

St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, Sofia

TOURISM STUDIES *and* **SOCIAL SCIENCES**

Editors

Vilian KRYSTEV
Sabriye ÇELİK UĞUZ
Recep EFE
Erol KAPLUHAN



TOURISM STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Editors

Vilian KRYSTEV
Sabriye ÇELİK UĞUZ,
Recep EFE
Erol KAPLUHAN

ISBN 978-954-07-5202-0



ST. KLIMENT OHRIDSKI UNIVERSITY PRESS
SOFIA • 2021

Editors

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vilian
KRYSTEV**

University of Economics – Varna
Faculty of Management
Varna – Bulgaria

Prof. Dr. Recep EFE

Balikesir University, Faculty of
Arts and Sciences, Department
of Geography, Turkey

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sabriye ÇELİK
UĞUZ**

Balıkesir University, Burhaniye
School of Applied Sciences,
Department of Tourism
Management, Burhaniye, Balıkesir,
Turkey

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erol KAPLUHAN

Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy
University, Faculty of Arts and
Sciences, Department of
Geography, Burdur-Turkey

St. Kliment Ohridski University Press

ISBN 978-954-07-5202-0

The contents of chapters/papers are the sole responsibility of the authors, and publication shall not imply the concurrence of the Editors or Publisher.

© 2021 Recep Efe and Emin Atasoy

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the editors and authors

CONTENTS

Preface	viii
SECTION 1: TOURISM	1
Chapter 1.....	2
Examining the Recreational Opportunities, Main City Attractions and Complementary Areas Offered by Brand Cities in Terms of E-Marketing <i>İlke BAŞARANGİL</i>	
Chapter 2.....	16
Gastronomy Tourism <i>Betül ÇETİN</i>	
Chapter 3	32
Geotourism Activities in The Geoparks in the Founding Member Countries of The European Geoparks Network <i>Emre BAKIRCI, Sabriye ÇELİK UĞUZ, Abdullah SOYKAN and Erkin TOKPANOV</i>	
Chapter 4.....	50
Determining the Travel Safety Attitudes of Potential Turkish Tourists: An Intergenerational Analysis <i>Cemali BUZLUKÇU and Nur Neşe ŞAHİN</i>	
Chapter 5.....	75
A Creative Approach in Creative Tourism: Apitourism <i>Esra CESUR</i>	
Chapter 6.....	92
How Much is Turkey Ready for The Covid-19 Crisis in Tourism? An Evaluation on Tourism Enterprises in Marmaris <i>Gizem ÖZGÜREL and Füsün ESENKAL ÇÖZELİ</i>	
Chapter 7.....	119
Using Digital Technologies in Destination Management <i>Gökhan ONAT and Yusuf KARAKUŞ</i>	
Chapter 8.....	134
An Overview of Gastronomy Tourism <i>Gülhan YALIN</i>	
Chapter 9.....	144
Challenges Faced by Female Tourist Guides and Suggested Solutions <i>Meltem INCE YENİLMEZ, Gulsun YILDIRIM and Ceyhun Çağlar KILINÇ</i>	

Chapter 10.....	161
The Effect of Perceptions on The Festival Effects of Local Public on Perceived Value, Festival Satisfaction and Festival Loyalty: International Şile Cloth Culture and Art Festival <i>Cemre TOKATLI, İlke BAŞARANGİL and Takican METİN</i>	
Chapter 11.....	182
Understanding Generation Y; The Effects, Problem and Solution Suggestions of Education Systems on Occupational Career and Entrepreneurship Tendency <i>Bayram ÖZER and Musa OFLAZ</i>	
Chapter 12.....	195
The Evaluation of Turkey Tourism Within the Context of Health Tourism <i>Olca ÖZİŞİK YAPICI</i>	
Chapter 13.....	208
SWOT Analysis of Sındırgı (Balıkesir) according to the Cittaslow Movement <i>Özge GÜDÜ DEMİRBULAT and Uğur SAYLAN</i>	
Chapter 14.....	220
Research on the Determination of the Destination Personality of Van Province in Terms of Branding <i>Pelin KOÇ</i>	
Chapter 15.....	239
Camp and Caravan Tourism <i>Özge ALKAN</i>	
Chapter 16.....	254
Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR) Tourism in the Context of Migration and Tourism: The Case of Turkey <i>Sabriye ÇELİK UĞUZ</i>	
Chapter 17.....	265
Effects of Ethnic Restaurant Experience on Tourist Behavior: A Research on Germans Visiting Turkish Restaurants in Berlin <i>Sami Sonat ÖZDEMİR</i>	
Chapter 18.....	285
Orientation Toward Nostalgia Sports Tourism Event: Ethnosport Cultural Festival in Turkey <i>Sibel SÜ ERÖZ, Mevlüt ÇINAR, Polat ERİK and Cansel DOĞAN AYDOĞAN</i>	

Chapter 19.....	312
Evaluation of Halal Tourism in Turkish Online News by Content Analysis	
<i>Sultan Nazmiye KILIÇ</i>	
Chapter 20	327
The Evaluation of Health Tourism in The Context of Digitalization and Digital Marketing	
<i>Müslim BUDAKKIRAN and Şefik Okan MERCAN</i>	
Chapter 21.....	341
Effect of Satisfaction on The Formation of Behavioral Intentions Towards the Destination of Local Tourists: Case of Ayvalık	
<i>Yakup DİNÇ</i>	
Chapter 22.....	353
A Study on The Potential of Cultural Tourism: The Case of Burdur Province	
<i>Kadir TEMURÇİN and Uğur TOZKOPARAN</i>	
Chapter 23.....	375
Current Supporting Practices in Health Tourism	
<i>Gülden POLAT and İlker ÖZTÜRK</i>	
Chapter 24.....	392
Tourism Perception of Local People; A Research Specific to Arhavi (Artvin) Destination	
<i>Ceyhan AKYOL</i>	
Chapter 25.....	404
A Study on the Perception of Eco-Culture Tourism: The Case of Safranbolu	
<i>Nurettin AYAZ</i>	
Chapter 26.....	416
Determinations of Factors Effecting the Destination Choice	
<i>Cenk Murat KOCOGLU and Mustafa İRİBAS</i>	
SECTION 2: GEOGRAPHY	431
Chapter 27.....	432
A Research on Energy Geography: The Importance and Effect of Hydrocarbon Discoveries in Eastern Mediterranean With Regard to Turkey	
<i>Erol KAPLUHAN</i>	

Chapter 28.....	459
Animal Husbandry Potential in the Southeastern Taurus Mountains and its Immediate Surroundings <i>Ayşe ÇAĞLIYAN and Esen DURMUŞ</i>	
Chapter 29.....	481
Place of Conservation Geography in The Secondary Education Geography Program <i>Öznur YAZICI</i>	
Chapter 30.....	503
Morphometric Analysis of Dolines on Kestel (Burdur) Mountain <i>Yıldırım ATAYETER and Onur YAYLA</i>	
Chapter 31.....	518
Changes of Extreme Temperature Indices in Urban/ Rural Settlements in Northern and Southern Turkey <i>Dilek AYKIR</i>	
Chapter 32.....	544
Biogeographic Characteristics of the Kaz Mountains (NW Turkey) <i>Recep EFE, Abdullah SOYKAN, İsa CÜREBAL and Süleyman SÖNMEZ</i>	
Chapter 33.....	562
UAV-DEM Generation and Error correction for 2D Hydrodynamic Flood Inundation Model <i>Emre ELBAŞI</i>	
Chapter 34.....	576
A Geographical Investigation of The Crimes Against Property in The Araç District Center in Terms of Crime Geography <i>Evren ATIŞ</i>	
SECTION 3: HISTORY	600
Chapter 35.....	601
The Visit of the Emperor-King Franz Joseph to Bosnia and Herzegovina, (May 30-June 3, 1910) <i>Senem GÖNENÇ</i>	
SECTION 4: LINGUISTICS	627
Chapter 36.....	628
Affect in Social Media: Tweets About The COVID-19 Pandemic <i>Esra AYDIN ÖZTÜRK, Gökhan SOYŞEKERCİ and Şule DÜZDEMİR</i>	

Chapter 37.....	642
An Analysis of -sAl Morpheme in Turkish <i>Özge CAN, Umut YOZGAT and Özgün KOŞANER</i>	
SECTION 5: PHILOSOPHY	652
Chapter 38.....	653
The Language of Thought: Somewhere Between Fodor and Dennett <i>Nazım GÖKEL</i>	
Chapter 39.....	668
Takiyettin Mengüşoğlu's Contribution to The Turkish Philosophical Literature from The Perspective of Phenomenology <i>Çiğdem YILDIZDÖKEN</i>	
SECTION 6: ADMINISTRATION	691
Chapter 40.....	692
The Relationship Between Dark Leadership and Organizational Silence: A Comparative Example of Service and Production Sectors <i>Nilüfer RÜZGAR and Buse BEDEL</i>	

