# **Profile of sustainability in some Mediterranean tourist destinations**



# Synthesis: Alanya, Turkey Based on the Case Study by Cevat TOSUN & Caner ÇALIŞKAN

Loïc BOURSE



The study is financed under the FEMIP Trust Fund. This Fund, which was established in 2004 and has been financed - to date - by 15 EU member States and the European Commission, is intended to support the development of the private sector via the financing of studies and technical assistance measures and the provision of private equity.







The analysis and conclusions of this report do not necessarily reflect the option of the European Investment Bank, nor of the Agencia Española de Cooperación para el Desarrollo, nor of the Agence Française de Développement.

### CONTENTS

Introduction	5
I. Tourism and economic development	8
1. Changes in the tourism offer and demand	
2. Revenue from tourism	
II. Tourism and socio-territorial development	12
III. Tourism and the environment	15
1. Water and energy consumption; production and treatment of solid and liquid waste	15
2. Land pressure associated with tourism	17
3. Biodiversity	18
IV. Tourism and governance	19
V. Proposals of policy measures	19
1. Defining local governance for improved political regulation of tourism	20
2. Policy measures in the business sector	20
3. Policy measures in the socio-territorial sector	21
4. Policy measures in the environmental sector	21
Conclusion	22
Bibliography	24
List of figures and tables	25
Appendices	26

# Introduction

The case study by Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan on Alanya (Turkey) is part of the Plan Bleu research project "Profiles of sustainability in some Mediterranean tourist destinations". It is based on an experimental method and involves measuring and assessing the impacts of tourism from the perspective of the key goals of the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development (MSSD), taking into account environmental, social and economic issues in the destinations studied. A "profile of sustainability" has been produced for 11 tourist destinations<sup>1</sup>; across eight Mediterranean countries using the DPSIR<sup>2</sup>; approach.

Firstly, the sustainability of the destination was studied using economic performance indicators (e.g. accommodation occupancy rates), territorial, demographic and sociological indicators (e.g. the effect of seasonality on employment, income levels of the local population, the quality of essential amenities and services) and environmental indicators (e.g. damage to the landscape associated with coastal development). Secondly, thought was given to political measures that could be taken to improve the sustainability of the destination. This systemic and territorial approach was used to examine the destination, which is the basic unit of tourism development, as well as taking into account several different levels (local, national and regional) and the various stakeholders across the region, while relating the Mediterranean tourist system with the other priority areas from the MSSD: water, transport, waste, energy, etc.

- In selecting the destinations to be studied, Plan Bleu defined a methodology requiring that each destination should be an administrative unit on the Mediterranean coast with significant international and/or domestic tourism, that is also home to a permanent population but is not a major city. Based on variables informed by the data supplied by the experts who authored the case studies, Plan Bleu proposed a classification of destinations (Type four (Rovinj) are destinations that are in rejuvenation phase, and represent destinations with primarily international customers, where Tour Operators do not play a significant role and whose accommodation options are primarily facilities other than hotels.

#### Figure 1):

- Type one (Torremolinos, Alanya and Djerba) are international destinations with extensive tourist amenities, and are characterised by a range of hotel accommodation, particularly 4 and 5 star hotels, with a wide selection of leisure activities (health spas, marinas, golf courses, casinos, etc.) and a dependence on tour operators. The sea, beach and associated activities are the main attraction, so these mass tourism destinations are referred to as "3 S" destinations (Sea, Sand and Sun).
- Type two (El Alamein, Siwa Oasis and Marsa Matrouh) are domestic destinations with extensive tourist amenities, and are characterised by mainly hotel accommodation (4 and 5 stars) with luxury amenities (health spas, marinas, golf courses, casinos, etc.) and a significant range of cultural centres, e.g. historical sites. Type two destinations are distinguished from type one on the basis of the origin of the tourists internal demand as opposed to foreign tourists.
- Type three (Cabras, Castelsardo, the Tetouan coast and Tipaza) are destinations attracting domestic tourists who mainly stay in accommodation other than hotels: residential accommodation, bed and breakfasts, camp sites, etc. Other factors that attract tourists to these destinations are their significant cultural and natural heritage (markets selling local products, nature reserves, etc.).
- Type four (Rovinj) are destinations that are in rejuvenation phase, and represent destinations with primarily international customers, where Tour Operators do not play a significant role and whose accommodation options are primarily facilities other than hotels.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Torremolinos (Spain), Cabras and Castelsardo (Sardinia, Italy), Rovinj (Croatia), Alanya (Turkey), El Alamein, Marsa Matrouh and Siwa Oasis (Egypt), Djerba (Tunisia), Tipaza (Algeria), the Tetouan Coast (Morocco).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Drivers - Pressures - State - Impacts - Responses.

#### Figure 1: Graph showing the types of tourist destinations studied



Key

- Destinations characterised by mass international tourism with features including high numbers of charter flights and extensive tourist amenities and hotels.
- Destinations that mainly host domestic tourists with accommodation and tourist amenities equivalent to international destinations.
- Destinations that mainly host domestic tourists. Accommodation is primarily in facilities other than conventional hotels. The cultural and natural
  heritage is used or could be used to attract tourists. However there is high pressure in terms of coastal development in connection with the
  construction of residential accommodation in particular (Tetouan and Tipaza).
- International destinations characterised by a range of accommodation that is not hotels. This is due to conservation in Rovinj and a drift towards residential accommodation in Torremolinos.

Source: Principal Component Analysis by Loïc Bourse based on produced by the experts and processed by Ioannis Spilanis, 2011.

Guide (see also Figure 16 in the Appendix): Axes 1 and 2 explain 64% of the data variance.

