September 2020

Antalya's tourist security: A gap analysis of expectations vs perceptions

Abraham Terrah
University of South Florida, abrahamterrah@gmail.com

Vivienne Wildes
Bucknell University, vjw100@gmail.com

Trishna Gajjar Mistry
University of South Florida, trishna@sar.usf.edu

Antalya's tourist security: A gap analysis of expectations vs perceptions

Authors

Corresponding Author

Abraham Terrah, 5310 26th W, Unit 302, Bradenton FL, 34207

Abstract

The tourism industry strongly contributes to the gross domestic product of many countries. An important aspect of the tourism industry is the security of tourists and its connection to the overall tourism security of a country or tourist location. It is essential to identify vulnerable areas and require security improvements within the tourism industry. This study aims to identify security gaps in the Mediterranean city of Antalya from a tourist perspective. Tourists have been classified in this study as *leisure tourists, business tourists,* and *special event tourists*. The research identified expectations and perceptions gaps in the transportation sector, accommodation sector, airports, and public places of Antalya. Data was collected from a sample size of 551 tourists residing in 34 different countries in Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East. Findings show gaps exist specifically in the levels of security of buses, hotels, airports, shopping malls, restaurants, tourist sites, and beaches of Antalya. The research also assessed the influence of tourists' purpose of travel and country of residence on their expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya. The study ultimately identified gaps concerning the security of tourists visiting Antalya, and future studies can explore the issues related to these tourism industry's components in which gaps exist.

Antalya's Tourist Security: A Gap Analysis of Expectations vs Perceptions

Abraham Terrah[1], Vivienne J. Wildes[2], and Trishna G. Mistry[3]

Muma College of Business
University of South Florida, United States
[1]terrah@usf.edu
[3]trishna@usf.edu

Freeman College of Management
Bucknell University, United States
[2]vw006@bucknell.edu

Abstract

The tourism industry strongly contributes to the gross domestic product of many countries. An important aspect of the tourism industry is the security of tourists and its connection to the overall tourism security of a country or tourist location. It is essential to identify vulnerable areas and require security improvements within the tourism industry. This study aims to identify security gaps in the Mediterranean city of Antalya from a tourist perspective. Tourists have been classified in this study as *leisure tourists*, *business tourists*, and *special event tourists*. The research identified expectations and perceptions gaps in the transportation sector, accommodation sector, airports, and public places of Antalya. Data was collected from a sample size of 551 tourists residing in 34 different countries in Europe, Central Asia, and the Middle East. Findings show gaps exist specifically in the levels of security of buses, hotels, airports, shopping malls, restaurants, tourist sites, and beaches of Antalya. The research also assessed the influence of tourists' purpose of travel and country of residence on their expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya. The study ultimately identified gaps concerning the security of tourists visiting Antalya, and future studies can explore the issues related to these tourism industry's components in which gaps exist.

Keywords: tourism security, Turkey, transportation, airport, accommodation, public places

Introduction

International tourism is of considerable importance for many countries and has enabled the development of diverse locations around the world. In 2018, the number of international tourists' arrivals worldwide was 1.4 billion people (Lock, 2019), which represents more than one-fifth of the world population. Tourism industries contribute enormously to the gross domestic product of several countries and are a major source of development for others. In general, the tourism industry consists of tourism-related businesses, which include not only hotels, restaurants, nightclubs, tourist sites, shopping malls, museums, but also other modes of transportation and accommodation, and the numerous activities that a tourist might engage in when visiting a tourist destination.

A critical component of the tourism industry is security (Ghaderi et al., 2017). The security level of a tourist destination affects the perceptions of tourists and is a determinant of future travel

behavior (Garg, 2015). In this sense, for a tourist destination to be prosperous, it should ensure the security of tourists while on their vacation or business visits. We remember sadly the terrorist attacks that occurred in Egypt or Tunisia in the past few years that severely hit the tourism industry of these North African countries. As tourists may also become victims of acts of crime, violence, and robbery, it is then the responsibility of the government of countries with multiple tourist destinations to take measures and precautions concerning the security of their tourists.

Security has been widely assessed as one of the most critical considerations for tourists when traveling to a destination (Mansfeld & Pizam, 2006; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Ryan, 1993; Sonmez & Graefe, 1998). The security of tourists while on vacation becomes not only the concern of visitors but also travel intermediaries such as tour operators (Holcomb & Pizam, 2006). However, various studies exist related to the security of tourists, but only a few assessed security from the perspective including the main facets of typical tourism industries to provide insights regarding areas in which security might be perceived by tourists as insufficient or failing. Most of the examinations about tourist security have centered discussions on risk perceptions and the related effects on travel behavior (Garg, 2015; Ghaderi et al., 2017; Kozak et al., 2007; Lepp et al., 2011; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Seabra et al., 2013; Sonmez & Graefe, 1998), while few other studies focused on the security of tourists at hotels (Chan & Lam, 2013; Rittichainuwat, 2013) and the security levels as perceived by tourists while visiting a destination (George, 2003; 2010).

Although the literature is extensive in investigating risk-related aspects in international travel and perceptions on security, a common point among the studies above is they did not incorporate a pre-trip perspective. To have a more comprehensive understanding of tourists' perceptions of security in a particular destination, one needs to go beyond hotels to include other accommodation means and transportation means, but also public places a tourist may visit during a trip. Thus, analyzing both tourists' perceptions of security while visiting a destination and expectations would provide much more actionable insights about the security levels in a location and untapped areas of improvement. Consequently, the current study aims at filling these gaps in the literature by providing insights about both expectations and perceptions of tourists for a destination, including transportation, accommodation, and public places, as used by tourists while on their visit.

Turkey is a country located between Europe and Asia, and which was ranked by the United Nations World Tourism Organization as the 6th most popular destination in terms of tourists' arrivals for the year 2019 (Daily Sabah, 2020). One key tourist destination in Turkey is the region of Antalya, an agglomeration with multiple seaside resorts that hosted more than 15 million tourists in 2019from 193 countries (Yildiz, 2020). As the main point of entrance to Turkey's southwest Mediterranean coast, Antalya is home to thousands of hotels—from large, all-inclusive hotels to small, independently owned and operated pensions. Although Antalya hasn't been hit by a terrorist attack, other cities in the country, including Ankara and Istanbul, have been targeted by secessionists and terrorists, and this has created an image problem for the entire country. This shows how important security is for the attractiveness for a destionation (Yavuz, et al., 2018). One diplomatic incident between Turkey and Russia resulted in billions of dollars lost and the closure of many businesses (Putz, 2016; Uras, 2016) that relied on the tourism industry. Security issues that threaten the prosperity of the tourism industry need to be addressed seriously. In this context, it is insightful to identify gaps in security that might affect tourist perception of a destination.

