



The effect of recreation experience preference on destination preference

Tebessüm AYYILDIZ DURHAN¹ , Ferhat KILIÇARSLAN¹ ,
Serkan KURTİPEK¹ , Nuri Berk GÜNGÖR² 

¹Gazi University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ankara, Türkiye

²Balıkesir University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Balıkesir, Türkiye

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8352567

Gönderi Tarihi/Received:

Kabul Tarih/Accepted:

Online Yayın Tarihi/Published:

03.04.2023

10.08.2023

20.09.2023

Abstract

This study, it is aimed to examine the effects of recreation experience preferences of individuals engaged in camping activities on destination preference and to determine how various variables differentiate the measurement tools. The study included 223 individuals participating in camping activities in Kaş region of Antalya province. The data were collected with the "Recreation Experience Preference Scale" and "Destination Preference Scale" as well as the personal data form. Descriptive statistics, independent sample T test, one-way analysis of variance ANOVA, post hoc tests, Pearson correlation test and multiple linear regression analysis were used to analyze the data. The findings show that the participants' recreation experience preferences levels are high (4.32 ± 0.49) and their destination preferences levels are at an average level (5.60 ± 0.88). It was determined that recreation experience preferences and destination preferences of individuals participating in camping activities differed according to gender, age, field of study, income, marital status variables, but did not differ significantly according to education level. It was determined that there was a positive and moderately significant relationship between Recreation Experience Preference and Destination Preference ($r=0.565$). The findings of the multiple regression analysis, in which the effect of recreation experience preferences on destination preference was determined to be approximately 40%, show that knowledge and adventure and transportation and activity sub-dimensions are significantly predicted by recreation experience preference.

Keywords: Recreation, experience, preference, destination, camping.

Rekreasyon deneyim tercihinin destinasyon tercihine etkisi

Öz

Bu araştırmada kamp faaliyetleri yapan bireylerin rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin destinasyon tercihine olan etkilerinin incelenmesi ve çeşitli değişkenlerin ölçüm araçlarını ne doğrultuda farklılaştırdığının belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Araştırmaya Antalya ili Kaş bölgesinde kamp faaliyetlerine katılan 223 birey dahil olmuştur. Veriler kişisel veri formunun yanı sıra "Rekreasyon Deneyim Tercihi Ölçeği" ve "Destinasyon Tercihi Ölçeği" ile toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizinde tanımlayıcı istatistikler, bağımsız örneklem T testi, tek yönlü varyans analizi ANOVA, post hoc testleri, pearson korelasyon testi ve çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular katılımcıların rekreasyon deneyim tercih düzeylerinin yüksek olduğunu ($4,32\pm 0,49$), destinasyon tercih düzeylerinin ortalama düzeyde olduğunu ($5,60\pm 0,88$) göstermektedir. Kamp faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin cinsiyet, yaş, çalışma alanı, gelir, medeni durum değişkenlerine göre anlamlı bir biçimde farklılaştığı, eğitim düzeyi değişkenine göre anlamlı biçimde farklılaşmadığı saptanmıştır. Kamp faaliyetinde bulunan katılımcıların destinasyon tercihleri ise sadece medeni durum değişkenine göre anlamlı bir biçimde farklılaştığı görülmektedir. Rekreasyon Deneyim Tercihi ve Destinasyon Tercihi arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir ($r=0,565$). Rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin destinasyon tercihi üzerindeki etkisinin yaklaşık %40 olarak belirlendiği çoklu regresyon analizi bulguları bilgi ve macera ile ulaşım ve aktivite alt boyutlarının rekreasyon deneyim tercihi tarafından anlamlı biçimde yordandığını göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rekreasyon, deneyim, tercih, destinasyon, kamping.

Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponded Author: Ferhat KILIÇARSLAN, **E-posta/ e-mail:** ferhat.kilicarslan@gazi.edu.tr
Genişletilmiş Türkçe Özet, makalenin sonunda yer almaktadır.

This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 20th International Sport Science Congress.

INTRODUCTION

It is a known fact that there is an increasing dissatisfaction, stress, difficulties, inactivity, lack of creativity and isolation in the structure of many societies in the world (Kurar, 2021). People, in their daily routine life, need to rest and have fun as well as fulfilling their obligatory jobs and requirements in order to continue their lives. Therefore, they participate in recreational activities in order to get rid of the increasing negativities in their free time left from work and responsibilities (Kül-Avan & Güçer, 2019). Positive developments such as urbanisation, development of technology, increase in welfare level, increase in intellectual levels of people, development of transportation system and increase in leisure time lead people to participate more in leisure time activities (Doğantan, 2014). Especially individuals in regions with high urbanisation, along with the stress and fatigue brought by intense working life, the increase in environmental awareness and globalisation, as well as the social distancing efforts of individuals who turn to leisure and holiday options that are more reliable and less social contact due to Covid-19 (Association of Türkiye Travel Agencies, 2021), people's preferred leisure activities have started to be among the preferences for being nature-friendly (Öztürk & Kalaycı, 2018; Kül-Avan & Güçer, 2019).

Nowadays, individuals seek to enrich their inner worlds through exploration, adventure, friendship and nature awareness. In this direction, the activities that people give primacy are mostly outdoor activities for nature such as camping, fishing, backpacking, nature photography (İsayeva & Kasalak, 2016). Outdoor activities; It includes activities carried out in water, land, air areas that spontaneously exist or are created in nature. Many activities such as mountain and rock climbing, hiking, camping, canyoning, caving, skiing, scuba diving, bird watching, botanical observation, training activities in nature, free diving, delta wing, sailing are examples that can be evaluated within the scope of outdoor leisure activities (Kızılar et al., 2018). Within these outdoor activities, camping activities will be explained as the subject of the study.

Camping, one of the outdoor recreation activities, is now a type of activity that people from all segments of society can participate in (Aksöz et al., 2020). With its various purposes and methods, camping is a leisure time activity that can be done especially financially for people in different segments. Today, the demand for camping activities is on the rise. According to Surdu (2014), there are 5 different types of camping. Adventure camping, glamping, historical camping, winter camping, work camping. Nowadays, campsites have become important centres for working people, travellers or tourists to meet with nature,

relieve stress and participate in recreational activities (Başarangil & Öztürk, 2019). Accordingly, in short, the word "camp" is defined as a place of accommodation in the form of tents or sheds, and "camping" is defined as a common life sustained in these accommodation structures (Doğantan, 2014). Although attractiveness is an important factor in the selection of camping activities, with its natural beauties, sunshine and climate, Türkiye is very suitable for camping and has a great potential (Şalk et al., 2018).

Camping is a way of protecting nature and increasing the welfare of local people. While making underdeveloped villages and regions a centre of attraction in terms of leisure, it brings the city and local people together and provides social and economic benefits to the region (Doğantan, 2014). In addition, in camping activities, people meet their needs in simple ways through nature. In this way, it is to meet the needs by minimising the damage to the resources without harming the nature (Şahbaz & Altınay, 2015; Karaçar, 2016). In this approach, people choose camping primarily for relaxation, personal health and social interaction (Surdu, 2014). In addition, camping is environmental, economic and spiritual for people. In this direction, the secondary and tertiary reasons for choosing camping activities are that they are economical and can be done in nature with family, friends and relatives (Doğantan, 2014). In addition, among the expectations of campers from campsites, the cleanliness of the campsite is the most common (Association of Türkiye Travel Agencies, 2021).

