



A Comparative Life Cycle Analysis of Two Mass Tourism Destinations in Turkey**

* Aynur GÜLEŇÇ BİRSEN^a , Yasin BİLİM^a 

^a Konya Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Management, Konya/Turkey

Article History

Received: 15.04.2019

Accepted: 20.06.2019

Keywords

Destination life cycle

Tourism development

Decline

Abstract

Tourism destinations pass through different stages of development, experiencing a life-style similar to that of humans and commercial products. This course, which starts with the discovery process, continues to declining stage for several reasons. Postponing the process depends on determining what development stage destinations are in and how they develop. The aim of this study is to determine the applicability of Butler's "Destination life cycle" model to Alanya and Manavgat which are two most important mass tourism destinations in Turkey and analyze what development stages they are in and compare their tourism developments within the context of the model. In the research, semi-structured interviewing techniques and document analysis were used. The findings were analyzed with descriptive analysis. As a result of the research, it was determined that Butler's model is consistent with the tourism development of Alanya and Manavgat destinations and both destinations are in "stagnation".

Article Type

Research Article

* Corresponding Author

E-mail: abirsen@konya.edu.tr (A. GüleŇç Birsen)

Suggested Citation: GüleŇç Birsen, A. & Bilim, Y. (2019). A Comparative Life Cycle Analysis of Two Mass Tourism Destinations in Turkey, *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 7 (2), 1290-1313.

DOI: 10.21325/jotags.2019.421

**This study was developed from a doctorate thesis named "Destinasyon Yaşam Döngüsü Modeliyle Eski ve Yeni Destinasyonların Gelişim Süreçlerinin İncelenmesi: Yerel Halk Algısına Dayalı Planlama Önerileri"

INTRODUCTION

Just like commercial products and human beings, tourism destinations also show a similar life cycle such as birth, childhood, youth, maturity and elderliness. This process can take a shorter or longer time than human life, depending on many factors. During the first stages of development of tourism activities, the benefits provided to the locals are excessive. So the negative effects are not realized because of the low number of tourists. However, as the life stage changes and the number of tourist increases, tourism carrying capacity of destinations decreases and it will not be possible to compensate the negative effects of tourism (Martin & Uysal, 1990).

In particular mature coastal destinations offering traditional products pass to the declining stage due to problems such as losing their old charm, having social, economic and environmental problems, decreasing number of visitors, deterioration of natural environment and image loss. These problems force tourism planners and managers to develop various strategies to extend the life span and increase their competitive power. Otherwise, the declining process of these destinations will become faster. Therefore, the success of the planning and management activities done with a sustainable development aim in social, environmental and economical sense is only possible by understanding which stages destinations are in, what their carrying capacity limits are, how they develop and why they change.

According to many tourism researchers, Butler's "Destination Life Cycle (Tourist Area Life Cycle-TALC)" model (1980) is seen as a useful model in terms of providing predictions related to the prolongation of life span by avoiding the collapse of destinations. In the model, tourist carrying capacity is the point that Butler emphasized much. If the destination tourist carrying capacity limits are exceeded, it will lose its competitive power in course of time. As a result, number of visitors will decrease and tourism development will pass to declining stage (Butler, 1980; Martin & Uysal, 1990; Getz, 1992; Agarwal, 1997; Baum, 1998; Ellul & Jurado, 2014).

Alanya and Manavgat, offering products for traditional mass tourism in Turkey since 1980's, can be considered to enter into a risky process or even collapse by showing a similar development to many mass tourism destinations that have experienced the declining process in the world. In this respect, the study aims to determine the applicability of "*destination life cycle-TALC*" model to Alanya and Manavgat which are among Turkey's first mass tourist destinations and to analyze what development stage they are in and to compare their tourism developments within the context of the model. To reach these aims is important in terms of learning their tourist carrying capacity limits, anticipating the problems that they may encounter in the future, taking precautions for possible negative impacts and prolonging their life span.

Literature Review

Destination Life Cycle (TALC)

Because of the dynamic structures of tourism destinations, it is important to determine in which life stage they are in to understand why the number of visitors rise, fall or stagnate in destinations where fluctuations in the number of visitors are seen. While they are popular tourist destinations which visitors preferred much in their first life stages, they change over time due to factors such as changes in tourism preferences and needs, gradually deteriorating natural and cultural attractions, infrastructure resources owned. Butler (1980) explains this theoretical development with "*destination life cycle (TALC)*" model (Butler, 1980). Although the applicability of the TALC model has been

discussed much, many researchers have used it in relation to the development of coastal resorts and accepted as a useful model (Hoviven, 1981; Cooper & Jackson, 1989; Martin & Uysal, 1990; Ioannides, 1992; Agarwal, 2002; Andriotis, 2005; Park, 2006; Güney, 2016).

It is possible to say that the starting point of this model is based on the "*product life cycle*" theory, which is traditionally known in the marketing sector. Accordingly, products pass through stages of "*entry, growth, maturity and regression*" just like any living organism (Casasnovas & Rossello, 2009). According to Butler, who sees destinations as touristic products, destinations are also developed to attract the tourist market as new products, and they change in order to appeal current market over time (Uysal et al., 2012; Crompton et al., 1987; Hoviven, 2002; Butler, 2011; Butler, 2014). Also, at the beginning of their life cycle they receive acceptance and demand. But after a while they become unfashionable and lose their old charm (Crompton et al., 1987; Hoviven, 2002; Butler, 2011; Uysal et al., 2012; Butler, 2014). While evaluating the course of development of a destination in terms of six life stages (exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and decline), Butler treats the number of tourists and the level of infrastructural facilities as development and change indicators (Agarwal, 1997; Casasnovas & Rossello, 2009; Uysal et al., 2012).

Changes and development indicators of each life stage in the development process of destinations can be summarized as follows:

Exploration: This is the first discovery of the destination. At first, only a small number of people know this place. But as its name is heard over time, a few adventurous tourists visit the area with a desire to discover an unspoiled and undiscovered destination. Livelihoods of the locals are mostly based on fisheries or agriculture. The seashores are underdeveloped and there is only one or two residential areas in the coastal area. As its transportation and tourist facilities are limited, visitors can only use local facilities. Hence there is a very positive interaction between visitors and locals. Besides, tourists often know the language and local culture of the community. In this phase, social and economic effects of tourism are often inconsiderable and perceptions of locals about tourism is positive (Butler, 1980; Tooman, 1997; Douglas, 1997; Andriotis, 2003; Andriotis, 2006; Brooker & Burgess, 2008; Uysal et al., 2012).

Involvement: Locals, municipalities, tradesmen, etc., who realize that visitors are interested in visiting their destination, begin to develop services for infrastructures, small-scale accommodation and catering facilities. It can be said that this process is the stage in which first tourist market and advertising activities are being tried to establish, the first pressures on local and official authorities are started in order to promote the region and attract visitors. So the perception of tourism season starts to occur. As more tourists become aware of the area, the number of tourists starts to increase (Butler, 1980; Lundtorp & Wanhill, 2001; Garay & Canoves, 2011; Uysal et al., 2012).

Development: It is a period in which a large number of visitors are attracted to the region with the increase in advertising activities. Number of visitors may even exceed the number of local residents. Tourism businesses can pass out of locals' control and foreign companies can invest to provide products and tourist opportunities to the region. Perhaps the most prominent feature of this stage is that locals, employees, companies providing tourist products and services have economic welfare. However, some of the developments and changes are not welcomed by locals. For example increasing number of visitors causes the local perceptions and attitudes of locals to change.