Axis 1 alone explains 39% of the information:

- on the right side, it represents domestic tourism with visitors using accommodation other than hotels (residential accommodation or camping), focusing on cultural products (e.g. markets selling local goods, craft demonstrations, etc.) and/or natural features (e.g. national parks, nature reserves and marine nature reserves);
- on the left side, it represents the international character of tourism characterised by widespread use of charter planes (influence of Tour Operators), extensive tourist amenities and a high density of hotel accommodation in the administrative area.

Axis 2 explains 25% of the information:

- on the top part, it represents tourism characterised by international visitors using accommodation other than hotels;
- on its bottom part, it represents tourism with extensively equipped hotels with historical sites and primarily domestic visitors.

Alanya is an "international destination with extensive tourist amenities". According to the Butler model for the life cycle of tourist destinations (BUTLER 1980), Alanya is in stagnation phase. Comparing it with other destinations of the same type, Torremolinos (Spain) is somewhere between consolidation phase and decline phase and Djerba (Tunisia) is in consolidation phase (Figure 2). In a highly competitive environment for tourist destinations, Alanya has increased its high-end hotel bed capacity (4 and 5 star hotels). This private sector offering has replaced the category of hotels that have a special agreement with the municipality. Indeed, one feature of this destination is government intervention, providing strong support for the tourism industry between 1980 and 2000 (a difficult period in terms of profitability due to severe price compitition among many identical tourist destinations and saturation), through these hotels with special agreements. The government then went on to "delegate" the activity to private stakeholders, in particular through operators' investments in accommodation facilities and leisure amenities.



Figure 2: "Domestic destinations with extensive tourist amenities" based on the Butler model (BUTLER 1980)

Source: The data was produced by experts then scaled and centred, Bourse, 2011.

The development of tourism in Alanya has been encouraged by the Turkish state through nation-wide financial incentives. In the 1980s, tourism was seen as a new growth industry, which led the government to pass the Encouragement of Tourism Act in 1982 (Act No. 2634) to support public and private investment. A policy of incentives thus led to the construction of the tourism infrastructure (hotels, restaurants, etc.) and other related public utilities infrastructure (transport, telecommunications, etc.). This is how Alanya became a centre for tourism development in 1983, setting in motion a process of change marked by the transition from a rural, agricultural community to a town influenced by the tourism industry. According to Tosun and Çalışkan, the consequences of this transformation can be observed in the destination's socio-cultural changes, economic structures, population profile and natural environment. While in the 1980s, the general characteristics of the population of Alanya were marked by the Anatolian tradition of summer migration, with the town being a starting point for their journeys, the structure of society was altered by the arrival of the tourism industry. Tourism then became the driving force of a new economy, making Alanya a centre of attraction for people in the outlying towns and villages, and changing the social structures of the population to build a workforce that would meet the needs of tourism.

On the basis of these observations, and with a view to presenting the profile of sustainability for Alanya, this summary of the case study is structured in four sections – corresponding to the four main variables identified in the MSSD (PLAN BLEU 2009) – through which we will discuss various indicators (SPILANIS & VAYANNI 2011), in particular:

- economic indicators: the number of hotel beds, the number and size of accommodation facilities, occupancy rates, the effect of seasonality and revenue per bed;
- socio-territorial indicators: demographic changes, the overall share of tourism in local employment by gender and types of employment contract, and unemployment statistics;
- environmental indicators: natural resource and energy consumption, production and treatment of solid and liquid waste, land pressure and biodiversity;
- governance indicators: implementation of an internationally-defined model of governance, local governance practices and the categories of stakeholders involved in governance.

In the conclusion, we will bring these four variables together in graphic form and assess the sustainability of the destination, then we will present the policy measures proposed by Tosun and Çalışkan to improve the sustainability of Alanya.

### I. Tourism and economic development

The data produced by Tosun and Çalışkan is presented below in order to summarise the consequences and economic impact of tourism for Alanya, focusing on changes in the tourism offer and revenue from tourism.

### 1. Changes in the tourism offer and demand

With regard to changes in the tourism offer, we will initially focus on the composition of the accommodation offering. It can be seen clearly from Figure 3 (a) that since tourism was adopted as a driver for local economic development, the hotel industry has held an overwhelming share of the accommodation facilities. Hotels account for approximately 90% of the accommodation offer, with holiday villages, guest houses, apartment complexes and campsites making up the remaining 10%. In addition, while in the 1980s the largest share was held by 4 and 5 star hotels, the hotels with special agreements with the municipality (municipality licensed accommodations) dominated the accommodation market in the 1990s (Figure 3 (b)). In 1995 and for the next ten years, hotels licensed by the municipality represented more than 50% of the accommodation offer, after which 4 and 5 star hotels regained the upper hand. With regard to accommodation other than hotels, Figure 3 (c) reveals the predominance of apartment complexes, as shown by the perfect symmetry of the curves until 1995. However, while apartment complexes dominated the supply of accommodation other than hotels for 30 years, guest houses increased strongly between 1995 and 2004 and a solid recovery of holiday villages was seen from 2004. Thus, the supply of tourist accommodation in Alanya is overwhelmingly dominated by upscale hotels on the one hand and hotels licensed by the municipality on the other.



Figure 3: Changes in types of tourist accommodation in Alanya based on the number of beds and places.



Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

In addition, Alanya is characterised by a relatively low occupancy rate coupled with significant seasonal variations (Figure 4): in 2008, which was the best year in the data series, the occupancy rate was only 49.69% in the July high season. However, there was a marked improvement in the overall occupancy rate between 1980 and 2008, increasing from 3.01% to 49.69% in July. There was a dip in 1995 in the otherwise upward trend of the occupancy rate, followed by an improvement from 2000 and a resumption of growth in 2006. With regard to seasonality, the high season lasts six months, from May to October, with occupancy rates for 2008 ranging from 33% in October to 49% in July.