Chapter 4

Determining the Travel Safety Attitudes of Potential Turkish Tourists: An Intergenerational Analysis

Cemali BUZLUKÇU¹ and Nur Neşe ŞAHİN²

¹Res. Assist. PhD; Balıkesir University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Management, Balıkesir-Turkey

²Lecturer, PhD; Yalova University, Armutlu Vocational School, Hotel, Restaurant and Catering Services Department, Yalova-Turkey

INTRODUCTION

Intergenerational differentiations are important in order to make inferences in the scientific field, to reach classifications and to make the right decisions. Each generation has important breaking points in its own life cycle. Some important events cause significant changes in the economic, political or social arena. Differences in forms of production, changes in consumption and their reflections on lifestyles leave different traces in individuals who experience these periods. It is considered important to monitor these traces and change, to observe social change and to make inferences about the future. Universal changes and great breaks can be mentioned, as well as periodic changes and their effects can make significant changes in societies. It is believed that the Covid-19 and pandemic process experienced will also create a number of differences that will be carried into later periods. In general, travel safety and differentiation of preferences within the framework of tourism activity is a subject that has been investigated and discussed. Of course, the tourism sector, which is based on people, is one of the areas most affected by social changes. For this reason, determining differences and looking closely at the direction of change are considered important and necessary for future planning. In the study, it was aimed to determine the differences in attitudes of potential Turkish tourists regarding travel safety in the X, Y, Z generations.

1.Generation Concept

The concept of generation, based on the origin of *genos* (ancient Greek) and meeting the meanings of existence and birth, has been the subject of research in many fields from history to Psychology, from management to sociology (Joshi et al, 2011; Lub et al, 2014). According to the first statement based on the differences between parents and the child in the family, the concept of a generation that marks a range of about twenty to thirty years has been criticized today for factors such as changing marriage, childbearing age, etc. Today, the twenty-thirty-year period

is not enough to define a generation. Therefore, in the societies it can be said that this range has extended to forty years. On the other hand, given the change of societies, twenty-thirty-year processes, combined with technology, globalization and changing values, are characteristically too long to identify and preserve the characteristics of generations. Especially today, everything becomes more temporary, variable and fluid. This is one of the main problems related to the identification and generalization of generations. Therefore, generations should be supported not only by birth/biological reasons, but also by sociological changes and factors in terms of the reasons mentioned (Lyons, 2003; Cennamo, 2005; Licata, 2007; McCrindle and Wolfinger, 2010).

Generational distinctions are also a very preferred topic of marketing and tourism literature. As a result of social, economic and political developments, the preferences and lifestyles of societies change, while each generation develops some unique behaviors (Akşit Aşık, 2019). Although there is no exact similarity and harmony for every person belonging to these generations when considering generations according to Lower (2008), Adıgüzel et al. (2014:169) are in the general framework of the generation concept in the relevant literature;

- When describing individuals born at the same time intervals,
- When specifying their position for each family member,
- It also mentions that in social and historical perception, a group of people with different values are used within themselves or in defining others.

Cox and Holloway (2010) point out that what is emphasized when classifying generations is the system of common behaviors, directions and values they have. Similarly, many well-established sources argue that similar birth intervals, as well as similar historical and social events, should be taken into account when determining generations and generalizing discourses in this direction. People who have similar experiences and acquire similar habits can look at life in a similar way (Mannheim, 1952; Strauss and Howe, 1991). Twenge and Campbell (2008) mentions that someone who grew up in the 90s and a person who grew up in the 50s will have different experiences, different social circles, different rights, values and habits, and that their decisions in life may differ to this extent. In order to present meaningful findings about the generations, the boundaries and basic characteristics of the generations should be explained well.

Defining generations and explaining their common characteristics requires both a historical classification and, as mentioned, a sociological explanation. These explanations may sometimes differ. For example, in the classification of generations for Israel, wars are based, while important social issues associated with birth for America are also taken into account. Generations can also mean other things to each society. Although there is no consensus on this issue in Turkey, this study is based on the classification determined both by taking into account TUIK (2020) data and by evaluating generally accepted sources together (Özer et al., 2013; TUIK, 2020).

In this context, if it is examined with general lines to look at intergenerational differences; Silent Generation (1924-1945) (Lyons, 2007; Sessa, 2007), The Baby Boomer generation (1946-1964) (Zhang and Bonk, 2010; Williams and Page, 2011; Trower, 2009), Generation X (1965-1979) (Kyles, 2005; Lyons, 2007; Kuran, 2010; Kelesh, 2011), Generation Y (1980-1999) (Kelesh, 2011; Kuran, 2010; Kyles, 2005; Crumpacker and Crumpacker, 2007) and Z Generation (2000 and later) (Twenge et al, 2010; Kuran, 2010; Aka, 2017) Although there is no complete consensus in terms of dates of birth (Chen and Choi, 2008; Damato and Herzfeldt, 2008) general characteristics and ranges of generations can be explained as follows:

Silent Zone

This generation, born between 1925-45, went through quite active times and witnessed important breaking points. The silent generation can also be considered as traditionalists. Their characteristic structures have been greatly influenced by the difficult times they lived through. Being extremely careful about precautions and their devotion to saving due to the crises they experienced are among the characteristics that best define them (Zemke et al, 2000; Reeves and Oh, 2008; Türk, 2013). They display highly suspicious and protective behaviors in taking risks. Their need for security is enormous. Silent generation members are known for their struggle to survive (Lehto et al, 2008; Levickaite, 2010; Srinivasan, 2012; Berkup, 2015).

Baby Boomer Generation

Born between 1946 and 1964, this generation is the children of the silent generation. They were born during the years of population boom after the Second World War. Since these babies are a billion, they are called the baby boom generation (Senbir, 2004; Kyles, 2005; Parry and Urwin, 2011). This generation, also called the 'Me Generation', attaches great importance to the state and state authority. This generation, which has reshaped society, has witnessed periods when human rights were discussed, revolutions, and multiparty periods. Baby boomers, the children of suit-wearing, humble and committed parents, have formed a highly workaholic group that processes everything step by step, takes slow and firm steps (Öz, 2015; Tolbize, 2008; Reeves ve oh, 2008, Twenge, 2013). This generation, which has a high tendency to spend and have fun, has a profile that is less concerned than its parents, has noticed life again and is focused on itself. They are referred to as a generation that does not compromise its own desires and always pursues its dreams (Smith and Clurman, 1997; Zemke et al, 2000; Kupperschmidt, 2000).

X Generation

This generation, considered to have been born between 1965 and 1979, is the children of a great disintegration period in which marriage and birth declined, the

concept of family was fragmented and redefined, and confidence in social institutions was broken (Fukuyama, 2009). They belong to a period in which important events took place in Turkey and dramatic changes occurred in education, health and population. Living standards can also be called generation X, intermediate generation or transitional generation grown in developed families compared to past periods (Erden Ayhün, 2013). Generation X individuals in general have a collaborative, combative, respectful of differences, prone to cultural diversity, tolerated, global thinking and highly guaranteed structure (Senbir, 2004; Toruntay, 2011; Karaaslan, 2014). Generation X, which is results-oriented, has an anxious spirit. It also sees change as a necessity. This can be exemplified by its mobility and entrepreneurship in business life. In addition, they have a more prone profile to technological developments than their parents.

This generation, which coincides with the first computer sales, is more enthusiastic and compatible with today's developments. Another important feature is that they prefer to communicate directly and can be more harmonious in society. Generation X exhibits a structure that cares about knowledge and sanctifies research. Personal development and attention are important to them (Reisenwitz and Iyer, 2009; Marcus, 2014; Adigüzel, 2014; Özer et al., 2014; Gulz, 2014). Generation X describes the steps it has skipped with these two basic indicators. Generation X, the first generation to recognize the concept of gender equality, exhibits a skillful and stand on their own feet. In addition, another characteristic of Generation X is that it has a high level of anxiety, pays great attention to measures and exhibits a guarantor character (Levickaite, 2010; Toruntay, 2011; Bayhan, 2014).