Furthermore, the image of a tourist destination significantly influences tourists' interest and potential to travel to a particular region (Gibson et al., 2008). Antalya is an excellent research location for the study, specifically to examine tourist expectations and perceptions of security in a prime tourist destination. The study uses gap analysis, a common way to determine, document, and improve upon capabilities for products and business. Gap analysis is a useful tool in business to reveal areas of vulnerability and areas for improvement (Wildes & Parks 2005). Tourists' expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya are analyzed for the following areas: accommodations and neighborhoods (i.e., hotels, pensions, apartment); public places (i.e., shopping malls, city center, historical sites, beaches, nightclubs, and restaurants); transportation (public transportation, i.e., buses and trams; private transportation, i.e., taxis and cars; and tour company transportation, i.e., shuttle service) and airports. The purpose of this study is to identify the gap between tourists' expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya.

Literature Review

Importance of Tourism Security for Destinations

The tourism industry contributes to 10.4% of the global gross domestic product and employs one out of ten people worldwide (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2019). International tourists are the main contributors to the dynamism of the industry, and international tourists' arrivals worldwide are expected to grow at a rate of 3% to 4% in 2020 (World Tourism Organization, 2020). Five types of tourists have been identified in the literature: (a) pleasure travelers, (b) business travelers, (c) travelers visiting friends or relatives, (d) travelers attracted by the lure of big-city shopping opportunities, and (e) travelers attending special events (Demos, 1992). The question of security of tourists at tourist destinations is widely discussed in the literature (Ghaderi et al., 2017; Tarlow, 2014; Tasci & Boylu, 2010), and we can sense a growing concern for the matter of tourist security for all countries.

The security of tourists is a prerequisite for a prosperous tourist business (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2006). For instance, Chu and Choi (2000) found security as the top priority for leisure travelers when choosing a hotel compared to business travelers, followed by service quality, room, and front desk. Early studies on tourist security investigated from the lens of crime and its impact on tourism demand (Alleyne & Boxill, 2003; Brunt et al., 2000; Levantis & Gani, 2000; Milman & Bach, 1999; Pelfrey, 1998; Pizam & Mansfeld, 1996; Sonmez & Graefe, 1998; Tarlow, 2000) and commonly viewed security as an essential factor and prerequisite in choosing a destination. A negative relationship appears between crime and tourism: the scholarship is unanimous that acts of crime or violence have negative repercussions on the tourism industry of countries (Demos, 1992; Pizam, 1999). Acts of crime and violence at tourist destinations can be attributed to economic, social, religious, or political motives. Security of tourists can be threatened by crimes, civil or political unrest, riots, terrorism, and war (Pizam, 1999). This typology of acts of crime and violence that occurred at tourist destinations generally has negative effects on tourism demand. Hence, if the demand for a tourist destination decreases because of low levels of security for the tourists, the prosperity and survival of the tourist destination itself are also threatened. The perception of crime, for example, may influence the evaluation of a tourist destination security from a tourist perspective (George, 2003).

There exists a consensus in the literature as to what perceptions of crime give rise to damaging consequences for tourists' travel behavior (Barker et al., 2003; Demos, 1992; George, 2003; 2010). Indeed, tourists are expected to choose the safest among destination options at hand (Sonmez & Graefe, 1998). According to Barker et al. (2003), perceptions of crime and safety may be a function of individuals' conditioning to safety, the way the destination is depicted, but also subject to media influences. Tourists nowadays have a plethora of choices when it comes to visiting a destination and, as such, ensuring tourists' security comes in the construct of international destination competitiveness. Indeed, a deficiency in security measures may be detrimental for the destination as a negative image can be created through negative word-of-mouth (Donaldson & Ferreira, 2009; George, 2003; Goodrich, 2002; Pizam, 2002). In such a context, tourists' perceptions concerning risks associated with their security at tourist destinations become influential for their future travel behavior. Evaluation of risk is shaped by past experiences of tourists in a destination, but also by media. Coupled with word-of-mouth and past experiences, the media creates a certain image of tourist destinations in the minds of tourists that affect their intent to travel to a destination. These elements contribute to the reputation of a tourist destination. For instance, prospective tourists may decide not to visit a tourist location because it has a reputation for having a high crime rate (George, 2003; Lepp et al., 2011).

Past travel experiences both increase the intent to travel there again and decrease the intent to avoid specific regions, particularly risky areas (Sonmez & Graefe, 1998). Furthermore, perceived risks and perceived safety are stronger predictors in avoiding regions than in planning to visit them. Tourists who feel threatened or unsafe are unlikely to return to such a destination and unlikely to recommend it to others (George, 2003). However, the notion of perceived risk in tourism is not to be confused with the idea of fear. The risk-fear paradox of tourists better explains this distinction. In the context of victimological literature, fear exceeds risk, while in the case of tourism, risk exceeds fear (Mawby, 2000).

There is an established link in the literature between the perception of risk and travel intentions (George, 2003; Kozak et al., 2007; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Sonmez & Graefe, 1998). Most of the scholarship has evaluated risk based on high-profile crimes and terrorist incidents. The literature has tended to overlook certain aspects relevant to tourist perception of security, such as robberies, swindling, drunken behavior, or even unfair bargaining from the local vendors. As well, scholars have taken tourist locations as units of analysis to assess the impact of high-and-low profile crimes on tourist destinations and have seldom focused on tourists themselves as units of analysis. The perception of risk by the tourists is a critical variable as it determines the probability of a tourist to travel to a destination.

Rationale for Expectations in the Destination Security Perspective

Security can be viewed as an indispensable condition for travel tourism, especially in this era of global tourism (Kovari & Zimanyi, 2011). Reinforcing security in a tourist location will likely have the effect of providing a low perception of risk by tourists in a tourist location (Kumar & Hussian, 2016). Though, expectations of tourists regarding a security location also influence their evaluations of risk. A panoply of factors are involved in measuring the security of a destination and include terrorism (Arana & Leon, 2008), political instability (Gartner & Shen, 1992); health threats (Carter, 1998; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009), natural disasters (Faulkner & Vikulov, 2001), and crime in or around tourist destinations (Pizam &

Mansfeld, 1996). These factors are very influential in the travel behavior of tourists. Moreover, the media also plays a role in shaping visitors' ideas about security at a destination. For instance, in the case of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, English and German media argued against going for the event as a result of the crime rate levels (George & Swart, 2012).

The perceived image of a destination as well as media influences when making a travel decision leads us to believe that tourist expectations may be an essential factor; yet, the *expectation* has not been much discussed in the literature. Several theories and explanations have been advanced about tourists' perceptions. Still, we should also consider that if tourists decide to go to a tourist destination, they might indeed have some ideas and preexisting thoughts about those locations, and about the security of those locations. There is a gap in the literature regarding the expectations of tourists about security in a destination.

Expectation can be defined as the performance of the establishment, ideal performance or desired performance; in terms of the relationship between expectation and satisfaction -in which perception determines satisfaction, the expectation is also understood as prior estimations made by customers' while receiving service (Aksu et al., 2010). As Singh (2015) states, tourists are rational consumers who move through the decision-making process by weighing benefits against costs. Thus, knowledge and comparison of tourists' expectations and perceptions about security can help detect security gaps of a tourist destination and enable us to address contributions to a high-risk perception of tourists. The security of tourists is a growing concern for the authorities of tourist destinations. This research contributes to the literature by identifying security concerns from a tourist perspective by evaluating gaps between expectations and perceptions.