When the provinces and regions where camping activities are generally carried out in Türkiye are examined; İzmir, Muğla and Denizli provinces in the Aegean Region; Balıkesir, Bursa and Tekirdağ provinces in the Marmara Region; Trabzon, Artvin, Gümüşhane and Rize provinces in the Eastern Black Sea Region and Antalya province in the Mediterranean Region (Her Mevsim Karadeniz, 2013). This study investigates the effects of recreation experience preferences of individuals participating in camping activities on destination preferences in Kaş in Antalya province. In Antalya province, it is possible to mention that there are multiple different leisure time activity opportunities in many destinations. Because Antalya has a great richness in terms of its natural, cultural, historical places and geographical features and its innovative and developed facilities (Çelik, 2014). It can be mentioned that the most suitable areas for camping in Antalya with different activity opportunities in many destinations are generally concentrated in the destinations in the western parts of the province. In and around the centre of these camping destinations, there are many camping spots with electricity, water, kitchen, telephone and restaurant for campers (Antalya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism, 2023).

Although camping activities are increasing in every region of the world and in Türkiye as a sector that develops and attracts interest, mainly due to economic reasons and the aim of getting away from social contact brought by the pandemic order, it is possible to mention that there is no action related to camping in the Türkiye Tourism Strategies 2023 Action Plan (Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Tourism and Culture, 2023). Perhaps as a result of this, the total number of domestic and foreign tourists staying in campsites in Türkiye in 2020 was 221,807, while this number was 362 million in 27 EU countries in 2019 (Association of Türkiye Travel Agencies, 2021). Especially considering the contribution of tourism and leisure time activities to the gross national product and the financial gains to the local people, the importance of making programmes and plans to take into account the needs of consumers in such activities is increasing.

Destination is defined as the visit area outside the area where the person resides. With the developing leisure and tourism sector, businesses and destinations have also entered into a competition (Olçay & Turhan, 2017). In order for destinations to stand out from each other in this competition, it is possible to mention that there are tasks that need to be done in that destination. This will create a preferable situation for potential visitors. In this case, destination preference varies with many factors according to the marketing and image of the destination, advertisements, tourism potential of the region, consumer behaviour profile and consumer tendency (Şengel et al., 2014). When revisiting a preferred destination for camping, the experience people have during the activity in the areas they have previously chosen for camping is very important. If there is no negativity in the environment and no bad events during the holiday, these memories leave lasting effects on people. Being in people's minds and enabling them to visit the same destination again (Karaçar, 2016) is related to whether the experience people have in that destination is memorable or not.

People are motivated by a suitable motivation for themselves in the activities they choose to do in their leisure time. For this orientation, researchers have two approaches to recreation with an objective and subjective definition. According to the objective understanding, the activities that individuals choose to do in their leisure time are subjectively related to the motives, attitudes and values of the participant who attaches importance to the activity rather than the activity itself (Raadik et al., 2014). The recreation experience emerges as a result of the meanings it carries for individuals rather than the content of the activities. Therefore, it can be said that recreation experience has different meanings for different individuals, in other words, it differs from person to person (Kozak & Doğantan, 2016).

The jobs and preferences that people will do in their free time are generally revealed by their own perspectives, attitudes, wishes and behaviours. People demand the desire for personal benefit in their leisure time activities (Shores & Scott, 2007). In order to realise these desires and experiences, they demand opportunities to participate in recreation activities in certain environments (Anderson & Fulton, 2008). Recreation experience preferences are motivations for pursuits that provide users with meanings for the activities they participate in (Oh et al., 2014). Recreation experience preferences examine a dimension that attempts to explain the reason for choice underlying motivations. However, recreation experience preferences also help to explain differences between visitors within the same activity. In this direction, recreation experience preference scales were first developed to identify and measure specific psychological benefit areas associated with participation in recreation activities (Williams et al., 1988). Although recreation experience preferences are motivations that lead to the initiation of a behaviour, recreation experience preference scales are also used to determine the measurement of recreation participation outcomes (Anderson & Fulton, 2008). These scales constitute an important step in determining the motives for recreational pursuits with intrinsic motivations. When the literature is examined, it is seen that the application of the Recreation Experience Preference (REP) scale is mostly related to terrestrial natural environments (and related activities) (Raadik et al., 2010; Weber & Anderson, 2010, Davras & Uslu, 2019; Le Corre et al., 2021).

There is a directly proportional relationship between recreation experience preference and destination. Connections to a place are likely to motivate a person to visit that place. For example, individuals with strong symbolic/emotional ties, such as a symbolic connection to a place of historical or religious significance, may be more motivated to visit the place for experiences such as learning or connecting with their heritage (Budruk & Stanis, 2013). Accordingly, it is possible to liken the recreation experience preference and the destination to the two most important branches that the visitor will choose with his/her own intrinsic motivation and knowledge, experience and experience in choosing a region. When the literature was examined, no study was found that measured recreation experience preference and destination preference together. In this case, it is thought that the current study will fill a gap in the literature. In the light of this information, this study aims to examine the effects of recreation experience preferences of individuals engaged in camping activities on destination preference and to determine how various variables differentiate the measurement tools.

METHOD

An application was made to the Ethics Commission of Gazi University Rectorate for the research. It was discussed at the meeting of Gazi University Rectorate Ethics Commission dated 13.09.2022 and numbered 15 and approved with the decision numbered E-77082166-604.01.02-455138. During the current research, the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" was followed.

Research model

In this research, the relational screening model, one of the general screening models of quantitative research methods, was used. This model is a screening approach that aims to reveal the existence of change between more than one variable together. In the relational survey model, it is tried to understand whether the variables used in the research change together or not, and if it is determined that there is any change, how this change occurs (Karasar, 2011).

Research group

The study included 223 individuals camping in Kaş region of Antalya province. The data were collected face-to-face with the sample group selected by convenience sampling method. As a result of the power analysis carried out with the G power 3.1.9.4 programme, the power value was considered to be at a high level as .80 with the assumption that the population was 222000, and an effect size of .18 was calculated. Demographic information about the participants who participated in the study is given in Table 1. Accordingly, 115 (51.6%) of the participants were male and 86 (38.6%) of these participants were 31 years of age or older. 160 (71.7%) of the participants were single. The majority of the participants (74%) have a bachelor's degree. While 84 (37.7%) of the participants were employed in the private sector, the majority of them (66.8%) stated that their income level was medium.

Data collecting tools

Demographic data form and "Recreation Experience Preference Scale" and "Destination Preference Scale" were used as data collection tools.