Y Generation

Generation Y includes individuals born between 1980 and 1999. They are children of an era when technology developed, adapted to life. As of 2025, they represent the largest generation in the world (Kuyucu, 2014). Generation Y, which easily adopts innovations, has a free spirit. They are well educated and defenders of free life (Yüksekbilgili, 2013). Their loyalty and feelings of trust are high. They're optimistic. They're healthily skeptical. In general, they make an impression that is fond of their safety and takes its own precautions (Bourne, 2009; Ferri-reed, 2013; Adigüzel et al., 2014). They try to make good use of technological networks and tools. They demonstrate a character in which all kinds of innovations, cultural diversity, sociability, communication, ease and speed are at the forefront (Zemke et al, 2000). Generation Y, which attaches importance to learning, exhibits a research character. They have a high self-confidence and a brave soul. Generation Y, who are quite confident in themselves, consists mostly of individuals who stand on their own and come up with solutions themselves because they have working parents (Tulgan and Martin, 2001; Ng et al. 2010; Dhevabachachai and Muangasama, 2013; Pinzaru et al. 2016). Y generation, who are interested in casual clothing, comfortable working and comfortable living, are

very interested in communication and entertainment. They can put in good teamwork (Twenge and Campbell, 2008; Yusoff and Kian, 2013; Adigüzel et al., 2014; Pinzaru et al., 2016).

Z Generation

Although there is no complete agreement on the years of birth, generation Z generally includes those born in 2000 and later. The Z's, children of the tech age, are known to be fond of speed, loneliness, individualism. Generation Z individuals who are impatient, difficult to satisfy, hard-trusting and are seen as more abstainer in communication than other generations can be treated as individuals who care about differences, are creative, seek innovation, make multiple decisions, adopt a form of instant consumption (Altuntug, 2012; Akdemir et al., 2013; Berkup, 2014, Valiant, 2016). Generation Z (Strauss and Howe, 1991; Haeberle et al., 2009), which became overly individualized, lonely and passive in communication, are children of an era completely surrounded by technology. Generation Z, also defined as digital natives because of their birth into technology, is also treated as a deeply emotional generation. Both their age and their life, which we can consider disconnected from the social order, are literally the subject of curiosity (Senbir, 2004; Williams, 2010). Generation Z, which has a focus problem, deals with many things at the same time, cannot belong, and their individual desires are too prominent (Mengi, 2009; Berkup, 2015). It is believed that they have different consumption habits, values and perspectives than other generations due to the period in which they live (Altuntug, 2012; Çetin Aydın and Başol, 2014; Berkup, 2015).

1.1. Studies on Tourism and Generation Differences

There are studies that show that lifestyles between generations are different and that their perspectives on life are clearly separated from each other (Acılıoğlu, 2015). At the same time, it can be mentioned that the personalities of generations and the ways of self-identification can be separated and grouped (Twenge, 2013). On the other hand, there are many studies that investigate similarities and differences in the type of consumption and shopping they prefer (Aysel, 2018), focusing on the differences and similarities of decision-making styles between generations (Engizek and Şekerkaya, 2016; Yüksekbiçgili, 2016), focus on whether they check when consuming, how much they care about information (Sladek and Grabinger, 2013), what they pay attention to in goods and services (Wood, 2013). As you can see, intergenerational gaps are open to research in many different ways.

When examined in terms of tourism, it is possible to find studies in which generations are defined and discussed separately. Generation X, perfectly adapting to the new world, travels with informed reservations and elaborated and detailed plans (Szromek et al., 2019). Generation Y has a more exploratory tourist trend with a sense of independence and the driving force of its innovators.

Generation Y, which spends more, is quite open to interesting experiences and knowledge of their travels, avoids mass tourism and exhibits a traveler's nature (Naidoo et al., 2015; Vukic et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2016). Generation Y, which cares about environmental problems and health, enjoys detailed trips with the help of current technologies in their travel and planning (Sun et al., 2016). It was determined that Generation Y is sensitive to price in terms of touristic products, makes decisions according to their social environment, their social infrastructure determines their preferences, and entertainment and cultural opportunities are important in destination selection (Barton et al., 2013; Vukic, 2015). In the study of Verrisimo and Costa (2018), it is noted that Generation Y communicates more, tends to local activities, stays in places where it feels like it is at home. It is also possible that Generation Z individuals live semi-dependent lives with their parents, and they participate in many different types of tourism activities. Generation Z, which is prone to local activities, show themselves in tourism activities where innovation, individuality come to the fore and communication is established on more virtual platforms (Szromek et al., 2019). Serçek and Serçek (2017) compared Generation X, Y and Z in their study, which mentioned differences in the way tourists perceive destination images. As can be seen in the relevant study, it can be said that the results of studies on the choice of destinations of Generation Y and Z show similarities and differences. For example, there are differences in points such as sensitivity to price, trying different things, and the importance given to natural attractiveness (Akşit Aşık, 2020; Barton et al., 2013). In addition, Akşit Aşık (2020) notes that Generation Z is looking for more exotic atmospheres than Generation Y and is prone to adventure. The sensitivity of Generation Y to nature and curiosity about historical cultural areas have been determined as more than Generation Z.

In their study, Başgöze and Bayar (2015) examined the process of purchasing eco hotel service. According to this study, generations X and Y were compared and it was noted that individuals belonging to Generation X had a higher tendency to buy the services of eco hotels. Li and others (2013) mention that international travelers have different attitudes and behaviors in terms of generations. Baby Boomer and generation X individuals, for example, see online travel information and sources of information as more important than millennials. Huang and Petric (2010) similarly compared travelers by generation, focusing specifically on sources of information and activity preferences. Accordingly, he emphasized that generations X and Y show similar characteristics.

2. Travel Safety, Covid 19 and Tourism

There are few studies in tourism that directly examine the safety of travel. In the literature, the issue of security is perceived in two different ways. Although this distinction is not clear, it is considered as protection from non-intentional, spontaneous situations and protection from human path behaviors and harm that contain obvious threats. Although this distinction is not clear, it is considered as

protection from non-intentional, spontaneous situations and protection from threatening human behaviors and harms. Being safe can sometimes be explained as a feeling of spiritual comfort, which can be achieved depending on security measures taken by official means, and sometimes personal security measures (Shinn, 2005; Popescu, 2011). Safety concerns carried during and before travel cause tourists to be affected both psychologically and behaviorally, which affects their tourism experience and holiday quality (Barker et al., 2002). Especially the perception that tourists are exposed to more safety problems is considered as an issue that should be seriously addressed within tourism activities due to the potential to make tourists obvious victims in terms of crime rates and accidents, with tourist destinations seen as overcrowded and uncontrolled (Biagi and Detotto, 2014).

There is a study that combines two close-up concepts as safety and security to create a new concept in the form of surety and studies travel safety in this way (Tarlow, 2006). The perception of travel safety, which is usually addressed together with the perception of risk (Lepp and Gibson, 2003; George, 2010) requires protection from any threats and harms that may arise from humans in general (Coursen, 2014) as well as any threats and harms that may arise from accidents (Korstanje and Clayton, 2012). The new travel safety attitude should be expressed together with both security and safety (Wan, 2007). The perception of travel safety, which has a direct impact on the image of destinations, travel potential and travel decisions of tourists, makes places that provide good information about security and develop measures more preferable than places with a low image in terms of security (Sönmez and Graefe, 1998; Nardi and Wilks, 2007).

Similarly, Bournie (2010) mentions that security has an important place in tourists' destination perception and image and in all their travels. Taking adequate security measures, increasing the number of tourists, improving the quality of tourism and creating positive returns in terms of destination image. The perception of security and concerns that occur before and during the holiday increase both the quality of the holiday and the possibility of choosing it again. Barker (2002) also mentions that security measures and information should be carried out with importance within the framework of security planning. Any situation that threatens tourist safety poses a serious problem for the destinations hosting the event.

The Covid 19 pandemic is also discussed seriously in terms of travel safety, both in terms of causing major changes around the world and threatening the sector as a tourist attraction. Covid 19 is a virus that spreads around the world from China's Vuhan province, showing symptoms similar to respiratory diseases, causing shortness of breath, fever and joint pain, defined on January 13, 2020. It was not limited to where it occurs and spread rapidly throughout the world (Covid19bilgi.saglik.gov.tr, 2020). Covid-19 the creation of a worldwide

indignance has often been discussed in terms of the fact that it is a serious security threat, especially from the point of view of the tourism sector. In the studies examining Covid-19 in the tourism sector, it is also underlined that this great epidemic can cause difficult wounds to the tourism economy and create a basis for serious changes (Acar, 2020; Hoque et al, 2020). On the other hand, according to Higgin-Desbiolles (2020), the Covid 19 pandemic has created a change in the future of tourism, where the direction of travel can change, causing us to rethink what we know.