- **Hypothesis 1:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about overall security in Antalya.

Internationational tourism would be near impossible without airports. Airports are the first places of tourist interaction with a tourist destination. The airport is the "first and last point of tourists' contact in their holiday destination" (Martin-Cejas, 2006, p. 874). As such, security levels in airports need to be optimal to ensure a continued flow of international visitors. Moreover, airports also have a revenue generator aspect through their facilities; therefore, security at airports is of utmost importance for operators (Enoma & Allen, 2007). Security at the airport has become even more critical following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 (Blalock et al., 2007). The need for better airport security became more pressing following the 9/11 attacks. The attacks have shown that airports were vulnerable targets for terrorists, but yielding greater damage.

Blalock et al. (2007) explained how airport security was reinforced in the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 2001, especially through the federalization of passenger-screening operations and baggage-screening procedures. The 9/11 attacks have brought problems for the US travel and tourism industry, with abrupt drops in airline passenger loads and hotel occupancy, up to about 50% (Goodrich, 2002). Blalock et al. (2007) reported passengers' willingness to undergo additional inconvenience and higher prices to have more security since the 9/11 attacks (Blalock et al. 2007, Travelocity, 2002).

- **Hypothesis 2:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about airport security.

Transportation, Accommodation, and Public Places

Many aspects of the tourism industry affect the overall perception of tourists about a destination. Among them is public transportation. Some tourists may feel unsafe when using public transportation at night; also, if tourists feel unsafe at a destination, they are less likely to take part in activities outside their accommodation (George, 2003). This shows that transportation and public places that tourists visit while on vacation, a business trip, or a special occasion visit affects the overall perception of security for the tourists; however, we should not omit that the place where these tourists stay during their visit is also an indicator of their perception of risk. Expectations and perceptions relate to distinctiveness for which the travelers' visits to a destination and perceptions formed due to the problems encountered during a visit. A study on India tourism found challenges faced by tourists – deficient accommodation, deficient roads, railways, and air transportation systems – links to their perceptions and intent to return (Chawla et al., 2019). Even shopping malls can be used in the evaluation of tourists' perceived risks about a location. Concerning shopping, the understanding of security not only relates to acts of robbery, violence, and terrorism but also dishonesty of sellers or the bargaining experience (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2006). The perception experience of being *ripped off* or *hassled* can affect a future decision to travel or avoid travel to a tourist destination.

- **Hypothesis 3:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about security in public places of Antalya.
- **Hypothesis 4:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about security in the transport sector.
- **Hypothesis 5:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about security in the accommodation sector.

According to Tarlow (2014), food consumption attractions, as well as places of lodging, represent one of the main pillars of tourism. Security is an important aspect when it comes to choosing a hotel (Dincer et al., 2016). It is the duty of hoteliers to ensure the security of their guests while on property. According to Feickert et al. (2006), when it comes to hotel security, it is conventionally accepted that hoteliers should be able to provide a secure environment for guests and their belongings; indeed, regardless of the hotel size, hotel security is viewed as a desired constant for guests. Moreover, it is a priority for hotels if they want to keep a good reputation in the eyes of customers (Feickert et al., 2006). Hotels have become a privileged target for terrorists, for example JW Marriott in South Jakarta in 2003, Taba Hilton in 2004 in Egypt, or Oberoi Hotels in Mumbai and Islamabad in 2008 (Mueller, 2004; Rivett-Carnac, 2016)

- **Hypothesis 5a:** There is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about security in hotels

Country of Residence and Purpose of Visit

The reputation of a tourist destination is not the only factor influencing tourist perception. Risk perception is also a function of cultural orientation and psychographic factors (Fuchs & Reichel, 2011). Nationality has been assessed in the literature as one of the factors influencing perceptions of travel-related risk (Barker et al., 2003; George, 2010; Richardson & Crompton, 1988; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006; Tremblay, 1989). This means that the country of residence of a tourist can also

determine the perception of risk. For example, although they found that most of the foreign tourists visiting for the 2010 FIFA World Cup viewed South Africa as a safe destination, George and Swart (2012) found nationality to be the most significant factor in tourists' crime-risk perceptions. In the case of South Africa, South America, and Western Europe, visitors felt the least safe while tourists from the Middle East felt safer. Thus, differences exist regarding risk perception of tourist destinations among tourists according to the city, country, or continent in which they live.

There can be two interpretations to these differences: first, international travelers appear to be sensitive towards the occurrence of any risk in tourist destinations; second, travelers from different national cultures have varying degrees of the perceived risk (Kozak et al., 2007; Seabra et al., 2013). If the country of residence is a demographic factor that can be used to evaluate tourists' perceptions of their security, we also ought to include other demographic factors such as age, gender, and purpose of visit to have a better idea of how demographics can influence the risk perception of a tourist towards a tourist destination (George, 2010). These imply that the concept of security for tourists is a multi-dimensional concept. Demographic factors of tourists and the reputation of the tourist destination according to the transportation, the accommodation, and the public places influence the perception of risk of the tourist destination, which in turn impact tourism demand. Moreover, the authors found it advisable to refer to the country of residence, as tourists do not necessarily reside in their country of nationality or citizenship; as such, country of residence became, for this study, a much more powerful indicator of the daily realities tourists might be exposed in their daily lives.

- **Hypothesis 6a:** There is a significant difference in the expectations of the tourists about safety and security based on the purpose of travel.
- **Hypothesis 6b:** There is a significant difference in the perceptions of the tourists about safety and security based on the purpose of travel.

Previous studies have established a link between the perception of travel risk and behavioral characteristics, like the purpose of the visit (George, 2010; Rittichainuwat et al., 2002). The perspective on nationality and purpose of visit has also been included as demographics (George, 2003, 2010; Tasci & Boylu, 2010). In his study about tourist security in Cape Town, George (2003) found significant differences in security perceptions concerning nationality. For example, Americans felt reasonably secure to be outside after nightfall in Cape Town compared to Germans, who were not certain about security after dark when walking in the city (2003). However, we could not identify a study linking the purpose of visit to security concerns, and, in this sense, this study will contribute to filling this gap. Thus, the following hypotheses arise from this argument:

- **Hypothesis 7a**: There is a significant correlation between the country of residence and the expectations of tourists about security.
- **Hypothesis 7b:** There is a strong correlation between the country of residence and the perceptions of tourists about security.

Methods

This empirical research analyzes components of the tourism industry of Antalya from a security perspective. The study also aims to contribute to the tourism literature by focusing on the aspect

of tourists' security, which tends to be overlooked in the scholarship in favor of studies generally concerning hotels, quality, and satisfaction of the tourists.

Instrument

This research used a quantitative approach, mainly a survey questionnaire with two main sections. The instrument development resulted from a review of the literature which identified the main constitutive elements of the tourism industry, namely *transportation* (Aksu et al., 2010; George, 2003; Tasci & Boylu, 2010) and *accommodation* (George 2003, Tasci & Boylu, 2010). Other vital components of tourism industries(i.e., shopping malls, restaurants, nightclubs, tourist sites, city center, and beaches) were classified under the category of *public places*. In contrast, the airport was analyzed as a single item due to its central importance for international tourism.