Recreation experience preference scale

The Recreation Experience Preference Scale was developed by Manfredo et al. (1996) to measure people's recreational activity experience preferences. Recreation Experience Preference Scale was adapted into Turkish by Ayar, Ayyıldız Durhan and Karaküçük (2020). It is a 5-point Likert-type measurement tool with 7 sub-dimensions consisting of nature,

physical fitness, physical rest, solitude, getting away from the crowd, escape from physical stress, and spending time with family. The lowest score that can be obtained from the measurement tool is 20 and the highest score is 100. While the internal consistency coefficient for the total scores of the recreation experience preference scale in the original form was 0.83, the internal consistency coefficient for the current study was determined as 0.84.

Destination preference scale

In the study, a 7-point Likert-type measurement tool developed by Davras and Uslu (2019) (1: Strongly disagree, ... 7: Strongly agree), which includes the statements used by Mutinda and Mayaka (2012) in their research to determine the factors affecting the destination region of the participants, was used. It is a 7-subdimensional measurement tool consisting of information and adventure, transportation and activity, socio-cultural factors, natural attraction, travel glamour, entertainment and recreation, and economic factors sub-dimensions. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 24 and the highest score is 168. In the original form, the internal consistency coefficient for the experience preference scale was found to be 0.86. For the current study, the internal consistency coefficient was determined as 0.89.

Data analysis

In order to determine whether the data were homogeneously distributed, kurtosis and skewness values were tested and parametric tests were applied since it was determined that the data showed normal distribution (Uysal & Kılıç, 2022). Descriptive statistics, independent sample T test and one-way analysis of variance ANOVA and post hoc tests (LSD) were used in the analysis of the data.

FINDINGS

This section presents the findings obtained from the data collected in the research.

Table 1. Percentage and frequency distributions for the study group

	Variable	f	%
Gender	Female	108	48.4
	Male	115	51.6
Age	<25	75	33.6
	25-30	62	27.8
	>30	86	38.6
Education	High School and Below	37	16.6
	Bachelor's degree	165	74.0
	Postgraduate	21	9.4
Working Area	Private Sector	84	37.7
	Government Sector	44	19.7
	Student	59	26.5
	Others	36	16.1
Perceived Income Level	Low	63	28.3
	Medium	149	66.8
	High	11	4.9
Marital status	Single	160	71.7
	Married	63	28.3

Demographic information about the participants is given in detail in the research group section.

Table 2. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and normality distributions for measurement tools

	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	S.d.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	2.40	5.00	4.32	0.49	-0.823	0.545
Nature	2.67	5.00	4.82	0.40	-2.858	8.746
Physical Fitness	1.00	5.00	4.30	0.85	-1.326	1.527
Physical Rest	1.00	5.00	4.72	0.59	-2.779	9.335
Loneliness	1.00	5.00	3.76	0.97	-0.572	-0.330
Moving Away from the Crowd	1.50	5.00	4.55	0.61	-2.004	4.859
Escape from Physical Stress	1.00	5.00	4.34	1.08	-1.672	1.854
Spending Time with Family	1.00	5.00	3.82	1.35	-0.907	-0.433
Destination Preference Scale	1.79	7.00	5.60	0.88	-0.976	1.756
Knowledge and Adventure	1.00	7.00	5.95	1.11	-1.726	4.162
Transport and Activity	2.40	7.00	5.74	1.06	-0.740	0.024
Socio Cultural Activities	1.00	7.00	5.18	1.22	-0.813	0.809
Natural Attractiveness	1.67	7.00	6.11	1.00	-1.402	2.227
Travelling Glamour	1.00	7.00	4.06	1.94	-0.042	-1.131
Entertainment and Recreation	3.00	7.00	5.84	1.10	-0.889	0.085
Economic Factors	1.00	7.00	6.03	1.35	-1.600	2.279

*=p<0.05

It was determined that the participants had high levels of Recreation Experience Preference Scale (4.32 ± 0.49), the lowest mean scores were obtained in the sub-dimension of spending time with friends (3.82 ± 1.35), and the highest mean scores were obtained in the nature sub-dimension (4.82 ± 0.40). In the same way, it was determined that the participants exhibited high values of destination preference in destination preferences (5.60 ± 0.88), the lowest sub-dimension score was obtained in the sub-dimension of travel vanity (4.06 ± 1.94), and the highest sub-dimension score was obtained in the sub-dimension of natural attraction (6.11 ± 1.00). It was determined that the kurtosis skewness values of the data showed a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Table 3. Independent sample t test results between the recreation experience preference scale and gender variable

	Gender	n	\bar{x}	S.d.	t	p
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	Female	108	4.36	0.51	1.170	0.243
	Male	115	4.28	0.48		
Nature	Female	108	4.79	0.45	-1.152	0.251
	Male	115	4.85	0.34		
Physical Fitness	Female	108	4.26	0.90	-0.665	0.507
	Male	115	4.34	0.81		
Physical Rest	Female	108	4.72	0.55	0.064	0.949
	Male	115	4.72	0.63		
Loneliness	Female	108	3.87	0.92	1.689	0.093
	Male	115	3.65	1.01		
Moving Away from the Crowd	Female	108	4.62	0.57	1.538	0.125
	Male	115	4.49	0.65		
Escape from Physical Stress	Female	108	4.53	0.96	2.549	0.011*
	Male	115	4.16	1.16		
Spending Time with Family	Female	108	3.78	1.38	-0.457	0.648
	Male	115	3.86	1.32		

*=p<0.05

According to the results of the independent sample t test between recreation experience preference and gender, statistically significant differences were found between recreation experience preference and gender only in the sub-dimension of escape from physical stress (t=2.549; p=0.011). It is observed that the significant difference determined in the escape from physical stress sub-dimension is in favour of female participants. According to the results of the independent sample t-test between destination preference and gender, no statistically significant differences were found between destination preference and gender. Although there are no statistically significant differences, it is seen that the average scores are higher in favour of female participants in the total score of destination preference and its sub-dimensions of information and adventure, transportation and activity, natural attraction, entertainment and recreation and economic factors, and the average scores are higher in favour of male participants in the sub-dimensions of socio-cultural activities and travel show.

Table 4. One-way analysis of variance ANOVA test results between recreation experience preference scale and age variable

	Age	n	\bar{x}	S.d.	F	p
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	<25	75	4.30	0.47	1.293	0.277
	25-30	62	4.25	0.51		
	>30	86	4.38	0.49		
Nature	<25 ²	75	4.71	0.53	6.028	0.003*
	25-30	62	4.82	0.34		
	>30 ¹	86	4.92	0.25		
Physical Fitness	<25	75	4.31	0.84	1.089	0.338
	25-30	62	4.17	0.84		
	>30	86	4.38	0.88		
Physical Rest	<25	75	4.71	0.55	0.721	0.487
	25-30	62	4.66	0.63		
	>30	86	4.77	0.60		
Loneliness	<25	75	3.81	0.80	0.566	0.569
	25-30	62	3.64	1.13		
	>30	86	3.79	1.00		
Moving Away from the Crowd	<25	75	4.59	0.51	0.650	0.523
	25-30	62	4.47	0.72		
	>30	86	4.57	0.61		
Escape from Physical Stress	<25	75	4.54	0.87	1.969	0.142
	25-30	62	4.18	1.13		
	>30	86	4.29	1.20		
Spending Time with Family	<25 ³	75	3.47	1.42	1.731	0.018*
	25-30 ²	62	3.93	1.32		
	>30 ¹	86	4.05	1.25		

*=p<0.05, 1>2>3

According to the results of the ANOVA test between recreation experience preference and age variable, statistically significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of nature (F=6.028; p=0.003) and spending time with friends (F=1.731; p=0.018). Significant differences in the sub-dimensions of nature and spending time with friends were analysed between groups, and post hoc tests showed that individuals in the age group of 31 years and above exhibited higher recreation experience preference in both groups. According to the results of the ANOVA test between destination preference and age variable, no statistically significant differences were found between the total score and sub-dimensions of destination preference and age variable.