Gössling et al. (2020) mentioned that Covid-19 will cause serious damage to the tourism sector. Not only have tourist numbers and economic returns fallen significantly, but tourism investments will also be forced to vary. It is an undeniable fact that the damage to the tourism sector is felt in all sectors related to tourism. For this reason, it becomes important to determine the effect and change. The Covid-19 pandemic (Stale, 2020), which led to a global recession, is frequently studied in the tourism literature and examined in different dimensions. Socio-economically, socially, special communication and communication problems prevention-oriented behaviors and the behavior of the equipment from many different angles Covid 19 and tourism/travel activities are discussed (Addo et al., 2020; Hoque et al., 2020; Nicola et al., 2020; Chakraborty and Maity, 2020, Wang and Su, 2020.

As another example, according to Silik and Dündar (2020), Covid 19 changed the travel preferences of the participants and created differences in holiday purchasing behavior. According to the study, participants largely mentioned that they wanted to buy holidays from travel agencies after Covid 19, stay away from crowded cities, turn to nature-oriented travel, and pay attention to hygiene where they will stay. Accordingly, it has been stated that generation X avoids mass tourism movements, generation Y individuals may prefer luxury hotels if security measures are taken, but they often intend to turn to alternative types. Due to the recent pandemic, tourists will prefer camp-caravan tourism and residential rental boutique hotels (Aydin and Dogan, 2020), prefer nature-based and short-term trips (Wanchyuni and Kusumaningrum, 2020), and choose less popular, less crowded places in the future. In addition, it can be said that tourists will exhibit touristic behavior by paying attention to hygiene criteria, avoiding exotic foods and increasing perceptions of safety due to the pandemic in the coming period (Chebli and Said, 2020). It is also thought that there will be a lot of private vehicle use when going on holiday, and boutique hotels or chain hotels that are calm, cleanliness will be preferred more (Wen et al. 2005; Yenişehirlioglu and Salha, 2020; Kılıç et al. 2020).

In the report on Turkey and World Tourism in the Covid19 process published by TÜRSAB, major changes were stated in relation to travel. For example, it is stated that people will turn to different types of Tourism, prefer to travel with their own vehicles, choose more natural places, and in terms of accommodation,

boutique hotels, house rental, caravan/yacht rental will come to the forefront. In addition, the report underlines that the demand for winter tourism may increase, as well as mentioning that safe travel and safe destinations will be at the forefront. Another important point emphasized in the report published by TÜRSAB is that the measures taken regarding security as a result of the research encourage booking and travel. It is seen as important to inform and raise awareness in terms of the Covid-19 pandemic that poses a risk to health (TÜRSAB, 2020).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aim of this research is to identify the travel safety attitudes of potential Turkish tourists. Tourist attitudes to travel safety were studied based on generational differences. The survey technique from quantitative research methods was used to collect data in the research. A common use among data collection techniques is the survey technique (Ural and Kılıç, 2013, 53), a method of obtaining data that occurs as a result of respondents' responses to pre-created questions within certain rules (Coşkun et al., 2015, 80). The survey consists of two parts. The first section includes the "Travel Safety Attitude Scale", which aims to identify participants' travel safety attitudes. In the second section, there are questions to determine the demographic information and travel attitudes of participants. The travel safety attitude scale, which was tested for reliability and validity by Wan (2017), consists of 22 items and 5 dimensions. Scales include travel safety information, health concerns, vulnerability to crime, policy safety, and personal safety. Five Likert scale ratings (1: I Strongly Disagree,...,5: Absolutely Agree) were used for items on the scale.

Potential Turkish tourists constitute the general target population of this research, while potential Turkish tourists living in Balıkesir province represent the target population. As a sampling method in the study, easy sampling method was preferred from sampling methods that are not based on probability. Field research was intensified throughout Balıkesir province in December and November in 2020 and data received from a total of 336 people.

Before the analysis of the data, the data set was checked for parametric analysis. It is seen that different tests are used in the relevant field. However, among them, the most used and accepted; Tests such as Kolmogorov-Smirnov, Shapiro-Wilk and Homogeneity of Variances (Levene Test). In addition, the normality of the data can be evaluated by the coefficients of Skewness and Kurtosis (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007:79). It is understood that there are different opinions regarding acceptable levels of kurtosis and Skewness values. As with research suggesting that these coefficients should be between ± 2 values (Kunnan, 1998:313), there are also studies (Kline, 1998:77) that indicate that the skewness value should be between ± 3 and the kurtosis value should be between ± 10). In this study, it was determined that the skewness value varied between -1.962 and -, 377, and the kurtosis value varied between +3.419 and -, 749. In accordance with these explanations, it was recognized that the skewness and kurtosis values of the data

used in the research correspond to the normal distribution of the data, and parametric tests were used for analysis.

Frequency analysis was conducted to determine the demographic data and vacation attitudes of the participants in the study. For the reliability and validity of the travel safety attitude scale, first explanatory, then confirmatory factor analysis was used. However, the relationship between travel attitudes and generations has been studied using the chi-square test. Finally, the generational difference in travel safety attitude has been analyzed with a one-way ANOVA.

EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Demographic information of the individuals participating in the study is indicated in Table 1. Accordingly, 50.6% of the participants were female and 49.4% were male. When the age status of the participants is examined; It is seen that 104 people are from generation X, 104 from Y and 128 from generation Z. In the case of education, it was concluded that more than 80% of the participants are university graduates. While 108 of the participants were married, 228 of them were single. Although there are participants from different professions in the study, it is understood that the most participants are students (34.8%), tradesmen (15.8%) and self-employed (12.2%).

Table 1: Demographic Findings

	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender			Profession		
Female	170	50,6	Worker	30	8,9
Male	166	49,4	Officer	24	7,2
Age*			Retired	28	8,3
Generation X (Age 41-55)	104	31,0	Students	117	34,8
Generation Y (Age 21-40)	104	31,0	Housewife	33	9,8
Generation Z (Age 8-20)	128	38,1	Academician	10	3,0
Education			Tradesmen	53	15,8
Primary School	16	4,8	Self-employed	41	12,2
Secondary-High School	49	14,6	Marital Status		
Associate Degree	100	29,8	Married	108	32,1
Bachelor's Degree	155	46,1	Single	228	67,9
Postgraduate	16	4,8	Total	336	100,0
Total	336	100,0			

Another issue covered in this research is the travel attitudes of the participants. This information is given in Table 2. A study of participants' attitudes to vacation shows that the vast majority take a vacation once a year (61%). Participants were also asked about their travel attitudes during the Covid-19 pandemic. Considering Covid-19 diagnosis of the first time he made history in Turkey in March 2020, it was found that those who never went on vacation after this date were 60.4% and those who went on vacation were 39.6%. Of the

participants, 208 planned holidays for 2021, while 128 stated that they would not take a holiday. It was concluded that participants who plan holidays for 2021 mostly plan to spend their holidays with Villa/house rentals (19.3%) and camping (11.9%), while participants who prefer all-inclusive hotels (11.6%) are also available. It is understood that mostly personal vehicles (55.1%) are preferred when going on vacation. However, bus (36%) is another preferred means of transportation.

Table 2: Travel Attitudes of Participants

	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>		<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Frequency of Vacation			Travel Attitude during Pandemic Period		
Once a month	3	0,9	Do not go on vacation during the pandemic	203	60,4
Once in three months	15	4,5	Go on vacation during the pandemic	133	39,6
Once in six months	58	17,3	Preferred Accommodation Type in 2021		
Once a year	205	61,0	All Inclusive Hotel	39	11,6
Once in two years	30	8,9	Boutique Hotel	20	6,0
Once in three years	25	7,4	Villa / House Rental	67	19,9
Transport Vehicle to Use While Going on Vacation			Camp	40	11,9
Personal Vehicle	185	55,1	Caravan	6	1,8
Bus	121	36,0	Holiday Village	19	5,7
Airplane	22	6,5	Second Home	17	5,1
Ship	4	1,2	I will not take a vacation	128	38,1
Rent a Car	4	1,2	Total	336	100,0
Do you plan to go on a vacation in 2021?					
Yes	208	61,9			
No	128	38,1			
Total	336	100,0			

The factor analysis used in the study was carried out using the Principal Component Analysis method and the Kaiser normalized Varimax vertical rotation method. The result of factor analysis applied to the travel safety attitude scale is given in Table 3. As a result of the analysis, factor loadings, communalities, eigenvalues of dimensions, variance explained, Cronbach's Alpha, and mean and standard deviation values are shown in the table. Accordingly, when KMO value (0.94) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity values ($\chi^2=5709,187$, $df=171$, $p<0,001$) are examined, it is understood that the overall structure of the travel safety attitude scale is suitable for factor analysis.