The first section of the questionnaire, which used a Likert type scale (1 = Poor and 5 = Excellent), had respondents rate their expectations and perceptions about security in Antalya. Specifically, this section included items related to the tourism industry of Antalya, namely *city in general*, transportation (i.e., public buses, tramways, cabs, and tour buses); accommodation (i.e., hotels, apartments, hostels/pensions, and neighborhoods); airports; and public places (i.e., airports, shopping malls, restaurants, nightclubs, tourist sites, city center, and beaches.) The components included as main aspects of the tourism industry are consistent with what Antalya's tourism market has to offer to tourists in terms of transportation, accommodation, and public places. The second section collected demographic information about the respondents (i.e., age, gender, country of residence, and purpose of travel.) The questionnaire also included a space for respondents to provide additional comments. For data collection purposes, the questionnaire was translated into Turkish, Arabic, and Russian languages to reach a broader range of respondents. The translation of the questionnaire in Russian and German languages in addition to English and Turkish is appropriate for the context of Antalya's tourism sector; in fact, Aksu et al. (2010) also had their survey translated in English, German, French, and Russian. Moreover, Arabic has been chosen in this study due to the increasing number of Arabs coming to Antalya for holidays (Ilhas News Agency, 2016).

Sampling and Data Collection

The sample population in this study comprises national and international tourists visiting the touristic city/region of Antalya. Respondents have been selected through purposive sampling: For practical and feasibility purposes, and to obtain sufficient data, Antalya International Airport was the most logical location to gather data for this study. The international airport as a prime location for data collection revealed to be strategic as it allowed gathering of information about both expectations through incoming tourists and perceptions through outgoing tourists. Similar studies such as Seabra et al. (2013) and Rittichainuwat (2013), which also investigated risk perceptions involved with visiting a destination, proceeded with data collection in international airports. In this study, the questionnaire regarding expectations was mainly administered at baggage claim areas, and the questionnaire regarding perceptions was mainly administered at the boarding section, specifically restaurants, cafes, and gates.

Data collection obtained a total of 622 questionnaires. Of those, 71 were discarded as unusable due to missing information in at least one of the main sections of the questionnaire (i.e.,

transportation, accommodation, and public places). Among the remaining 551 questionnaires, 269 were related to expectations and 282 to perceptions. The sample is consistent with samples used in previous studies: Chaudahary (2000) and Tsang (2000) had 152 and 213 tourists respectively in their sample, while George (2010) and Tasci and Boylu (2010) had 303 and 306 respectively. The sample size was consistent with those of similar studies. Missing data, which accounted for 12% of the sample size in this study, was included in the analysis as it was predictable. For instance, a given tourist would typically use only one or two transportation types during a visit; similarly, they would also use one accommodation type, and not necessarily visit all of the public places. Nevertheless, the number of questionnaires in which missing data were found (66) compared to the size of the sample (551) does not impede the possibility of generalizing the findings.

Data Analysis

The analysis used gap analysis, which, in this study, compared expectations and perceptions to identify areas of vulnerability and areas for improvement in transportation, accommodation, and public places that constitute Antalya's tourism industry. Gap analysis, also known as disconfirmation theory, has been used mainly in service quality-related studies as a means to assess the difference between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality (Daud & Sapuan, 2012). Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988) are known to be the pioneers in studies related to service quality in organizations, providing five dimensions used by customers when measuring service quality, and including tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. According to Parasuraman et al. (1988), measuring service quality involves a comparison of customer expectations and customer perceptions of actual service performance.

Gap analysis has also been used in studies (Tsang, 2000; Wei et al., 1999; Winch et al., 1998) to assess gaps between customer expectations and managers' perceptions of customer expectations, but also in-service quality (Lee et al., 2016). This analytical tool has been assessed as a common way to determine, document, and improve upon capabilities for products and businesses. Gap analysis can also be viewed as an instrument for analyzing satisfaction as compared to expectations in the context of service quality (Arabatsiz, 2010; Brown & Swartz, 1989; Davis & Fisher, 2002; Headley & Choi, 1992; Zouni & Kouremenos, 2008). In the tourism context, gap analysis has also been used as an analytical school in a variety of studies (Bahar & Kozak, 2007; Palmer & O'Neill, 2004; Swanson, 2004; Zouni & Kouremenos, 2008). In that light, gap analysis is an essential tool in providing information regarding how well a destination is doing, thus at the same time providing insights on areas to improve. Although the tool has been used in service quality settings to assess differences between expectations and perceptions, gap analysis is seamlessly suitable for our study, which evaluated the gaps within the main components of Antalya's tourism industry (and their sub-components). According to March and Woodside (2005), travel motivations can be considered as one of the most critical psychological influences of tourist behavior. To this end, measures of gaps between expectations and perceptions provide a useful tool for this research by which to analyze tourist intent. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) v. 26 was used to test the hypotheses developed for this study.

Findings

The final dataset included a sample size of 551 tourists from 34 different countries of Europe, Central Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Among the respondents, 283 were male, and 229 were

female. The majority of tourists were visiting Antalya for leisure purposes (71%), while the remainder were visiting for business purposes (9.66%) and special events (7.68%). The hypotheses were tested using two main statistical tools: paired samples t-tests and correlation analysis. Paired samples t-tests were used to test H1 to H5, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the relationships between variables in H6 and H7 (Lusby, 2017).

Table 1 highlights the results for H1 showing that there is a significant difference between tourists' expectations and perceptions about overall security in Antalya. A comparison of the means between expectations and perceptions shows a gap between expectations ($\bar{x}$ = 2.04) and perceptions ($\bar{x}$ = .34), and a significant difference between expectations and perceptions (p < .05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of H1. De facto, there are significant differences between the expectations and the perceptions of tourists. Tourists have, in general, high expectations ($\bar{x}$ = 3.35) and lower perceptions ($\bar{x}$ = 2.97) about the security of Antalya as a city in general.

Table 1. Paired Samples Statistics for Tourists' Expectations and Perceptions About Overall Security in Antalya

Expectation				Perception				Paired Samples Test		
N	*M*	*SD*	*SE*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*	*t*	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
228	2.04	13.22	1.24	228	3.43	2.91	.82	11.76	113	.000

Table 2 provides a comparison of the means according to the components of Antalya's tourism industry. Thus, tourists have higher expectations and low perceptions of the security in the city in general, the tramways, the hotels, the airport, the shopping malls, the restaurants, and the tourist sites. These gaps between expectations and perceptions reveal that there might exist some security issues that make tourists view security concerning these items as lower than expected. Concerning tour buses, tourists seem to have a higher perception of security than expectations, suggesting buses in Antalya are up to security standards among international visitors.