Table 5. Independent sample t test results between the recreation experience preference scale and marital status variable

	Martial Status	N	\bar{x}	S.d.	t	p
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	Single	160	4.29	0.50	-1.332	0.184
	Married	63	4.39	0.47		
Nature	Single	160	4.78	0.43	-2.507	0.013*
	Married	63	4.93	0.28		
Physical Fitness	Single	160	4.30	0.82	0.036	0.971
	Married	63	4.30	0.94		
Physical Rest	Single	160	4.72	0.55	-0.093	0.926
	Married	63	4.73	0.68		
Loneliness	Single	160	3.74	0.95	-0.386	0.700
	Married	63	3.80	1.03		
Moving Away from the Crowd	Single	160	4.52	0.63	-1.276	0.203
	Married	63	4.63	0.57		
Escape from Physical Stress	Single	160	4.39	1.01	1.010	0.314
	Married	63	4.23	1.25		
Spending Time with Family	Single	160	3.66	1.40	-2.912	0.004*
	Married	63	4.23	1.09		

*=p<0.05

Table 5 shows the independent sample t test results between the recreation experience preference scale and marital status variable. According to these results, it was determined that the recreation experience preference differed significantly according to the marital status variable, and all significant differences observed in the sub-dimensions of nature (t=-1.332; p=0.184) and spending time with friends (t=-2.912; p=0.004) were in favour of married people.

Table 6. Independent sample t test results between the Destination Preference scale and marital status variable

	Martial Status	n	\bar{x}	S.d.	t	p
Destination Preference Scale	Single	160	5.61	0.82	0.394	0.694
	Married	63	5.56	1.02		
Knowledge and Adventure	Single	160	6.00	0.97	1.137	0.257
	Married	63	5.82	1.40		
Transport and Activity	Single	160	5.63	1.03	-2.451	0.015*
	Married	63	6.01	1.09		
Socio Cultural Activities	Single	160	5.26	1.14	1.588	0.114
	Married	63	4.97	1.40		
Natural Attractiveness	Single	160	6.17	0.96	1.460	0.146
	Married	63	5.95	1.09		
Travelling Glamour	Single	160	4.06	1.89	-0.003	0.997
	Married	63	4.06	2.07		
Entertainment and Recreation	Single	160	5.86	1.09	0.378	0.706
	Married	63	5.80	1.15		
Economic Factors	Single	160	6.05	1.35	0.303	0.762
	Married	63	5.99	1.36		

*=p<0.05

According to these results of Table 6, statistically significant differences were found between the sub-dimension of the destination preference scale, transportation and activity (t=-2,451; p=.015) and marital status. It can be mentioned that this significant difference is in favour of married people.

Table 7. One-way analysis of variance ANOVA test results between the Recreation Experience Preference scale and the study area variable

	Working area	n	\bar{x}	S.d.	F	p
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	Private Sector	84	4.38	0.52	1.232	0.299
	Government Sector	44	4.21	0.49		
	Student	59	4.34	0.46		
	Others	36	4.28	0.47		
Nature	Private Sector ¹	84	4.92	0.23	4.903	0.003*
	Government Sector	44	4.87	0.33		
	Student ²	59	4.69	0.55		
	Others	36	4.74	0.42		
Physical Fitness	Private Sector	84	4.37	0.80	1.669	0.175
	Government Sector	44	4.18	1.03		
	Student	59	4.42	0.75		
	Others	36	4.08	0.87		
Physical Rest	Private Sector	84	4.79	0.52	2.009	0.114
	Government Sector	44	4.55	0.80		
	Student	59	4.78	0.45		
	Others	36	4.65	0.64		
Loneliness	Private Sector	84	3.79	1.00	0.322	0.810
	Government Sector	44	3.63	1.00		
	Student	59	3.79	0.93		
	Others	36	3.79	0.97		
Moving Away from the Crowd	Private Sector	84	4.53	0.72	0.774	0.510
	Government Sector	44	4.46	0.61		
	Student	59	4.64	0.49		
	Others	36	4.56	0.50		
Escape from Physical Stress	Private Sector ³	84	4.22	1.23	3.911	0.010*
	Government Sector ⁴	44	4.00	1.27		
	Student ¹	59	4.61	0.76		
	Others ²	36	4.61	0.75		
Spending Time with Family	Private Sector ¹	84	4.16	1.26	3.448	0.017*
	Government Sector	44	3.77	1.22		
	Student ²	59	3.46	1.45		
	Others	36	3.68	1.38		

*=p<0.05

Table 7 presents the results of the ANOVA test between the recreation experience preference scale and the working area variable. According to these results, statistically significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of the recreation experience preference scale, nature sub-dimension (F=4.903; p=0.003), escape from physical stress sub-dimension (F=3.911; p=0.010) and spending time with friends sub-dimension (F=3.448; p=0.017). It was determined that private sector employees exhibited higher recreation experience levels in the nature sub-dimension and spending time with family sub-dimension, and students exhibited higher recreation experience levels in the escape from physical stress sub-dimension.

Table 8. One-way analysis of variance ANOVA test results between recreation experience preference scale and income variable

	Perceived Income Level	n	\bar{x}	S.d.	F	p
Recreation Experience Preference Scale	Low	63	4.37	0.41	0.529	0.590
	Medium	149	4.30	0.53		
	High	11	4.30	0.47		
Nature	Low	63	4.86	0.35	0.867	0.422
	Medium	149	4.80	0.42		
	High	11	4.90	0.21		
Physical Fitness	Low	63	4.34	0.83	0.530	0.590
	Medium	149	4.27	0.87		
	High	11	4.51	0.72		
Physical Rest	Low	63	4.74	0.65	0.232	0.793
	Medium	149	4.70	0.58		
	High	11	4.81	0.46		
Loneliness	Low	63	3.78	0.88	0.102	0.903
	Medium	149	3.76	1.01		
	High	11	3.63	1.02		
Moving Away from the Crowd	Low ¹	63	4.70	0.48	3.327	0.038*
	Medium ²	149	4.51	0.65		
	High ³	11	4.29	0.65		
Escape from Physical Stress	Low	63	4.57	0.81	1.888	0.154
	Medium	149	4.25	1.17		
	High	11	4.31	1.10		
Spending Time with Family	Low	63	3.65	1.43	0.730	0.483
	Medium	149	3.89	1.30		
	High	11	3.90	1.49		

*=p<0.05

When the analysis between the recreation experience preference scale and destination preference and income level was examined, it was determined that the significant difference in the sub-dimension of the recreation experience preference scale, getting away from the crowd (F=3.327; p=0.038), was in favour of individuals with low income level.