Table 3: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis for Travel Safety Attitude Scale

Factor	Item	Fact. Lo.	Com.	Eig.	%	α	\bar{x} (Std.)
Travel Safety Information	Travel safety information can help reduce personal injuries (tsi2)	0,788	0,793	5,069	26,677	0,94	4,05 (0,94)
	It is important to provide safety information in different languages (tsi3)	0,783	0,817				
	Travel safety information may help ensure my personal safety while traveling (tsi5)	0,783	0,873				
	Tourist destinations should provide travel safety information to visitors (ts1)	0,775	0,818				
	Seeking travel safety information is a wise use of my time (tsi4)	0,763	0,807				
	It is worth spending some time to collect travel safety information when planning a trip overseas (tsi6)	0,691	0,744				
Police Safety	I think the local police ensure tourists are not victimized (pos17)	0,871	0,896	3,017	15,878	0,92	3,44 (1,02)
	I believe the local police protect tourists from potential criminal activities (pos16)	0,855	0,882				
	I feel safer when I see local police officers present (pos18)	0,792	0,819				
Health Concern	Tourists may be easily suffered from food poisoning (hc13)	0,808	0,780	2,815	14,813	0,87	3,69 (0,97)
	Some infections in foreign countries may threaten my health (hc14)	0,665	0,828				
	As a tourist, I may be vulnerable to unfamiliar bacteria (hc12)	0,662	0,775				
Persona I Safety	I prefer to travel with others to avoid potential crimes (e.g., assault, robbery, pickpocketing) (pes21)	0,821	0,878	2,359	12,417	0,86	3,41 (1,04)
	I usually stick to frequently traveled streets at all times to avoid crimes (e.g., assault, robbery, pickpocketing) while traveling (pes22)	0,791	0,832				
	I think traveling with an organized tour is safer than traveling alone (pes19)	0,653	0,770				
Vulnerability to Crime	Carrying a large sum of money makes tourists more susceptible to crimes (vc10)	0,485	0,724	1,975	10,396	0,88	3,75 (1,00)
	Tourists are easy targets for robbers or pickpockets (vc9)	0,428	0,693				
	To reduce the threat of robbery when traveling, tourists should not wear expensive rings, jewelry or watches (vc11)	0,747	0,799				
	Excessive alcohol consumption while traveling can make tourists more vulnerable to crimes than locals (vc7)	0,518	0,706				
Cumulative Variance Explained (%)				80,183			
Total Cronbach's Alpha				0,95			
Kaiser's Measure of Sampling Adequacy				0,94			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity				$\chi^2=5709,187$, $df=171$, $p<0,001$			

As a result of the analysis, the vc8 item belonging to the vulnerability to crime dimension, the hc15 item belonging to the health concern dimension and the personal safety dimension the pes20 item was excluded from the scale, respectively, due to its overlap. It was observed that after the excluded item the scale structure consisted of 5 dimensions and 19 items. The cumulative variance explained is 80% and the total Cronbach's Alpha is $\alpha=0.95$. It is also seen that all communality values are higher than 0.50. Accordingly, it can be said that the scale is reliable and valid.

First-order confirmatory factor analysis was applied to the travel safety attitude scale obtained as a result of exploratory factor analysis in 5 dimensions and 19 items. Figure 1 shows a first-order confirmatory factor analysis model of the travel safety attitude scale. In Table 4, The travel safety attitude scale first-order confirmatory factor analysis model standard regression coefficients, non-standard regression coefficients, measurement errors, critical ratio (C.R. / t) and significance value (p) are given.

Table 4: Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Travel Safety Attitude Scale

Factor	Item	St. Reg. Weights	Reg. Weights	S.E.	C.R.	p	AVE	CR
Travel Safety Information	tsi6	,776	1,000				0,68	0,86
	tsi5	,931	1,225	,063	19,572	***		
	tsi4	,827	1,061	,062	17,012	***		
	tsi3	,865	1,133	,064	17,638	***		
	tsi2	,855	1,096	,063	17,421	***		
Police Safety	tsi1	,888	1,179	,064	18,481	***	0,73	0,94
	pos18	,828	1,000					
	pos17	,933	1,043	,047	21,978	***		
Health Concern	pos16	,921	1,040	,048	21,494	***	0,80	0,924
	hc14	,916	1,000					
	hc13	,725	,881	,054	16,453	***		
Personal Safety	hc12	,874	1,038	,045	23,214	***	0,71	0,87
	pes22	,856	1,000					
	pes21	,833	,933	,051	18,171	***		
Vulnerability to Crime	pes19	,786	,881	,056	15,651	***	0,65	0,88
	vc11	,723	1,000					
	vc10	,860	1,139	,074	15,421	***		
	vc9	,830	1,085	,073	14,822	***		
	vc7	,810	1,072	,074	14,454	***		
Fit Indices		χ^2/sd	RMSEA	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	NFI	CFI
Model Fit Indices		2,907	,075	,039	,88	,84	,92	,95
Acceptable Values		$\chi^2/sd: \leq 5$; RMSEA: $\leq 0,08$; SRMR: $< 0,10$; GFI: $\geq 0,8$; AGFI: $\geq 0,8$; NFI: $\geq 0,9$; CFI: $\geq 0,9$						

When Table 4 are examined, it is seen that the model is acceptable. Standard Regression Weights representing each dimension are understood to be quite high. Value calculated for the fit of the model; Normed fit index (NFI) .92, Comparative fit index (CFI) value .95, Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) value .88, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) value .0392 and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value was found to be .075. However, it is understood that the AVE values for the dimensions are greater than 0.50, the CR values are greater than 0.70, and the Cronbac's Alpha values are greater than 0.70. Thus, the structure validity and reliability of the model is ensured (Fornell et al., 1981; Hair et al., 2010).

The results of the chi-square test of the participants' travel attitudes and generations were given in Table 5. Accordingly, there is a statistically significant difference between the vacation attitudes of the participants and the generations ($\chi^2 = 72.699$, $p < 0.001$). Of the 203 people who did not go on vacation during the pandemic period, 48.3% were from the X Generation, 21.7% from the Y Generation and 30% from the Z Generation. However, 4.5% of the 133 people who went on holiday during the pandemic period were Generation X, 45.1% Generation Y and 50.4% Generation Z participants.

Table 5: Comparison of Travel Attitude and Generations

		Generation			Total
		Gen. X	Gen. Y	Gen. Z	
Travel Attitude during the Pandemic Period	Do not go on vacation during the pandemic	98 (48,3%)	44 (21,7%)	61 (30%)	203 (60,4%)
	Go on vacation during the pandemic	6 (4,5%)	60 (45,1%)	67 (50,4%)	133 (39,6%)
Total		104 (30,9%)	104 (30,9%)	128 (38,2%)	336 (100%)

The 2021 vacation plans of the participants and the results of the chi-square test of generations are given in Table 6. Accordingly, there is a statistically significant difference between the 2021 vacation plans of the participants and the generations ($\chi^2 = 53.168$, $p < 0.001$). Of the total 208 people with holiday plans for 2021, 16.8% were from generation X, 39.9% from generation Y and 43.3% from generation Z. However, of the total 128 people who do not have a holiday plan for 2021, 53.9% are from generation X, 16.4% from generation Y and 38.2% from generation Z.

Table 6: Comparison of 2021 Vacation Plan and Generations

		Generation			Total
		Gen. X	Gen. Y	Gen. Z	
Do you plan to go on a vacation in 2021?	Yes	35 (16,8%)	83 (39,9%)	90 (43,3%)	208 (63,9%)
	No	69 (53,9%)	21 (16,4%)	38 (29,7%)	128 (38,1%)
Total		104 (30,9%)	104 (30,9%)	128 (38,2%)	336 (100%)

The results of the chi-square test of the participants' holiday preferences and generations are shown in Table 7. Accordingly, there is a statistically significant difference between the type of accommodation that participants would prefer for 2021 and the generations ($\chi^2= 74,363$, $p<0,001$). Of the total 39 participants who would prefer an all-inclusive hotel in 2021, 10.3% were from generation X, 30.8% from generation Y and 59% from generation Z. However, it is seen that the participants will prefer to rent the most villas/houses for 2021. Accordingly; of the 67 people who would prefer to rent a villa/house in 2021, 23.9% are from generation X, 35.8% are from generation Y and 40.3% are from generation Z.

