Sociocultural impacts of tourism development on heritage sites

Chapter · February 2019

2 authors:

Orhan Akova
Istanbul University
124 PUBLICATIONS **650** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Ozan Atsız
Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University
46 PUBLICATIONS **124** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Master's Thesis View project

renewable energy View project

19

SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT ON HERITAGE SITES

Orhan Akova and Ozan Atsiz

Introduction

Tourism has grown rapidly, creating more investment and more jobs around the world. Now, more than a billion tourists travel to an international destination each year. One of the main motivations of this movement is the desire to explore cultural identities and cultural heritage sites. Cultural heritage sites are valued tourism assets that motivate travelers and distinguish destinations from others. It is important for these cultural heritage attractions to be protected and preserved as they are, because the tourist movement may spoil them. According to UNWTO (1998), tourism is evaluated as the *activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes*. Also, it has been stated that tourism is a subset of travel. This movement is temporary, and tourists return to their normal place of work and residence. During their travelling and staying period, tourists expect their needs such as accommodation, food and beverages, facilities and so on to be catered for. These needs are satisfied by international or local tourism businesses. Together with their stay in the tourist destination region, this situation necessarily creates an interaction between local residents and tourists. The outcome of this relationship can be positive, such as opportunities for meeting interesting people, learning more about other nations, and improving language skills and quality of life, or can be negative, such as congestion, noise, drug abuse and lack of mutual confidence among people (Ratz, 2000).

Research has mostly been conducted into the sociocultural effects of tourism applied to various destinations. Findings obtained from these studies show that they differ between destinations. It is difficult to determine or measure the sociocultural impact of tourism as tourism can impact social and cultural changes directly or indirectly. Also, as stated in the tourism literature, the lack of a commonly used methodology prevents these impacts being clearly determined and measured. But these studies partly reveal the effects of tourism. This chapter will try to review the sociocultural effects of tourism using the perspective of previous studies conducted on heritage sites

Heritage sites and heritage tourism

Heritage sites are the most important attractions for tourists interested in experiencing authenticity, foreign cultures and their elements. Travelers visit heritage sites because of

their unique, valued heritage, and these sites help them to know their self and boost their self-esteem and self-respect (World Bank, 1999; Li, 2003). Therefore, it can be concluded that cultural and heritage attractions have great potential to improve respect among different nations and can effectively promote destinations. Furthermore, they can offer favorable potential for local tourism improvement (van der Merwe & Rogerson, 2013). These heritage attractions can be promoted not only to local tourists but also to international (long-haul) tourists (Ivanovic & Saayman, 2013). Therefore, in the process of creating policy concerning tourism, heritage opportunities must be utilized locally and globally (Rogerson & van der Merwe, 2016). That means tourism policies should cover the cultural heritage opportunities both locally and globally

Heritage tourism is regarded as the most important niche market and more popular than other types of tourism (Chen & Chen, 2012; David & van der Merwe , 2016). Furthermore, it provides protection for the heritage attractions that sustain the local economy because of the collective responsibility that tourists feel for these elements (Nuryanti, 1996). Heritage tourism is a difficult concept to define (Li, Wu & Cai, 2008). There is little consensus on the definition of heritage tourism (Balcar & Pearce 1996, p. 203; Goh, 2010) Many definitions exist (Goh, 2010): nostalgia, romanticism, aesthetic pleasure and a sense of belongingness (Ashworth & Goodall, 1990), past images of history (Hewison, 1987), nostalgia and experience of cultural landscapes (Zeppel & Hall 1992), landscapes, natural history, buildings, artifacts and cultural traditions (Prentice, 1993; Carter & Horneman, 2001), history, culture, wildlife and landscape (Sharpley, 1993), activities of rural tourism (Lane, 1994), sociocultural assets (Fyall & Garrod, 1998), and ethnicity, nationalism and global identity (Hitchcock & King, 2003). Heritage tourism can be defined as tourists' visits to a particular destination to experience the past, history, culture, traditions, arts and crafts, music, dance, aesthetics, sociocultural assets, ethnicity, authenticity and the objects or things that are related to heritage. Heritage tourism can be classified into three groups. These are as follows (Jun, Nicholls & Vogt, 2004):

- Natural:
    - Landforms
    - Rural scenery
    - Flora and fauna

- Cultural:
    - Festivals
    - Arts/crafts
    - Traditional practices/products

- Built:
    - Historical buildings
    - Monuments
    - Industrial sites.

These categories, natural, cultural and built heritage, are so important for now and the future. Hence, heritage must be protected by stakeholders who have a role in the destination, such as local residents and tourist and destination managers. These categories have been extended by various authors (Perera, 2015). However, those generally accepted are listed as above. Besides,

in the Nebraska Heritage Tourism Plan (2011), five clear principles have been put forward for good, sustainable heritage tourism. These are as follows:

- Collaborate
- Find the fit between community and tourism
- Make sites and programs come alive
- Focus on quality and authenticity
- Preserve and protect irreplaceable resources.

