

# PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF TURKISH TOURISM ECONOMICS BY TOPSIS BETWEEN THE YEARS 2003-2015

**Halil Akmese, Asst. Prof.**

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

**Alper Ates, Asst. Prof.**

Selcuk University, Tourism Faculty, Konya/Turkey

**Ahmet Buyuksalvarci, Assoc. Prof.**

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

**Ceyhan Kilinc, Assoc. Prof.**

Selcuk University, Tourism Faculty, Konya/Turkey

**Halil Sunar**

Selcuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya/Turkey

**Mustafa Coskuner**

Selcuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya/Turkey

## ABSTRACT

Tourism is a sector that coming into prominence by its contribution to economies, especially in developing countries. Countries plan and develop strategies to get more percentage from tourism and to overpower the rival countries. Because of its brittle structure, some developments may affect tourism. The aim of this study is to evaluate the tourism economy in 2003-2015 by TOPSIS method and to investigate the reasons. In this study, total tourism net incomes, per capita expenditures, the percentage of tourism incomes in GSMH and tourism income – export ratio are considered as criterions. In this research, 2011 has the best performance in the field of economy, while 2006 has the worst.

**Key Words:** Tourism Economy, TOPSIS, Turkey

**Jel Codes:** M21, Z3, Z32

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The interest in tourism is increasing day by day as a result of globalization and countries constantly compete with each other to achieve economic income from tourism activities. In order to get in advantageous position in competition, required tourism investments are made and tourism policies are being developed and tried to practice. There are both positive and negative consequences of implemented policies. The main objective of the tourism policies developed by the Ministry of Tourism is to provide foreign currency to the country and to contribute to economy. Thus, evaluating the performance of the tourism economy is an important need. The purpose of this study is to examine the situation in tourism sector considering the most and least successful years in the period from November 2002 until today, because the government is identical in these years, and to evaluate by TOPSIS method which is a multi-criteria decision making method.

## 2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The first work written about the economy is Xenophon's "oikonomia". Considering the origin of the word "economy", it consist of the words which means in Greek houses "oikos" and meaning rule "nomos". Oikonomia means household management. When we look at the history of economy in Turkey, first they use "scientific fold" and "scientific wealth of nations" words. Then instead of these words, derived from the word Arabic "ode" which means making savings and spending limited the word "Saving" has been used to define economy. Today saving the word is used synonymously with the word economy (Öztaş, 2002: 7).

According to Ünlüönen et al., economy means the investigation of how to choose scarce factors of production for using various goods and service production and the distribution of the outputs among society (Ünlüönen et al., 2011: 2). Tourism is a socio-economic event, which starts with an economic decision about how people spend their leisure time and money, and which has economical terms such as investment, consumption, employment, exportation and public revenue (Kozak et al., 2010:7). According to the World Tourism Organization tourism, provided that there is no permanent residence and not to income generating activities incidents arise from the temporary accommodation and overall relations. (Mısırlı, 2008: 1)

### 2.1. Tourism Economy

The importance for the economies of some countries towards the end of 1920 tourism has become a rapidly growing nature of activities. Having important effects for balance of payments and known as invisible

exportation, tourism is accepted as an exportation of goods and services with retail prices. Tourism, that provides very high levels of foreign currency into countries, how many people will participate in community tourism, how much of that do overnight, what kind of goods and services will be requested, which will be directed to the area of expenditures to be made, are the working areas of economics (Kozak et al., 2010: 8). Due to national and international mobility, tourism is an economic activity that creates stimulating effects created indirectly and directly and affects them in employment and income (Öztaş, 2002: 20). According to İçöz and Kozak, tourism economy is the discipline which evaluates the economic consequences of tourism events, dimensions of these consequences and the influences that tourism causes directly or indirectly (İçöz and Kozak, 1998: 1). According to another definition, tourism economy is a discipline which presents the tourism principles and laws searching the cause of tourism events, important developmental conditions, its results, the relationship between cause and results through scientific methods (Olalı and Timur, 1988, 195).

## 2.2. TOPSIS Method

One of the multi-criteria decision-making methods, Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to the Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) method (1981), with Hwang and Yoon reference is presented by Chen and Hwang (Ertuğrul and Özçil, 2014: 269).