Thus, Tosun and Çalışkan highlight two complementary, cumulative findings:

- the dependence of the destination on international customers is reflected in the length of stay (mean 6 days) and the time of year, since 79.41% of arrivals are between the months of May and October.
- the dependence of the destination on international tour operators, to the extent that 88.3% of tourists who visited Alanya in 2007 had booked their holidays through a tour operator.



Figure 4: Five-yearly changes in monthly occupation rates for Alanya

Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

### 2. Revenue from tourism

The indicator based on "revenue per number of beds" shows that the decline in tourism between 1990 and 2000 had direct repercussions on tourism revenues (Figure 5 (a)). Thus, the strong growth between 1980 and 1985, increasing the revenue per bed from  $\pounds 2,280$  to  $\pounds 7,038$ , was followed by a sharp decline that lasted ten years, with revenue per bed dropping to  $\pounds 4,339$  in 1990,  $\pounds 4,137$  in 1995 and  $\pounds 5,601$  in 2000. It was not until 2006 that a return to 1985 levels was seen and revenue per bed again exceeded  $\pounds 7,000$ . The further decline in 2009 (to  $\pounds 5,895$  per bed) illustrates the cyclical effects induced by the dependence of the destination on the international market.

This phenomenon can be observed through a second indicator: the contribution of tourism revenue to the destination's GDP (Figure 5 (b)). In 1985 and 2006, tourism GDP accounted for 59% and 67% of total GDP respectively, reflecting the dependence of Alanya's economy on tourism. Such dependence is indicative of the fragility of Alanya's economy, which raises the major problem of "economic drain". Although no reliable data exists on economic drain from Alanya, it is estimated nationally that between 51% and 60% of revenue from package tours organised by foreign tour operators is not injected into the Turkish economy. Tosun and Çalışkan estimate that the drain from package tours organised by foreign tour operators may be as high as 85% of tourism revenues from Alanya.



Figure 5: Changes in revenue from tourism (€) (2009)



Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

By comparing the various data on tourist supply and demand, the effects of Alanya's dependence on tourism result in:

- dominance of tourism in the resulting local economy, which leads to the region's dependence on this sector;
- dominance of the international market, which leads to the dependence of tourism on foreign customers, mainly consuming a product offered by international tour operators;
- sensitivity of tourism to cyclical effects, which means on the one hand a reliance on public and private investment with regard to the composition of the accommodation offer and on the other, significant economic losses through economic drain.

This three-fold dependence arises from policy options decided by the Turkish state, not only through financial incentives but also through land-use planning. Indeed, while the Anatolian interior is dedicated to industrial activities, the coastlines of this Mediterranean region have been developed for tourism. Government intervention to maintain tourism as a means of stimulating regional development is reflected in several ways: participation in accommodation supply at the early stage of tourism development, and delegation of the hotel market to private entrepreneurs.

Finally, despite the dependence of Alanya on tourism, income per capita is on the rise. GDP per capita has been growing continuously since the 1980s, from around  $\notin$ 1,000 per capita in 1980 to approximately  $\notin$ 5,500 per capita in 2008 (Figure 5 (c)). However, the increase in average per-capita income does not necessarily reflect a balanced distribution of the revenue from tourism throughout all segments of the population. According to Tosun and Çalışkan, the situation remains highly inequitable, since the share of GDP reaped by the wealthiest elements of Alanya's population increased from 44.4% of GDP in 1980 to over 56% of GDP in 2009.

# II. Tourism and socio-territorial development

The population of Alanya has increased sharply due to the pull of tourism as a means of employment (Figure 6 (a)). Immigration is Alanya's demographic strong point because, until 2000, the migration rate was over 5% while the rate of natural increase was approximately 1%. However, these rates have been moving towards a state of balance since 2008 (Figure 6 (b)). Thus, the population of Alanya has almost quadrupled in three decades, up from 63,275 inhabitants in 1980 to 233,919 in 2009.

Figure 6 (a) also shows a population decline in 2005. While it is hard to interpret this phenomenon using the available data, the following hypothesis may be put forward: because (1) the population decreased between 2005 and 2008 and (2) in 2005 the rate of natural increase was the same as 2000 but lower than in 2008, the decline in population growth of Alanya may have been caused by a massive population outflow. Figure 6 (c) shows that the migration rate became positive again in 2008 and that emigration and immigration movements are in general declining, which we will try to explain.





Was the decline in population between 2005 and 2008 caused by a decrease in supply in the job market? To answer this question, three variables must be examined. The first concerns the dependence of employment on the tourism sector. According to Figure 7 (a), the service sector has accounted for approximately 60% of total employment since 2005, clearly gaining ground from agricultural labour. The second variable is the proportion of the service sector represented by tourism (Figure 7 (b)): tourism has been steadily increasing its share of employment in the service sector, from 55% in 2000 to 80% of jobs in 2009, accounting for over 45% of total employment in Alanya during the period 2005-2009. The third variable highlights the ability of tourism to create jobs. The changes in the indicator "number of jobs created per number of beds available" (Figure 7 (c)) illustrate the fact that the number of jobs created in the tourism sector was very high in the early years of the industry in 1980 and 1985 (3.83 and 2.65 jobs per bed respectively) and then

stabilised at around 0.5 jobs created per bed between 1990 and 2005, to finally represent no more than 0.32 jobs per bed in 2009 (with a rate of 0.13 for direct employment per bed). These results mean that:

- employment is heavily dependent on tourism;
- tourism no longer creates as many jobs as it did when tourism was first being developed in Alanya;
- the population decrease is caused by the decline in the attractiveness of the area in terms of employment.







Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

What can be said about working conditions? As a general rule, for all sectors, the predominant type of contract in Alanya is the permanent contract, which is classified as "stable employment" in Figure 8 (a). Between 2000 and 2009, these contracts accounted for approximately 70% of contracts compared to about 30% of temporary contracts, here referred to as "seasonal employment".

There are also substantial gender inequalities in access to jobs in the tourism industry (Figure 8 (b)). These gender-based inequalities are reflected in the unemployment figures. The rate of unemployment has been increasing steadily since 1990, and was around 17.12% of the workforce in 2009 (Figure 8 (c)). Unemployment particularly affects women and young people aged 15-24. Indeed, in 2008, 7.13% of the active population were unemployed women and 3.81% were unemployed people under 25 years of age, meaning that women accounted for 48% of the total unemployed active population and under 25s, for accounted for 25%.



Figure 8: Employment conditions (%)



Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

Despite high unemployment in Alanya, Tosun and Çalışkan note a marked improvement in the level of training of the workforce employed in the tourism sector, which may reflect that the overall levels of education of the population of Alanya have improved. Since 1985, the tourism workforce has been increasingly composed of individuals with secondary education and higher education, with fewer and fewer who lack qualifications or are illiterate. However, Figure 9 shows that the majority of the tourism workforce still has only primary education.





Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

To summarise the socio-economic situation, Alanya is dependent on tourism, which is itself dependent on an international market dominated by tour operators, thus resulting in another level of dependence: dependence on the job market, in which women and under 25s are strongly affected by unequal access to employment. These gender and generational inequalities are also effectively inequalities in terms of redistribution of the fruits of growth, since the wealthiest 20% of the population accounted for more than 56% of GDP in 2009, and 70% of this GDP was income from tourism.

## III. Tourism and the environment

On the basis of the economic and socio-territorial indicators used, the following observations can be made:

- the destination has high visitor numbers in the summer, increasing Alanya's population of 233,919 residents in low season to 900,000 in high season.
- high land pressure caused by the construction of hotel and residential accommodation facilities.
- an increase of the total resident population in Alanya, together with a longer life expectancy (from 63.3 years in 1975 to 73.7 years in 2009).

These various observations will be used to examine the consequences of tourism on the environment through three components: the consumption of water and energy resources and the production and treatment of solid and liquid waste; the footprint of tourism in terms of land use; and the state of biodiversity in Alanya.

# 1. Water and energy consumption; production and treatment of solid and liquid waste

The issue of water supply in Alanya is not as problematic as in other destinations considered in the "Profiles of Sustainability – Mediterranean Destinations" research project, as water is in abundant supply, sufficient to meet the needs of both the population and tourists. Moreover, the government has built storage infrastructure that has massively increased the district's water supply capacity. These facilities can meet the tourist industry's ever-growing demand for water, while also meeting the needs of the resident population, which has quadrupled in less than thirty years. Water consumption does not therefore exceed distribution capacity; daily consumption of the tourism sector is 0.4 m<sup>3</sup> per night stay for a daily capacity of 0.55 m<sup>3</sup> per person per day in terms of production, and 2.98 m<sup>3</sup> per person per day in terms of storage (Figure 10 (b)). However, the issue of managing water resources could become problematic in the current context of reduced rainfall.



#### Figure 10: Capacity to supply water consumption in the tourism sector (m<sup>3</sup>)

Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

Unlike the demand for water, electricity consumption is problematic, in the sense that the district of Alanya has to import energy in order to meet its ever-increasing needs (Figure 11 (a)). Between 2000 and 2008, total electricity consumption rose from 199,704,360 to 615,408,681 kWh. According to Figure 11 (a), total electricity consumption is growing much faster than electricity consumption linked to tourism: while in 2002, tourism accounted for 43% of total electricity consumption, it totalled only 21% in 2008. This general increase could be explained by an improvement in the living conditions of the population of Alanya. However, the changes in the "consumption of electricity per overnight stay" indicator show that tourism consumption has tripled in the space of eight years, from 3 kWh per overnight stay in 2000 to 8.5 kWh in 2008 (Figure 11 (b)).

Figure 11: Relationship between mean monthly electricity consumption from tourism, total mean monthly consumption for Alanya and electricity consumption (kWh)



Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

In correlation with water consumption from the tourist industry, which saw a peak in its growth between 2000 and 2008, wastewater production from tourism increased 53-fold in three decades, from 156,750 m<sup>3</sup> in 1980 to 9,351,156 m<sup>3</sup> in 2008. But this increase is not due so much to tourism (or at least not directly) as to population growth. The contribution of tourism to the production of wastewater is about 62.26% of total wastewater production (Figure 12). It should also be noted that the district of Alanya has very limited wastewater treatment infrastructure, which may result in discharge into rivers and the sea.



Figure 12: Changes in annual wastewater production (m<sup>3</sup>)

Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

With regard to solid waste production, tourism accounted for 20,806,432 kg per day in 2008, representing 44% of total production, which is approximately 46,772,000 kg per day in Alanya, i.e. solid waste production of 1.36 kg per day per tourist and 0.55 kg per day per capita (Table 1). Moreover, 760,000 kg of plastic packaging waste is recycled, 1.7% of all solid waste generated in 2009, and the landfill site has a total capacity of 350,000 tonnes.