In heritage sites, local residents first expect to increase their income and to improve the community through tourism. Also, local residents expect investments, economic benefits which last a long time and infrastructure improvements to improve (Marschall, 2012). Local residents use their heritage elements of traditional rituals, dance, music and crafts in tourism and benefit from some economic gains (Günlü, Pırnar & Yağcı, 2009). However, when local residents benefit from the tourism industry, they actually interact with tourists, and an encounter happens with them first. This situation creates mutual influence, because tourists encounter a culture that they are unused to, and local residents interact with people that they do not know. Multiple studies have been conducted to measure and observe the impacts of these encounters (Bello, Neil, Lovelock & Xu, 2017; Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012; Marković & Klarić, 2015). But a few studies have investigated the impact on heritage sites (Okech, 2010; Rasoolimanesh, Roldán, Jaafar & Ramayah, 2017; Jimura, 2011; Nicholas, Thapa & Ko., 2009).

As heritage is the backbone of a tourist destination for local, regional and national development and identity owing to its cultural, environment and economic resources, it must be protected and developed sustainably. Therefore, it must be handled with an integrated approach among stakeholders (Bujdosó et al., 2015). This will provide economic benefits for the destination as well as local residents. This benefits local residents by protecting their heritage sites and sustains their heritage, which is tangible and intangible. This is so important because tourists desire to see authenticity in the destination and travel for it (Nicolaides, 2014).

Sociocultural impact of tourism

Apart from the economic and environmental impacts of tourism, there is also the sociocultural impact that causes positive or negative consequences in terms of social and cultural changes (Gjerald, 2005). The sociocultural impact of tourism has been defined by Pizam and Milman (1986, p. 29) as "the ways in which tourism is contributing to changes in value systems, individual behavior, family relationships, collective lifestyles, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremonies and community organization."

As stated above, tourism is a temporary relationship between local residents and tourists. Therefore, during a stay, some sociocultural impacts are revealed as a result of this interaction in the host society, including changes in value systems, individual behavior, family relationships, collective lifestyles, traditional ceremonies or community organization (Milman & Pizam, 1988). Also, the impacts that result from tourism are extremely important for tourism planning. The social impact of tourism is particularly important in order to acquire information from local communities (Ap, 1990).

Studies conducted on the sociocultural impacts of tourism have gradually increased. These can be classified into four main groups: host–guest interaction and relationship, sociocultural impacts of tourism in general, sociocultural impacts as perceived by local residents, and response to the impacts of tourism and adjustment strategies (Gjerald, 2005).

There are three main contexts for encounters between tourist and host: where the tourist is buying some good or is offered a service by the host, where they meet in any other place in a destination, and when they come face to face for the purpose of sharing information and ideas (de Kadt, 1979). Reisinger (2009) implied that social contact between tourists and hosts occurs usually at any tourist attractions and when tourists purchase goods or services from hosts. These contexts impact the results of the interaction taking place between tourists and host (Eusébio & Carneiro, 2012). Changes derived from this interaction in the host society's quality of life are revealed by two major factors, which are the tourist–host relationship and the development of the tourism industry (Ratz, 2000).

Encounters between different cultures in international tourism areas likely happen in terms of cross-cultural encounters, because a tourist who wonders about different cultures travels for this purpose and has contact with people who belong to those cultures (Chiemi, 2003). Besides, tourism, by definition, brings people together for a limited time in any destination in terms of the main characteristics of tourism, which are named the spatial and time aspects (Fennell, 2006). These characteristics provide an occurrence of the tourist–host interaction (Reisinger & Turner, 2003).

A number of features of the tourist–host relationship are characterized by various authors. These features differ in studies conducted in different destinations. They are listed below (UNESCO, 1975; Reisinger, 2009; Ronay, 2011; Jafari, 1986; de Kadt, 1979; Milman & Pizam, 1988):

- There is a transitory relationship, a lack of time and space, an inequality, and spontaneous encounters that occur between tourist and host society.
- As tourists generally stay in any destination for a short time, the relationship between them is not important. That means that there is no opportunity to improve their relationship.
- Before the development of tourism, the relationship was based on traditional hospitality in some destination. In the next phase of this development, this spontaneous hospitality turns into a commercial one, and those values are commercialized over time.
- Tourist–host interaction obviously leads to mistrust, exploitative behavior and deception. This, hence, impacts the host society substantially in terms of the sociocultural aspect.

One of the most important sociocultural impacts of tourism which is handled in tourism studies is regarded as the "demonstration effect"; it concerns visible differences between tourist and host and creates detrimental impacts on the socioculture of the host society (Mason, 2003). It usually occurs where interactions between tourist and host are relatively transitory, with a short-lived stay. Mathieson and Wall (1987) define the demonstration effect as people trying to imitate "the behaviors and spending patterns of others." On the other side, Xenos (1989) evaluates it as people copying their betters. In the light of this information, in tourism studies, it is defined as the host society copying tourists' behavior. In such a case, the hosts' behaviors change. But it is difficult to understand the demonstration effect in terms of how, when and why it occurred. Also, it must be noted that tourists can copy the host community's behavior patterns (Fisher, 2004). This concept is reinforced by Reisinger (2009) referring to local residents adapting the styles and manners of visiting tourists. Furthermore, the decision-making process of the demonstration effect has three basic propositions needed for it to exist. These are suggested to be (Fisher, 2004):

1   The behavior of tourists and hosts is initially different.
2   Behavioral patterns are transferred from one group to the other.
3   The imitators maintain the demonstrated behavior.