Table 7: Comparison of Accommodation Type and Generations

		Generation			Total
		Gen. X	Gen. Y	Gen. Z	
Accommodation Type	All Inclusive Hotel	4 (10,3%)	12 (30,8%)	23 (59%)	39 (11,6%)
	Boutique Hotel	1 (5%)	7 (35%)	12 (60%)	20 (6,0%)
	Villa / House Rental	16 (23,9%)	24 (35,8%)	27 (40,3%)	67 (19,9%)
	Camp / Caravan	8 (17,4%)	26 (56,5%)	12 (26,1%)	46 (13,7%)
	Holiday Village	0 (0%)	9 (47,4%)	10 (52,6%)	19 (5,7%)
	Second Home	6 (35,3%)	5 (29,4%)	6 (35,3%)	17 (5,1%)
	I will not take a vacation	69 (53,9%)	21 (16,4%)	38 (29,7%)	128 (38,1%)
	Total	104 (30,9%)	104 (30,9%)	128 (38,2%)	336 (100%)

In line with the purpose of the study, one-way variance analysis was performed to reveal the relationship between participants' ages and travel safety attitudes. The results of the analysis are included in Table 8. The ages of the participants were examined under three generations. Accordingly, Statistically significant differences were found between travel safety information ($F(2,333)=19,335$, $p<,001$), health concern ($F(2,333)=12,667$, $p<,001$) personal safety ($F(2,333)=9,953$, $p<,001$) and vulnerability to crime ($F(2,333)=20,524$, $p<,001$). However, there was no statistical differences between the lower dimension of police safety ($F(2,333)=,189$, $p>.05$) and the generations. Post Hoc testing is required to determine which groups the statistically significant differences originate from. Levene test results are taken into account when it comes to which test to choose. The Levene test tests the hypothesis that the variances of the comparable groups are different from each other, and the fact that this test does not make sense is a prerequisite for ANOVA. If the Levene test is significant, the difference between the groups is the F value and sig. (İslamoğlu and Alnaçık, 2014: 314-315). According to One way ANOVA results; Since the Levene test results were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level in terms of all dimensions, the Games-Howell test was used to determine the levels of the difference for these variables and F and sig. values were evaluated according to the results of Welch

statistics. If the Levene test is significant, the difference between the groups is made based on the F value obtained as a result of welch statistics (Islamoglu and Alniaçık 2014: 314-315). According to the results of one-way ANOVA; since the results of the Levene test in terms of all dimensions are significant at the level of $p < 0.05$, the Games-Howell test was used to determine at what levels the difference occurred for these variables and F and sig. their values were evaluated according to the results of Welch statistics.

Table 8: One Way ANOVA Result of Travel Safety Attitude Factors on Generation

Factor	Gen.	N	\bar{x}	Std.	Welch's F	Sig.	Games-Howell
Travel Safety Information	X	104	4,3894	,31125	19,335	,000	X>Y X>Z
	Y	104	3,9167	1,11356			
	Z	128	3,8958	1,07220			
Police safety	X	104	3,4647	,85952	,189	,828	-
	Y	104	3,3910	1,16442			
	Z	128	3,4766	1,04298			
Health Concern	X	104	4,0128	,60370	12,677	,000	X>Y X>Z
	Y	104	3,5064	1,10308			
	Z	128	3,5833	1,05658			
Personal Safety	X	104	3,7083	,79736	9,953	,000	X>Y
	Y	104	3,1282	1,08467			
	Z	128	3,4089	1,13884			
Vulnerability to Crime	X	104	4,1563	,59036	20,524	,000	X>Y X>Z
	Y	104	3,4880	1,11389			
	Z	128	3,6367	1,07443			

When the results of the Post Hoc test are examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between generation X (3.9167 ± 1.11356) and generation X and generation Z (3.8958 ± 3.8958) in favor of generation X (4 ± 31125) for travel safety information size. When the health concern dimension is examined, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between generation X and generation Y ($3 \pm 5064 \pm 1.10308$) and generation X (3.5833 ± 1.05658) in favor of generation X ($4.0128 \pm .60370$). Similarly, there is a statistically significant difference between generation X and generation Y ($3 \pm 4880 \pm 1.11389$) and generation X ($3 \pm 6367 \pm 1.07443$) in favor of generation X ($4.1563 \pm .59036$). In the personnel safety dimension, it is seen that there is a statistically significant difference between the X generation and the Y (3.1282 ± 1.08467) in favor of the X generation ($3.7083 \pm ,79736$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Male and female participant ratios are close to each other in the sample group included in the study. The majority of participants have associate degree and higher education levels. However, the fact that the sample group consisted of individuals from different professions was found to be effective in terms of the

representation ability of the study. When the generations that form the focus of the study are examined, it is seen that the ratios of generations X, Y and Z, which include sampling, are quite close to each other. When we examine the travel attitudes of the participants, it can be said that the frequency of vacationing is predominantly once a year. It has been observed that those on vacation mostly prefer their personal vehicles. However, buses are used the most among public transportation vehicles. The majority of participants chose not to go on holiday during the pandemic period.

However, it was determined that the number of participants planning to go on vacation in 2021 is higher. It is seen that the type of accommodation these participants plan to choose for 2021 is a high proportion of villa/house rentals. In second choice is all-inclusive hotels. It is seen that the results obtained in this study on the direction of tourism movements after the pandemic in terms of both transportation choice and accommodation preferences are also in line with the literature (Aydın and Doğan, 2020; Chebli and Said, 2020; Yenişehirlioğlu and Salha, 2020; Kılıç et al., 2020).

Compared to generations with the situation of going on holiday during the pandemic period, it was observed that generation Z individuals continue to go on holiday during the pandemic period. Similarly, it was determined that the rate of going on vacation is higher in the generation Y. Generation X individuals, on the other hand, were found to avoid vacation at a high rate. It was concluded that the individuals planning a holiday for 2021 are mostly generation Z, while the vast majority of individuals who do not intend to take a holiday are from generation X. It is quite natural that the health concerns of Generation X are high during this period. From the point of view of the tourism sector and the travel industry, potential tourists of Generation X should be included in the tourism activity again. In this regard, emphasis can be made on increasing health importance, food menus can be made healthier and safer, and units, tours and holiday models specific to generation X, compatible with their sensitivities, can be created. In the study, it was revealed that villa/house rental, which is the first of the most preferred types of accommodation, is mostly in demand by Generation X individuals. It was observed that the camp/caravan accommodation type in the second place is preferred by generation Y and the all-inclusive hotels in the third place are preferred by generation Z. Although the preference of boutique hotels and chain hotels can be found in the literature (Kilic et al,2020; Yenişehirli and Salha, 2020), camping caravan tourism is among the most preferred results in parallel with the literature (Aydın and Dogan, 2020; TÜRSAB, 2020). It is thought that generation Y preference for campervan type may be due to price sensitivity or their preferences focused on socialization, convenience and entertainment when examined in terms of studies in the literature (Barton et al., 2013; Vukic, 2015). Villa-house rental preference of Generation X may be due to health concerns.

As a result of comparing the attitude to travel safety and generations that

constitute the main problem of the study, it was found that potential tourists in Generation X pay more attention to travel safety information than potential tourists in Generation Y and Z. There is no statistically significant difference between the generations in terms of police safety. When health concern was evaluated, it was concluded that generation X was more concerned about the health problems they may face during the holiday than generations Y and Z. In terms of personal safety, generation X potential tourists were found to pay more attention to personal safety than potential millennial tourists. Accordingly, it can be said that potential tourists of Generation X feel safe with mass tourism, preferring to travel by package tour. When vulnerability to crime and intergenerational differences were examined, it was found that potential tourists in Generation X felt more open to crime than in Generation Y and Z, and therefore tend to behave more cautiously. Generation X's security concerns, preference for familiar places, their predisposition to planned travel and their adaptation to mass tourism are also in line with the literature (Szromet et al, 2019). When evaluated in terms of future periods, it can be suggested to increase information on travel safety and to ensure that generation X is more involved in tourism activities.