TOPSIS method can be applied directly on the data without a quantitative conversion. Using this method, alternative options, in accordance with certain criteria, and by calculating the maximum and minimum values of the criteria can receive, between them the order of the scores obtained from the evaluation of the ideal solution (Eleren and Karagül, 2008: 6). Application steps of the method are described below (Ömürbek and Kınay, 2013: 352-355)

- Step 1: Establishment of the Decision Matrix (A)
- Step 2: Creating the normalized decision matrix to (R)
- Step 3: Creating a Standard Weighted Decision Matrix (V)
- Step 4: Creating the Ideal Solution Sets of Positive (d+) and (d-) Negative Ideal
- Step 5: Calculation of Discrimination Measure
- Step 6: Calculating the relative proximity to the Ideal Solution
- Step 7: None of each of Alternative Relative Ranking and Rating

## 2.3. Criteria

With the purpose of contribution to economy and having important incomes, all countries do planning and develop policies about tourism and some goals are determined. The most important objective here is to achieve the goals and to contribute to the national economy at the highest level. In this study, total tourism net revenue, the average expenditure per capita and the share of tourism revenue in GDP and the ratio of tourism revenues and exports are considered as criteria. Criteria are limited to five to obtain the most accurate and precise information. Using data since 2003, the successful and unsuccessful years are determined with TOPSIS, and the causes of this situation are examined.

## 3. LITERATURE

Yayar and Baykara (2012) evaluated the efficiency and productivity of the participation banks in the Turkey's financial system between the years 2005-2001, by using TOPSIS method. According to the results; Albaraka Turk is the most effective, while Bank of Asia has been identified as the most efficient bank. It has also been determined that Kuwait Turkish Bank has diversified its financial instruments and increased its efficiency and productivity.

Soba, Akcanlı and Erem (2012), performed measurement and evaluations of 26 businesses which are in the sector of stone and earth and 28 businesses in the sector of metal, by using data envelopment analysis and TOPSIS. In the study, performance appraisal or activity measured in many different analysis techniques to be applied, but the appropriate input-output combination to be a significant impact on the study results to determine the truth has also concluded the requirements should not be ignored.

In the study of Uygur Turk and Korkmaz (2012), using financial statements, 13 main metal industry businesses' financial performances have been analyzed by TOPSIS method. As a result, basic metal industry sector of the enterprises operating performance during the analysis of the scores have been found to vary in general.

Çonkar, Elitaş and Atar (2011), study on which is traded on the Istanbul Stock Exchange, located in the Corporate Governance Index in 2007 and 7 in 2008, 10 were made public large-scale research on the data of the companies. Financial ratios selected as the scope of the analysis of financial performance for 2007 and 2008 is calculated separately for each year and according to the company's performance has been tested and listed by TOPSIS method. In addition, the study measured the financial performance of the company in the period analyzed corporate governance ratings.

Kaya and Gülhan (2010), 2008 the global financial crisis, business activities and performance level in their work in order to determine the effect, which is listed on the Istanbul Stock Exchange, who analyzed 25 companies

operating in the metal goods and machinery sectors. These businesses are starting three months before and after the financial crisis in the industry using the two terms of the ratio of 10 events and performance were measured. In determining the effectiveness and business performance data envelopment analysis and TOPSIS were used. Data envelopment analysis results have shown that businesses use resources more efficiently than before the financial crisis, according to TOPSIS analysis results showed that no significant difference in operating performance rankings.

Dumanoğlu 2010, in his study, Istanbul Stock Exchange using the financial statements of 15 cement companies that are traded on the stock market, has analyzed the financial performance of the companies with TOPSIS method. The results obtained for performance evaluation and comparisons are made between the 2004-2009 study periods. Results of the evaluation according to some companies, their ranking within the group that maintains a stable manner, saving a group of companies if the recovery in the last stages of their place in the ranking and the group is to be unstable or negative development was determined to be unsuccessful due.