Apart from these effects, tourism can provide some improvements and changes in the quality of life, social structure and social organization of the local society (Ratz, 2000). Host communities are also affected by the tourism industry itself, as stated above. The tourism industry is believed to create the opportunity for new employment in the destination (Vroom, 1979; Kozak, Kozak & Kozak, 2017). However, because of the employment characteristic of tourism, the jobs are seasonal, lower-skilled or unskilled, the positions are temporary, and payments are lower and have no stability (Jolliffe & Farnsworth, 2003; Centre for Economics and Business Research, 2014; Barrett, 1987). The development of tourism can contribute to the destination's economy in terms of revenue, but this situation can impact or change utterly occupations in the destination or traditional work patterns such as those in agriculture. This adaptive process can be difficult for local society (Jayaprakashnarayana & Raghu, 2016). For instance, the existing agriculture in Kemer, located in Turkey, lost its workforce to tourism as a result of tourism development (Aykaç, 2009). Other important impacts of tourism development can be listed as follows (Marković & Klarić, 2015; Tsartas, 2004; Khadaroo & Seetanah, 2008; Milman & Pizam, 1988):

- Tourism creates some changes in the size of the host population and its demographic structure.
- Tourism provides mobility for women and young adults.
- Tourism development results in infrastructure development in the destination.
- Finally, tourism development can impact positively by improving the quality of life of local people.

All studies on tourism's sociocultural impacts should include all stakeholders and relevant parties concerned with the positive and negative effects of tourism from a sociocultural point of view. Therefore, taking into account the perceptions and attitudes of local people, the local population should benefit as much as possible from the positive effects, and the negative effects should be reduced.

A few models have been put forward about reactions of local residents' interactions with tourists. One of the most prominent and well known is known as Doxey's irridex or "irritation index" (Reisinger, 2009). According to this theory, a temporal sequence takes place in local communities with regard to tourists. It involves euphoria, apathy, irritation and finally antagonism. At the first level, there is an informal relationship and a sense of excitement and anticipation between them. Then, at the second level, tourists are seen as a source of income, and contacts between them become more formal. At the third level, the local community begins to be annoyed by the industry itself. At this level, visitors continue to increase, and investments continue to be made. Eventually, irritations are displayed, verbally and physically (Murphy & Murphy, 2004; Canavan, 2014).

Another model is Butler's (1980) tourist area life-cycle model. There is a relationship between Doxey's irridex and Butler's (1980) tourist area life-cycle model. This model identifies a few phases (exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and decline or rejuvenation) in the evolution of tourism at any destination. Doxey's irridex and Butler's (1980) tourist area life-cycle model are evaluated under the extrinsic dimension with regard to theoretical and empirical aspects (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997).

A continuum has been put forward by Ap and Crompton (1993) who reported four main strategies, which comprised embracement, tolerance, adjustment and withdrawal. Tourism creates positive and negative impacts, and, therefore, five strategies to cope with these results have been identified: resistance, retreatism, boundary maintenance, revitalization and

adoption (Doğan, 1989). Also, the most significant contribution to this field is social exchange theory. Ap (1992) stated that this theory is the best and most relevant to measure the sociocultural impacts of tourism. It was first introduced by Emerson (1962). Ap (1992) applied it to tourism, where it explains impacts in the host community from tourism in terms of costs and benefits.

It has been stated in the Nebraska Heritage Tourism Plan (2011) that tourism protects cultural heritage values and development. Tourism policies should protect and develop cultural heritage values. Applying these policies, awareness is created, and local communities and tourists are informed by authorities. Thus, both are educated regarding cultural heritage values (Bello et al., 2017). When tourists visit a destination, they communicate with local people. Local people who have businesses are particularly obligated to learn their language. This situation encourages local people to learn a foreign language and creates new professions (Jack & Phipps, 2012; UNWTO, 2010). Besides, tourism provides gender mainstreaming between people and creates some improvements in women's rights. In particular, women participate in the division of labor and gain economic potential (UNWTO, 2010). Also, tourism increases not only economic awareness for women but also social and political terms changing traditional gender roles (Hemingway, 2004). Furthermore, tourism encourages the emergence of new social institutions. This happens especially in less-developed destinations (Milne & Ateljevic, 2001). Additionally, tourism improves recreational benefits (parks, playgrounds, sports fields, bike lanes, etc.) in a destination and presents leisure opportunities not only for tourists, but also for local residents (Cioban & Slusariuc, 2014).