	1 1 7	,
	Units	Quantity
Water (2009)	m <sup>3</sup> per overnight stay	0.40
Mean electricity consumption (2008)	kWh per overnight stay	8.47
Waste production (2008)	kg per tourist per day	1.36
Wastewater production (2008)	m <sup>3</sup> per day	15,939

Table 1: Water and electricity consumption, solid and liquid waste production in Alanya (tourism sector)

Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

### 2. Land pressure associated with tourism

Tourism development is undeniably the most influential factor in the process of urbanising Alanya, with high densities concentrated in the "useful part" of the region. Indeed, it is estimated that 1.7% of all land in the administrative area of Alanya is used for tourist establishments, or 30.6 km<sup>2</sup> of the available 1780 km<sup>2</sup>, compared to 14.66% for agricultural land, 60.6% for forest and 4.2% for housing (Figure 13 (a)). Since the coastal tourist area is already saturated, tourist facilities have been built outside the so-called residential area; due to rapid urban development, however, these tourist facilities have now become integrated into residential areas.



#### Figure 13: Changes in land use





Source: Data from Cevat Tosun and Caner Çalışkan, 2011.

The tourist establishments requiring the greatest surface area are hotels licensed by the municipality (64% of the area occupied by tourist facilities in 2006 and 50% in 2008) and luxury hotels (17% of the area occupied by tourist facilities in 2006 and 25% in 2008) (Figure 13 (b)). Land use linked to tourism has transformed the landscape of the coastal zone: 50 km (over 70%) of the 70 km coastline are now occupied by tourist establishments (Figure 13 (c)). However, the large forested area of the interior is a protected nature reserve that cannot be developed (at least for now...).

### 3. Biodiversity

A rapid decline in biodiversity has been observed over the past 40 years in Turkey<sup>3</sup>. Although it is not easy to measure or assess biodiversity on a local level, Antalya (which is the administrative centre for Alanya) is the city with the most plant species and in particular, species endemic to Turkey. It is estimated that about 8% of the 2126 specified plant species and 578 plant species endemic to the region of Antalya (Anatolia) are located in Alanya, that is to say nearly 180 species of specified plants and 49 endemic plant species. Looking at the rich land fauna (Figure 14 (a)), the territory of Alanya is home to more than a hundred species. According to the IUCN (Figure 14 (b)), at least six land animal species are threatened, including the striped deer, the Anatolian leopard and the caracal.





a. Species richness of terrestrial amphibians, mammals, dragonflies and reptiles in the Mediterranean basin.



b. Species richness of threatened terrestrial amphibians, mammals, dragonflies and reptiles in the Mediterranean basin.



c. Species richness of marine mammals in the Mediterranean Sea.

1,000

0 250 500 1,000 Course: IUCN

d. Species richness of threatened marine mammals in the Mediterranean Sea.

Source: CUTTELOD, A. et al., 2008. The Mediterranean : a Biodiversity Hotspot under Threat. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. One reason for this loss of animal biodiversity is the disappearance of some areas of habitat (such as farmland) in favour of constructing infrastructure for tourism. With regard to the biodiversity of marine animal species (Figure 14 (c) and (d)), the Mediterranean monk seal is an endangered species and one of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The author quotes Özhatay, N., Byfield, A. and Atay, S (2003) Important Plant Areas of Turkey. WWFTurkey Press, İstanbul, Turkey.

most endangered pinniped species in the world. The monk seal is threatened with extinction mainly due to tourism, since "tourism-related activities increase the risk of population decline through accidents with boats, wastewater spills, disease transmission, and discharge of pollutants and waste" (CUTTELOD et al. 2008).

# IV. Tourism and governance

Governance of tourism in Alanya is based on a compromise between two systems:

- Firstly, a system that links international, national and local interests, whose protagonists are both international stakeholders in the market and also other national stakeholders from the world of politics.
- Secondly, an international system developed by international institutions that promote good governance based on interactions between stakeholders from politics, the market and civil society.

What are we talking about when we mention compromise? As a starting point, if we take the system of governance that came first in historical terms, the Turkish state saw tourism as a way of stimulating regional and national development in the early 1980s. Thus, the government decided to shift the focus of the Turkish economy toward tourism, designating specific areas of the country that would play host to the industry. Tourism in Alanya is thus a consequence of national planning in a specialised sector of the economy, with centralised territorial planning. To encourage the development of tourism, the government established a legal framework of incentives, notably financial incentives, in order to attract investors. The state's central role in organising tourism is amplified by its being the main player both in terms of political decision-making (it has the power to approve or refuse any tourist project), but also in terms of economic decision-making, since the state is the primary point of contact for foreign investors. In addition, the national government is supported locally by two types of representative that relay its decisions: the governor, who represents the central government locally, and locally elected officials, who derive from a business elite.

However, central government is constrained by international orders, notably from the European Union and the United Nations Environment Programme, which recommend a more decentralised and democratic form of tourism governance. For example, the adoption of Agenda 21 requires the State to make new commitments. Consequently, the central state has started to delagate its various power and functions to local authorities and the NGOS. Indeed, the NGOs identified by Tosun and Çalışkan in Alanya (Alanya Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Association of Managers of Tourist Establishments, Alanya Association of Businessmen and Industry) were encouraged to take part in the decision making process of local matters including tourism development issues. However, these NGOs are composed of the classic stakeholders in the tourist industry, in other words, national political stakeholders alongside local business elites and private bodies.

Naturally, the compromises resulting from the adoption of international recommendations amount to circumventing these orders and continuing to exclude local people from the decision-making process in tourism and tourism management. According to Tosun and Çalışkan, the lack of consideration of local stakeholders, be they from the political arena, the market or from civil society, leads to: worsening of socio-economic inequalities; perpetuation of economic drain; violation of coastal protection standards; limitation of the decision-making powers of locally elected officials, especially if they do not belong to the ruling political party; failure to integrate local priorities, whether economic, social or environmental. This leads to the continued dependence of Alanya's economy on external or "non-local" stakeholders.