Table 2. Comparison of Means for Expectation and Perception

Questionnaire Item	*M* Expectation	*M* Perception	Difference Perception-Expectation	*p*	Significant Difference
City in general	3.3545	2.9712	-.3833	.000	Yes
Buses	3.1894	3.1993	.0099	.747	No
Tramway	3.2126	3.1120	-.1006	.403	No
Cabs	3.2980	3.3043	.0063	.822	No
Tour buses	3.2551	3.4139	.1588	.120	No
Hotel	3.6758	3.3838	-.2920	.006	Yes
Apartment	3.3628	3.4477	.0849	.121	No
Hostel/pension	3.1759	3.2117	.0358	.920	No
Neighborhoods	3.2397	3.4458	.2061	.018	Yes
Airport	3.5560	3.2482	-.3078	.001	Yes
Shopping malls	3.5426	3.4356	-.1070	.366	No
Restaurants	3.5114	3.3608	-.1506	.170	No
Nightclubs	3.2336	3.2785	.0449	.962	No
Tourist sites	3.5058	3.3891	-.1167	.145	No
City Center	3.6115	3.5725	-.0390	.890	No
Beaches	3.4586	3.6455	.1869	.018	Yes

Table 3 highlights the results related to expectations and perceptions about security in airport, public places, transportation, accommodation sector and hotel. There is a significant difference between expectations and perceptions of tourists about security at the airport, as highlighted in Table 3 ($p < .05$). The tourists have a higher level of expectation ($\bar{x} = 3.57$) and a lower level of perception ($\bar{x} = 3.26$) for the security at the airport, which may indicate a security gap at the airport. Hypotheses H3 ($p > .05$), H4 ($p > .05$), and H5 ($p > .05$) are rejected at a 95% confidence level, demonstrating no significant differences between expectations and perceptions of tourists about transportation, accommodation sector, and public places. Interestingly, a paired sample t-test for H5a results in $p < .05$, which suggests significant differences between expectations and perceptions of tourists about security at hotels.

Table 3. Paired Samples Statistics for to Expectations and Perceptions About Security in Airport, Public Places, Transportation, Accommodation Sector and Hotel

Hypothesis	Expectation				Perception				Paired Samples Test		
	N	*M*	*SD*	*SE*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*SE*	*t*	*df*	*Sig. (2-tailed)*
H2 (Airport)	260	3.57	1.05	.07	260	3.26	1.13	.07	3.380	259	.001
H3 (Public Places)	155	24.67	5.83	.47	155	23.67	5.77	.46	1.633	154	.104
H4 (Transportation)	185	13.16	3.54	.26	185	12.93	3.16	.23	.623	184	.534
H5 (Accomodation)	142	13.56	3.9	.33	142	13.21	3.29	.28	.834	141	.406
H5a (Hotel)	245	3.65	1.04	.07	245	3.38	1.15	.07	2.753	244	.006

Hypotheses 6a and 6b investigated differences in expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya based on the tourists' purpose of travel. There was no difference in the expectations and perceptions of tourists about the security in Antalya based on the purpose of travel. These results are highlighted in Table 4. The purpose of travel did not influence the expectations of security since $p > .05$. So, respondents had similar expectations of security in Antalya regardless of their purpose of travel. Similarly, the purpose of travel also did not influence the perceptions of security among tourists in Antalya ($p > .05$). These results suggest that tourists had similar perceptions of security in Antalya irrespective of their purpose of travel.

Table 4. ANOVA Results for Differences in Expectations and Perceptions of Security in Antalya Based on the Tourists' Purpose of Travel

Variable	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Expectations	Between Groups	267.188	3	89.063	.446	.720
	Within Groups	34335.699	172	199.626		
	Total	34602.886	175			
Perceptions	Between Groups	209.138	3	69.713	.831	.479
	Within Groups	14264.724	170	83.910		
	Total	14473.862	173			

Lastly, hypotheses 7a and 7b investigated if there were any differences in tourists' expectations and perceptions of security in Antalya based on their country of residence. These results are highlighted in Table 5 and showed no significant difference in the expectations as well as perceptions of security based on the tourists' countries of residence. The respondents' country of residence did not play a role in influencing their expectation of security since $p > .05$. Additionally, the country of residence also did not influence the perceptions of security in Antalya as $p > .05$.

Table 5. ANOVA Results for Differences in Tourists' Expectations and Perceptions of Security in Antalya Based on Their Country of Residence

Variable	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Expectations	Between Groups	5800.153	29	200.005	1.021	.446
	Within Groups	29202.015	149	195.987		
	Total	35002.168	178			
Perceptions	Between Groups	1697.264	26	65.279	.758	.793
	Within Groups	12825.094	149	86.074		
	Total	14522.358	175			

Discussion of the Results

The statistical analysis allowed the identification of some security gaps in security as expected and perceived by tourists to Antalya. While there are differences in the means for transportation, accommodation, and public places, they are rendered not significant by statistical analysis. That said, looking at the mean values for the city in general, there is a marked difference between expectations ($\bar{x} = 3.35$) and perceptions ($\bar{x} = 2.97$) of tourists about the security of Antalya. In general, this could indicate that some areas of vulnerability in the tourism industry sector of Antalya need to be improved in terms of security to ensure tourists feel safe. The analysis of the other variables under the categories of transportation, accommodation, and public places is consistent with this first gap discovered.

Transportation Sector

Tourists appear to see the overall transportation sector as above their expectations, with one exception: the tramways, for which the tourists have higher expectations ($\bar{x} = 3.2$) than perceptions ($\bar{x} = 3.1$). Although the difference between expectations and perceptions concerning tramways may be explained in that the use of tramways may not be as common as the use of buses, cabs, and tour buses when visiting Antalya. Nevertheless, the difference in means signals security in Antalya's tramways might need to be reinforced. This also shows tourists may be reluctant to use an uncommon mode of transportation when on vacation, business trips, or special event travel that results in a lack of trust about the security in this transportation. This is supported by tour buses were superior in perception than expectation, which can be explained by tour buses offer a more closed form of transportation for people to feel safe with familiar faces. Furthermore, this result suggests that security might be increased in tramways in Antalya, for example, with overt security devices at the tramway stations.

Accommodation Sector

In the accommodation category, differences have only been found about expectations and perceptions of tourists concerning hotels in Antalya. Tourists have higher expectations than perceptions about security in Antalya hotels. These differences may be explained by the issue of a hotel being related to several components of security, such as the risk of robbery, acts of violence, and robberies. We may conjecture that lower perceptions are related to different security systems between hotels or to mixed levels of responsiveness of hotel security guards when unpleasant situations occur. We cannot generalize from this study when analyzing differences in hotels as the study did not separate hotels according to their ranking; instead, the study lumped hotels together as an accommodation facility.

Certain physical and behavioral devices such as deadbolt locks, closed-circuit TV cameras, door viewports, caller screening by telephone operators, locked side entrances into the hotel, and routine visits to the hotel by police provide tourists with a greater sense of security (Milman et al., 1999). For example, the visibility of law enforcement officers at hotels can be seen as an essential factor in tourists' perceptions of security. However, some scholars have argued that too many security measures may produce reverse effects on the risk perception of tourists. Rittichainuwat (2013) found that a stringent increase in the safety measures could frighten tourists because such measures can create a false perception that something untoward has previously happened at the destination. To reduce such adverse effects, there should be a balance concerning overt security measures so as not to exceed the acceptable safety threshold of tourists. If the goal of a tourist location is to have a good reputation by being perceived as low risk, the security in this location should be reinforced, but not in a way to frighten the tourists.