On the other hand, tourism development changes the demographic structure of society, the age of the population and population location (UNWTO, 2012). In the destination, tourists are seen as wealthy people and are served by local people. However, not all local people participate in tourism. This creates a social imbalance between local people and changes the lifestyles of local people (Ronay, 2011). Tourism also creates cultural degeneration (Güzel, 2013), cultural diffusion, which refers to cultural elements between tourists and local people, cultural change (Reisinger, 2009) and cultural commercialization (Coronado, 2014). Furthermore, it causes an increased crime rate (Okech, 2010), hostility to foreigners (Reisinger, 2009), overcrowding (Gill & Williams, 1994) and language deterioration and corruption (Lytras & Papageorgiou, 2015).

Studies of sociocultural impacts of tourism development on heritage sites

Heritage sites have been evaluated as of great importance for tourism by academics, government and industry (Okech, 2010). Tourism based on the use of heritage sites has been increasing in developing countries and is taken into consideration by destination stakeholders. In general, some governments use these sites to decrease alleviation and create new jobs in these countries (Lapeyre, 2011). This is so important for a country which wishes to decrease statistics related to these situations. As tourism generates employment, large-scale revenues, exchange earnings and so on, the economic benefit is obvious and inevitable. Also, tourism stimulates the improvement and conservation of cultural heritage areas (Bello et al., 2017). Therefore, measuring the sociocultural impacts of tourism is crucial for these destinations. However, limited studies have directly studied heritage destinations.

A study by Okech (2010) was concerned with the sociocultural impacts of tourism from the communities' perspective in two heritage sites, Lamu (Kenya) and Zanzibar Islands. In this study, surveys, participant observation, existing literature and short informal interviews were

used in a mixed methodological approach. A total of 220 sample sets and a survey were applied to adult family residents. The main results gained from the study were as follows (Okech, 2010):

- The majority of the participants (85%) had dwelt on the islands for more than 15 years (Lamu), and 45% of them were employed full time in tourism businesses, 30% part time, and the rest were running their own establishments. Hence, attitudes to tourism were positive, and nearly 70% of them favored the presence of tourists in the destination.
- On the two islands, the residents did not think that tourism deteriorated the image of the islands, with results of 6% in Lamu and 5% in Zanzibar. In other words, there was no difference between them.
- Social benefits included positive outputs toward local tourism and traditional lifestyles.
- Residents who dwelt on both Lamu and Zanzibar (18%) wanted to increase the number of tourists. However, 14% in Lamu and 15% in Zanzibar preferred not to increase it.
- On both islands, residents had a significant level of control over destination management, and residents in Lamu (73%) and residents in Zanzibar (64%) were aware that these destinations are World Heritage Sites.
- Participation in tourism varied between residents. Some of them implied that the government should encourage participation in tourism facilities. Others stated that it should be dependent on the government.
- Residents had a great deal of knowledge about their ecosystems.
- Residents thought that costs of living increased as a result of tourism.
- Residents were worried about negative impacts of tourism as a result of development. They thought that an increase in crime and vandalism, feeling less safe, degradation of their culture and heritage and traffic problems had been revealed.
- A measurement related to tourism management concluded that men (90%) dominated committees and groups.
- It was stated that local residents were perceived to improve some changes, such as cost of land, employment opportunities, cultural identity, standard of living, conservation of old buildings, littering and cultural facilities.
- It was concluded that an increase in cost of living, noise, crime and congestion were perceived to have been revealed by local residents.

In summary, the research by Okech (2010) suggested positive and negative sociocultural impacts from tourism. These impacts were revealed over time, and benefits were perceived by local residents. At this point, it can be said that there is support for Doxey's idea. Also, it is known generally that tourism benefits women in areas such as entrepreneurship and employment. However, in this study, women were not dominant in tourism management committees and groups. Therefore, it can be said that there is a gender difference in heritage sites. But it varies between destinations. In general, residents of heritage sites are aware of their culture and ecosystems and they resist some changes to their value systems.

In a study carried out to explore impacts of tourism in cultural and heritage sites by Gnanapala and Sandaruwani (2016), data were collected in semi-structured interviews, focused group discussions, documents and participant observation, and secondary data were obtained from online media. It was carried out in the Sacred City of Anuradhapura (1982), the Ancient City of Polonnaruwa (1982), the Golden Temple of Dambulla (1991), the Ancient City of Sigiriya (1982), the Sacred City of Kandy (1988) and the Old Town of Galle and its fortifications (1988). Findings obtained from the research process concluded that there were positive and negative impacts of tourism in terms of general impacts. Positive

impacts are considered as income generation, employment generation, development of cottage and supportive industries, support for regional development such as road networks, water, electricity, safety and security, and so on. Negative impacts are listed such as over-concentration on tourism, conflicts of interests, unauthorized constructions and modifications, inappropriate behavior of tourists, misinterpretations through guiding, and poor site management and site facility management. In this study, the authors evaluated the general impacts of tourism and while the economic benefits were found to be positive, the sociocultural impacts of tourism were found to be negative. These effects are likewise revealed in the study by Nkwanyana (2012).