While the physical appearance of the region is changing considerably, a decrease in the quality of touristic service is seen due to overuse of tourist resources and overcrowding. In addition, this is the stage in which multi-purpose and large-scale hotels replace small ones; agricultural lands turning to theme parks, golf courses etc. Shortly, it is the stage where an artificial transformation is experienced in tourist attraction areas (Tooman, 1997; Andriotis, 2003; Garay & Canovas, 2011; Uysal et al., 2012).

Consolidation: Total number of visitors may exceed the number of residents. But the rate of tourists' visits may begin to decrease despite the fact that the absolute figures keep growing (Garay & Canovas, 2011). The fact that negative effects of tourism movements and increasingly worsening quality of life are felt very much by the locals, cause the public to show negative attitudes towards the visitors (Uysal et al., 2012). A large part of the economy now depends on tourism. The most striking aspect of this phase is that the developments in tourism begin to surpass the environmental, social and economic capacity (Butler, 1980).

Stagnation: Now maximum number of visitors and tourist carrying capacity limit have been reached or exceeded due to many factors causing economic, environmental or social problems (Andriotis, 2005). The maximum number of visitors caught can only be maintained with efforts of facility managers to encourage business visitors and repeat visits. In this process, artificial attractions replace natural or cultural ones and popularity of the destination has decreased (Tooman, 1997).

Decline: Even if the period of stagnation continues theoretically, destination will either fall back into a recession or renew itself and continue its life cycle again. Destination is no longer attractive to visitors during decline stage. This situation causes some tourism facilities to disappear from the market and the others to be pushed into an uncertainty (Uysal et al., 2012). According to Butler, decline is caused by a loss of market share resulting from a situation that cannot compete with new destinations. And it is a consequence of the reciprocal effects of internal and external forces and reduces the competitiveness of destinations (Butler, 1980).

Rejuvenation: This is the phase in which the destination entering the regression process is either renewed as a tourist product or re-entering the market. However, unless all of the destination planners and marketing agencies actively participate in this process and the existing attractions and facilities are completely changed, it will not be possible to rejuvenate the destination. The rejuvenation process, in which all stakeholders participate jointly, may be possible by developing previously unused natural attractions or by the creation of artificial attractions (Butler, 1980, 2008; Uysal et al., 2012).

Studies on Destination Life Cycle

The "TALC" (Tourist Area Life Cycle) model proposed by Butler (1980) has been used in many field researches, and its applicability has been discussed by many researchers and accepted as a useful model in relation to the various aspects of the development of coastal destinations (Lundtorp & Wanhill, 2001). Within these studies, Hoviven (1981) investigated visitor numbers with a historical approach in his study for Lancaster County in 1981. As a result of his research Hoviven concluded that model was in great harmony with the study and there was no collapse of the region's tourism (Hoviven, 1981).

Meyer, in his study of Louisiana "Grand Island" (1985), emphasized cultural and environmental processes and highlighted travel time durations, tourism building and capacity issues. The researcher concluded that the study supports the TALC model and the region is experiencing the decline (Lagiewski, 2006).

Cooper and Jackson, in their research on "Isle of Man" in 1990, used visitor numbers and other tourist statistics covering a 100-year period and made strategic suggestions for restructuring the region, stating that Butler's model was a useful model (Cooper & Jackson, 1989).

Martin and Uysal, in their research that was not bound to a particular destination in 1990, emphasized the importance of carrying capacity and stated that each life stage carries a different carrying capacity. Also different management policies are required for each stage (Martin & Uysal, 1990).

In his research on "Cyprus" in 1992, Ioannides addressed the model from all angles, focusing on the role of the government and dependence on foreign tour operators. In his study he used visitor numbers, number of beds, types of accommodation, tourist arrivals and tourist types as indicators. He concluded that government intentionally directed tourism to the consolidation phase. Besides he found that destinations follow a predictable life cycle through identifiable stages (Ioannides, 1992).

In 2002, during a study of three English coastal cities "Minehead, Weymouth and Scarborough" where mass tourism is common, Agarwal, used TALC and reconstruction theories together. The result of the study is that both theories provide a profound insight into the decline process and that a deeper understanding of the restructuring of the resorts is needed (Agarwal, 2002).

In a study of tourism development of the Greek island of Crete in 2001, Andriotis (2005) used historical data as indicators of change since the beginning of the 20th century. As a result Andriotis determined that the island was in maturity phase and emphasized the necessity of immediate action by the public and private enterprises in order to prevent the decline (Andriotis, 2005).

On the other hand, in his doctoral dissertation study on Jesu Island in South Korea in 2006, Park used elements such as visitor numbers, tourism incomes, developments of accommodation sector and travel agencies, tourism dependency and the structure of tourism industry as indicators of change. When these factors are taken into account, Park concluded that Jesu island is in consolidation phase in terms of visitor numbers, tourism revenue, travel agencies and the structure of the industry and in a stagnation phase in terms of hotels and tourism dependency (Park, 2006).

Güney (2016) investigating the tourism development of Kuşadası, coastal town in Turkey, in his master's thesis within the scope of Butler's model, came to the conclusion that Kusadasi's tourism development is in full harmony with the model. According to the researcher, Kusadasi experienced all phases of its life cycle as expressed in the model and has been in the process of decline (Güney, 2016).

Research

Methodology

It is desired to reach retrospective information within the process analysis logic in order to be able to examine the tourism developments and determine the life stages of research areas. Interviews and document analysis from

qualitative research techniques were used to reach these aims. But due to the inability to access formal and printed official materials for the pre-1980s at a satisfactory level, only limited document analysis was possible. Therefore, it was decided that the in-depth study of the past can only be reached through semi-structured interviews methods. And data obtained in these interviews continued to be used as supporting data for the post-1980 in addition to statistical ones such as tourist numbers, accommodation, tourism incomes, number of residents etc.

Sampling of the Research and Data Collecting Process

In the research where purposeful sampling was preferred, selection of the interviewee was provided with snowball sampling. Participants consist of 20 people, 5 female and 15 male, with different features such as local authorities in official institutions or tourism businesses, local representatives, sector representatives, historians and writers living in Alanya and Manavgat for many years. The time of the study is between 15 June - 15 July 2016.

Table 1. Demographic features of the participants

Participants	Gender	Occupation
K1	Male	Hotel Owner
K2	Male	Hotel Owner
K3	Male	Hotel Owner
K4	Male	Hotel Operator
K5	Male	Hotel Operator
K6	Male	Hotel Operator
K7	Female	Hotel Operator
K8	Male	Mayor
K9	Female	President Of Touristic Operators Association
K10	Male	Journalist-Writer
K11	Male	Director Of National Education
K12	Male	Historian
K13	Female	Artisan
K14	Female	Artisan
K15	Male	Artisan
K16	Male	Artisan
K17	Male	Artisan
K18	Male	Artisan
K19	Female	Tourism Agent
K20	Male	President Of Alanya Chamber Of Commerce

Before the semi-structured interviews, in accordance with the research aims and related literature resources, three basic questions were developed to analyze the tourism developments of Alanya and Manavgat. These questions are:

- When and how did the first tourism movements begin and develop?
- How did locals and local governments participate in the process?
- How were the developments of the sub and superstructure in both regions?