Table 9. Pearson correlation analysis results between the scales

Recreation Experience	1								
Destination Preference	0.565**	1							
Knowledge and	0.457**	0.719**	1						
Transport and Activity	0.578**	0.777**	0.494**	1					
Socio Cultural	0.446**	0.863**	0.565**	0.560**	1				
Natural Attractiveness	0.281**	0.752**	0.535**	0.402**	0.684**	1			
Travelling Glamour	0.318**	0.594**	0.255**	0.346**	0.449**	0.332**	1		
Entertainment and	0.446**	0.800**	0.510**	0.582**	0.633**	0.607**	0.400**	1	
Economic Factors	0.190**	0.464**	0.129	0.361**	0.260**	0.319**	0.226**	0.353**	1

**=p<0.01 *=p<0.05

According to Table 13, as a result of Pearson correlation analysis, it was determined that there was a positive and moderately significant relationship between the recreation experience preference scale and the destination preference scale (r=0.565). When the relationship between the recreation experience preference scale and the sub-dimensions of the destination preference scale is analysed, a positive low-level significant relationship (r=0.190) was found

in the economic factors sub-dimension, while positive moderate-level significant relationships were found with the other sub-dimensions.

Table 10. Multiple linear regression analysis results between the scales

Variables	B	Std. error	β	t	p
Constant					
Knowledge and Adventure	0.093	0.031	0.209	2.990	0.003*
Transport and Activity	0.179	0.034	0.384	5.301	0.000*
Socio Cultural Activities	0.046	0.035	0.113	1.318	0.189
Natural Attractiveness	-0.075	0.039	-0.152	-1.915	0.057
Travelling Glamour	0.024	0.015	0.093	1.545	0.124
Entertainment and Recreation	0.047	0.035	0.105	1.331	0.185
Economic Factors	-0.005	0.022	-0.014	-0.244	0.808
R=0.632	R ² =0.399				
F _(20,381) =0.000 p<0.000					

Dependent variable: Recreation experience preference, *=p<0.05

The findings of the multiple regression analysis, in which the effect of recreation experience preferences on destination preference is determined to be approximately 40%, show that knowledge and adventure and transportation and activity sub-dimensions are significantly predicted by recreation experience preference. The increase in the values of the participants' recreation experience preferences

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the findings obtained as a result of this study, which aimed to examine the effects of recreation experience preferences of individuals engaged in camping activities on destination preference and to determine how various variables differentiate the measurement tools, it was concluded that the participants' recreation experience preferences were high (4.32±0.49) and their destination preferences were also high (5.60±0.88). It was determined that the participants' recreation experience preference levels were high (4.32±0.49), the lowest average scores were obtained in the sub-dimension of spending time with friends (3.82±1.35), and the highest average scores were obtained in the nature sub-dimension (4.82±0.40). In the studies where the recreation experience preference scale was used in the literature, it was concluded that the highest mean scores were generally in the sub-dimension of "enjoying nature" in support of the current study (O'Connell, 2010; Weber & Anderson, 2010; Budruk & Stanis, 2013; Smith et al., 2014; Eryılmaz & Akgündüz, 2017; Le Corre et al., 2021).

According to the findings of this study, it was determined that there was a positive, moderately significant relationship between the recreation experience preference scale and the destination preference scale (r=0.565). It is seen that the highest level of relationship between recreation experience preference and destination preference is in the sub-dimension of transport and activity (r=0.578). In addition, the findings of the multiple regression analysis,

in which the effect of recreation experience preferences on destination preference was determined as approximately 40%, show that information and adventure and transport and activity sub-dimensions are significantly predicted by recreation experience preference. Based on these findings, it can be said that recreation experience preference is an important variable in destination preference. According to these results, the emergence of easier ways of transport for individuals engaged in camping activities and the increase in their level of knowledge about camping indicate that they will prefer destinations to a higher degree. According to the results of the study conducted by Kil et al. (2010), it was concluded that more direct interactions with natural environments or longer physical experiences in natural environments increase the level of commitment to natural environments. This situation reveals the relationship between recreation experience preference and destination more clearly. Since the activities carried out in natural environments such as camping will increase the attachment to the region, managers such as businesses and municipalities responsible for camping areas will be able to have more visitors who visit those areas more frequently and repeatedly by making the areas more efficient and useful according to demand and interest.

It was found that the recreation experience preferences of individuals participating in camping activities differed significantly according to gender, age, field of study, income, marital status variables, but did not differ significantly according to the education level variable (Şengel et al., 2014). It was found that participants' recreation experience preferences differed significantly according to gender. These significant differences were found to be in the sub-dimension of escape from physical stress (Shores & Scott, 2007; Şengel et al., 2014; Le Corre et al., 2021). These results are in favour of female participants. In addition, although no significant differences were found in the sub-dimensions of loneliness and getting away from the crowd, which are sub-dimensions of recreation experience preference, it is seen that female participants have higher averages. Accordingly, it can be said that female participants prefer camping activity in order to spend time alone by getting away from stress. It can be concluded that male participants prefer camping activities because they can weigh themselves in nature, that is, they can be physically active and spend time with their families. According to Kurar (2021), according to the relationship between the recreation experience preferences of Alanya people and their gender, contrary to the current study, gender does not statistically significantly differentiate the escape from physical stress, but the gender variable is a significant differentiator. Contrary to the current study, it is possible to come across studies in the literature where significant differences are not detected (Shores & Scott, 2007).

Statistically significant differences were found between the recreation experience preference and age variable between the dimensions of spending time with nature and family (Kurar, 2021; Le Corre et al., 2021). It is seen that these significant differences are in favour of participants aged 31 and over. Accordingly, as age increases, recreation experience preference also increases. In the dimensions of loneliness, getting away from the crowd and escape from physical stress, it was concluded that the averages of the participants decreased as the age decreased. According to the results of the study conducted by Shores and Scott (2007), no statistically significant differences were found between recreation experience preferences and age variable.

In the current study, statistically significant differences were found between the participants' field of study and recreation experience preferences in the dimensions of nature, escape from physical stress and spending time with family (Shores & Scott, 2007; Kurar, 2020; Kurar, 2021; Le Corre et al., 2021). It was concluded that these significant differences were in favour of private sector employees between private sector and students in the nature dimension, in favour of students in the escape from physical stress dimension, and in favour of private sector employees between private sector and students in the spending time with family dimension. Accordingly, it can be said that private sector employees prefer camping activities because they are held in nature and they can spend time with their families, while students participate in camping activities in order to relieve the stress they carry on themselves. According to the results of the study conducted by Sonntag-Öström et al. (2011), they found that leisure activities in nature relieve and relieve stress. Accordingly, it can be said that camping can be one of the best activities that students can do to get away from stress factors in the current study. According to the results of the study conducted by Şengel et al. (2014), unlike the current study, the destination preferences of domestic tourists do not change significantly according to the study area variable. According to Sezen Doğancılı and Akgün (2020), the first purpose of people residing in the province of Ordu in participating in leisure activities is to get away from stress. In this direction, according to the results of the current study, it is possible to mention that camping activity is an activity that people can apply to get away from stress in leisure time.