Ongkhluap (2012) measured the perceptions of the host community in terms of tourism impacts on the Ayutthaya World Heritage Site. The evaluation in this study concerned economic and sociocultural values. It was concluded that the community desired to develop heritage conservation via tourism, such as the enhancement of a good community image and the enhancement of the conservation of historical buildings and archaeological remains, and the study confirmed that tourism improves community members' quality of life. They stated that tourism should be managed and improved. Rasoolimanesh et al. (2017) investigated residents' perceptions of tourism development comparing differences between rural and urban World Heritage Sites. The study was carried out in two areas, rural Lenggong and urban George Town World Heritage Sites in Malaysia. The results of the study considered the positive and negative impacts of tourism associated with economic gain, community involvement, environmental attitude and community attachment. Positive impacts resulted in economic benefit, and locals perceived that tourism increased their standard of living. Among the negative impacts, one indicator of sociocultural impacts related to an increasing rate of crime due to tourism was revealed. They did not think tourism caused an increase in the rate of crime.

A study carried out in Mardin, located in Turkey, put forward perceived impacts of tourism development at cultural heritage sites. According to the results of the study, economic benefit, environmental problems and preservation of the heritage site are the effects of tourism development (Gündüz & Erdem, 2010). Akova (2006) conducted a study to determine residents' perceptions of and attitudes to tourism impacts on two different dates, in 2001 and 2003, in a newly developing cultural heritage destination in Cumalıkızık, Turkey. In the study, economic benefits, social cost, cultural enhancement and damage to the environment were determined as impact factors. In the results of the study, the factor of social cost perception varied between the two dates. In 2001, it was seen that those who do not work in tourism, those with a high average age, those who are native to Cumalıkızı, those who do not have contact with tourists, those with a low education level and males negatively perceived the social cost of tourism. In 2003, there were no significant differences between the social factors and the education-level variables. However, in 2003, there were significant differences between the social factors during the period of living in the region. Those who had a high average age in 2003 and who lived longer in the region, those who had no contact with tourists and those who did not work in tourism businesses were perceived as negative about all factors related to the social cost of tourism. Also, the factor of cultural enhancement perception varied between the two dates. It was revealed that, in 2001, those who had a higher level of education, those who had contact with tourists, and those who worked in tourism businesses positively perceived one or more of the factors of cultural enhancement. In 2003, those who had a higher average age, those who had a higher education level, those who worked in tourism businesses, and those who had contact with tourists perceived cultural enhancement positively. In 2003, there were differences in perceptions compared with 2001. In 2003, there was no significant difference in the perception of cultural enhancement factors among locals, but there was a significant difference between those

with higher age averages and cultural enhancement factors. In this study, it was revealed that the perception of the social cost and cultural enhancement effects of tourism varies depending on the development level and demographic factors, and the perception of demographic factors may be affected by the level of development of the destination at the time.

Among these studies, only the study conducted by Okech (2010) directly examined the sociocultural impacts of tourism. In the literature, authors analyzed the general impacts of tourism at heritage sites, such as a mixture of cultural, economic and enviromental impacts. These are studies measured indirectly perceived impacts or interaction of tourist and local host encounters.

Conclusions

This chapter aims to reveal the sociocultural impacts of tourism development in heritage sites. Tourism is an important industry in the world and creates many economic benefits for countries and regions, and communities also benefit from tourism. On the other hand, the movement of people from one place to another creates some positive and some negative impacts for those concerned. These effects need to be managed for the sustainability of destinations. The sociocultural impacts of tourism are widely researched by academicians within the scope of the overall effects of tourism. But there are limited studies that focus on the sociocultural impacts of tourism. The sociocultural impact of tourism has been defined by Pizam and Milman (1986, p. 29) as "the ways in which tourism is contributing to changes in value systems, individual behavior, family relationships, collective lifestyles, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremonies and community organization." The sociocultural impacts of tourism cover these changes in a destination.

Sociocultural impacts are revealed as a result of interaction in the host society and include changes in value systems, individual behavior, family relationships, collective lifestyles, traditional ceremonies and community organization. Tourist–host interaction obviously can lead to mistrust, exploitative behavior and deception. This, hence, impacts substantially on the host society from a sociocultural point of view. Changes derived from this interaction in the host society's quality of life are revealed by two major factors, which are the tourist–host relationship and the development of the tourism industry. Tourism can provide some improvements and changes in quality of life, social structure and social organization of local society, family relationships and lifestyles, improve education in the region, develop a tolerant environment, aid progress in women's rights, improve leisure time activities and recreational benefits, develop awareness of historical and cultural values, lead to foreign language learning, create new professions and cause the emergence of new social institutions. On the other hand, it causes changes in the size of the host population and its demographic structure and lifestyles, increases imbalances between social classes, creates cultural diffusion, cultural pollution, cultural degeneration and cultural change, can increase foreign hostility and crime rates, and can cause cultural commercialization, overcrowding, deterioration in local traditions, language deterioration and destruction of traditional sectors.