Dumanoğlu and Ergül (2010) examined Istanbul Stock Exchange using the financial statements of eleven technology companies listed on the Stock Exchange. The company has analyzed the financial performance by TOPSIS method between 2006 and 2009, according to the company, and they sort of get their financial performance scores.

Eleren and Karagül between the years 1986-2006 have evaluated the performance of Turkey's economy with using TOPSIS method. 7 different macro variables used in the study and achievement scores were obtained for each year. Accordingly, the performance of the year, while in 1986 it was the highest, respectively, 1990, 1987 and 1993 were followed. The years with the lowest performance are 1999, 2001, 2006 and 2000.

#### 4. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Decision matrix also frames the values of the normal matrix by taking the square root of the total (0-1 between values) are made.

**Table 1:** Standard Decision Matrix

YEARS	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
2003-2004	0,235	0,242	-0,008	-0,022	-0,106
2004-2005	0,198	0,19	-0,001	-0,045	-0,019
2005-2006	-0,094	-0,04	-0,046	-0,166	-0,202
2006-2007	0,102	0,175	-0,041	-0,085	-0,121
2007-2008	0,251	0,138	0,064	0,062	-0,04
2008-2009	-0,055	0,033	-0,045	0,205	0,253
2009-2010	-0,045	0,031	-0,035	-0,17	-0,12
2010-2011	0,185	0,094	0,03	0,058	0,136
2011-2012	0,081	0,008	0,021	0,027	-0,076
2012-2013	0,108	0,075	0,036	0,054	0,109
2013-2014	0,065	0,055	0,004	0,102	0,023
relative value	0,489	0,408	0,119	0,361	0,429

Maximum and minimum values are found from the normalized value in the table1.

**Table 2:** Normalized Decision Matrix

YEARS	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
2003-2004	0,480	0,594	-0,069	-0,061	-0,247
2004-2005	0,405	0,466	-0,009	-0,125	-0,046
2005-2006	-0,193	-0,098	-0,388	-0,460	-0,470
2006-2007	0,21	0,429	-0,344	-0,237	-0,283
2007-2008	0,513	0,338	0,545	0,172	-0,094
2008-2009	-0,113	0,081	-0,378	0,569	0,588
2009-2010	-0,093	0,078	-0,300	-0,472	-0,279
2010-2011	0,378	0,231	0,255	0,162	0,317
2011-2012	0,165	0,021	0,183	0,076	-0,178
2012-2013	0,221	0,185	0,306	0,149	0,254
2013-2014	0,134	0,136	0,040	0,283	0,054
Max.	0,513	0,594	0,545	0,569	0,588
Min.	-0,193	-0,098	-0,388	-0,472	-0,470

The criteria are weighted according to their importance.

**Table 3: The Weighted Criteria**

CODE	CRITERIA	WEIGHTED
W1	Tourism Net Income	1
W2	Number of visitor	1
W3	Average Expenditure	1
W4	GDP Share of tourism income	1
W5	Export Proportion of tourism income	1

After calculating the positive and negative from positive and negative offsets are found mainly multiplied by weights.

**Table 4: Positive and Negative Distance Values**

Years	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
2003-2004	0,032	0	0,614	0,630	0,836
2004-2005	0,107	0,128	0,554	0,694	0,634
2005-2006	0,707	0,693	0,933	1,030	1,059
2006-2007	0,303	0,164	0,889	0,806	0,872
2007-2008	0	0,256	0	0,396	0,682
2008-2009	0,626	0,513	0,923	0	0
2009-2010	0,607	0,516	0,845	1,041	0,868
2010-2011	0,135	0,363	0,289	0,406	0,270
2011-2012	0,348	0,573	0,361	0,492	0,767
2012-2013	0,292	0,409	0,238	0,419	0,334
2013-2014	0,473	0,458	0,504	0,285	0,534
Weight	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Negative Distance Weighted Value</b>					
Years	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5
2003-2004	0,674	0,693	0,319	0,410	0,223
2004-2005	0,599	0,565	0,378	0,346	0,424
2005-2006	0	0	0	0,011	0
2006-2007	0,403	0,528	0,043	0,235	0,187
2007-2008	0,707	0,437	0,933	0,644	0,376
2008-2009	0,080	0,180	0,010	1,041	1,059
2009-2010	0,099	0,177	0,088	0	0,191
2010-2011	0,571	0,330	0,644	0,634	0,788
2011-2012	0,358	0,120	0,572	0,548	0,292
2012-2013	0,414	0,284	0,694	0,621	0,725
2013-2014	0,327	0,235	0,429	-0,123	0,525
Weight	1	1	1	1	1

Weighted Positive and Negative Values calculated by taking the square root distance after collecting the squares of the criteria  $d^+$  and  $d^-$  scores are calculated.