During the interviews, additional questions were asked taking into consideration the critical change and development indicators in TALC. Interviews were recorded by telephone, taking notes or by both methods according to participant's preferences.

Validity and reliability are the two most widely used measures in scientific researches for the credibility of the results. However, there have been some evaluations that it is more suitable to mention credibility, confirmability instead of validity, reliability and competence of researcher (Guba, 1981; Krefting, 1991). In this regard, Guba

emphasizes the importance of trustworthiness rather than validity - reliability in qualitative researches and set four main criteria as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. It is proposed to specify at least one of these criteria to control the accuracy of the findings (Başkale, 2016).

To ensure credibility in the study, obtained data in the interviews were verbally summarized to the participants and they were asked to confirm the accuracy of the information. Another technique used in the study is to have support from experts who have general knowledge of the research topic and expertise in qualitative research methods to prevent misinterpretation of data obtained. The third one used for ensuring the reliability of the research is that participants with different characteristics to include in the data source. Besides, interview data were also supported by document review techniques to increase the reliability.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis technique was used to analyze the research data. The purpose of descriptive analysis is to structure raw data in a way that readers can understand and use. In these analyzes, after the obtained data are firstly put into a logical order, descriptions made are interpreted and results of future estimations are reached. Quotations are also important in terms of reflecting the striking views of the participants. They can be obtained from interviews, observation notes, or other data collected from collection methods to ensure the reliability of the study in these analyzes, which are defined as the classification of data, summarization and coming to a conclusion (Altunışık et al., 2005: 258).

During the analysis process participants' answers were first converted into texts by quoting and summarizing under specific headings. In this phase parallel points which participants indicated with the critical change and development indicators expressed for each life phase in Butler's model were evaluated for pre-1980s rather than the statistical data which were mostly preferred by other researchers. For the post-1980 period sociological data obtained from the participants were also evaluated in addition to some statistics in order to identify the life cycle stages. The statistics are based on the number of tourists, number of accommodation facilities and beds, number of nights spent, population and tourism revenues. Thus, life stages of both destinations were defined by means of derived data. Consequently predictions for the future were put forward.

Alanya and Manavgat Destinations

Alanya and Manavgat, which are two neighboring tourism towns within the provincial boundaries of Antalya, are located on the Mediterranean region. Both destinations, whose economy is largely based on tourism and agriculture, were included within the scope of priority regions declared tourism development zone in 1982 with Tourism and Encouragement Law No. 2634 (Resmi Gazete, 1982). From this date these destinations became the first mass tourist areas with touristic investments thanks to the government, and passed on a process of urbanization rapidly with migrations from other cities in Turkey and foreign countries. Today Alanya and Manavgat, which are providing economical input significantly for the country, can be accepted as two of the Turkey's most important mass tourism destinations.

Life Cycle Analysis of Alanya and Manavgat According to Butler's Model

In this research, where mostly semi-structured interviewing was preferred, interviewing data were obtained with descriptive analysis in which parallel expressions of the participants with the change and development indicators proposed for each life stage in Butler's model were analyzed. In this process, the tourism developments of Alanya and Manavgat destinations were evaluated under certain headings. Also, while collecting and analyzing data, each participant was given codes like K1, K2,... In addition to the information gathered from the participants, a detailed document analysis related to the tourism developments such as population and secondary housing was carried out.

Exploration Stage

Some of the expressions of the participants for the first years of Alanya's tourism taking into consideration the changes and developmental factors proposed in the model are as follows;

K16: *"...The first tourism movements in Alanya started in 1948 with domestic tourism for health purposes after the discovery of Damlataş Cave... "*

K1: *"...Until these years, locals of Alanya were living on fishing, citrus, banana production and lumbering..."*

K5: *"...At the beginning of the 1950s, German and French intellectual traveling tourists coming by their caravans, not to exceed 3 to 5 people per year, were visiting the city for cultural purposes..."*

K2: *"...In this period, the infrastructure resources were insufficient. For example, in 1950s, the roads were stabilized and we traveled from Alanya to Manavgat in 3-4 hours and from Alanya to Antalya in 8-10 hours..."*

K6: *"...There were a few city hotels such as Alanya Palas, Dogan Hotel, Ferah Hotel, Kent Hotel, Riviera Hotel, Ankara Hotel meeting accommodation needs of the visitors coming for treatment purposes from 1950-1960..."*

K7: *"...Interaction between locals and visitors was extremely hearty. Locals were such hospitable people that they offered the fruits and vegetables they were growing in their own gardens to the visitors..."*

Exploration stage between 1950 -1960 for Alanya destination in the direction of the participants' statements can be summarized as follows:

Before the first tourism movements Alanya's economic structure was largely based on fishing, agriculture and lumber trade. Then the first tourism movements started as a domestic tourism for health after the accidental discovery of Damlataş cave in 1948. But a small number of intellectual foreign tourists who came by their caravans to discover the unique natural beauties were also among the first visitors of the town. The accommodation facilities were extremely insufficient. Moreover the vast majority of visitors were lodged in the homes of local people. When the economic structure of the city, the lack of tourist infrastructure, a small number of visitors, the untouched natural and cultural resources of the town were assessed by considering the change and development factors offered in Butler's model it is understood that, the town entered the "exploration" phase from 1950s and this process continued until the beginning of 1960's, although it is difficult to give a date with definite lines.

On the other hand, the indication of changes and developments factors predicted during the "exploration" process of the model couldn't be found in the other case study done for Manavgat. For example, intellectual, curious tourist type was not seen in Manavgat. The information given by the participants on very few foreign hippies, who came

with their own initiatives, is quite surprising. According to participants, they did not come with good intentions. One of the participant's statement about these visitors is;

K18: "...I remember a small number of hippie-style strangers who came to Side before the '70s, but I think these people did not come in good faith. Because the traces of these persons left in tents while leaving were suspicious...".

The first data obtained from participants on accommodation facilities and the local-public infrastructure development efforts done in Manavgat dates back to the 1970s. In accordance with the data, it can be said that the Manavgat destination did not live "exploration" process and entered the "involvement" phase directly about twenty years later in comparison to Alanya. It can be considered that the most important reason why Alanya met tourism earlier than Manavgat is the exploration of Damlataş Cave. Another reason may be because Alanya had better accommodation facilities in those times. Also, road transportation conditions were very bad in these years. So transportation could be mostly done by ships. Therefore, Alanya, which had a pier, was more fortunate than Manavgat with this feature. Another issue is that Alanya could adapt tourism more quickly due to the commercial infrastructure it had. Therefore, it may be said that the tourism life of Alanya started earlier than Manavgat depending on the accommodation infrastructure, its pier and an established commercial structure it had.

Involvement Stage

According to the information obtained from the participants, it was concluded that Alanya entered into "involvement" process after 1960s in terms of tourism development. Some of the entrepreneurial local people, who were aware of the tourist movements in these years tried to convert one floor of their own traditional Alanya houses into hostel. In following years, these initiatives increased even more and small-scale hotels, infrastructure facilities such as restaurants etc. were opened. Also local government's services started. After the neighboring effect created by the first motel "Alanya Motel" (Little Alantur) established in 1961, the first hotels started to be built consciously. In 1968, the first travel agency was opened and caravan camps were established. In 1963, the first commercial and publicity studies in professional sense started with the "banana festival" held in the lead of "İsmet Hilmi Balcı" who governed the governorship and mayor of the period. Involvement phase was at a slowly pace at the beginning years then continued gradually to the beginning of the 1980s.

