneurs. It could be said from these results that the those who provide economic benefit from the region and from the rural tourism should be the people of the region and the foreign investors are worried about turning this development in the region into an earning gate. It is possible for us to make a comment that the participants want the rural tourism whose one of main aims is the economic development of the local people to be developed as the local people in the center. This study conducted on those living in the city of Izmir has revealed the result that the Izmir people consider the development of rural tourism positively in economic meaning and they are sensitive in the issue of its environmental and social impacts. Besides; the fact that the results do not show any difference in terms of the personal factors shows that there is a consensus in general meaning. This study is the first research measuring the opinions of those living in the city of Izmir regarding the impacts of the rural tourism. Therefore; it leads the studies to be conducted in this subject. The study is considered to be conducted in wider scope within country-wide.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1]. Ayaz, N., Yeşiltaş, M., Türkmen, F.,(2012)., Turizm Eğitimi Alan Öğrencilerin Kırsal Turizme Bakış Açılımları and Algıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma, KMÜ Sosyal and Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi 14 (22): 103-112, 2012, ISSN: 1309-9132
- [2]. Büyüköztürk, Ş.(2010), Veri Analizi El Kitabı(12.Baskı), Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- [3]. Coşar, Y.,( 2014) ‘Turistik Ürün Çeşitlendirme Stratejisi’, Turistik Ürün Politikaları, Ed:AlpTimur, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- [4]. Çeken, H., Dalgın, T. and Çakır, N. (2012). Bir alternatif turizm türü olarak kırsal turizmin gelişimini etkileyen faktörler and kırsal turizm etkileri, Uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi, 2 (2), 11-16.
- [5]. Çelik,A.,Polat, T., (2002). Tokat’ın Kırsal Turizm Arz Potansiyelinin Saptanması and Değerlendirilmesine Yönelik Bir Çalışma, 3. Ulusal Türkiye Turizmi Sempozyum, İzmir.
- [6]. Çokluk, Ö., G. Şekercioğlu, and Ş. Büyüköztürk (2010), Sosyal Bilimler İçin Çok Değişkenli İstatistik: SPSS and LISREL Uygulamaları, 1. Baskı, Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- [7]. Doğan, H. Z. (1987), Turizmin Sosyo-Kültürel Temelleri, Uğur Ofset, İzmir, 1987.



