



## Tourism Potential of Ulaanbaatar: Perceptions of the Local Residents and the Tourism Representatives\*\*

\* Ankhbayar KHURELDEE <sup>a</sup> , Kevser ÇINAR <sup>a</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Management, Konya/Turkey

### Article History

Received: 04.03.2021

Accepted: 25.05.2021

### Keywords

Ulaanbaatar

Tourism potential

Tourism impact

Tourism representatives

Local people

### Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine how tourism affects Ulaanbaatar, which is the capital of Mongolia in terms of economic and socio-cultural aspects and to explain the tourism potential in the city through its infrastructure and superstructure. It is also aimed to reveal how local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar perceive the effects of tourism and whether their views on tourism change according to their demographic characteristics. The data was collected through a 5-point Likert-type scale from local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar between September 2019 and March 2020. According to the study, some of the positive impacts of tourism on Ulaanbaatar are determined as tourism contributes to the city's economy, increases employment, protects natural and historical assets. In contrast, the negative effects are determined as tourism increases the service prices and weakens the local people's affordability.

### Article Type

Research Article

\* Corresponding Author

E-mail: k.cinar22@gmail.com (K. Çınar)

DOI:10.21325/jotags.2021.806

\*\*This paper is produced from the master thesis of Ankhbayar Khureldee (2020) titled as 'Ulanbator Şehrinin Turizm Potansiyeli, Yerel Halk ve Sektör Temsilcilerinin Turizme Yönelik Algıları'.

## INTRODUCTION

Cities offer various options for visitors such as walking around the streets, experiencing the traces of history, learning about the life and traditions of the local people, visiting cultural and popular places, shopping, watching international sports matches, etc. Expenditures of the visitors for food and beverage, accommodation, and various activities during their travel contribute to the city's economy (İçellioğlu, 2014).

Tourism has both positive and negative impacts on countries and regions in socio-cultural terms. Thanks to the positive effects of cultural exchange and communication between tourists from diverse communities and local people, the negative stereotypes towards each other can be reduced (Ferreira, Castro & Gomes, 2021). In addition, the development of the tourism sector increases land value (Crompton, 2004), attracts foreign investment (Sheng & Tsui, 2010), increases business opportunity (Prentice, 1993), and increases infrastructure development of the community (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). On the other hand, it can also adversely impact the local community, such as increased prices, crime, congestion, etc. (Choi & Murray, 2010; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). Furthermore, it reduces unemployment rates with the business environment provided by the tourism sector.

Involving residents in the decision-making process of tourism planning can help develop more positive attitude towards tourism (Vargas-Sa'nchez et al., 2015). This is due to resident satisfaction, vital for successful tourism development (Ribeiro et al., 2017; Xie, Bao & Kerstetter, 2014). Resident satisfaction is related to the tourism benefits, life quality of residents, and their commitment to developing their community (Fakhraan & Zafran, 2020).

On the other hand, when it comes to negative socio-cultural effects, tourism development cause deterioration of local identity, culture, and traditions (Şahbaz, 2015). Furthermore, the inflation rate in the region increases in terms of touristic activities and thus causes an increase in the city's cost. As a result of this, tourists and local people are affected economically. Simultaneously, with the seasonal fluctuation of tourism, unemployment problems arise when demand is low (Şahbaz, 2015).

Finding out the residents' perspective can ease the adoption of policies that minimize potential negative impacts of tourism development and maximize the benefits leading to community development and greater support for tourism, particularly in developing countries where tourism is still at an infant stage of development (Li, Hsu & Lawton, 2014; Thetsane, 2019). This study aims to determine how tourism affects Ulaanbaatar economically and in socio-cultural terms and explain the tourism potential through its infrastructure, superstructure and current tourism types perceived by local people and sector representatives. It is also aimed to determine how local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar perceive the effects of tourism and whether their views on tourism change according to their demographic characteristics.

## Literature Review

Tourism potential is all of the values of any region in terms of economic demand, supply, competition and market conditions. Tourism has great potential to speed up progress across the economic sectors in a sustainable manner. Through integrated policies, tourism can generate quality employment opportunities for durable economic and social growth, hence it reduces poverty and provides encouragement for environmental protection, and thus offer a triple-win situation for nations to move toward an inclusive and resilient economy (Khan, Bibi, Lorenzo, Lyu & Babar, 2020). The region needs to unearth this existing power with complete and correct methods. Different methods are

used to determine the tourism potential and the region's supply sources. In this context, the method chosen in determining the tourism potential is critical. However, tourism is a very comprehensive branch of science, and it is a set of affairs and relationships that affect each other. Therefore, the current potential should be determined by focusing on several components, including tourism (Aktymbayeva, Koshkimbayeva, Abisheva, Tokbergenova & Tumazhanova, 2020; Sugiarto, Sofyan, Jayadianti & Wibowo, 2020; Uslu, Alagöz & Güneş, 2020; Wang, Hunang, Gong & Cao, 2020; Soykan, 2004).