Some of the striking statements of the participants regarding the involvement process of Alanya for 1960-1980 are as follows:

K9: "...The end of the 1950s - from the beginning of the 1960s, boarding houses started. The main lodgings known for the period were Gökçe, Ülkü and Bulut Pensions...".

K10: "...In 1961, the gas garage of the municipality was transformed into a motel by Ismet Hilmi Balci, who was both the governor and the mayor. As a result the first motel with 6-8 rooms called as "Alanya Motel" (or Little Alantur) was established".

K12: "...Municipality services in these years were small-sized like street cleaning, mosquito-fighting, etc., ...".

K11: "...The need for electricity was provided by supplement generators installed in addition to the tribunes built on the Oba River...".

K15: "...Between 1960 and 1970, the first caravan camp in the territory of British Petroleum Company in Okurcalar region was opened...".

K4: "...In 1968, four companies jointly opened a travel agency. The arrival of foreign tourists through a travel agency first started this year...".

K13: "...There were very positive relations between the locals and visitors. The guests, who could not be lodged at hotels were accommodated in the houses of locals just like in 1950s...".

K12: "...Although the majority of the tourists visiting the town in 1960s were still natives, mostly French, German, Austrian and British tourists who were about 150-200 and some of whom were in caravans were coming to the town...".

K20: "...Among the promotional activities, the "banana festival" came first which was held on the initiative of İsmet Hilmi Balcı in 1963...".

K17: "...Foreign visitors visiting Alanya in these years were mostly rich. In fact, some of these were factory owners...".

The answers of the participants to the questions and their expressions related to those years are in harmony with the indicators proposed in the model just as they are in the exploration phase. However, considering the change and developmental indicators of the model, it is understood that involvement phase lasted about 20 years in Alanya.

On the other hand, according to the statements of the participants, the first tourist movements in Manavgat destination were seen in Side antique urban district, which is 3.5 km away from the seaside. And unlike Alanya, this process started in Manavgat after 1970's. Also, it is seen that the residents and local government of Manavgat witnessing the tourism developments in neighboring province since 1950s started some efforts to receive the day-trippers coming from Alanya, Antalya or close regions. So house pensioning process was initiated to be used by a small number of visitors who were mostly natives in the first years. Apart from pensions, there were very few hotels in the province these years. The first hotels were "*Afrodite Hotel*" which was built in 1971 (the name was changed to Side Cennet Hotel) and "*Cleopatra Hotel*". Then "*Turtel*" hotel with a capacity of 110 beds came into service as the largest hotel of the period in 1974–1975. Initially visitors were providing their needs from grocery-like places as there weren't any businesses like restaurants in Manavgat. In the following years, these types of places were gradually opened. There weren't much support of infrastructure of the government like highway, water, electricity and so on. For example, Antalya highway was stabilized and the electricity requirement of the town was met by the generator system but only in the evening. Although there isn't enough data obtained in the interviews about the changes and development elements such as advertisement and publicity studies, infrastructure support of the government, new type of tourists, number of tourists, tourism effects, secondary houses, tourism season, local people's participating in the process with some enterprises such as pensions, hotels, restaurants constitute the most important criterion proposed in the model for the involvement stage. Therefore it is considered that Manavgat destination lived this stage from 1970s to the beginning of 1980s. Some of the prominent expressions given by the participants related to Manavgat for 1970s are as follows:

K12: "...The tourism movements in Alanya started much earlier than Manavgat. Tourism started in Manavgat in 1970s...".

K16: "...In 70's, very few local tourists came to Manavgat...".

K14: "...Touristic movements were seen only in the ancient city area of Side in the first years...".

K19: "...Due to the fact that the transportation conditions were not good in those years, visitors who came to Manavgat were generally from the surrounding cities like Alanya, Antalya, Konya...".

K8: "...Manavgat can be said to have learned many things from Alanya...".

K3: "...In '70s, the first investments started with a house pensioning...".

K19: "...There were very few hotels in '70s. The first hotels were Hotel Afrodite (1971), Hotel Cleopatra and Hotel Turtel (1974). After Turtel, the number of hotels began to increase...".

K13: "...There weren't sufficient support of the government for infrastructure, water, electricity, etc...".

K14: "...Before 70s, the functions of the businesses like restaurants were done by groceries...".

The involvement phase taking place between 1970 and 1982, showed a slower development in comparison to Alanya. It can be said that the reasons for this are due to the fact that Manavgat is new and inexperienced destination which is following the tourism development process in Alanya as sample. Also, the poor transportation conditions in those years can be considered another reason.

Development Stage (1982-2000)

After 1980s, the development processes of Alanya and Manavgat destinations were evaluated in accordance with the data obtained from official sources such as tourist numbers, accommodation data and related literature in additions to the semi-structured interviews considering the indicators proposed for this stage in the model.

Tourism and Encouragement Law numbered 2634 issued in 1982 is a turning point in terms of tourism life cycles of both destinations. With this law, Antalya coasts, which were declared as priority development regions in tourism, entered into a rapid development process with opportunities such as incentive credits provided for investors, land acquisition (Doğaner, 2001: 31). Therefore, Alanya and Manavgat, which were offered to mass tourism, made a rapid entry into the "development" process since the beginning of 1980's. Manavgat, relatively younger destination which, entered into tourism with direct involvement stage after a period of twenty years in comparison to Alanya, closed the development deficit of the past years very fast thanks to the investment supports and incentives given to investors by the state since 1982 and has followed a similar course of development since then.

The statements of the participants related to Alanya's tourism development for these years are as follows;

K1: "...Until the 1980s, mostly wealthy, intellectual tourists were coming to Alanya for cultural visits, but then it began to change towards tourists from middle and working class...".

K12: "...Tourists who visited Alanya in 1980s were largely from Germany, Austria and Scandinavian countries such as, Sweden, Norway and Finland...".

K5: "...Some of the indigenous people of Alanya who became aware that they could earn money from tourism acted in a confused manner between agriculture and tourism after 1980 and sold their banana gardens to tourism investors. Thus, large hotels began to take up the place of farming fields that gradually moved to the inner parts...".

K13: "...Especially after 1985 Alanya got a lot of internal migration...".

K17: "...After 1986 apart hotel outbreak was experienced in Alanya..."

K20: "...Popularity of the apart hotels and half-board system continued in 1990s, but the number of unplanned hotels on the coast was increasing. From these years, Alanya's old architectural structure has begun to become increasingly ugly...".

K14: "...Increasing number of tourists made the tradesmen happy...".

K3: "...The sale of real estate to foreigners also began to increase. Most of the real estate sales were made to the Germans...".

K6: "...A noteworthy point in these years is that the town received much immigration...".

To summarize 1982-2000 years for Alanya, it is understood that the years 1982-1990 when the "all inclusive" system was not discussed yet, were the development years in terms of the town's tourism. In these years, half board system was dominant in Alanya and infrastructure services were still not done professionally. For example, the sewage system in the district was almost completed in 1988. In Alanya, which became increasingly popular, the number of touristic enterprises and visitors increased steadily after 1985. In the summer season the district received almost the same amount of visitors as the total population. Another important point is that the number of migrations from the inner regions increased steadily. Data related to the population of Alanya and the number of visitors between 1980-1990 is given in the table below.