**Table 5: Distance Weighted Positive and Negative Values**

Years	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	$d^+$
2003-2004	0,032	0	0,614	0,630	0,836	1,214
2004-2005	0,107	0,128	0,554	0,694	0,634	1,105
2005-2006	0,707	0,693	0,933	1,030	1,059	2,009
2006-2007	0,303	0,164	0,889	0,806	0,872	1,523
2007-2008	0	0,256	0	0,396	0,682	0,830
2008-2009	0,626	0,513	0,923	0	0	1,228
2009-2010	0,607	0,516	0,845	1,041	0,868	1,785
2010-2011	0,135	0,363	0,289	0,406	0,270	0,687
2011-2012	0,348	0,573	0,361	0,492	0,767	1,188
2012-2013	0,292	0,409	0,238	0,419	0,334	0,773
2013-2014	0,473	0,458	0,504	0,285	0,534	1,026
<b>Negative Distance Weighted Value</b>						

Years	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	d-
2003-2004	0,674	0,693	0,319	0,410	0,223	1,121
2004-2005	0,599	0,565	0,378	0,346	0,424	1,059
2005-2006	0	0	0	0,011	0	0,011
2006-2007	0,403	0,528	0,043	0,235	0,187	0,731
2007-2008	0,707	0,437	0,933	0,644	0,376	1,456
2008-2009	0,080	0,180	0,010	1,041	1,059	1,498
2009-2010	0,099	0,177	0,088	0	0,191	0,292
2010-2011	0,571	0,330	0,644	0,634	0,788	1,369
2011-2012	0,358	0,120	0,572	0,548	0,292	0,925
2012-2013	0,414	0,284	0,694	0,621	0,725	1,283
2013-2014	0,327	0,235	0,429	-0,123	0,525	0,799

$d - / ((d -) + (d +))$  CC scores are calculated using the formula and are ranked according to the size of the points.

**Table 6:** 2003-2014 Year Performance Ranking of Turkey Tourism Economy

Years	d+	d-	CC	Ranking CC
2003-2004	1,214	1,121	0,479	<b>6</b>
2004-2005	1,105	1,059	0,489	<b>5</b>
2005-2006	2,009	0,011	0,005	<b>11</b>
2006-2007	1,523	0,731	0,324	<b>9</b>
2007-2008	0,830	1,456	0,636	<b>2</b>
2008-2009	1,228	1,498	0,549	<b>4</b>
2009-2010	1,785	0,292	0,140	<b>10</b>
2010-2011	0,687	1,369	0,665	<b>1</b>
2011-2012	1,188	0,925	0,4378	<b>7</b>
2012-2013	0,773	1,283	0,624	<b>3</b>
2013-2014	1,026	0,799	0,4376	<b>8</b>

## 5. RESULTS

Accordance with the criteria set out between 2003 and 2014, according to TOPSIS multi-criteria method of performance appraisal is seen as the highest performance in 2011. Between 2003 and 2014 the poor performance is based on the specified criteria in 2006. High performance in the year 2011 while following the 2008 and 2013, The worst performance of the year 2006 , 2010 and 2007 which showed poor performance compared to other years

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The contribution it makes to the national economy, especially in developing tourism is increasingly the case of a sector of increasing importance. Countries are making short and long-term investment and planning to take advantage of to gain more revenue and competitive environment. These plans sometimes provide positive results, tourism, wrong policies, natural disasters, terrorism, political strategy because of external factors, and the like can be affected quickly disappointed. In this study, who made a positive impact on the tourism economies of the year with the help of five criteria TOPSIS scores are calculated. In 2010 and 2011, the best improvement in terms of performance is observed, while the worst performance is observed to occur in 2005 and 2006.