REFERENCES

- Acılıođlu, İ. (2015). İş'te Y Kuşaađı. (1. Baskı) Ankara: Elma Yayınevi.
- Adıgüzel, O; Batur, Z., Ekşili, N. (2014). Kuşakların Deđişen Yüzü ve Y Kuşaađı ile Ortaya Çıkan Yeni Çalıřma Tarzı Mobil Yakalılar. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, ss. 165.
- Adıgüzel, O. Sönmez Ö., Tanrıverdi, H. (2011). Mesleki Profesyonellik Ve Bir Meslek Mensupları Olarak Hemşireler Örneđi, Yönetim Bilimleri Derg., 9:2.
- Addo, P. C., Jiaming, F., Kulbo, N. B. and Liangqiang, L. (2020). Covid19: Fear Appeal Favoring Purchase Behavior Towards Personal Protective Equipment. The Service Industries Journal, 40(7-8), 471- 490
- Akşit Aşık, N. (2020). Seyahat Motivasyonları ve Destinasyon Seçimi: Y ve Z Kuşakları Arasında Bir Karşılařtırma, Türk Turizm Arařtırmaları Dergisi, 4(3): 1746-1762
- Akdemir, A., Konakay, G. ve Demirkaya H., vd. (2013). Y kuşaađının kariyer algısı, kariyer deđişimi ve liderlik tarzı beklentilerinin arařtırılması, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Arařtırmaları Dergisi, 2(2), 11-42.
- Akşit Aşık, N. (2019). X ve Z Kuşaađı Tüketicilerin Yiyecek Tercihlerini Etkileyen Faktörler. Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies, 7(4), 2599-2611.
- Altuntuđ, N. (2012). Kuşaktan Kuşaađa Tüketim Olgusu Ve Geleceđin Tüketici Profili, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1 (4), 203-212.
- Aydın, B. ve Dođan, M. (2020). Yeni Korona Virüs (Covid-19) Pandemisinin Turistik Tüketici Davranıřları ve Türkiye Turizmi Üzerindeki Etkilerinin

- Değerlendirilmesi. *Pazarlama Teorisi ve Uygulamaları Dergisi*, 6(1), 93-115.
- Aysel, A. (2018). Kuşakların Tüketim Davranışlarında Değişim Üzerine Bir İnceleme (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.
- Barker, M., Page, S.J., and Meyer, D. (2002). Modeling Tourism Crime: The 2000 America's Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 762-782.
- Bar-On, R. (1996). Measuring The Effects On Tourism Of Violence And of Promotion Following Violent Acts.(In *Tourism, Crime and International Security Issues*, edited by A. Pizam and Y. Mansfeld) Chichester, UK: Wiley
- Başgöze, P. ve Bayar, N. A. (2015). Eko otellerden Hizmet Satın Alımında Kuşaklar Arası Farklılaşmalar Üzerine Bir Çalışma. *Sosyoekonomi*, 23(24), 118-130.
- Bayat, G. (2020). The Effects of COVID-19 on the Tourism Sector and Hotel Businesses: The Case of Marmaris
- Biagi, B., and Detotto, C. (2014) Crime as Tourism Externality. *Regional Studies*, 48(4), 693-709.
- Bourne, Paul A. (2010). Crime, tourism and trust in a developing country. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2): 69-83.
- Barton, C., Haywood, J., Jhunjhunwala, P. and Bhatia, V. (2013). Traveling with Millennials, BCGThe Boston Consulting Group. [Online] <https://www.bcg.com/documents/file129974.pdf>.
- Bayhan, V. (2014). Milenyum veya (Y) kuşağı gençliğinin sosyolojik bağlamı. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(3), 8-25.
- Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with Generations X and Y in Generation Z Period: Management of Different Generations in Business Life, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 218-229.
- Berkup, S. B.. (2015). Sosyal Ağlarda Bireysel Mahremiyet Paylaşımı: X ve Y Kuşakları Arasında Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analiz. Doktora Tezi, Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Halkla İlişkiler ve Tanıtım Anabilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Bourne Bea B. (2009). Phenomenological Study of Response to Organizational Change: Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y", *ProQuest*,
- Cennamo, L. (2005). Generational Differences in Work Values, Work-Related Outcomes and Person-Organisation Values Fit.
- Chebli, A. ve Said, F. B. (2020). The impact of covid-19 on tourist consumption behaviour: a perspective article. *Journal Of Tourism Management Research*, 7(2), 196-207.
- Chen, P. ve Choi, Y. (2008). Generational Differences in Work Values: A Study of Hospitality Management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 20(6): 595-615.
- Coşkun, R., Altunışık, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S. ve Yildirim, E. (2015). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri. Adapazarı: Sakarya Kitabevi.
- Cox, J. and Holloway, M. (2010). Multi-generational team building in today's

work environment, international handbook of academic research and teaching, Intellect base international consortium, Academic Conference, Nashville, TN, May 27-29, Intellectual Perspectives & Multi-Disciplinary Foundations, 10, 61-68.

- Crumpacker, M. ve Crumpacker, J.M., (2007). Succession Planning and Generational Stereotypes: Should HR Consider Age-Based Values and Attitudes a Relevant Factor or a Passing Fad?, *Public Personnel Management*, Cilt:36 (4), ss. 349-369.
- Çetin Aydın, G. ve Başol, O. (2014). X Ve Y Kuşağı: Çalışmanın Anlamında Bir Değişme Var mı?, *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, 4(4), 1-15.
- Dhevabachachai, N. ve Muangasama, K. N. (2013). The Preferred Word Paradigm for Generation Y in the Hotel Industry: A Case Study of the International Tourism and Hospitality International Programme, Thailand. *International Education Studies*.6(10): 27-38.
- Engizek, N and Şeker kaya, A. (2016). X ve Y kuşağı kadınlarının karar verme tarzları bakımından incelenmesi. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13 (36), 242-271.
- Erden Ayhün, S. (2013). “Kuşaklar arasındaki farklılıklar ve örgütsel yansımaları”, *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Ekonomi Ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1): 93-112.
- Ferri-Reed Jan, (2013). Millenials-Generation ‘Screwed’ or Generation ‘Shrewd?’, *The Journal for Quality & Participation*, April, ss.22.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39–50.,
- Fukuyama, Francis. *Büyük Çözümle: İnsan Doğası ve Toplumsal Düzenin Yeniden Oluşturulması*. (Çev. Hasan Kaya), 2. Baskı. İstanbul: Profil Yayınları, 2009
- 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.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D. and Hall, M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of Covid-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28, 1-20.
- Haerberle, K., Herzberg J. ve Hobby T. (2009). Leading the Multigenerational Work Force, *Healthcare Executive*, Cilt: 24 (5), ss. 66-67.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: global perspective*. pearson education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020). Socialising tourism for social and ecological justice after Covid-19. *Tourism Geographies*, 22, 1-5.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J. ve Mullen, M. (2008). Structural equation modelling: guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business*

Research Methods, 6 (1), 53 – 60.

- Hoque, A., Shikha, F. A., Hasanat, M. W., Arif, I. and Hamid, A. B. A. (2020). The effect of coronavirus (Covid-19) in the tourism industry in China. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 3(1), 52-58.
- Huang, Y. C. and Petrick, J. F. (2010). Generation Y's travel behaviours: A comparison with babyboomers and generation X. (In: *Tourism and generation Y*). (Eds. Beckendorff et al.). Wallingford-UK: CAB International.
- İslamoğlu, H. ve Alnıaçık, Ü. (2014). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri*: Beta Yayıncılık.
- Joshi, A., Dencker, J. C. ve Franz, G. (2011). Generations in Organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*. 31: 177-205.
- Karaaslan, S. (2014) *Kuşaklararası farklılıkları örgütler üzerinden anlamak: Bir alan araştırması*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.
- Keleş, H. N. (2011). Y Kuşağı Çalışanlarının Motivasyon Profillerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2):129-139
- Kılıç, B., Aslan, H., Gövce, M. (2020) Covid19 Sonrası Turistik Tüketim Toplumunu. *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences 2020 Special Issue* 554-570
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. NY: Guilford publications.
- Korstanje, M. E., and Clayton, A. (2012). Tourism and terrorism: Conflicts and commonalities. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 4(1), 8-25.
- Kunnan, A. J. (1998). An Introduction to Structural Equation Modeling for Language Assessment Research. *Language Testing*, 15 (3), 295-332.
- Kupperschmidt, B. R. (2000). *Multigenerational Employees: Strategies for Effective*
- Kuyucu, M. (2014). Y Kuşağı Ve Facebook: Y Kuşağının Facebook Kullanım Alışkanlıkları Üzerine Bir İnceleme, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 13(49):55-83
- Kyles, D., (2005). *Managing Your Multigenerational Workforce*, *Strategic Finance*, Cilt: 87, Sayı: 6, syf:53-55.
- Lehto, X. Y., Jang, S. S., Achana, F. T. and O'Leary, J. T. (2008). "Exploring tourism experience sought: A cohort comparison of baby boomers and the silent generation", *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Cilt: 14(3), ss.237-252.
- Lepp, A., and Gibson, H. (2003). Tourist roles, perceived risk and international tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 606-624.
- Levickaite, R. (2010). Generations X, Y, Z: How Social Networks Form the Concept of the World Without Borders (The Case of Lithuania). *LIMES: Cultural Regionalistics*. 3(2): 170-183.
- Li, X., Li, X. and Hudson, S. (2013). The application of generational theory to