# V. Proposals of policy measures

As a result of the various observations on the sustainability of Alanya, we will now focus on the policy measures proposed by Tosun and Çalışkan. We will base the structure of these proposals on an observation

agreed upon by the group of experts who produced the case studies for the "Profiles of sustainability – Mediterranean Destinations" research and development project: tourism should be seen as a means to develop an area and not as an end in itself. Consequently, tourism must be rooted in the territory, such that the tourism offer can be developed through encouraging a focus on quality rather than quantity by mobilising economic and social forces in the area. Thus, Tosun and Çalışkan's proposals regarding integrated and sustainable local development are set out as follows: a proposal for local governance over decision-making processes; and proposed policy measures for the economic, socio-territorial and environmental sectors.

### 1. Defining local governance for improved political regulation of tourism

In Alanya, tourism has followed a planning model orchestrated by central government and foreign private bodies, without exploring the potential for the emergence of flexible, efficient, independent institutions that are run locally. Thus, according to Tosun and Çalışkan, for tourism to follow a sustainable development model in Alanya, the government should embark upon decentralisation reforms, transferring more planning and decision-making powers to lower-level bodies and basing this decentralisation process on the principles of participatory democracy, including local officials, NGOs and community organizations.

However, while centralised administration has caused local governments to become dependent, decentralisation could itself lead to financial and technical dependence brought about by national and international support for the NGOs. This is why Tosun and Çalışkan propose that political regulation of tourism in Alanya follow a community-based local development model, similar to Porto Alegre in Brazil, meaning autonomous local development with policy decisions taken by local stakeholders in partnership with the government and community groups. For Tosun and Çalışkan, following this model would improve the living conditions of the population and more specifically, fight poverty more effectively. In short, in Alanya, a participatory approach to tourism development could provide the following results:

- Benefits in terms of better distribution of the costs of tourism development between different bodies in the industry (local authorities, central and decentralised administrations, private entrepreneurs and civil society representatives).
- Protection of the natural and cultural heritage of the region<sup>4</sup>.
- Better consensus among the tourism stakeholders.
- Improved acceptance of tourism among the local population, since "where development and planning do not mesh with local aspirations and capacities, resistance and hostility can destroy (...) the entire industry"<sup>5</sup>.

### 2. Policy measures in the business sector

In order reduce Alanya's dependence on tourism and external stakeholders (tour operators, foreign tourists, etc.), Tosun and Çalışkan propose that strategies be put in place to diversify the tourism offer. These strategies could, in part, be based on the development and promotion of alternative forms of tourism such as eco-tourism, special interest tourism and agro-tourism. These new tourism product offerings would help deal with the seasonal and geographic concentration of activities. In addition, the diversification of tourism products could increase Alanya's competitiveness both in the international market and in the domestic tourism market. Implementation of these strategies could also serve to empower stakeholders (from the political, private, and voluntary sectors) in relation to the influence of international tour operators on defining the tourism offer in Alanya. These strategies would also expand tourism into the less-developed inland areas, which would help to redress the balance of development in the region.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Tosun quotes Inskeep 1994; Timothée, 1999.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Tosun quotes Murphy, 1985, p. 153.

To reduce the economic drain associated with the dependence of Alanya on external players, Tosun and Çalışkan suggest promoting locally-produced products, emphasising the local nature of the products and their short supply chains. However, local businesses, whatever the industry, are small to medium-size companies, making them less competitive than larger firms benefiting from economies of scale. The following steps could be taken to overcome these difficulties:

- Support local businesses to meet the tourist demand for goods and services, to cause traditional production techniques to evolve, to establish quality standards for local products and, finally, to create cooperative links between local firms in order to facilitate economies of scale.
- Steer tourist consumption towards local products through marketing strategies that emphasize the recognition of product quality and thus minimize tourists' fear of the risk of food poisoning.
- Organize a "partnership market" to encourage and assist local businesses in establishing a competitive price for their products, grouping supplies from wholesalers and learning marketing techniques, to enable them to be recognised by the tourism industry.

However, implementation of these guidelines may generate resistance among those stakeholders who would not benefit from them directly. It is therefore necessary that policymakers seek to balance the interests of different stakeholders.

Still on the subject of reducing economic drain, Tosun and Çalışkan highlight two points. On the one hand, through tax incentives, companies must be encouraged to employ local labour, which would also require the development of training programmes to meet the needs of businesses. On the other hand, tax incentives and micro-credit should help promote local entrepreneurship, so as to contribute to economic self-sufficiency, broadening access to employment and combating poverty.

### 3. Policy measures in the socio-territorial sector

As an alternative to centralised land planning, Tosun and Çalışkan propose that land use decisions be made via proactive planning processes that involve the tourism stakeholders considering the long-and short-term socio-economic and environmental changes, focusing on land use, economic activities, demographic and social development of local populations and natural disaster management. Tosun and Çalışkan specifically emphasise the regulation of land use which they say should include different types of areas, namely highdensity areas, business districts, business parks and workplaces, low-income community neighbourhoods, public amenities and infrastructure and vulnerable areas comprising heritage sites and environmental resources. Such regulation would require long-term, large-scale financial investment, requiring human resources in many areas such as tourism planning, urban planning, economic planning, architecture, construction engineering, agriculture and environmental and forestry engineering. Proactive planning would constitute a challenge for the public sector, both in terms of the organisation and the financing of such a mechanism.

### 4. Policy measures in the environmental sector

In terms of policy measures in the environmental sector, Tosun and Çalışkan suggest that the focus should be on maintaining and preserving natural and cultural resources, which are major assets. Indeed, those involved in the tourism industry recognise that natural and cultural resources are major attractions for investment and tourism demand. Thus, greater awareness of environmental protection is a sine-qua non for the maintenance and development of tourism in Alanya.