Table 2. Population and number of visitors in Alanya between 1980-1990

Year	Population	Arrivals
1980	74.148	57.835
1985	87.080	80.498
1990	129.106	185.277

Source: Population is derived from TÜİK (Turkish Statistical Institute), 2017; Tourist arrivals, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017

The number of visitors arriving during the summer season is nearly equal to the local population in 1985s and exceeds the total population after these years causing the social deterioration. Participants' statements on these years mostly focus on increasing population, number of tourists, increasing accommodation investments, deterioration in the physical and social structure of the county.

When the tourism and population data for Alanya destination are examined from 1990 to 2000, it is understood that the number of facilities with operating license, number of visitors and beds, overnight stay and the county population are steadily rising about three times over the past decade from the beginning of these years until 2000.

Table 3. Number of facilities with operating license, number of beds, tourist arrivals and overnight stays in Alanya between 1990-2000

Year	Number of Operating Licensed Hotels	Number of Beds	Arrivals	Overnight-stays
1990	71	12.869	185.277	1.583.580
1991	72	13.198	136.672	1.388.306
1992	82	15.842	217.525	2.104.720
1993	96	19.134	229.717	1.930.846

1994	110	21.507	231.546	1.958.284
1995	112	22.120	112.376	1.092.267
1997	137	25.971	828.429	4.530.542
1998	183	46.852	502.853	3.092.352
1999	193	50.693	444.201	2.555.580
2000	199	53.014	548.095	3.741.974

Source: Derived from Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2016

Table 4. Number of population (1990-2000) in Alanya

Year	Population
1990	129.106
2000	257.671

Source: Derived from TÜİK (Turkish Statistical Institute), 2017

Manavgat, which is the second research area, was also a small-scale family pension and agriculture town until the 1980s. But in 1982 with the Tourism Encouragement Law numbered 2634, it was included in the regions declared as the priority development zone in tourism (Resmi Gazete, 1982) and entered a rapid development process profiting by the promotions provided just like Alanya. Since then, investments were accelerated primarily in hospitality sector.

Some of the statements of the participants for the visitors and increasing accommodation facilities are;

K18: *"...After 1980, many people in the public preferred to sell their fields to investors..."*.

K11: *"...Facility investments increased rapidly with the incentives and loans granted to the business operators by the government in these years..."*.

K7: *"Touristic movements in Manavgat started to increase after 1990..."*.

K15: *"...After 90s there was a tourism boom in Manavgat and number of hotels increased rapidly..."*.

To summarize the years 1982-2000 for Manavgat, it is understood that there has been a significant increase in the population especially since 1985-1990 together with the investments of accommodation. The population of the town, which was 73.511 in 1980, reached 199.385 in 2000 (http://www.yerelnet.org.tr/ilceler/ilce_nufus.php?ilceid=198289). On the other hand, the number of visitors also increased rapidly with the investments made in mass tourism. Undoubtedly, the most important share in this increase is the fact that the Antalya International Terminal opened in 1998. The increase in the number of foreign tourists since this date is striking. The local people who are aware of the economic contributions of tourism are very satisfied with the situation and tend to sell their agricultural lands to the investors quickly. Consequently they are drawn to the inner regions. Therefore, due to the accommodation facilities built by the coastal areas, local people are almost prevented from accessing the shoreline. In addition, there have been significantly migrations from the neighboring cities to the city in order to work in tourism sector. This situation has led to the creation of new settlement areas by revealing the need for secondary housing in the district (Alpaslan, 2009: 70).

The number of visitors to Manavgat city center and Side, which was 130,935 in 1990, reached well above the total number of local population with 736,470 (Ministry of Culture and Tourism) in 2000. However this situation has caused considerable pressure on the natural and historical structure of the region. As a result, population growth has brought about the need for physical areas and infrastructure. Coastal forests, agricultural lands and sand dunes have

started to be transformed into urban areas and tourism settlements (Alpaslan, 2009: 67). So tourism structuring, the natural and architectural structure of the city became degenerated.

Table 5. Manavgat population and the number of arrivals to the operating license hotels

Year	Population	Number of Arrivals
1990	115.731	130.935
2000	199.385	736.470

Source: Population is derived from http://www.yerelnet.org.tr/ilceler/ilce_nufus.php?ilceid=198289; number of arrivals, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2016

When the information obtained from participants, literature sources and official data is evaluated considering the change and development indicators such as tourist and local population rates, development of accommodation investments and sector, second housing construction, labor migration, and the situation of farmlands, it is concluded that the developmental stages of Alanya and Manavgat destinations last up to 2000.

Consolidation Stage (2000-2010)

Some of the statements of the participants in the semi-structured interviews for the tourism developments of the study areas for 2000-2010 are as follows:

K13: *"...Since the 1990s, the catastrophes in the world and in our country have affected tourism very badly..."*

K5: *"...Until the year 2000, all-inclusive system was not mentioned, but with this system tourism has taken a different dimension..."*

K16: *"...The visits through package tours started..."*

K11: *"...Architectural and natural image of the city have begun to deteriorate due to the hotels built alongside the shores and false construction practices..."*

K17: *"...Local people dealing with agriculture and having land in the coastal regions sold their lands to hotel investors in order to make easy money..."*

K10: *"...People who work in agriculture preferred to work in tourism..."*

K8: *"...The coasts were almost filled with the hotels that are far away from the aesthetic sense..."*

K2: *"...With all-inclusive system of the 2000's, the low price policy that hotels applied has led to an increase in the number of tourists, a decrease in service quality..."*

K9: *"...The attractiveness of Manavgat and Alanya region decreased in comparison to the old years..."*

As a conclusion, following evaluation can be made within the direction of the participants' statements and data obtained from official sources for the years 2000-2010;

Since 1980s, investments in hospitality sector continued at an increasing rate in 1990s. However, Alanya and Manavgat, most of whose economy is based on tourism, have been affected by many national and international crises like 1990-1991 gulf Crisis, terrorist attacks, 1999 earthquakes etc. These crises caused the occupancy rates of the hotels to be low. Tourism investors came to the solution about these problems by bringing the "all inclusive" system

to accommodation facilities. The information obtained from the participants indicates that hospitality operators have gone through some misapplications in relation to this system. Initially launched in large scale hotels, this system has even entered very small scale accommodation establishments. Because the investors were in a ruthless competition. Although the unplanned construction of hotels and secondary dwellings, which were built on the coast in 1990s, became increasingly popular the 2000s are seen as a much more ambitious period than in the past. Unplanned tourism construction approaching the shore and even constructed on the sand has been destroying the architectural aesthetic and natural appearance of the city. The number of 3 and 2-star hotels has declined steadily over the years. Many of the 4 star hotels have had to be renovated and the number of 5 star hotels has increased steadily. Also between 2000 and 2010, the number of facilities with operating licenses in Alanya and Manavgat increased steadily. Another practice for investors is to rush to attract customers by price reduction in order to compete. On the other hand, a large part of the local people selling their lands to investors have preferred to work in tourism, either by opening their businesses or by working as workers. As a result, their economies have become largely dependent on tourism. Secondary housing constructions have increased rapidly due to the migration from outside. Another issue that increases the demand for secondary housing except migrations is the sale of real estate to foreigners. While the number of residences and immovables bought by foreigners in Antalya between 2003-2012 reached 35.000, 62% of these sales happened in Alanya and 23% in Side-Manavgat region (*Akdeniz Turistik Otelciler ve İşletmeciler Birliği - AKTOB*, 2014: 47). On the other hand, it became almost impossible to reach to the coastal areas for the locals due to the hotels covering the coastal areas. Parallel to the increase in capacity, while the number of visitors increased, tourism expenditures remained below the expectations. The reason of this is associated with the cheap country image resulted from misapplications in “*all inclusive*” system. In addition to the image loss, a common view of the participants related to the result of the system is the changing profile of the tourists. For the solution, a need of a planned development model to develop alternative tourism types in order to spread the tourism movements to whole country, preserve the environment, protect the cultural heritage and diversify the tourism products were emphasized by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 2004 (Manavgat Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası- MATSO, 2013).