- tourism consumer behavior: An American perspective. *Tourism Management*, 37, 147-164.
- Licata, P. P. (2007). *Multiple Generations in the Workplace: A Study Comparing Work Values of Different Generations of Workers*.
- Lower, J., (2008). Brace yourself: here comes generation Y. *Critical Care Nurse*. 28 (5), ss. 80-85.
- Lub, X., Bal, P.M., Blomme, R. J ve Schalk, R. (2014) *Why Do Generational Differences in Psychological Contracts Exist? Generational Diversity At Work: New Research Perspectives* (ss. 37-51). Ed. E. Perry. London: Routledge.
- Lyons, S. (2003). *An Exploration of Generational Values in Life and at Work*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Ottawa: Carleton Üniversitesi Management. *The Health Care Manager*. 19(1): 65-76.
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbuky, L. and Higgins, C. (2007). *An Empirical Assessment of Generational Differences in Basic Human. Values*. *Psychological Reports*, 101, 339-352.
- Mannheim, K. (1952). *The Problem Of Generations. Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (ss. 276-322). Ed. P. Kecskemeti. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Marcus, M. (2014). *Work Values and Generational Differences: Using Work Values to understand generational differences in the canadian workplace*. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Minnesota: Capella Üniversitesi
- McCordle, M. and Wolfinger, E. (2010). *Generations Defined*. *Ethos*. 18(1): 8-13.
- Mengi, Z. (2009). İş başarısında kuşak farkı, <http://www.kigem.com/isbasarisinda-kusak-farki.html>
- Naidoo, P.; Ramseook-Munhurrub, P.; Seebaluck, N.V. ve Janvier Procedia, S. (2015). *Investigating the Motivation of Baby Boomers for Adventure Tourism*. *Soc. Behav. Sci.* 175, 244–251.
- Nardi, M., and Wilks, J. (2007). *Tourist water safety: Surf life saving initiatives for the Japanese inbound market*. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(3), 275-283.
- Ng, E. S. W., Schweitzer, L. and Lyons, S. T. (2010). *New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of The Millennial Generation*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 25(1): 281-292.
- Nicola, M., Alsafi, Z., Sohrabi, C., Kerwan, A., Al-Jabir, A., Iosifidis, C., Agha, M. and Agha, R. (2020). *The socio-economic implications of the coronavirus and Covid-19 pandemic: A review*. *International Journal of Surgery*, 32305533.
- Özer, P. Eriş. E.D., Neczan, Ö. Özmen.T. (2013). *Kuşakların Farklılaşan İş Değerlerine İlişkin Emik Bir Araştırma*, *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 38(10):123-142.

- Parry, E. and Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence, *International Journal Of Management Reviews*, Sayı: 13, ss: 79-96.
- Popescu, L. (2011). Safety and security in tourism. Case study: Romania. *Forum geografic*, X(2), 322-328.
- Reeves Thomas C., Oh Eunjung. (2008). Generational Differences, in *Handbook of Research on Educational Communication and Technology*. Ss.296-297. Ed: J.M.Spector, M.D.Merrill, J.V.Merrienboer, M.P.Driscoll. 3th ed. Athens, Georgia.
- Reisenwitz T. H. ve Iyer R., (2009). Differences In Generation X and Generation Y: Implications For The Organization and Marketers, *The Marketing Management Journal*, Cilt:19, Sayı:2.
- Santos, M.C.; Veiga, C. and Aguas, P. (2016). Tourism Services: Facing the Challenge of new Tourist Profiles. *Worldw. Hosp. Tour. Themes*, 8, 654–669.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H. and Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23-74.
- Senbir H. (2010). *Z Son İnsan Mı?*, 1. Baskı, İstanbul: O Kitaplar, 2004, 2010.
- Shin, Y. (2005). Safety, security and peace tourism: The case of the DMZ area. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(4), 411-426.
- Silik, C.E., Ilgaz, B., and Dündar, Y. (2020). COVID-19 Sonrası Turist Davranışlarının Kuşak Farklılıkları Açısından Çoklu Uyum Analizi (MCA) ile Değerlendirilmesi. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi Sayı: 24*. 341- 372.
- Sladek, S.and Grabinger, A. (2013). Gen Z: the first generation of the 21st century has arrived!. Erişim Adresi: http://xyzuniversity.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/GenZ_Final.pdf
- Smith, J. W. and Clurman, A. (1997). *Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Report on Generational Marketing*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Sönmez, S., and Graefe, A. (1998). Determining future travel behavior from past travel experience and perceptions of risk and safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 171-177.
- Srinivasan, V. (2012). Multi Generations in the Workforce: Building Collaboration. *Indian Institute of Management Bangalore Management Review*. 24: 48-66.
- Strauss, W. and Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*, NewYork: Perennial.
- Sun, S.; Nang Fong, L.H.; Law, R. and Luk, C. (2016). An Investigation of Gen-Y's Online Hotel Information Search: The Case of Hong Kong. *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.* 21, 443–456.
- Szromek, A. R., Hysa, B. and Karasek, A. (2019). The Perception of Overtourism

- from the Perspective of Different Generations. *Sustainability*, 11(24), 7151, 1-19.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Tarlow, P. (2006). Issues in health, safety and security. *e-Review of Tourism Research*, 4 (3), 12-14.
- Toruntay, H. (2011). *Takım Rollerini Çalışması: X ve Y Kuşuğı Üzerinde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Tulgan, B. and Martin, C. A. (2001). *Managing Generation Y: Global Citizens Born in the Late Seventies and Early Eighties*. Massachusetts: HRD Press.
- Türsab (2020). Covid19 sürecinde Türkiye ve Dünya Turizmi Değerlendirmesi. <https://www.tursab.org.tr/assets/assets/uploads/arastirmalar/covid-19-surecinde-turkiye-ve-dunya-turizmi.pdf>
- Twenge, J. M. and Campbell, S. M. (2008). Generational Differences in Psychological Traits and Their Impact on the Workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 23(8): 862-877.
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., and Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in workvalues: Leisure and extrinsic value sincreasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing, *Journal of Management*, Cilt: 36(5), ss.1117-1142.
- Twenge, J.M. (2013). *Ben nesli. (Çev. Esra Öztürk). (3. Baskı) İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları*.
- Ural, A.ve Kılıç, İ. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve spss ile veri analizi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Verissimo, M. and Costa, C. (2018). Do Hostels Play A Role in Pleasing Millennial Travellers? The Portuguese Case, *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 4(1): 57-68.
- Vukic, M.; Kuzmanovic, M. and Kostnic Stankovic, M. (2015). Understanding the Heterogeneity of Generation Y's Preferences for Travelling: A Conjoint Analysis Approach. *Int. J. Tour. Res.*, 17, 482–491.
- Wachyuni, S. S. and Kusumaningrum, D. A. (2020). The effect of Covid-19 pandemic: How are the future tourist behavior?. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 33(4), 67-76
- Wan, Z. (2017). *Modification and Validation of a Travel Safety Attitude Scale (T-SAS)*. Yayınlanmamış master tezi. The University of Guelph, Canada.
- Wang, Q. and Su, M. (2020). A preliminary assessment of the impact of Covid-19 on environment-a casestudy of China. *Science of the Total Environment*, 728, 138915.
- Wen, Z., Huimin, G. ve Kavanaugh, R. R. (2005). The impacts of SARS on the consumer behaviour of Chinese domestic tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8(1), 22-38.

- Williams, S. (2010). Welcome To Generation Z. B&T Magazine, 60(2731).
- Williams, K. C., and Page, R. A. (2011). Marketing to the generations. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, 3(3), 1–17.
- Wood, S. (2013). Generation z as consumers: trends and innovation. Institute for Emerging Issues. North Carolina State University. 1-3.
- Yenişehirliođlu, E. and Salha, H. (2020). Covid-19 pandemisinin Türkiye iç turizmine yansımaları: Deđişen talep üzerine bir araştırma. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(37), 355-368.
- Yiđit Seyfi, Ü. (2016). X ve Y Kuşaklarının Ruhsal Zekâ Özellikleri İle Çalışma Algıları Üzerine Bir Analiz. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Manisa: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yusoff, W. F. W. and Kian, T. S. (2013). Generation Differences in Work Motivation: From Developing Country Perspective. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*. 2(4): 97-103.
- Yüksekbilgili, Z. (2013). Türk tipi Y kuşađı. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (45), 342-353.
- Zemke, R., Raines, C., Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the Workplace*. New York: American Management Association.
- Zhang, Ke and Bonk, Curtis J. (2010). Generational Learners ve e-learning Technologies. *Handbook of Research on Practices and Outcomes in elearning: Issues and Trends*, ss.76-92.