Development of tourism can contribute to destination economies in terms of revenue, but this situation can utterly change occupations in the destination or traditional work patterns, such as in agriculture. This adaptive process can be difficult for the local society, and this change can also affect the sociocultural structure of the local community.

One of the most important sociocultural impacts of tourism handled in tourism studies is regarded as the "demonstration effect," which is interested in visible differences between tourist and host and creates detrimental impacts on the socioculture of the host society.

Heritage is an important part of a destination culture and attracts tourists with its unique cultural values. As the local heritage become part of a destination, undesired consequences may threaten heritage sites' sustainability, and, because of pressure on cultural resources and deterioration in the destination, residents may not support tourism development. Heritage site residents use their heritage elements, traditional rituals, dances, music and crafts in tourism and benefit from some economic gains (Günlü et al., 2009). However, when local residents benefit from the tourism industry, they actually interact with tourists, and an encounter happens first between them. This situation creates mutual influence, because tourists encounter an unfamiliar culture, and local residents interact with people that they do not know. Multiple studies have been conducted to measure and observe these encounter impacts. According to studies conducted in heritage sites, the negative sociocultural effects of tourism development are overconcentration on tourism, conflicts of interests, increase in cost of land, unauthorized construction and modifications, inappropriate behavior of tourists, misinterpretations through guiding, poor site management and site facility management, an increase in crime and vandalism, feeling less safe, degradation of culture and heritage, and traffic problems, and increases in cost of living, noise and congestion. On the other hand, the positive effects of tourism development are the desire to develop heritage conservation via tourism, such as the enhancement of a good community image, the enhancement of the conservation of historical buildings and archaeological remains, improvement in quality of life, income generation, employment generation, development of cottage and supportive industries, support for regional development such as road networks, water, electricity, safety and security, and so on, cultural identity, standard of living, littering and cultural facilities. Also, it can be emphasized that the sociocultural impacts of tourism vary depending on the development level and demographic factors, and the perception of demographic factors may be affected by the level of development of the destination at the time. These studies conducted in heritage sites show that tourism development improves and conserves cultural heritage areas and their infrastructure and develops quality of life at the destination. On the other hand, degradation of the culture and heritage and traffic problems, poor management, increases in cost of living, noise, crime and congestion are the main negative affects which local residents perceive from tourism development.

As a result, the sociocultural effects of tourism development in heritage sites are similar to those obtained from studies conducted in other areas. However, those living in these cultural heritage sites perceive that tourism development will protect the cultural heritage, preserve old structures and raise living standards. Cultural areas are of great importance in terms of human history. However, tourism activities that develop in cultural heritage sites cause both positive and negative effects. For this reason, it is necessary to protect cultural heritage sites and preserve them for future generations. The protection of cultural heritage and the achievement of the sociocultural and economic development of people living in cultural heritage areas depend on the adoption of sustainable tourism. Within the scope of sustainable tourism activities, it is possible to reduce the adverse effects of tourism on heritage sites. New business areas, employment opportunities, restoration of old buildings, and infrastructure and superstructure renewal in the heritage sites thanks to tourism development may change the public's point of view about tourism development for a certain period in a positive way. But, when the negative effects arise, residents' attitudes will become negative. For this reason, tourism development needs to be developed in line with sustainable tourism principles. For this, it is important for all stakeholders to participate in the tourism planning process to be carried out on tourism development. Also, the sociocultural effects of tourism development in heritage sites need to be studied more widely to develop an understanding of sustainable tourism in heritage sites.

References

Akova, O. (2006). Yerel halkın turizmin etkilerini algılamalarına ve tutumlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, 1 (2), 1–34.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17 (4), 610–616.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19 (4), 665–690.

Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (1), 47–50.

Ashworth, G., & Goodall, B. (1990). Tourist images: Marketing considerations, in B. Goodall, & G. Ashworth (Eds.), *Marketing in the Tourism Industry*, pp. 213–233. London: Routledge.

Aykaç, A. (2009). *Yeni işler, Yeni İşçiler: Turizm Sektöründe Emek*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Balcar, M., & Pearce, G. (1996). Heritage tourism on the west coast of New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 17 (1), 203–212.

Barrett, R. (1987). Tourism employment in Montana: quality versus quantity? *Western Wildlands*, 13 (2), 18–21.

Bello, F., Neil, C., Lovelock, B., & Xu, F. (2017). Local residents' perceptions of socio-cultural impacts of tourism in Mangochi, Malawi. *Advances in Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 5 (1), 1–22.

Bujdosó, Z. D., Tőzsér, A., Kovács, G., Major-Kathi, V., Uakhitova, G., Katona, P., et al. (2015). Basis of heritagization and cultural tourism development. *Procedia-Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 307–315.

Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 24 (1), 5–12.

Canavan, B. (2014). Beyond Doxey, beyond Butler: Building upon insights in small island tourism research to extend tourism theory. British Academy of Management Conference. Belfast, NI.