Statistically significant differences were found between the perceived income levels of the participants in the study and their recreation experience preferences (Kurar, 2020; Kurar, 2021). It is seen that this difference in the dimension of getting away from the crowd is in favour of the participants who say that their income level is low. Accordingly, it can be

interpreted that the reasons why participants with low perceived income level prefer camping activities are that they can get away from the crowd and camping activities are more economical. According to Şengel et al. (2014), there are no statistically significant differences between the income levels of domestic tourists and their destination preferences.

In the current study, significant differences were found between the marital status of the participants and their recreation experience preferences (Kurar, 2020). These significant differences were found in favour of married participants in the sub-dimension of spending time with nature and family. Accordingly, it can be said that married participants prefer the camping activity because it is possible to do this activity with the family while doing it in nature. In the study conducted by Kurar (2021), significant differences were found between marital status and recreation experience in support of the current study. Contrary to the study, these significant differences are in favour of single participants.

It can be said that the demographic variables of individuals camping in Kaş destination of Antalya province do not change the destination preference. A statistically significant difference was found only in the transportation and activity sub-dimension of the participants participating in the study according to the marital status variable. This difference was found to be in favour of married participants. This situation can be said that the reason why married individuals who prefer Kaş region of Antalya prefer this region is that they want to prefer a region that is easy to reach while spending time with their friends in nature. The results of the study conducted by Davras and Uslu (2019) on British tourists on holiday in Fethiye support the current study. In the study conducted by Davras and Uslu, it was determined that singles were effective in the transportation and activity sub-dimension, those with a high level of education in the dimension of travel glamour, and those aged 46 and over in the dimension of entertainment and recreation. Although no statistically significant differences were found according to the results of the ANOVA test between the income variable and the destination preference scale, it is possible to mention that those with low and medium perceived income status of the participants received higher scores on average. For the total score and sub-dimensions of the destination preference scale, it can be mentioned that the average scores are higher for the participants with higher income levels only in the natural attractiveness and entertainment and recreation sub-dimensions. These findings are quite consistent with the studies conducted by Kyle et al. (2004) and Kil et al. (2010) In contrast to the current study, Le Corre et al. (2021) found that recreation experience preference differed significantly according to gender, age and occupation variables, and according to the results of the study

conducted by Eker (2022), it was concluded that destination preferences differed significantly according to gender, age, income status and marital status variables as well as the variables of tourists. These results reveal that individuals with high income levels are also interested in the general appearance of the areas they prefer. Accordingly, it can be said that Kaş region of Antalya is a visually attractive place for camping.

Recommendations

In general, the results of the study show that demographic variables are not very effective in the preference of a centre, but it has been determined by the researchers that experience preference and the attractiveness of the destination may be important factors in the preference of that centre. It can also be said that the characteristics of the social participation group and the destination are important for understanding the experiences that individuals seek in recreation activities. In line with these results, it is recommended by the researchers for future studies that recreation experience preference and destination preference measurement tools are used together on individuals who prefer different outdoor recreation activities and prefer different destinations, and that the participants are divided into domestic and foreign tourists.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

GİRİŞ

İnsanlar, günlük rutin hayatı içinde, yaşamlarını devam ettirmek için zorunlu işlerini ve gerekliliklerini yerine getirmenin yanı sıra, dinlenme ve eğlenme gereksinimi duyarlar. Bu nedenle işten ve sorumluluklarından arta kalan boş zamanlarında giderek artan olumsuzluklardan kurtulmak amacıyla rekreatif etkinliklere katılım sağlarlar (Kül-Avan & Güçer, 2019). Özellikle şehirleşmenin çok olduğu bölgelerdeki bireyler, yoğun çalışma hayatının getirdiği stres ve yorgunlukla birlikte, çevre bilincinin ve küreselleşmenin artması ayrıca Covid-19 nedeniyle daha güvenilir ve sosyal temasın daha az olacağı boş zaman ve tatil seçeneklerine yönelen (Türkiye Seyehat Acentaları Birliği, 2021) bireylerin sosyal mesafe çabaları ile birlikte insanların tercih ettikleri boş zaman faaliyetleri de doğayla dost olmaya yönelik tercihler arasında yer almaya başlamıştır (Öztürk & Kalaycı, 2018; Kül Avan & Güçer, 2019). Kamping etkinliklerinde insanlar doğa ile olma ihtiyaçlarını basit yollarla karşılarlar. Doğaya zarar vermeden, kaynaklara en az zarar vererek gereksinimleri karşılamak doğayla bütünlük sağlamaktır (Şahbaz & Altınay, 2015; Karaçar, 2016).

Antalya'da kamping için en uygun bölgeler genellikle ilin batı kesimlerindeki destinasyonlarda yoğunlaştığı söylenebilir. Destinasyon, kişinin ikamet ettiği alan dışına gerçekleştirdiği ziyaret sahası olarak da ifade edilir. Kamping için tercih edilen bir destinasyonun tekrar ziyaretinde, insanların daha önce kamping yapmak için seçtikleri bölgelerde yaptıkları aktivite boyunca yaşadıkları deneyim çok

önemlidir. Rekreasyon deneyimi tercihleri, kullanıcılara katıldıkları faaliyetler için anlamlar sağlayan uğraşlara yönelik motivasyonlardır (Oh ve ark., 2014).

Rekreasyon deneyim tercihi ile destinasyon arasında doğru orantılı bir ilişki mevcuttur. Buna göre rekreasyon deneyim tercihi ile destinasyonun ziyaretçiyi bir bölgeyi seçme konusunda kendi içsel motivasyonu ve bilgi, deneyim ve tecrübeleri ile seçeceği en önemli iki kola benzetmek mümkündür. Literatürde rekreasyon deneyim tercihi ile destinasyon tercihini birlikte ölçen bir çalışmaya rastlanmamıştır. Bu durum mevcut çalışmanın literatürdeki bir eksikliği dolduracağını düşünülmektedir. Bu bilgiler ışığında, bu çalışmada kamp faaliyetleri yapan bireylerin rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin destinasyon tercihine olan etkilerinin incelenmesi ve çeşitli değişkenlerin ölçüm araçlarını ne doğrultuda farklılaştırdığının belirlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

YÖNTEM

Bu çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden genel tarama modellerinden ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. İlişkisel tarama modelinde, çalışmada kullanılan değişkenlerin birlikte değişip değişmediği; herhangi bir değişim olduğu tespit edilirse bunun nasıl gerçekleştiği anlaşılmaya çalışılır (Karasar, 2011). Çalışmaya Antalya ili Kaş bölgesinde kamp yapan 223 birey dahil olmuştur. Kolayda örnekleme yöntemiyle seçilen örneklem grubu ile veriler yüz yüze toplanmıştır. Veri toplama aracı olarak demografik veri formu ve “Rekreasyon Deneyim Tercihi Ölçeği” ve “Destinasyon Tercihi Ölçeği” kullanılmıştır. Verilerin homojen dağılıp dağılmadığının belirlenmesi üzere basıklık çarpıklık değerleri test edilmiş, verilerin normal dağılım gösterdiği belirlendiğinden parametrik testler uygulanmıştır (Uysal & Kılıç, 2022). Verilerin analizinde tanımlayıcı istatistikler, bağımsız örneklem t testi ve tek yönlü varyans analizi ANOVA ve post hoc testleri (LSD) kullanılmıştır.