In general, 5-star hotels are more secure than others. Antalya has a multitude of 5-star hotels, but not all tourists stay at these hotels during their vacation, business trip, or special event travel. Hotels are a vital aspect of the tourism industry in Antalya, and the gap identified in hotel security is one that should be further analyzed. A future study can attempt to explore particular security issues of hotels in Antalya, according to their ranking. Significant differences were not found for other accommodation means, which are apartments, hostels/pensions, and neighborhoods. In the limitations section, we addressed this issue, which is related to the fact that a majority of tourists in this study stay at hotels, and only a few of them stayed at apartments, hostels/pensions, and neighborhoods.

Airport and Public Places

Security gaps were identified not only in airports but also in public places such as shopping malls, restaurants, tourist sites, and beaches. For airports, shopping malls, restaurants, and tourist sites, the expectations are higher than the perceptions; however, tourists had higher perceptions than expectations for beaches. The low perceptions of security in the airport and shopping malls may be attributed to an effect in the mind of tourists by events in which airports (Istanbul International Airport) and shopping malls (Hyper Cacher in France) that were touched by terrorist attacks. Tourists expect security to be higher in public areas. Most restaurants in Antalya are open sky and do not have security guards. Tourists may feel anxious at restaurants in Antalya since they are exposed. It can be argued security in restaurants should be reinforced, as in airports and shopping malls. Tourists also have lower perceptions than expectations at tourist sites. Tourists expect security to be at a certain level, and their lower perceptions may be explained by the lack of guards, exposure to robbery, acts of violence, and terrorist attacks. Regarding beaches, which are also the open sky, tourists might have lower expectations according to the events in which terrorist attacks have hit certain beaches (i.e., Sousse in Tunisia). But their perception in Antalya is higher because of the presence of law enforcement presence at most of the beaches.

Expectations and Perceptions According to the Purpose of Travel

Furthermore, the analysis there is no significant difference in the expectations and perceptions of tourists based on the purpose of travel.. Hypotheses 6a and 6b assumed tourists visiting Antalya for leisure purposes would have higher expectations than tourists on a business trip as they would engage in more activities outside their accommodation, use various transportation modes, and visit

more public places. The same assumption goes for tourists visiting Antalya for a special occasion who might not place a higher value on security than leisure and business tourists because such tourists plan their trips and itineraries around the event, considering security a matter of secondary importance.

However, results in this study demonstrated that the considerations mentioned above do not hold. There was no difference between expectations and perceptions of tourists about security in Antalya based on their purpose of travel. This can be interpreted that the tourist city of Antalya has a positive image as a prime tourist destination in Turkey. Furthermore, business and special event tourists together represented 17.34% of the sample, which shows that the majority of tourists visiting Antalya do so for leisure purposes (82.66%). This implies that the former would potentially be in agreement with the latter regarding expectations and perceptions about security.

Expectations and Perceptions According to the Country of Residence

There was no significant difference in the expectations and perceptions of tourists based on the country of residence.. Increasing homogeneity in the security concerns of tourists can explain this. Hypotheses 7a and 7b were formulated based on the assumption that tourists from countries located in the Middle East, where insecurity is an important issue, might have lower expectations on security and, to some extent, higher perceptions. However, these hypotheses could not be proven.

The implication could be that regardless of the country of residence, tourists have the same concerns about their security when on their vacation, business trip, or special event travel. The level of insecurity in the tourists' country of residence does not affect their expectations and perceptions about the level of security when visiting a destination. Moreover, when thinking of Antalya, tourists might already have some standards of expectations about security, which are not related to what they encounter in terms of securing their daily lives.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The security of tourists is a concern that lies at the heart of the prosperity of the tourism industry. The perceived risk of a tourist location affects the future travel behavior of tourists and is determinant of the demand for a tourist location. Thus, the authorities of tourist destinations should take measures aimed at protecting the tourists while on their vacation, business trips, or special event travels. This study explored the gaps in levels of security for the tourism industry of Antalya, Turkey. The components of the tourism industry of Antalya were regrouped in three main categories, namely transportation, accommodation, and public places. Several gaps have been identified regarding the security of tourists in buses, hotels, airports, shopping malls, restaurants, tourist sites, and beaches. The difference between expectations and perceptions in hotels is significant and reveals that measures need to be taken by the authorities for this essential component of the Antalya tourism industry. A future study can explore the security of tourists in Antalya hotels according to their ranking. This study shows that security could be reinforced in restaurants and shopping malls as tourists feel anxious in these places. Concerning airports, security could also be increased, especially in controlling the entrances in the airport domain.

The study determined that for Antalya, there is no significant correlation between the country of residence and expectations and perceptions about security. Additionally, the purpose of travel did not impact the expectations and perceptions of tourists. These findings imply that there is increased homogenization in the concerns of the security of tourists regardless of their cultural background, but also regardless of whether they visit a destination for leisure purpose, business purpose, or special occasion.

Ensuring the security of tourists can represent a challenge for the authorities of tourist destinations. This study identified the gaps related to the security of tourists visiting Antalya. Based on these identified gaps, future studies can focus on exploring what are the security issues related to buses, hotels, airports, shopping malls, restaurants, tourist sites, and beaches as part of the tourism industry of Antalya.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

This study adds to the body of literature on tourism destination security by analyzing security from a destination perspective, including the main components of the typical tourism industry, namely transportation, accommodation, and public places. While previous studies evaluated security in touristic destinations through risk perception -mostly as related to crime, this study stresses on the perspective of the tourist, adding to the analysis a pre-trip variable allowing for a base of comparison to truly reveal security as perceived by tourists. The methodological contribution in this study is the use of gap analysis in the context of tourism destination security. Including expectations in the analysis provided a base for comparison against perceptions to identify areas of improvement or points of vulnerability. Regarding country of residence and purpose of visit, the findings of this study contrast with the relevant literature (Barker et al., 2003; George, 2010; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006; Rittichainuwat et al., 2002) suggesting converging expectations and standards in terms of security in touristic destinations.

From a practical perspective, the findings from this study can be used by tourist operators, local authorities, and governments preoccupied with the security of tourists. Tourists might change their travel plans if they expect threats to their security to be high (Kozak et al., 2007). The results of this study can also be of use for hoteliers willing to position themselves around a priority on security for tourists. For instance, a security system may be viewed as a differentiator among different properties and, as such, become crucial in hoteliers' competitive strategies toward enhancing trust from customers (Marshall, 1993). One way to increase tourist' security in hotels could be by having safety tips in the rooms and hotel corridors. Practical implications from the results of this research can be used as valuable and accurate information for destination marketers, managers, and government officials to implement strategies and plans to attract more visitors, but also to enhance destination satisfaction and encourage tourists to revisit.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study is that the scope of the questionnaire did not allow us to gather information about the number of previous visits of the tourists to Antalya. Many tourists already visited the city. Antalya is a preferred destination for them, which can alter their expectations or perceptions about the security levels of the city. Another limitation is that the *hotel* variable in the questionnaire did not distinguish the type of hotel where the tourist stayed, such as hotel rating or

if the hotel was all-inclusive (i.e., resort hotel). The region of Antalya comprises thousands of hotels distributed in five main zones that are Antalya Center, Lara Kundu, Alanya, Belek, Side, and Kemer. The center of Antalya is located at least one hour away from these outlying locations and can affect the perception of tourists about security according to the zone they visited. Finally, tourists did not necessarily use all of the transportations, visit all public places and stay at all the accommodation places in the survey. While this resulted in missing data, the number of responses allowed for reliable statistical analysis.