The worst year, when examined in 2006, first, the development plans prepared regularly the ninth plan could not put into. In place of this development plan envisaged a transition plan. The aim of the transition plan, the number of enterprises certified bed 460 thousand, while the number of municipalities certified bed was projected to reach 410 thousand, as 23 million people, the number of tourists coming while tourism revenues are targeted \$ 20 billion to be realized. (DPT, 2006: 69) However, these goals could not be reached. A number of developments are due to the fragile nature of tourism has affected tourism. Not showing the necessary sensitivity and sufficient margin for the promotion of Turkey, cartoon crisis experienced with Denmark, World Cup events in Germany might be possible reasons. For reasons such as the encountered cases of bird flu occurred in Turkey's tourism has not been achieved the desired yield (Coşkun, 2010: 36).

Turkey is affected after a year of crisis in the world which begun in 2008. In this context, the United States continued its influence in 2009. When seen as a recovery in 2010, while in 2011 that has the highest performance is an indication of the accuracy of studies and monitoring strategy. Something must be learned from the problems experienced in 2006 and again the external factors that could be possible considering the possibility of alternative planning are envisaged. Short and long-term alternative tourism strategies with



precision, taking into account environmental factors in planning for emergencies is tourism that can be done should be established.

## 7. REFERENCES

- Çonkar, M. K. Elitaş, C. ve Atar, G. (2011). İMKB Kurumsal Yönetim Endeksi'ndeki Firmaların Finansal Performanslarının TOPSIS Yöntemi İle Ölçümü ve Kurumsal Yönetim Notu İle Analizi, İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, Cilt:61, Sayı:1.
- Coşkun, N. (2010). Türkiye'de Turizm Politikaları ve Turizm Sektörü Üzerindeki Etkileri, T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Kütüphaneler ve Yayımlar Genel Müdürlüğü, Uzmanlık Tezi, Ankara.
- DPT Müsteşarlığı (2006). Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı (2007-2013), <http://www.metu.edu.tr/system/files/kalkinma.pdf>, Retrieval date: 10.04.2016.
- Dumanoğlu, S. (2010). İMKB'de İşlem Gören Çimento Şirketlerinin Mali Performanslarının TOPSIS Yöntemi İle Değerlendirilmesi, Marmara üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi, Cilt: XXIX, Sayı: II.
- Dumanoğlu, S. ve Ergül, N. (2010). İMKB'de İşlem Gören Teknoloji Şirketlerinin Mali Performans Ölçümü, Muhasebe ve Finansman Dergisi, Sayı: 48.
- Eleren, A. ve Karagül, M. (2008). 1986-2006 Türkiye Ekonomisinin Performans Değerlendirmesi, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi İİBF Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi, 15(1), p.1-14.
- Ertuğrul, İrfan, Özçil, Abdullah (2014) Çok Kriterli Karar Vermede TOPSIS ve VIKOR Yöntemleriyle Klima Seçimi, Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi Y.2014, Cilt 4, Sayı 1, ss.267-282
- İçöz, O. , Kozak, M. (1998) Turizm Ekonomisi, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara
- İçöz, O. (2005) Turizm Ekonomisi, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara
- Kaya, A. ve Gülhan, Ü. (2010). Küresel Finansal Krizin İşletmelerin Etkinlik ve Performans Düzeylerine Etkileri: 2008 Finansal Kriz Örneği, İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Ekonometri ve İstatistik Dergisi, Sayı:11.
- Kozak, M. , Bahar, O. (2012) Turizm Ve Rekabet, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara 7-19
- Kozak, N. , Kozak, M. A. , Kozak, M. (2010) Genel Turizm İlkeler ve Kavramlar, 9. Baskı, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara
- Mısırlı, İ. (2008) Seyahat Acentacılığı ve Tur Operatörlüğü, Detay Yayıncılık, 3. Baskı, Ankara
- Olalı H. , Timur, A. (1988) Turizm Ekonomisi, Ofis Ticaret Matbaacılık Şirketi, İzmir
- Öztaş, K. (2002) Turizm Ekonomisi Genel Turizm Bilgileri, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara
- Ömürbek, V. ve Kınay, B. (2013) Havayolu Taşımacılığı Sektöründe TOPSIS Yöntemiyle Finansal Performans Değerlendirmesi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, C.18, S.3, S.343-363.
- Soba, M. , Akcanlı, F. ve Erem, I. (2012). İMKB'ye Kayıtlı Seçilmiş İşletmelere Yönelik Etkinlik Ölçümü ve Performans Değerlendirmesi: Veri Zarflama Analizi ve TOPSIS Uygulaması, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Sayı:27.
- Usal, A. , Kurgun, O. A. (2006) Turizm İşletmelerinde Maliyet Analizleri, Detay Yayıncılık, 3. Baskı, Ankara
- Ünlüöner, K. , Tayfun, A. , Kılıçlar, A. (2011) Turizm Ekonomisi, 3. Basım, Nobel Yayınevi, Ankara
- Yayar, R. ve Baykara, H. V. (2012).TOPSIS Yöntemi ile Katılım Bankalarının Etkinliği ve Verimliliği Üzerine Bir Uygulama, Business and Economics Research Journal, Vol: 3, No: 4.

## BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS

### Asst. Prof. Dr. HALİL AKMESE

Dr. AKMESE was born in 1980. He started his M.Sc. in Department of Business Administration at Selcuk University after graduating from Tourism and Hotel Management Department of Bilkent University with the degree of Bachelor of Science. He worked as a lecturer between 2003 and 2014 at Social Sciences Vocational School of Selcuk University. He completed business administration Master's degree program at Social Sciences Institute in 2006 and received doctorate diploma in Business administration in 2013 from Social Sciences Institute. He has become an assistant professor in 2014 at Necmettin Erbakan University. He has been working at Tourism Faculty and lecturing accounting, finance, management, financial statements analyses, cost accounting, sustainability and corporate social responsibility courses.

### Asst. Prof. Dr. ALPER ATES

He was born in 1979 in Elazığ. Years of education and training during the years after the end of the cultivars studied in schools, Istanbul University School of Business, studied "Business Administration" undergraduate program and after that Selcuk University Social Sciences Institute, studied "Business Administration" MBA and Doctorate programs. I have been working at Selcuk University since 2005

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. AHMET BUYUKSALVARCI**

He was born in 1971. Dr. BUYUKSALVARCI started M.Sc. in Department of Business Administration at Selcuk University after graduating from Business Administration Department of Başkent University. After completing M.Sc. program, he worked as a lecturer in Beysehir Vocational School during 2002-2006. He finished Ph.D. program in Business Administration at Selcuk University in 2007. He became Assistant Professor in 2008. He has been working as an Associate Professor of Finance in Tourism Faculty of Necmettin Erbakan University since 2012. Dr. Buyuksalvarci is also a member of some international academic journals worldwide.

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. CEYHUN CAGLAR KILINC**

Dr. Kilinc started M.Sc. in Department of Business Administration at Selcuk University after graduating from Business Department at Eastern Mediterranean University. After completing M.Sc. program, he worked as a lecturer in Beysehir Vocational School during 2004-2009. He finished Ph.D. program in Business at Selcuk University in 2009. He became Assistant Professor in 2010. He has been working as an Associated Professor of Marketing in Tourism Faculty of Selcuk University since 2015. Dr. Kilinc is also a member of some international academic journals worldwide and now is the co-editor of the International Journal of Economic Perspectives and International Journal of Tourism Perspectives.

**HALIL SUNAR**

He was born in Hatay in 1988. After finishing primary and high school in Hatay in 2010 he graduated from Selcuk University. After that in 2013 he graduated from Mustafa Kemal University and his study area was tourism management and now he is a post graduate student at the department of travel management and tourism guidance.

**MUSTAFA COSKUNER**

He was born in Aksaray in 1990. He has graduated from primary school and high school in Aksaray. He received his bachelor's degree from Selcuk University, department of English Language. Now he is a post graduate student in travel management and tourism guidance at Selcuk University.