BULGULAR

Katılımcıların rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin yüksek olduğunu ($4,32\pm 0,49$) ve yine aynı şekilde destinasyon tercihlerinin de yüksek düzeyde olduğu ($5,60\pm 0,88$) sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın bulgularına göre Rekreasyon Deneyim Tercihi Ölçeği ve Destinasyon Tercihi Ölçeği arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir ($r=0,565$). Ayrıca rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin destinasyon tercihi üzerindeki etkisinin yaklaşık %40 olarak belirlendiği çoklu regresyon analizi bulguları bilgi ve macera ile ulaşım ve aktivite alt boyutlarının rekreasyon deneyim tercihi tarafından anlamlı biçimde yordandığını göstermektedir. Kamp faaliyetlerine katılan bireylerin rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin cinsiyet, yaş, çalışma alanı, gelir, medeni durum değişkenlerine göre anlamlı bir biçimde farklılaştığı saptanmıştır. Destinasyon tercihi ölçeği açısından çalışmaya katılan katılımcıların sadece ulaşım ve aktivite alt boyutunda medeni durum değişkenine göre anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmiştir.

TARTIŞMA VE SONUÇ

Bu çalışmanın bulgularına göre RDTÖ ve DTÖ arasında pozitif yönlü orta düzeyde anlamlı ilişki olduğu belirlenmiştir ($r=0,565$). Rekreasyon deneyim tercihinin destinasyon tercihi ile en yüksek düzeyde ilişkilerin ulaşım ve aktivite ($r=0,578$) alt boyutunda olduğu görülmektedir. Ayrıca rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin destinasyon tercihi üzerindeki etkisinin yaklaşık %40 olarak belirlendiği çoklu regresyon analizi bulguları bilgi ve macera ile ulaşım ve aktivite alt boyutlarının rekreasyon deneyim tercihi tarafından anlamlı biçimde yordandığını göstermektedir.

Antalya ilinin Kaş destinasyonunda kamp yapan bireylerin demografik değişkenlerinin destinasyon tercihini değiştirmediği söylenebilir. Çalışmaya katılan katılımcıların sadece ulaşım ve aktivite alt boyutunda medeni durum değişkenine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılık tespit edilmiştir. Bu farklılık evli katılımcıların lehine olduğu sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır. Bu durum Antalya'nın Kaş bölgesini tercih eden evli bireylerin bu bölgeyi tercih etme nedenlerinin doğada arkadaşları ile zaman geçirirken ulaşım konusunda kolay olan bir bölgeyi tercih etmek istemelerinden kaynaklandığı şeklinde söylenebilir (Davras & Uslu, 2019).

Genel olarak çalışmanın sonuçlarında bir merkezin tercihinde demografik değişkenlerin çok fazla etkili olmadığını, bunun yanında deneyim tercihinin ve destinasyonun ilgi çekiciliğinin o merkezin tercihinde önemli etkenler olabileceği araştırmacılar tarafından tespit edilmiştir. Ayrıca bireylerin rekreasyon faaliyetlerinde aradıkları deneyimleri anlamak için sosyal katılım grubunun özelliklerinin ve destinasyonun önemli olduğunu da söylenebilir. Bu sonuçlar doğrultusunda araştırmacılar tarafından gelecekte yapılacak çalışmalar için farklı açık hava rekreasyon faaliyetlerini tercih eden ve farklı destinasyonları tercih eden bireyler üzerinde rekreasyon deneyim tercihi ve destinasyon tercihi ölçme araçlarının bir arada kullanıldığı ve katılımcıların yerli ve yabancı turist ayrımı yapılarak araştırmalar yapılması tavsiye edilmektedir.

REFERENCES

- Aksöz, E. O., Önem, B. & Aydın, B. (2020). Kamp deneyimi yaşayan bireylerin glamping'e ilişkin algılarının belirlenmesi. *Gastroia: Journal of Gastronomy and Travel Research*, 4(2), 185-196.
- Anderson, D. H., & Fulton, D. C. (2008). Experience preferences as mediators of the wildlife related recreation participation: Place attachment relationship. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 13(2), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10871200701669971>.
- Antalya İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü (2023, February 18). *Kamp ve karavan turizmi*, antalya.ktb.gov.tr/TR-68446/kamp-ve-karavan-turizmi.html.
- Ayar H., Karaküçük S., & Ayyıldız, D. T. (2019, Aralık 19-20). *Rekreasyon deneyim tercihi ölçeği geçerlik güvenirlik çalışması* [5. Uluslararası Sosyal Beşerî ve Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi]. İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Başarangil, İ., & Öztürk, H. (2019). Kamp alanlarının hizmet kalitesi bileşenlerinin sadakat değişkeni üzerine etkisi: Gökçetepe tabiat parkı örneği. *Journal of International Social Research*, 12(66). <https://doi.org/10.17719/jisr.2019.3647>.