Tosun and Çalışkan propose several strategies. The first is based on the design and implementation of environmental training and education programmes to raise awareness of environmental issues. Target populations and participants for these training and environmental education programmes would include local government employees, private sector representatives, NGO members, local people and tourists. In this context, a manual could be drawn up to support these programmes, providing information on the fragility of the town's historical and natural heritage. The second strategy refers to the actual application of regulations, which requires a clarification of regulatory texts to avoid misinterpretation and misuse, while encouraging cooperation among international, national and local institutions. The third strategy focuses on the use of alternative energy sources, by initiating local power generation projects based on solar and wind energy. Finally, to reduce water and electricity wastage, action should be taken to improve infrastructure and alter consumption patterns.

# Conclusion

In order to summarise the profile of sustainability for Alanya, we compared it with the other destinations studied in the "Profiles of sustainability – Mediterranean Destinations" research project: a second Principal Component Analysis (Figure 15) compares the sustainability of each destination with the mean and standard deviation<sup>6</sup> for all sites studied and for each indicator used, based on the MSSD variables. This second Principal Component Analysis (PCA) does not incorporate information regarding governance because the "governance" variable can be considered more as a component used to explain the results and the economic, social, territorial and environmental impact of tourism on the destinations. In other words, the results observed correlate closely with the policy choices implemented in each destination. For instance, in destinations where the availability of water is not a problematic issue, this is due to the fact that the authorities have invested in infrastructure projects such as dams and desalination plants. In contrast, in destinations where, for instance, the land pressure caused by tourist and residential accommodation facilities is high, this is often because of a failure to enforce the regulatory framework or a lack of regulation, as well as because of property-related and financial speculation.

The PCA results are used to distinguish between four types of "sustainability profile" for the destinations:

- destinations with a high level of economic performance, where social protection offers cohesion and the environmental impact of tourism is high (e.g. Torremolinos),
- destinations that are economically competitive, socially fragmented and where the environmental impact is significant (e.g. Djerba and Alanya),
- destinations that, in economic terms, are emerging or in rejuvenation phase, that are socially fragmented and where the environmental impact is either controlled (e.g. Rovinj) or geographically limited (e.g. Matrouh Governorate),
- destinations whose economic performance is poor, that are socially fragmented and where the environmental impact is low or controlled, but where land pressure is a threat (e.g. Cabras, Castelsardo, Tipasa and the Tétouan Coast).

Compared with Djerba and Torremolinos, which are the same type of destination, "international destinations with extensive tourist amenities", Alanya achieves results that are substantially equivalent to Djerba, but the social and environmental impacts are lower than in Torremolinos, which is why Alanya is very close to Axis 3 and slightly below Axis 1 on Figure 15. The economic performance of Alanya is high, but daily spending per tourist is lower than the mean of the destinations studied, because it is a mass tourism destination. Seasonality remains extremely high, despite occupancy rates stabilising at around 40% for six months of the year. From a social standpoint, population growth is chiefly influenced by the migration rate and the dependent population is smaller than the mean for the destinations, and this situation is made tougher by the higher-than-average unemployment. From an environmental perspective, water consumption is high in Alanya, but this is offset by infrastructure that is sufficient to meet the current needs of the population and the various business sectors. Wastewater production in Alanya is in line with the mean for the destinations, solid waste production is below average and land use is lower than average, but with high levels of urban development along the coastline.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Standard deviation is the difference between the largest value and the smallest value in a sample.





Source: Principal Component Analysis by Loïc Bourse, 2011.

Guide (see also Figure 15 in the Appendix): Axes 1 and 3 explain 61% of the data variance.

Axis 1 alone explains 53% of the data:

- The further the destination is to the right on Axis 1, the higher the environmental performance and the lower the social and economic performance in the destination,
- The further the destination is to the left on Axis 1, the higher the economic and social performance of the destination, alongside more negative environmental impacts.

Axis 3 explains 8% of the data:

- The higher the destination is on Axis 3, the higher the economic and social performance of the destination, with high environmental impacts,
- The lower the destination is on Axis 3, the lower the social and economic performance in the destination, with controlled or low environmental impacts.

# Bibliography

BUTLER, R.W., 1980. The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe canadien*, 24(1), p.5-12. Available at: [Consulté mai 31, 2011].

CUTTELOD, A. et al., 2008. The Mediterranean: a Biodiversity Hotspot under Threat. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

PLAN BLEU, 2009. Etat de l'environnement et du développement en Méditerranée, Sophia Antipolis: Plan Bleu, PNUE/PAM.

SPILANIS, I. & VAYANNI, H., 2011. Tourism results and impacts to the destinations' sustainability, Sophia Antipolis: Plan Bleu.

TOSUN, C., 2002. Host perceptions of tourism impacts: A comparative study. Annals of Tourism Research, 28(4): 231-253.

TOSUN, C., TIMOTHY, D.J. and ÖZTÜRK, Y., 2004. Tourism growth, national development and regional inequality in Turkey. In B. Bramwell and B. Lane, eds., Trends and Issues in the Mediterranean Tourism, pp 133-156. Channel View Publication.

TOSUN, C. and FYALL, A., 2005. Making tourism sustainable: prospects and pitfalls. *In* Adaman, F and Arsel, M. (Eds) Environmentalism in Turkey: Between Democracy and Development, pp.249-262, Ashgate Publishing.

TOSUN, C., FLETCHER, J. and FYALL, A., 2006. Turkish tourism development pattern in the New Europe: Implication of EU enlargement. In Hall, D., Marciszewska, B. and Smith, M. (Eds.) Tourism in the New Europe: The Challenges and Opportunities of EU Enlargement, pp.279-287, CABI Publishing.

TOSUN, C., 2006. Expected level of community participation in the tourism development process. Tourism Management, 27(1):493-504.