References

Aksu, A., İçigen, T. E., & Ehtiyar, R. (2010). A comparison of tourist expectations and satisfaction: A case study from Antalya region of Turkey. *Turizam*, *14*(2), 66-77.

Alleyne, D., & Boxill, I. (2003). The impact of crime on tourist arrivals in Jamaica. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 5*(5), 381–391.

Arabatzis, G., & Grigoroudis, E. (2010). Visitors' satisfaction, perceptions and gap analysis: The case of Dadia– Lefkimi–Souflion National Park. *Forest Policy and Economics, 12*(3), 163-172.

Arana, J. E., & León, C. J. (2008). The impact of terrorism on tourism demand. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(2), 299-315.

Bahar, O., & Kozak, M. (2007). Advancing destination competitiveness research: Comparison between tourists and service providers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 22*(2), 61-71.

Barker, M., Page, S. J., & Meyer, D. (2003). Urban visitor perceptions of safety during a special event. *Journal of Travel Research, 41*(4), 355–361.

Blalock, G., Kadiyali, V., & Simon, D. H. (2007). The impact of post-9/11 airport security measures on the demand for air travel. *The Journal of Law and Economics, 50*(4), 731-755.

Brown, S. W., & Swartz, T. A. (1989). A gap analysis of professional service quality. *Journal of Marketing, 53*(2), 92-98.

Brunt, P., Mawby, R., & Hambly, Z. (2000). Tourist victimization and the fear of crime on holiday. *Tourism Management, 21*(4), 417–424.

Carter, S. (1998). Tourists and traveler's social construction of africa and asia as risky locations. *Tourism Management, 19*(4), 349-58.

Chan, E. S., & Lam, D. (2013). Hotel safety and security systems: Bridging the gap between managers and guests. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 202-216.

Chandler, J. (1991). How safe are our airports? *Travel and Leisure, 21*(5), 94-100

Chu, R. K., & Choi, T. (2000). An importance-performance analysis of hotel selection factors in the Hong Kong hotel industry: A comparison of business and leisure travellers. *Tourism Management, 21*(4), 363-377.

Daud, S., & Sapuan, N. M. (2012). Expectation−perception gap in private higher education institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Management in Education, 6*(1-2), 22-37.

Daily Sabah. (2020, February 11). Turkey named world's 6th most favorite tourism destination in 2019. *Daily Sabah*. https://www.dailysabah.com/business/2020/02/11/turkey-named-worlds-6th-most-favorite-tourism-destination-in-2019

Davis, D., & Fisher, T. (2002). Attitudes of middle managers to quality-based organizational change. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice, 12*(6), 405-413

Dincer, F. I., Dincer, M. Z., & Avunduk, Z. B. (2016). Marketing strategies for boutique hotels: The case of Istanbul. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal, 1*(2), 94-106.

Demos, E. (1992). Concern for safety: A potential problem in the tourist industry. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *1*(1), 81-88.

Donaldson, R., & Ferreira, S. (2009). (Re-) creating urban destination image: Opinions of foreign visitors to South Africa on safety and security?. *Urban Forum, 20*(1), 1-18

Enoma, A., & Allen, S. (2007). Developing key performance indicators for airport safety and security. *Facilities, 25*(7-8), 296-315.

Faulkner, B., & Vikulov, S. (2001). Katherine, washed out one day, back on track the next: A post-mortem of a tourism disaster. *Tourism Management, 22*(4), 331−344.

Feickert, J., Verma, R., Plaschka, G., & Dev, C. S. (2006). Safeguarding your customers: The guest's view of hotel security. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 47*(3), 224-244.

Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2011). An exploratory inquiry into destination risk perceptions and risk reduction strategies of first time vs. repeat visitors to a highly volatile destination. *Tourism Management*, *32*(2), 266-276.

Garg, A. (2015). Travel risks vs tourist decision making: A tourist perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems*, *8*(1), 1-9.

Gartner, W. C., & Shen, J. (1992). The impact of Tiananmen Square on China's tourism image. *Journal of Travel Research, 30*(4), 47-52.

George, R. (2003). Tourist's perceptions of safety and security while visiting Cape Town. T*ourism Management*, *24*(5), 575-585.

George, R. (2010). Visitor perceptions of crime-safety and attitudes towards risk: The case of Table Mountain National Park, Cape Town. *Tourism Management*, *31*(6), 806-815.

George, R., & Swart, K. (2012). International tourists' perceptions of crime–risk and their future travel intentions during the 2010 FIFA World Cup™ in South Africa. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 17*(3), 201-223.

Ghaderi, Z., Saboori, B., & Khoshkam, M. (2017). Does security matter in tourism demand? *Current Issues in Tourism*, *20*(6), 552-565.

Gibson, H. J., Qi, C. X., & Zhang, J. J. (2008). Destination image and intent to visit China and the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management*, *22*(4), 427-450.

Goodrich, J. N. (2002). September 11, 2001 attack on America: A record of the immediate impacts and reactions in the USA travel and tourism industry. *Tourism Management 23*(6), 573– 658.

Headley, D. E., & Choi, B. (1992). Achieving service quality through gap analysis and a basic statistical approach. *Journal of Services Marketing, 6*(1), 5-14.

Holcomb, J., & Pizam, A. (2006). Do incidents of theft at tourist destinations have a negative effect on tourists' decisions to travel to affected destinations? In Y. Mansfeld, & A. Pizam (Eds.), *Tourism security & safety* (pp. 105-124). Butterworth Heinemann

Ihlas News Agency. (2016, February 18). Arab tourists prefer Turkey for its highlands and health tourism. *Daily Sabah.* https://www.dailysabah.com/tourism/2016/02/18/arab-tourists-prefer-turkey-for-its-highlands-and-health-tourism

Kovari, I., & Zimányi, K. (2011). Safety and security in the age of global tourism (The changing role and conception of safety and security in tourism). *Applied Studies in Agribusiness and Commerce*, *5*, 59-61.

Kozak, M., Crotts, J. C., & Law, R. (2007). The impact of the perception of risk on international travellers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *9*(4), 233-242.

Kumar, J., & Hussian, K. (2016). Factors affecting medical tourism destination selection: A Malaysian perspective. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal, 1*(1), 1-10.

Lee, Y. C., Wang, Y. C., Chien, C. H., Wu, C. H., Lu, S. C., Tsai, S. B., & Dong, W. (2016). Applying revised gap analysis model in measuring hotel service quality. *SpringerPlus, 5*, 1-14.