- Budruk, M., & Stanis, S. A. W. (2013). Place attachment and recreation experience preference: A further exploration of the relationship. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, (1), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2013.04.001>.
- Çelik, P. (2014). *Antalya turizm destinasyonunun rekabetçilik analizi*. [Doktora tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi].
- Davras, Ö. & Uslu, A. (2019). Destinasyon seçimini belirleyen faktörlerin destinasyon memnuniyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Fethiye’de İngiliz turistler üzerinde bir araştırma. *Manas Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(1), 679-696.
- Doğantan, E. (2014). *Frigya bölgesine alternatif konaklama tesisi önerisi: Karavancılık*. [Doktora tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi].
- Eryılmaz, G., & Akgündüz, Y. (2017). Bireyleri rekreatif faaliyetlere yönelten motive edici faktörler. *Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research*, 4(1), 13-26.
- İsayeva, S., & Kasalak, M. A. (2016). Sürdürülebilir turizm yönetimi kapsamında yer alan örnek ekoturizm uygulamaları. *Çatalhöyük Uluslararası Turizm ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, (1), 183-200.
- Karaçar, E. (2016). *Rekreatif faaliyetlerde çevreye yönelik tutumların ve destinasyon imajının tekrar ziyaret niyetine etkisi: Ilgaz dağı milli parkı örneği*. [Doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi].
- Kızır, O., Genç, H., Kayantaş, İ., & Kargün, M. (2018). *Doğa sporları*. Gece Kitaplığı.
- Kil, N., Holland, S. M., & Stein, T. V. (2010). Improving the management of natural resource recreation areas through understanding place-attached visitor segments. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*, 28(3).
- Kozak, M. A., & Doğantan, E. (2016). An assessment of students’ recreation participation. *US-China Education Review*, 6(8), 467-480.
- Kurar, İ. (2020). Yerel halkın rekreasyon deneyim tercihlerinin, beklentilerinin ve memnuniyet düzeylerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma: Alanya Dim Çayı Vadisi örneği. *Journal of Tourism Theory and Research*, 6(2), 140-155.
- Kurar, İ. (2021). Research on the determination of recreational experience preferences, expectations, and satisfaction levels of local people. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 9(1), 41-66.
- Kül-Avan, S., & Güçer, E. (2019). Kapadokya bölgesinde yapılan açık alan rekreasyon etkinliklerinin seyahat acentaları tarafından değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Social Sciences*, (25), 154-168.
- Kyle, G., Graefe, A., & Manning, R. (2004). Attached recreationists... who are they. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 22(2), 65-84.
- Le Corre, N., Saint-Pierre, A., Hughes, M., Peuziat, I., Cosquer, A., Michot, ... et al. (2021). Outdoor recreation in French coastal and marine protected areas. Exploring recreation experience preference as a way for building conservation support. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, (33), 100332.
- O’Connell, T. S. (2010). The effects of age, gender and level of experience on motivation to sea kayak. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning*, 10(1), 51-66.
- Oh, C. O., Sutton, S. G., & Sorice, M. G. (2013). Assessing the role of recreation specialization in fishing site substitution. *Leisure Sciences*, 35(3), 256-272.

- Olçay, A., & Turhan, U., (2017). Türkiye’de glamping hizmeti veren işletmelerin sahip ve yöneticilerinin “yeni turizm trendi glamping” ile ilgili görüşleri (Muğla ve Antalya örneği), *Gaziantep University Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(4), 980-996.
- Öztürk, S., & Kalaycı, M. (2018). Dilek Yarımadası Büyük Menderes Deltası Milli Parkı ekoturizm potansiyeli. *Kuşadası Peyzaj Değerleri İçinde*, 110-119.
- Raadik, J., Cottrell, S. P., Fredman, P., Ritter, P., & Newman, P. (2014). Understanding recreational experience preferences: application at fulufjället national park, Sweden. In *Frontiers in Nature-based Tourism*. Routledge, 59-75.
- Sezen D. O., & Akgün, M. (2020). *Ordu ili rekreasyon alanlarının yerel halk açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Shores, K., & Scott, D. (2007). The relationship of individual time perspective and recreation experience preferences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 39(1), 28-59.
- Smith, A. J., Tuffin, M., Taplin, R. H., Moore, S. A. & Tonge, J. (2014). Visitor segmentation for a park system using research and managerial judgement. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 13(2-3), 93-109.
- Sonntag-Öström, E., Nordin, M., Slunga-Järvholm, L., Lundell, Y., Brännström, R., & Dolling, A. (2011). Can the boreal forest be used for rehabilitation and recovery from stress-related exhaustion? A pilot study. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 26(3), 245-256.
- Surdu, A. (2014) *Social Media as a Channel of Communication with Customers in the Hospitality Industry*. [Doctoral dissertation, Delft University]. Tudelft.
- Şahbaz R. P., & Altınay, M. (2015). Türkiye’deki milli parkların rekreasyon faaliyetleri açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 3(3), 125-135.
- Şalk, S., Dumanlı, Ş. & Köroğlu, Ö. (2018). Tatilcilerin çadır kamp faaliyetlerine katılım motivasyonlarının belirlenmesi. *Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(2), 130-144.
- Şengel, Ü., İbiş, S., Zengin, B., & Batman, O. (2014). *Turistik destinasyon seçiminin demografik özelliklere göre belirlenmesi: yerli turistler üzerine bir araştırma* [15. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi]. Muğla, Türkiye.
- Trabzon Ticaret ve Sanayi Odası (2013, April 10). *Her mevsim karadeniz projesi master planı*. investin Trabzon.gov.tr/dosya/1-kis-turizmi-master-plan.pdf.
- Türkiye Seyahat Acentaları Birliği (2021, August 05). *360 derece kamp/karavan araştırması*. <https://www.tursab.org.tr/duyurular/tursabin-girisimleri-ve-ulusal-kamp-ve-karavan-federasyonu-ile-kuantum-arastirma-sirketinin-destekleriyle-hazirlanan-360-derece-kampkaravan-arastirmasi-raporu>.
- T.C. Turizm ve Kültür Bakanlığı (2023, February 14). *Türkiye turizm stratejisi 2023 eylem planı*. yigm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-11699/turkiye-turizm-stratejisi.html.
- Uysal, İ., & Kılıç, A. (2022). Normal dağılım ikilemi. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 12(1), 220-248.
- Weber, D., & Anderson, D. (2010). Contact with nature: Recreation experience preferences in Australian parks. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 13(1-2), 46-69.
- Williams, D. R., Ellis, G. D., Nickerson, N. P., & Shafer, C. S. (1988). Contributions of time, format, and subject to variation in recreation experience preference measurement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(1), 57-68.

KATKI ORANI CONTRIBUTION RATE	AÇIKLAMA EXPLANATION	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR CONTRIBUTORS
Fikir ve Kavramsal Örgü <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Tebessüm AYYILDIZ DURHAN
Tasarım <i>Design</i>	Yöntem ve araştırma desenini tasarlamak <i>To design the method and research design.</i>	Ferhat KILIÇARSLAN
Literatür Tarama <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Nuri Berk GÜNGÖR Serkan KURTİPEK Serkan KURTİPEK
Veri Toplama ve İşleme <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlemek ve raporlaştırmak <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Tebessüm AYYILDIZ DURHAN Nuri Berk GÜNGÖR
Tartışma ve Yorum <i>Discussion and Commentary</i>	Elde edilen bulguların değerlendirilmesi <i>Evaluation of the obtained finding</i>	Ferhat KILIÇARSLAN Serkan KURTİPEK Tebessüm AYYILDIZ DURHAN

Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı/ Statement of Support and Acknowledgment

Bu çalışmanın yazım sürecinde katkı ve/veya destek alınmamıştır.

No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.

Çatışma Beyanı/ Statement of Conflict

Araştırmacıların araştırma ile ilgili diğer kişi ve kurumlarla herhangi bir kişisel ve finansal çıkar çatışması yoktur.

Researchers do not have any personal or financial conflicts of interest with other people and institutions related to the research.

Etik Kurul Beyanı/ Statement of Ethics Committee

Bu araştırma, Gazi Üniversitesi Etik Kurulunun E-77082166-604.01.02-455138 sayılı kararı ile yürütülmüştür.

This research was conducted with the decision of Gazi University Ethics Committee numbered E-77082166-604.01.02-455138



This study is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).