From a theoretical economic perspective, tourism development in a particular country or region based on the global economic growth, global industry growth, and global competitive growth (Dogru, Suess & Sirakaya-Turk, 2020). The potential of economic growth due to tourism has been noted in many recent studies (Armenski et al., 2018; Assaf & Josiassen, 2012; Tsai et al., 2009). It is expected that tourism will continue to play a significant role in propelling increased growth and opportunities, particularly in smaller countries (Croes, 2011).

Robust policies should be developed to evaluate the tourism potential and create a unique, competitive, and particular region. Regions with natural beauties may not have tourism value on their own. Tourism can only be booming when it mainly targets effective tourism products. Since the carrying capacity is low, the number of tourists arrive is limited and uncontrolled tourism development has negative effects on the local environment, resources, social culture, and regional resilience (Graymore, Sipe, & Rickson, 2010; Guan, Gao, Su, Li, & Hokao, 2011). Some social problems, such as overpopulation, environmental degradation, traffic congestion, declining quality of life, and cultural destruction, have attracted increasing attention. Therefore, a region's tourist carrying capacity is also essential. In the study carried by Akgün (2016, p. 33), the fact that the natural and socio-cultural resources that constitute the tourism supply potential of the regions have economic value, which is directly correlated with the existence of physical and institutional infrastructure. In other words, to realize tourism investments, natural and socio-cultural resources should be revealed together with the physical infrastructure. Destinations that want to gain economic income from tourism should reveal their touristic supply potential. The touristic supply potential, which many researchers classify, generally consists of natural and social resources, psychological data, and tourist supply and demand (Mayer & Vogt, 2016).

There are important studies in the literature on the impact of tourism (e.g., Gilbert & Clarke, 1997; Huse, Gustavsen & Almedal, 1998). However, there is evidence that studies focusing on the tourism potential about a destination have been conducted from the perspective of tourists and have therefore neglected the perception of the place image of the inhabitants (Stylidis, Biran, Sit & Szivas, 2014; Stylidis, 2016; Stylidis, Shani & Belhassen, 2017). The impact of tourism is crucial for the way residents perceive the image of the destination as the place where they live (Reiser & Crispin, 2009).

Tourism researchers generally agree that it is beneficial to have community involvement in the planning and development stages. The involvement of communities can enhance local socio-economic benefits (Aktymbayeva et al., 2020; Mitchell & Eagles, 2001). It also increases the limits of tolerance through participation by locals in the tourism development process (Tosun, 2000). According to development theory, which focuses on people, grassroots and bottom-up approaches, and local involvement (Harrison & Schipani, 2007), alternative tourism support types of tourism which are small scale, locally owned, and thought to be less harmful to the environment and culture

(Brohman, 1992). They stress equitable participation and empowerment of local communities in decision-making and the benefits of tourism (Sugiarto et al., 2020; Scheyvens, 2007).

Residents' perceptions and attitudes are critical for successful and sustainable tourism development. Studying the attitudes and perceptions of communities and forming perceptions of tourism development could enable meaningful information for decision-makers (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005). Residents play an important role in the process of supporting sustainable tourism development. They contribute to the strength of the tourism industry and the success of community improvement in developed countries (Kapsalis & Kapsalis, 2020; Castela, 2018; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017; Park & Kim, 2016; Bello, Carr & Lovelock, 2016;) and in developing countries (Albu, 2020; Kihima & Musila, 2019; Thetsane, 2019; Hai & Alamgir, 2017; Khoalenyane & Ikechukwu, 2016)

Previous studies conclude that residents are one of the key actors in the tourism development process as they are directly affected by that (Kapsalis & Kapsalis, 2020; Castela, 2018; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017; Ap, 1992; Gunn, 1994). Understanding residents' perceptions about the impacts of tourism are essential for successful tourism development (Zhang & Chan, 2016). Several studies about residents' perceptions of tourism development have been carried so far (Kapsalis & Kapsalis, 2020; Castela, 2018; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017; Park & Kim, 2016; Bello, Carr & Lovelock, 2016; Vargas-Sanchez et al., 2015; Garcia, Vazquez, Macias, 2015; Sharpley, 2014; Buono, Padiaditi & Carsjens, 2012; Cavus & Tanrisevdi, 2003; Akis et al., 1996; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999;). A significant result obtained from Ramseook-Munhurrin and Naidoo's (2011, p. 50) studies stating that the more benefits local people get from tourism, the more likely they support tourism development. Furthermore, they expressed the local people's concerns about environmental impacts during tourism development to protect the destination. According to a study by Monterrubio and his colleagues (2012, p. 48-49) examining the attitudes of local people in the Huatulco region of Mexico, one of the important expectations of the local people is that the government provides more support to the region in order for the destination to develop and receive more visitors.