TOSUN, C., and TOKMAK, A., 2007. Climate Change and Its Possible Implications for Tourism Development in Turkey", Mediterranean Countries and Economic Activities: Tourism and Climate Change: Impacts and Adaptations ENERGAIA International Conferences 6-8 December 2007, Montpellier – France.

TOSUN, C., 2008. Barriers to Sustainable Coastal Tourism Development: Reflection from Turkey. In Economic Valuation of Natural and Marine Ecosystems, CIESM Workshop Monographs: 37, pp. 87-94. CIESM, 16 bd de Suisse, MC-98000, Monaco.

TOSUN, C., 2009. Promoting a Sustainable Tourism: National Study for Turkey. UNEP/MAP/BLUE PLAN: Promoting Sustainable Tourism in the Mediterranean: Proceedings of the Regional Workshop, pp. 963-1022. Sophia Antipolis, France, 2 - 3 July, 2008. MAP Technical Reports Series No. 173. UNEP/MAP, Athens.

TOSUN, C., ERDOGAN, N. and ERDOĞAN, İ., 2009. Seyahat Acentelerinin Faaliyetlerinin Sürdürülebilir Turizm Anlayışı Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesi: Türkiye Örneği Proje No: 107K200, TÜBİTAK, Ankara.

TOSUN, C., OKUMUS, F. and FYALL, A., 2008. Marketing Management Philosophies in a Developing Country Context, Annals of Tourism Research, 35(1):127-147.

TOSUN, C. & CALISKAN, C., 2011. Profile of sustainability in Alanya (Turkey) as a Tourist Destination. An Analysis for Achieving a Better Level of Sustainable Tourism Development at Local Scale, Sophia Antipolis: Plan Bleu.

# List of figures and tables

Figure 1: Graph showing the types of tourist destinations studied	5
Figure 2: "Domestic destinations with extensive tourist amenities" based on the Butler model	
(BUTLER 1980)	7
Figure 3: Changes in types of tourist accommodation in Alanya based on the number of beds and	
places	)
Figure 4: Five-yearly changes in monthly occupation rates for Alanya10	)
Figure 5: Changes in revenue from tourism (€) (2009)1	1
Figure 6: Changes in the population of Alanya12	2
Figure 7: Share of tourism in the number of jobs (%)1	3
Figure 8: Employment conditions (%)14	4
Figure 9: Changes in education of the workforce in the tourist industry14	4
Figure 10: Capacity to supply water consumption in the tourism sector (m <sup>3</sup> )1!	5
Figure 11: Relationship between mean monthly electricity consumption from tourism, total mean monthly consumption for Alanya and electricity consumption (kWh)	6
Figure 12: Changes in annual wastewater production (m <sup>3</sup> )10	5
Figure 13: Changes in land use	7
Figure 14: Alanya and Mediterranean biodiversity, as defined by the IUCN (CUTTELOD et al. 2008)	8
Figure 15 : Graph showing the profiles of sustainability for the tourist destinations studied	3
Figure 16 : Schematic representation of the classification based on a Principal Component Analysis2	.6
Figure 17 : Schematic representation of the Principal Component Analysis of the sustainability profiles	7
Table 1: Water and electricity consumption, solid and liquid waste production in Alanya (tourism sector)	7
Table 2 : Destination Datasheet of Alanya       23	3

# **Appendices**



Figure 16 : Schematic representation of the classification based on a Principal Component Analysis

Source: Loïc Bourse, 2011





Source : Loïc Bourse, 2011.

	Year	Value (1 : yes ; 0 : no)
Demand		
Residents (%)	2008	8,97%
Non-residents (%)	2008	91,03%
Charter passengers/total passengers	2008	90%
Airport	2011	1
Harbour	2011	0
Accommodation offer		
Number of beds	2008	147 571
Hotel beds / total number of beds (%)	2008	91.64%
Holiday village beds (%)	2008	3.01%
Other beds (%)	2008	5 35%
Campsite spaces (%)	2008	0%
Leisure amenities	2000	
Spac / health clubs	2011	1
Spas / Health clubs	2011	1
Sports amenities	2011	1
California	2011	0
	2011	1
Leisure parks	2011	0
Midfillids Conference and exhibition control	2011	1
Conference and exhibition centres	2011	1
Beaches	2011	1
Natural and cultural heritage	1	
Historic monuments	2011	1
Places of worship	2011	0
Museums	2011	1
Cultural events (festivals or traditional events)	2011	1
Nature reserves	2011	0
Places selling local products (craft markets)	2011	0
Cultural activities	2011	0
Economic performance	T	l
Number of overnight stays	2008	13 914 397
Daily spending per tourist (€)	2009	56
Revenue per bed (€)	2009	5 895
Revenue per overnight stay (€)	2009	57
Seasonality		-
Mean annual occupancy rate	2008	28,06%
Social performance		
Direct employment per bed (number of jobs)	2009	0,13
Unemployment	2009	17.12%
Level of education of employees: higher education	2009	20.00%
Level of education of employees: secondary education	2009	26,00%
Level of education of employees: primary education	2009	49,43%
Level of education of employees: no qualifications	2009	4.57%
Demographic indicators		
Total population	2008	233 919
Dependent population	2008	33%
Life expectancy	2009	73.6 ans
Population growth rate	2008	3.69%
Migration rate	2008	2%
Environmental performance	_000	
Water consumption	2009	0.40 m3/nuitée
Energy consumption	2008	8.47 kwh/nuitée
Waste production	2008	1.36 kg/touriste/iour
Wastewater production	2008	15 939 m3/inur
Land area of tourist accommodation / total area governed by	2000	10 000 110/jour
local authority	2008	84,04

#### Table 2: Destination Datasheet of Alanya