Table 6. The number of operating licensed hotels in Alanya and tourist arrivals

Year	Number of Operating Licensed Hotels	Number of arrivals
2000	199	548.095
2001	206	975.981
2002	213	1.179.048
2003	216	1.408.216
2004	228	1.646.665
2005	249	1.514.247
2006	245	1.796.830
2007	249	1.542.797
2008	255	1.377.146
2009	258	1.448.725
2010	228	2.028.161

Source: Derived from Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2016

Table 7. The number of Operating Licensed Hotels in Manavgat and tourist arrivals

Year	Number of Operating Licensed Hotels	Tourist arrivals
2004	88	1.249.620
2005	89	1.403.972
2006	98	2.001.902
2007	104	2.473.789
2008	112	1.822.234
2009	129	2.015.888
2010	169	2.585.959

Source: number of hotels is derived from Antalya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, 2017; tourist arrivals, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017

Stagnation Phase (after 2010)

Some of the expressions of the participants for the years after 2010 in parallel with the change and development indicators proposed in the model are below;

K4: "...There are too many foreign property owners...".

K1: "...There is an understanding of poor quality tourist and cheap service...".

K8: "...Operators make price reduction unnecessarily for more customers...".

K15: "...Cities are not as much beautiful as they were in the past...".

Based on the statements of the participants, the statistics and the information obtained from the written documents, following assessments can be made for the period after 2010:

Except 2016 the number of tourists coming to Alanya increased and reached the maximum level between 2010 and 2017. However, tourism revenues remained at a low level compared to previous years except for 2014.

Table 8. The number of tourists and tourism revenues in Alanya

Year	Foreign Tourist arrivals	Tourism Revenue (\$)
2010	2.028.161	1.009.339.422
2011	2.031.898	1.412.500.000
2013	2.696.939	2.020.007.311
2014	3.901.699	3.023.816.725
2015	3.441.512	2.178.131.670
2016	2.187.199	1.131.003.888
2017	2.722.620	1.789.110.540

Sources: Derived from Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Alanya 2016, 2017; Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2017

Similarly, the number of visitors and accommodation facilities between 2010 and 2015 in Manavgat continued to increase in the right proportion and rose to the maximum level.

Table 9. Number of Operating Licensed Hotels in Manavgat and visitors

Year	Number of Operating Licensed Hotels	Number of beds	Number of visitors
2010	139	85.663	2.585.959
2011	145	88.521	2.857.410
2012	154	100.950	3.089.708
2013	157	105.109	3.292.985
2014	175	121.780	3.285.307
2015	192	133.254	3.227.257

2016	193	134.392	2.764.468
2017	199	134.627	3.694.307

Source: number of visitors is derived from Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2010-2016; number of operating licensed hotels and beds, Matso, 2017.

Problems such as wars in neighboring countries, terrorist incidents in the country and aircraft crises with Russia have affected all tourism destinations (Tourism and Investment Business and Industry magazine, 2016: 6). After the plane crisis experienced with the Russian government in November of 2015, the year 2016 became a "tourism crisis" for all of Turkey as a result of many sanctions such as the cancellation of scheduled flights from Russia to Turkey and the calls made to the tourism companies for the suspension of the sales of the vacation packages to Turkey (Demir, 2015: 1; Koçak, 2017: 11). As a result of these crises, the number of visitors decreased in 2016 in both cities. Popularity of these destinations, whose economy are largely based on tourism, have been lost and seriously affected by these crisis. As of 2016, there was a serious decline in tourism revenue from one side, while on the other side many accommodation facilities were in danger of shutting down and some investors went bankrupt. The groups who were most affected by these crises affecting all sectors were the local artisans with insufficient economic power and the ones employed in tourism.

Table 10. 2014-2016 Manavgat destination tourism revenues (billion dollars)

	2014	2015	2016	2017
Antalya	11.320	10.383	7.383	8.882
Manavgat	3.735	3.426	1.438	2.931

Source: Matso, 2017

It can be said that one of the most important reasons of this conclusion is that the tourism market of these cities, whose economy are largely based on tourism, being in the hands of foreign tour operators. The security risk, which is the common view of some participants, is another reason. Also there has also been a significant decline in the number of visitors from Germany and other countries that constitute the tourist market of the counties due to security concerns (Matso, 2016: 62). The distribution of visitors according to their nationality has changed in the period between 2014 and 2017. For example, Scandinavian countries such as Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland and some European countries have shrunk and replaced by markets such as Russia, Ukraine, the Netherlands, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Israel, Romania, Iran, Lithuania, Moldova, Azerbaijan (AKTOB, 2017: 41-43).

Findings

As a result of the analysis of the participants' expressions in the interviews by descriptive analysis and the tourism data derived from the documents, it is concluded that both destinations are in the "stagnation" stage. As a result of this development phase, the coastal agricultural lands have been replaced by the hotels similar to each other in international standards offering services and facilities. Also the natural and ancient architectural structures of the areas have been degenerated. In addition, local people who sold their agricultural lands to investors have become dependent on tourism by *plunging into* the position of workers in tourism. The property market has also risen due to the increasing need of second housing caused by the migrations to both destinations. Another result is that even though they have a certain image, the changing tourist profile shows that there is a loss of popularity in these districts. Besides, the number of visitors coming to both destinations increased to maximum level from 2010 until 2016.

As a result, it is understood that both destinations are experiencing a similar "stagnation" phase between the years 2010 and 2015. However, as a result of problems such as aircraft crisis with Russia in November 2015, wars in neighboring countries, and terrorist incidents in our country, falling image of the country into a distrustful one among foreign countries has caused Alanya and Manavgat to suffer serious declines in visitor numbers and lose their old popularity.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study aims to determine the applicability of Butler's "*destination life cycle*" model to Alanya and Manavgat, analyze what development stages they are in and compare their tourism developments within the context of this model. Study is important in terms of giving planning and management strategies and directions for the tourism destination planners and managers. Many studies have different technical approaches about destination management and planning. But most of them have not examined the issue comparatively. By this way, study provides both empirical and practical viewpoints. As a result of the comparative analysis of semi-structured interviews conducted for the research purposes, the following inferences were reached:

It can be accepted that the tourism development of Alanya, which can be evaluated as an old destination compared to Manavgat, is compatible with the model. On the other hand, although Manavgat destination, which is a relatively young one, does not seem to have experienced the exploration process. But other life stages seem to fit the model. As a result, the same estimation can be made for this destination. In addition, data obtained from document analysis and semi-structured interviews reveal that both destinations are in the "*stagnation*" phase.