Lepp, A., & Gibson, H. (2003). Tourist roles, perceived risk and international tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(3), 606-624.

Lepp, A., Gibson, H., & Lane, C. (2011). Image and perceived risk: A study of Uganda and its official tourism website. *Tourism Management*, *32*(3), 675-684.

Levantis, T., & Gani, A. (2000). Tourism demand and the nuisance of crime. *International Journal of Social Economics, 27*(7-10), 959-967.

Lock, S. (2019). *International tourist arrivals worldwide from 1996 to 2018*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/209334/total-number-of-international-tourist-arrivals/

Lusby, C. (2017). American and Macau student perceptions towards working in the tourism and hospitality industry. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal, 2*(1), 54-64.

Mansfeld, Y., & Pizam, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Tourism, security and safety*. Routledge.

March, R. G., & Woodside, A. G. (2005). *Tourism behavior: Travelers' decisions and actions*. CABI.

Marshall, A. (1993). Safety top guest's priority list: Sell security as No.1 amenity. *Hotel and Motel Management, 208*(11), 21-21.

Martin-Cejas, R. R. (2006). Tourism service quality begins at the airport. *Tourism Management, 27*(5), 874-877.

Mawby, R. I. (2000). Tourists' perceptions of security: The risk-fear paradox. *Tourism Economics*, *6*(2), 109-121.

Milman, A., Jones, F., & Bach, S. (1999). The impact of security devices on tourists' perceived safety: The central Florida example. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *23*(4), 371-386.

Mueller, J. (2004). A false sense of security. *Regulation, 37*, 42–46.

Palmer, P., & O'Neill, M. A. (2004). Wine production and tourism: Adding service to a perfect partnership. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 45*(3), 269–284.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing, 49*(4), 41–50.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry L., L. (1988). SERVOUAL: A multiple item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-37

Pelfrey, W. V. (1998). Tourism and crime: A preliminary assessment of the relationship of crime to the number of visitors at selected sites. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 22*(2), 293–304.

Pizam, A. (1999). A comprehensive approach to classifying acts of crime and violence at tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, *38*(1), 5-12.

Pizam, A. (2002). Tourism and terrorism. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 21*(1), 1-3

Pizam, A., & Mansfeld, Y. (1996). *Tourism, crime and international security issues*. John Wiley and Sons

Putz, C. (2016, June 30). The Turkish-Russian rapprochement. *The Diplomat.* https://thediplomat.com/2016/06/the-turkish-russian-rapprochement/

Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel anxiety and intentions to travel internationally: Implications of travel risk perception. *Journal of travel research*, *43*(3), 212-225.

Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2006). Cultural differences in travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 20*(1), 13–31.

Richardson, S. L., & Crompton, J. (1988). Vacation patterns of French and English Canadians. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(3), 430-435.

Rittichainuwat, B. N. (2013). Tourists' perceived risks toward overt safety measures. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *37*(2), 199-216.

Rittichainuwat, B. N., & Chakraborty, G. (2009). Perceived travel risks regarding terrorism and disease: The case of Thailand. *Tourism Management, 30*(3), 410-418.

Rittichainuwat, B. N., Qu, H. L., Mongknonvanit, C. (2002). A study of the impact of travel satisfaction on the likelihood of travellers to revisit Thailand. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing 12* (2-3), 19–43.

Rivett-Carnac, M. (2016, January 14). Indonesia: the last six major terrorist attacks. *Time.* https://time.com/4180220/indonesia-terrorist-attacks-history-jakarta/

Ryan, C. (1993). Crime, violence, terrorism and tourism: An accidental or intrinsic relationship. *Tourism Management, 14*(3), 173–183.

Seabra, C., Dolnicar, S., Abrantes, J. L., & Kastenholz, E. (2013). Heterogeneity in risk and safety perceptions of international tourists. *Tourism Management*, *36*, 502-510.

Singh, J. (2015). Safety & security concerns in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Management Commerce Innovation*, *2*(2), 1-5.

Sönmez, S. F., & Graefe, A. R. (1998). Determining future travel behavior from past travel experience and perceptions of risk and safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, *37*(2), 171-177.

Swanson, K. K. (2004). Tourists' and retailers' perceptions of souvenirs. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10*(4), 363–367.

Tarlow, P. (2000). Creating safe and secure communities in economically challenging times. *Tourism Economics, 6*(2), 139–149.

Tarlow, P. (2014). *Tourism security: Strategies for effectively managing travel risk and safety*. Elsevier.

Tasci, A. D., & Boylu, Y. (2010). Cultural comparison of tourists' safety perception in relation to trip satisfaction. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *12*(2), 179-192.

Tremblay, P. (1989). Pooling international tourism in Western Europe. *Annals of Tourism Research, 16*(4), 477-491.

Tsang, N., & Qu, H. (2000). Service quality in China's hotel industry: A perspective from tourists and hotel managers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management 12*(5), 316–326

World Trade Organization. (2020, January 20). International tourism growth continues to outpace the global economy. *UNWTO.* https://unwto.org/international-tourism-growth-continues-to-outpace-the-economy

Uras, U. (2016, March 31). Turkey tourism hit by Russia row and security concerns. *Al Jazeera.* https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/03/turkey-tourism-hit-russia-row-security-concerns-160331041930972.html

Wei, S., Ruys, H., & Muller, T. E. (1999). A gap analysis of perceptions of hotel attributes by marketing managers and older people in Australia. *Journal of Marketing: Practice Applied Marketing Science, 5*(6-7-8),* 200-212.

Wildes, V., & Parks, S. C. (2005). Internal service quality: Marketing models can help to reduce employee turnover. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 6*(2), 1-27.

Winch, G., Usmani, A., & Edkins, A. (1998). Towards total project quality: A gap analysis approach. *Construction Management & Economics, 16*(2), 193-207.

World Tourism Organization. (2020, January 20). International tourism growth continues to outpace the global economy. *UNWTO.* https://unwto.org/international-tourism-growth-continues-to-outpace-the-economy

World Travel & Tourism Council. (2019, February 27). Travel tourism continues strong growth above global GDP. *WTTC.* https://www.wttc.org/about/media-centre/press-releases/press-releases/2019/travel-tourism-continues-strong-growth-above-global-gdp/

Yavuz, M. C., Cavusoglu, M., & Corbaci. (2018). Reinventing tourism cities: Examining technologies, applications and city branding in leading smart cities. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal, 3*(1), 57-70.

Yildiz, A. (2020, February 1). Turkey's Antalya breaks tourism record in 2019. *AA.* https://www.aa.com.tr/en/economy/turkeys-antalya-breaks-tourism-record-in-2019/1690530#:~:text=Record%2Dbreaking%20foreign%20tourists%20flocked,recorded%20at%2013%2C642%2C000%20in%202018

Yuksel, A., & Yüksel, F. (2007). Shopping risk perceptions: Effects on tourists' emotions, satisfaction and expressed loyalty intentions. *Tourism Management*, *28*(3), 703-713.

Zouni, G., & Kouremenos, A. (2008). Do tourism providers know their visitors? An investigation of tourism experience at a destination. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 8*(4), 282-297.