Carter, R., & Horneman, L. (2001). Is there a market for heritage tourism? *Bulletin of Australian Institute for Marine Archaeology*, 25, 61–68.

Centre for Economics and Business Research. (2014). *Understanding the Travel and Tourism Labour Market*. London: Association of British Travel Agents.

Chen, C. F., & Chen, P. C. (2012). Exploring tourists' stated preferences for heritage tourism services— The Case of Tainan City, Taiwan. *Tourism Economics*, 18 (2), 457–464.

Chiemi, Y. (2003). *Tourist Encounters with Other Tourists*. Queensland: James Cook University.

Cioban, G. L., & Slusariuc, G. C. (2014). The effect of leisure time on touristic resources and on the quality of life. *Ecoforum Journal*, 3 (1). www.ecoforumjournal.ro/index.php/eco/article/view/91

Coronado, G. (2014). Selling culture? Between commoditisation and cultural control in indigenous alternative tourism. *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 12 (1), 11–28.

David, C., & van der Merwe , C. D. (2016). Tourist guides' perceptions of cultural heritage tourism in South Africa. *Bulletin of Geography*. *Socio-economic Series*, 34, 117–130.

de Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism—Passport to Development? Perspectives on the Social and Cultural Effects of Tourism in Developing Countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Doğan, H. Z. (1989). Forms of adjustment: Sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 16 (2), 216–236.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *Annals Review of Sociology*, 27 (1), 31–41.

Eusébio, C. A., & Carneiro, M. J. (2012). Determinants of tourist–host interactions: An analysis of the university student market. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 13 (2), 123–151.

Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5 (1), 3–28.

Fennell, D. A. (2006). Evolution in tourism: The theory of reciprocal altruism and tourist–host interactions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9 (2), 105–124.

Fisher, D. (2004). The demonstration effect revisited. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (2), 428–446.

Fyall, A., & Garrod, B. (1998) Heritage tourism: At what price? *Managing Leisure*, 3 (4), 213–228

Gill, A., & Williams, P. (1994). Managing growth in mountain tourism communities. *Tourism Management*, 15 (3), 212–220.

Goh, E. (2010). Understanding the heritage tourist market segment. *International Journal of Leisure & Tourism Marketing*, 1 (3), 257–270.

Gjerald, O. (2005). Sociocultural impacts of tourism: A case study from Norway. *Journal of Tourism & Cultural Change*, 3 (1,)36–58.

Gnanapala, W. A., & Sandaruwani, J. A. (2016). Impacts of tourism development in cultural and heritage sites: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Economics & Business Administration*, 2 (6), 68–78.

Gündüz, E., & Erdem, R. (2010). The perceived impacts of tourism development at cultural heritage sites—Mardin sample. Urban Transformation: Controversies, Contrasts & Challenges, IPHS 14th Biennial Conference, Isanbul, pp. 1–9.

Günlü, E., Pırnar, İ., & Yağcı, K. (2009). Preserving cultural heritage and possible impacts on regional development: Case of Izmir. *International Journal of Emerging & Transition Economies*, 2 (2), 213–229.

Güzel, F. Ö. (2013). Tourism as a paradox creative sector from socio–cultural perspective: A sociological analysis on Dalyan destination. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 10 (1), 780–794.

Hemingway, S. (2004). The impact of tourism on the human rights of women in South East Asia. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 8 (3), 275–304.

Hewison, R. (1987). *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen.

Hitchcock, M., & King, V. (2003). Discourses with the past: Tourism and heritage in South East Asia. *Indonesia & Malay World*, 31 (89), 2–15.

Ivanovic, M., & Saayman, M. (2013). South Africa calling cultural tourists. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation & Dance*, 19, 138–154.

Jack, G., & Phipps, A. (2012). Tourism. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 537–551). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Jafari, J. (1986). A systemic view of sociocultural dimensions of tourism. In: *President's Commission on American Outdoors* (pp. 33–50). Washington, DC: United States Travel and Tourism Administration.

Jayaprakashnarayana, G., & Raghu, A. (2016). *Tourism Management Philosophies, Principles and Practices*. Hyderabad: Zenon Academic Publications.

Jimura, T. (2011). The impact of World Heritage Site designation on local communities—A case study of Ogimachi, Shirakawamura, Japan. *Tourism Management* , 32 (2), 288–296.

Jolliffe, L., & Farnsworth, R. (2003). Seasonality in tourism employment: Human resource challenges. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15 (6), 312–316.

Jun, S. H., Nicholls, S., & Vogt, C. (2004). Heeding the call for heritage tourism: More visitors want an 'experience' in their vacations–something a historical park can provide. *Parks & Recreation*, 39 (9), 38–49.

Khadaroo, J., & Seetanah, B. (2008). The role of transport infrastructure in international tourism development: A gravity model approach. *Tourism Management*, 29 (5), 831–840.

Kozak, N., Kozak, M., & Kozak, M. (2017). *Genel Turizm İlkeler Ve Kavramlar*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Lane, B. (1994). Sustainable rural tourism strategies: A tool for development and conservation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2 (1/2), 102–111.