Generally speaking, understanding what life stages these destinations are in and how the next possible process may follow will be useful for the tourism managers and planners in terms of the decisions to be taken on how to extend the life of the regions. But it is doubtful whether the year 2016 which many investors call as the "crisis year" should be used in the evaluation for the applicability of the model to these two destinations and determination of their life stages. Because sudden terror attacks are the crises that can be encountered all over the world. Therefore, whether these events may cause a loss of popularity or not may be disputable. Moreover the fact that positive images of destinations can be easily destroyed in many directions can be more important than the catastrophes or even wars.

Especially traditional mature mass tourism destinations offering sea, sand and sun have to deal with the problems like negative image and competition with new destinations. Perhaps the worst of these is the loss of image. It might be a new research and discussion subject whether the loss of popularity that Alanya and Manavgat experienced results from a positive image loss or not. As indicated for the maturing stages in Butler's model, the economies of Alanya and Manavgat destinations have been largely dependent on tourism since the maturity stage. It is possible to say that the most important reason for the loss of visitors in 2016 is dependency on tour operators, which is the result of all-inclusive system, rather than safety concerns. Also it can be argued that the most important reason of this dependency results from the tour operators that make all the processes of holiday arrangements on their own.

It is considered that whether the tourism development of research areas to enter into the decline phase or not after these crises will be clarified with other scientific researches. In addition, although the number of visitors to both areas increased in 2017 compared to 2016, the fluctuation experienced in numbers may create a perception of uncertainty

regarding the future of destinations. Therefore, the fact that whether these destinations will be able to maintain their current levels is still doubtful.

Suggestions

The life span of tourism destinations starting with the exploration continues towards a decline phase by following a development course similar to a human life. Each life cycle within this course may take a short or long period depending on many factors. To extend the life span as much as possible and perhaps not to settle down to the point of decline may be possible with understanding what their life stages and carrying capacities are. Otherwise, it may not be possible to control the tourism future of destinations.

In accordance with the findings of the research and literature sources, the following suggestions can be made for the planning and management of tourism in Alanya and Manavgat destinations and for the new developing destinations:

- The findings indicate that both destinations are in stagnation phase. The maximum number of visitors that can be reached during this phase has been reached. So after this stage, there are no tourism developments for Alanya and Manavgat destinations. The next process will take place either as a collapse or as a restructuring. Therefore, the best thing that can be done is to take the necessary measures to preserve the existing positions and to extend their life spans. However, considering the cost of improving or rejuvenating the current situation, it may not be preferred. Therefore, it is possible to continue to serve the products for the same market while preserving the current situation for these destinations. But it is obvious that it will not be possible to provide a competitive advantage with a single product considering existing competitors or new ones. As a result, it is advisable to make comprehensive plans regarding the alternative products created by taking into consideration the potential tourism resources.

- One of the criticisms about the tourism development of these destinations in the interviews is the misapplications of the operators in “*all inclusive*” system. Therefore, what should the expectations of this system be and what kind of negative effects that the system's left to these destinations should be examined once again in detail.

- Another issue criticized by the participants is the environmental destruction created by the investors. In this respect, the participants stated that tourism development plans were disconnected from each other and did not cover long years. So, it can be suggested that the zoning plans should not be taken with hasty, panic decisions and changed. Also they should cover long years and be controlled in practice. Otherwise, it is inevitable that there will be an irreversible coastal destruction.

- Another disturbance is the decrease in the quality of the personnel damaging the quality in tourism. One of the reasons for the changing visitor profile in previous years in both destinations may have been this poor quality staff. This professional erosion needs to be corrected as soon as possible.

- Another point is to focus on marketing and promotion efforts to strengthen the positive image of destinations. Because losing image and popularity may be more destructive than any other crises.

- Since the touristic product offered in Alanya and Manavgat destinations is standard, the visitor type does not come to these destinations with different expectations. Special infrastructure facilities such as theme parks,

entertainment, shopping centers and sport facilities etc.. should be included in the destination attractions to meet the expectations of other visitor types.

- The common view of the participants in the interviews about the tourism impacts is that Alanya and Manavgat lost their old aesthetics, natural structure and some social values. Therefore, it may be necessary to conduct more comprehensive researches about what the perspectives of the local people are towards the socio-cultural and environmental impacts and what factors affect their perceptions. These are very important in terms of planning and managing the host culture.

In addition, following recommendations can be given for young destinations that are newly entering tourism or are in the early stages of their developments and for the future researches:

- For a sustainable development of tourism destinations, the concept of life cycle should be well evaluated by planners.

- Determining the stage is important for the future plannings of tourism destinations. Because the tourist carrying capacity of each life cycle is different and different effects are encountered at each stage. Therefore while considering the life cycle of the destination, tourism expectations and goals should be determined in advance. Different scenarios and different strategies should be determined for each stage in line with the decisions taken.

- Destinations should take care not to exceed their carrying capacity in order to ensure maximum benefit from the tourism resources they have and to prevent customer satisfaction from entering a risky process.

- It should be noted that tourism resources attracting visitors are not unlimited. Therefore, especially in destinations addressing mass tourism, it should be determined in advance whether the tourism targets are too much tourist-less profit or less tourist-more profit or to prevent the direction of collapse or to create a new market. In this way, price and management policies should be established according to the decisions taken.

- Participation of local people who are directly affected by tourism is essential for planning decisions regarding the future of tourism. It is important to identify how local people perceive tourism, what their perspectives are and what factors affect their perspectives. Because the local people who perceive tourism development negatively will reflect these perspectives and attitudes to visitors. As a result, tourism development of destination will be negatively affected.

- Destination management is the business of influencing visitors' holiday location, time, transportation, touristic product preferences, supply sources and educational variables of destinations. Therefore, destination management should be evaluated in a multi-faceted way including visitors, local people, industry, government agencies and voluntary organizations. So it is important to carry out separate planning studies and implementations regarding the management of each variable mentioned.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, S. (1997). The Resort Cycle and Seaside Tourism: An Assessment of Its Applicability and Validity, *Tourism Management*, 18 (2), 65-73.
- Agarwal, S. (2002). Restructuring Seaside Tourism The Resort Lifecycle, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), 25-55.

- Akdeniz Turistik Otelciler ve İşletmeciler Birliği - AKTOB* (2017). *Resort Turizm Perspektif*, Sayı: 173, Eylül, 2017.
- Akdeniz Turistik Otelciler ve İşletmeciler Birliği - AKTOB* (2014). 2023'e Doğru Türkiye'de Turizmin 100 yılı; Turizm Sektörünün Yapısı, Büyüklüğü ve Ekonomiye Katkısı; Turizm ve Konaklama Sektörünün Sosyo-Ekonomik Etkileri, *Akdeniz Turistik Otelciler ve İşletmeciler Birliği*, Şubat 2014.
- Alpaslan, Ö. (2009). Antalya Kıyı Bölgesi Planlama Sürecinin Kıyı Alanlarına Etkileri: Side-Manavgat Örneği. *TMMOB Şehir Plancıları Odası Yayını*, Sayı 2009: 2.
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun R., Bayraktaroğlu S. ve Yıldırım, E. (2005). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri: SPSS Uygulamalı*. Geliştirilmiş 4. Baskı. İstanbul: Sakarya Kitabevi.
- Andriotis, K. (2003). Coastal Resort Morphology: The Cretan Experience, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 28 (1), 67-75.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). The Tourism Life Cycle: An Overview of the Cretan Case. *International Conference on Tourism Development and Planning*, A.T.E.I. of Patra, Patra, Greece.
- Andriotis, K. (2006). Hosts, Guests and Politics: Coastal Resorts Morphological Change, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (4).
- Antalya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism (2017). <http://www.antalyakulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,68131/manavgat.html>. Last accessed on 21 April 2017.
- Başkale, H. (2016). Nitel Araştırmalarda Geçerlik, Güvenirlik ve Örneklem Büyüklüğünün Belirlenmesi, *DEUHFED* 2016, 9 (1), 23-28.
- Baum, T. (1998). Taking the Exit Route: Extending the Tourism Area Life Cycle Model, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1(2), 167-175.
- Brooker, E. and Jason B. (2008). Marketing Destination Niagara Effectively Through the Tourism Life Cycle, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20 (3), 278-292.
- Butler, W. R. (1980). The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources, *Canadian Geographer*, XXIV, 1.
- Butler, W. R. (2008). The Concept of A Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*: June 2008.
- Butler, W. R. (2011). The Origins of the Tourism Area Life Cycle. *Folia Turistica*, 25(1).
- Butler, W. R. (2014). Coastal Tourist Resorts: History, Development and Models. *220 ACE© AÑO*, 8 (25).
- Casasnovas, A. L. A and Rossello. A. S. (2009). The Tourist Area Lifecycle and the Unit Roots Test: A New Economic Perspective For A Classic Paradigm In Tourism. http://dea.uib.es/digitalAssets/136/136622_w38.pdf. Last accessed on 06 May 2017.

- Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Manavgat (Manavgat Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası) (2013). 2013 Ekonomik Raporu, (Economic Report of Manavgat) <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByaLif82oLaTb3Rtd2ZvVy1EVnc/view>, Last accessed on 21 April 2017.
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Manavgat (Manavgat Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası) (2016). 2016 Ekonomik Raporu (Economic Report of Manavgat). <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0ByaLif82oLaTeF91SW80dTc1WTQ/view>, Last accessed on 21 April 2017.
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Manavgat (Manavgat Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası) (2017). 2017 Ekonomik Raporu (2017 (Economic Report of Manavgat) https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MLdPeiTzR4jFWck5_Yj2GI2mTybPkIKX/view Last accessed on 17 May 2018.
- Cooper C. and Stephen J. (1989) Destination Life Cycle:the Isle of Man Case Study, *Annal of Tourism Research*, 16, 377-398.
- Crompton, J. L., Ian S. R. and Uysal, M (1987). Empirical Identification of Product Life Cycle Patterns in the Delivery of Municipal Park and Recreation Services, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 5 (1), 17–34.
- Demir, E. (2015). Rusya'nın Yaptırımlarının Türkiye Ekonomisine Olası Etkileri, *Türkiye İş Bankası İktisadi Araştırmalar Bölümü* https://ekonomi.isbank.com.tr/UserFiles/pdf/ar_15_2015.pdf. Last accessed on 19 August 2017.
- Doğaner, S. (2001). *Türkiye Turizm Coğrafyası*, İstanbul: Çantay Kitabevi
- Douglas, N. (1997). Applying the Life Cycle Model To Melanesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (1).
- Ellul, D. F. T. and Jurado, E.N (2014) Destination Lyfe Cycle in Jafari, J., Xiao, H.(ed). *Encyclopedia of Tourism*, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 1-3.
- Garay, L. and Canoves, G (2011). Life Cycles, Stages and Tourism History: The Catalonia (Spain) Experience, *Annals Of Tourism Research*, 38 (2), 651-671.
- Getz, D. (1992). Tourism Planning And Destination Life Cycle, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 772-770.
- Guba, G. E. (1981). Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Naturalistic Inquiries, *Educational Resources Infonnation Center Annual Review Paper*, 29 (2), 75-91.
- Güney, İ. (2016). Turizm Alanlarının Yaşam Döngüsü Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Kuşadası Örneği, (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Hoviven G. R. (1981), A Tourist Cycle In Lancaster County, PENNSYLVANIA, *The Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*, 25, 283–286. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0064.1981.tb01649.x.
- Hovinen, G. R. (2002). Revisiting The Destination Life Cycle Model, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), 209-230.

- Ioannides D. (1992). Tourism Development Agents: the Cypriot Resort Cycle, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 711-731.
- Krefting L. (1991). Rigor in Qualitative Research: The Assessment of Trustworthiness, *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, March 1991, 45, 214-222. doi:10.5014/ajot.45.3.214.
- Koçak, M. (2017). Türkiye Rusya İlişkileri, *Seta Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Toplum Araştırmaları Vakfı Yayını*, Sayı, 201.
- Lagiewski, R. (2006). The Application of the Talc model: a literature survey. *Aspects of Tourism: The Tourism Area Life Cycle Vol. 1 Applications and Modifications*. Ed. Richard Butler. Great Britain: Cromwell Press, 2006, 27-50.
- Lundtorp, S. and Wanhill, S.(2001). The Resort Lifecycle Theory: Generating Processes and Estimation, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28 (4), 947-964.
- Martin S. B. and Uysal, M (1990). An Examination of the Relationship Between Carrying Capacity and the Tourism Lifecycle: Management and Policy Implications, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 31, 327-333.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2016). Gelen Turist Sayısı ve Geceleme Sayısı (Tourist Arrivals and Number of Overnight Stays. <http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/>. Last accessed on 10 October 2016.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2017). Gelen Turist Sayısı (Number of Arrivals). <http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR.9851/turizm-istatistikleri.html> Last accessed on 10 October 2017.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2016). İşletme Belgeli Tesis ve Yatak Sayısı (Number of Operating Licensed Hotels and Number of Beds). <http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/>. Last accessed on 10 October 2016.
- Park, H. K. (2006). A Study on Tourist Area Life Cycle and Marketing Strategy: Case of Jesu Island. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, KDI School of Public and Management.
- Resmi Gazete (1982). Turizm Teşvik Kanunu, Sayı: 2634; Kabul Tarihi: 12/3/1982 (Tourism Encouragement Law no. 2634; Date of Acceptance: 12/3/1982). Ankara: Resmi Gazete.
- Tooman, L. Alex (1997). Applications of the Life Cycle Model in Tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (1), 214-234.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu) (2017). 1980-1990 Alanya Nüfusu (Population of Alanya in 1980-1990. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Start.do>. Last accessed on 21 April 2017.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu-TÜİK) (2017). 1990-2000 Alanya Nüfusu (Population of Alanya in 1990-2000. <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/Start.do>. Last accessed on 21 April 2017.
- Tourism and Investment Business and Industry Magazine (Turizm ve Yatırım İşletme ve Endüstri Dergisi) (2016). Turizmciler Krizden Çıkış Yolu Arıyor, MART 2016, Sayı, 44. http://www.turizmyatirimdergisi.com.tr/images/dergi/44-S44_LQ.pdf, Last accessed on 24 June 2017.
- Uysal, M., Woo, E and Singal, M (2012). The Tourist Area Life Cycle (TALC) and Its Effect on the Quality-of-Life (QOL) of Destination Community. M.Uysal., Richard, R.P ve M.Joseph. S, (Ed). *Handbook of Tourism and*

Quality-of-Life Research: Enhancing the Life Of Tourists And Residents of Host Communities, in (423-445).
London / New York: Springer.

http://www.yerelnet.org.tr/ilceler/ilce_nufus.php?ilceid=198289 “Manavgat İlçesi Nüfus Listesi”, Last accessed on
01 June 2017.