- [8]. Karacan, E., Karacan, S., Gngör, Y. (2016). Kırsal Turizm and Alternatif Kırsal Turizm Hizmetleri, 5.Doğu Akdeniz Turizm Sempozyumu and I. Uluslararası Doğu Akdeniz Turizm Sempozyumu, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Turizm Fakültesi, 22-23 Nisan 2016, KKTC.,
- [9]. Kastenholz, E., Davis, D. and Paul, G. (1999), "Segmenting tourism in rural areas: The case of North and Central Portugal," Journal of Travel Research, (37), 353-363.
- [10]. Kozak,N. Kozak M, Kozak, M., (2015). Genel Turizm (17.Baskı), Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- [11]. Küçükaltan, D. (1997). Trakya Ekonomisi İçin Bir Bölgesel Kalkınma Modeli: Kırsal Turizm, 7. Ulusal Bölge Bilimi Bölge Planlama Kongresi, 1. Kitap, 20 - 22 Ekim, İzmir: Pro-Ofset Matbaacılık
- [12]. Nakip, M.(2003), Pazarlama Araştırmaları Teknikler and (Spss Destekli) Uygulamalar, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- [13]. Park, D. B. and Yoon, Y. S. (2009), "Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study," Tourism Management, (30), 99-108.
- [14]. Soykan, F. 2003. Kırsal Turizm and Türkiye İçin Önemi, Ege Coğrafya Dergisi, S:12, 1-11, İzmir.
- [15]. Soykan, F., 2000.,Kırsal Turizm Ve Avrupa'da Kazanılan Deneyim, Anatolia Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi (Türkçe), Yıl:11, Mart-Haziran, Sy.21-33.
- [16]. Soykan, F..(2003). Turkey Kırsal Turizm Ve Türkiye Turizmi İçin Önemi, Ege Coğrafya Dergisi,s: 12 1-11, İzmir.
- [17]. Tekin, H. (1993). Eğitimde Ölçme and Değerlendirme. Ankara: Yargı.
- [18]. Torre, G. M. V. and Gutiérrez, E. A. (2008), The demand of rural tourism in a natural park in Southern Spain. In: P.M. Burns and M. Novelli (Eds.), Tourism Development: Growth, Myths and Inequalities. (p.113125). London: CAB International.
- [19]. Usta, Ö. (2008). Turizm Genel and Yapısal Yaklaşım, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- [20]. Üzümcü, Tülay P. Çelik,A. Otur, (S), Hacıoğlu, A. (2015). Kırsal Alanların Sürdürülebilir Kırsal Turizm Amaçlı Kullanılması Kocaeli-Kandıra Örneği, Uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi,5(1): 25-31,ISSN:1307-1149,E-ISSN:2146-0086.
- [21]. Yang, Z., Cai, J. and Shluzas, R. (2010). "Agro-tourism enterprises as a form of multi-functional urban agriculture for peri-urban development in China", Habitat International, Vol.34, Issue 4, October, ss.374-385.
- [22]. Yeniçare, E., 2007. Kırsal Turizm Nedir and Örnekler Üzerinde İrdelenmesi, Namık Kemal Üniversitesi Peyzaj Mimarlığı Anabilim Dalı, 6-7
- [23]. Yıldırım A. and Şimşek H. (2004), Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri ( 5. Baskı), Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık,. ISBN 9750200071
- [24]. Ahıpaşaoğlu, Suhavi, Çeltek, Evrim, Sürdürülebilir Kırsal Turizm, Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara, 2006.
- [25]. <https://www.haritatr.com/izmir-ilceleri-s23>
- [26]. Ataberk, Emre. (2017) "Tire (İzmir)'de Turizm Türlerini Bütünleştirme Olanakları: Kültür Turizmi, Kırsal Turizm, Agroturizm and Gastronomi Turizmi" Turizm Akademik Dergisi, 02 (2017) 153-164.
- [27]. Çoşukler and Aslan. (2018) SEYAHAT ACENTELERİ AÇISINDAN BİRGİ'NİN TURİZM POTANSİYELİ, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322317866>
- [28]. DOKUZ EYLÜL ÜNİVERSİTESİ FEN BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ İZMİR İNCİRALTINDA DOĞA TEMELLİ BİR AGRO TURİZM YAKLAŞIMI KENTSEL TASARIM PROJESİ Nazlı SHAFEEİ Haziran, 2012 İZMİR
- [29]. I. ULUSAL TİRE SEMPOZYUMU 18-20 Ekim 2010, Tire YEREL PAZARLAR-TURİZM İLİŞKİSİ VE TİRE Öğr. Gör. Emre ATABERK
- [30]. Uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi International Journal of Social and Economic Sciences 6 (2): 01-06, 2016 ISSN: 2146-5843, E-ISSN: 2146-0078, www.nobel.gen.tr Ödemiş-Tire-Kemalpaşa Yöresi Kırsal Turizm and Girişimciliğini Tespiti Yönelik Bir Araştırma Burhan AYDEMİR1 Didem UZUN2\* Zeynep Güvercin GÖÇMEN3
- [31]. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem ÜNAL, . Besime YÜCEL(2018). KIRSAL TURİZMİN GELİŞTİRİLMESİ VE YÖNETİLMESİNDE YEREL HALKIN ALGI VE TUTUMLARI. ÖDEMİŞ/BİRGİ ÖRNEĞİ Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi: Haziran-2018, Yıl:23, Sayı: 39, Sayfa:113-130 Eastern Geographical Review; June-2018, Volume:23, Numbers: 39, Page:113-130
- [32]. İzmir Karaburun Bölgesinin Agroturizm Fırsatları Açısından Değerlendirilmesi1 Taki Can METİN1 Gökhan ERŞEN2 Saye Nihan ÇABUK3 Hilmi Rafet YÜNCÜ4 Sibel SARIÇAM5 Alper International Journal of Social and Economic Sciences Uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi E-ISSN: 2146-0078, 7 (2): 46-53, 2017.
- [33]. uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi International Journal of Social and Economic Sciences 6 (1): 52-58, 2016 ISSN: 2146-5843, E-ISSN: 2146-0078, www.nobel.gen.tr Bölgede Yaşayanların Yöresel Mutfak Kültürü İle İlgili Algısının Belirlenmesi: Ödemiş Örneği Nükhet Adalet AKPULAT\*
- [34]. Uluslararası Sosyal and Ekonomik Bilimler Dergisi International Journal of Social and Economic Sciences 5 (2): 84-91, 2015 ISSN: 1307-1149, E-ISSN: 2146-0086, www.nobel.gen.tr Ödemiş'in Kırsal Turizm Arz Kaynakları Açısından Değerlendirilmesi and Öneriler
- [35]. <http://www.izmir.gov.tr/istatistiklerle-izmir>

## Attachments

| Year | District   | Total Population |
|------|------------|------------------|
| 2017 | Buca       | 492.252          |
| 2017 | Karabaglar | 480.790          |
| 2017 | Bornova    | 442.839          |
| 2017 | Konak      | 363.181          |
| 2017 | Karsiyaka  | 342.062          |
| 2017 | Bayrakli   | 314.402          |
| 2017 | Çigli      | 190.607          |
| 2017 | Torbali    | 172.359          |

|      |             |                |
|------|-------------|----------------|
| 2017 | Menemen     | <b>170.090</b> |
| 2017 | Gaziemir    | <b>136.273</b> |
| 2017 | Odemis      | <b>132.241</b> |
| 2017 | Kemalpasa   | <b>105.506</b> |
| 2017 | Bergama     | <b>102.961</b> |
| 2017 | Aliaga      | <b>94.070</b>  |
| 2017 | Menderes    | <b>89.777</b>  |
| 2017 | Tire        | <b>83.829</b>  |
| 2017 | Balcova     | <b>78.442</b>  |
| 2017 | Narlidere   | <b>66.269</b>  |
| 2017 | Urla        | <b>64.895</b>  |
| 2017 | Kiraz       | <b>43.859</b>  |
| 2017 | Dikili      | <b>41.697</b>  |
| 2017 | Cesme       | <b>41.278</b>  |
| 2017 | Seferihisar | <b>40.785</b>  |
| 2017 | Bayindir    | <b>40.258</b>  |
| 2017 | Selcuk      | <b>35.991</b>  |
| 2017 | Guzelbahce  | <b>31.429</b>  |
| 2017 | Foca        | <b>31.061</b>  |
| 2017 | Kinik       | <b>28.271</b>  |
| 2017 | Beydag      | <b>12.391</b>  |
| 2017 | Karaburun   | <b>9.812</b>   |

2.716.510

Prof.Dr. Nükhet A. Akpulat" A Study on Determining the Opinions of Those Living in Izmir Regarding the Impacts of Rural Tourism" International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI), vol. 08, no. 6, 2019, pp.30-39