Lapeyre, R. (2011). The Grootberg lodge partnership in Namibia: Towards poverty alleviation and empowerment for long–term sustainability? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14 (3), 221–234.

Li, Y. (2003). Heritage tourism: The contradictions between conservation and change. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 4 (3), 247–261.

Li M., Wu B., & Cai, L. (2008). Tourism development of world heritage sites in China: A geographic perspective. *Tourism Management*, 29 (2), 308–319.

Lytras, P., & Papageorgiou, A. (2015). *Tourism That Hurts: The Invisible and Defamatory Side of Tourism*. Athens: Papazisis.

Marković, I., & Klarić, Z. (2015). Attitudes of local population of tourism impacts on destination sustainability—Case of Croatia. *Turizam*, 19 (3), 98–110.

Marschall, S. (2012). Sustainable heritage tourism: The Inanda Heritage Route and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (5), 721–736.

Mason, P. (2003). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Oxford: Elsevier, Butterworth-Heinemann.

Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1987). *Tourism: Economic, Physical, and Social Impacts*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15 (2), 191–204.

Milne, S., & Ateljevic, I. (2001). Tourism, economic development and the global–local nexus: theory embracing complexity. *Tourism Geographies*, 3 (4), 369–393.

Murphy, P. E., & Murphy, A. E. (2004). *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gaps*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Nebraska Heritage Tourism Plan. (2011). *Nebraska Heritage Tourism Plan*. Retrieved April 4, 2018, from govdocs.nebraska.gov/epubs/H6000/B027-2011.pdf

Nicholas, L., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. (2009). Residents' perspectives of a World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research* , 36 (3), 390–412.

Nicolaides, A. (2014). Authenticity and the tourist's search for being. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 3 (1), 1–11.

Nkwanyana, M. S. (2012). *The Potential of Cultural Heritage Tourism as a Driver of Rural Development in the Zululand District Municipality*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Zululand.

Nuryanti, W. (1996). Heritage and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (2), 249–260.

Okech, R. (2010). Socio-cultural impacts of tourism on World Heritage sites: Communities' perspective of Lamu (Kenya) and Zanzibar Islands. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 15 (3), 339–351.

Ongkhluap, S. (2012). Tourism impacts on the Ayutthaya World Heritage Site: Measuring the perceptions of the host community. *Journal of International & Thai Tourism*, 8 (1), 31–55.

Perera, K. (2015). The role of museums in cultural and heritage tourism for sustainable economy in developing countries. Colombo: Regional Centre for Strategic Studies.

Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1986). The social impacts of tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 11 (1), 29–33.

Prentice, R. (1993). *Tourism and Heritage Attractions*. London: Routledge.

Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Roldán, J. L., Jaafar, M., & Ramayah, T. (2017). Factors influencing residents' perceptions toward tourism development: Differences across rural and urban world heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56 (6), 760–775.

Ratz, T. (2000). Residents' perceptions of the socio-cultural impacts of tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary. In G. Richards & D. Hall (Eds.), *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development* (pp. 36–47). London: Routledge.

Reisinger, Y. (2009). *International Tourism: Cultures and Behavior*. Hungary: Butterworth-Heinemann-Elsevier.

Reisinger, Y., & Turner, L. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Behavior in Tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann.

Rogerson, C. M., & van der Merwe, C. D. (2016). Heritage tourism in the Global South: Development impacts of the cradle of humankind world heritage site, South Africa. *Local Economy*, 31 (1–2), 234–248.

Ronay, S. (2011). *Turizm Bir Sistem Analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Sharpley, R. (1993) *Tourism and Leisure in the Countryside*. Huntington, UK: ELM Publications.

Tsartas, P. (2004). Tourism development in Greek insular and coastal areas: Sociocultural changes and crucial policy issues. In B. Bramwell, *Coastal Mass Tourism: Diversification and Sustainable Development in Southern Europe* (pp. 68–84). Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

UNESCO. (1975). The effects of tourism on socio-cultural values. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4 (2), 74–105.

UNWTO. (1998). *Community Methodology on Tourism Statistics*. Luxembourg: European Union.

UNWTO. (2010). *Global Report on Women in Tourism 2010*. New York: UNWTO.

UNWTO. (2012). *Demographic Change and Tourism*. New York: UNWTO.

Van der Merwe, C. D., & Rogerson, C. M. (2013). Industrial heritage tourism at the "big hole", Kimberley, South Africa. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation & Dance*, 2, 155–171.

Vroom, J. A. (1979). Employment opportunity through tourism. *The Tourist Review*, 34 (3), 10–11.

World Bank. (1999). *Sustainable Tourism and Cultural Heritage: A Review of Development Assistance and Its Potential to Promote Sustainability*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Xenos, N. (1989). *Scarcity and Modernity*. London: Routledge.

Zeppel, H., & Hall, C. (1992). Arts and heritage tourism. In B. Weiler & C. Hall (Eds.), *Special Interest Tourism* (pp. 47–68). London: Belhaven.