Another study revealed that local people's support in tourism development is parallel relationship with the perceived socio-cultural effects (Garcia, Vazquez & Macias, 2015). In addition, local people support tourism development in their own living spaces with a more positive perception of socio-cultural effects. As a result, in addition to economic and environmental factors, the impact of tourism on socio-cultural factors has been revealed (Meimand et al., 2017). The number of researches on tourism in Ulaanbaatar is limited. According to a study conducted by the Ulaanbaatar Governorate Implementation Unit and the Ministry of Tourism on the economic impact of tourism on the city, tourists coming to Mongolia stop by the city only to enter and exit the country. A tourist coming to Mongolia spends an average of 450 dollars in Ulaanbaatar. Also, 75 percent of shopping consists of cashmere products. In the last five years, direct purchases of the tourism industry constituted 4.76 percent of GDP; that is, the tourism industry directly affects the capitalist economy. Also, tourism-related employment is growing. In the last five years, the number of tourism workers in Ulaanbaatar has increased by an average of 114,000 (Ulaanbaatar Governorate Implementation Unit and Ministry of Tourism, 2015).

It is also important to understand stakeholders' perceptions in the construction of tourism experiences, activities, and practices so that both tourism suppliers and visitors are satisfied and understand one another. Due to the recent growth in interest for both media and scholars in the tourism phenomenon in Mongolia, there are still relatively few studies that have examined the perceptions of destination stakeholders in this regard. Thus, the necessity of exploring

various influencing modes about tourism perception is self-evident. This study provides a fresh perspective on behaviors and perspectives not covered by previous researchers (e.g., Shircliff, 2018; Nault & Stapleton, 2011; Buckley, Ollenberg, & Zhong, 2007; Yu & Goulden, 2006).

### **Tourism Potential of Ulaanbaatar City**

The capital Ulaanbaatar means "Red Hero" in English. It was officially found in 1639. Its name has been changed several times in history, but it has been called Ulaanbaatar since 1924. Ulaanbaatar consists of 9 districts (Master Plan of Ulaanbaatar City, 2013). Under the influence of communism Ulaanbaatar was surrounded by rectangular concrete buildings. Circus, opera, universities, theaters, libraries, and more were also built in the city, containing all the necessary infrastructure. Since then, the numbers of modern style buildings have risen in the city and changed the city's face dramatically. In addition to this significant change, it can be seen that ancient buildings, historical Mongolian tents, and new modern buildings create a unique harmony in the city (Ulaanbaatar City Tourism Department, 2018).

A total of 1,444,669 people, including 748,770 women and 697,870 men, live in Ulaanbaatar and constitute 45.3% of Mongolia's population. Most of them are Khalkh Mongols. Other ethnic groups living in Ulaanbaatar today are Khalkh, Dorvod, Buriat, Darhad (Duha Turks), and Kazakh people (Ulaanbaatar City Tourism Department, 2018). In terms of tourism, the holiday and tourism area around the Ulaanbaatar Municipality consists of three regions. The first (inner) region, covering 7670 km<sup>2</sup>, is an intense area where various sectors such as industry, agriculture, farming, entertainment, and tourism operators. On the other hand, it can be defined as a diverse economic region. This area is divided into ten sub-regions and 32 micro-regions. The second (intermediate) zone, covering an area of 28656 km<sup>2</sup>, is divided into six sub-regions and 18 micro-regions. There are agricultural areas, livestock enterprises, and industries in this region. The third (environmental) region, covering 43022 km<sup>2</sup>, is divided into five sub-regions and 11 micro-regions. There are different tourism potentials available in these regions (Ulaanbaatar Ministry of Tourism, 2013).

Ulaanbaatar is Mongolia's most prominent and most crowded city. Although the infrastructure is more developed than other cities, there are problems in the infrastructure due to the high population density. Ulaanbaatar is divided into two zones, where old apartments and tents are together in one place and modern buildings are in another part. The modern apartments are located in the city center developed in terms of infrastructure. However, the infrastructure has not developed in the districts of old apartments and tents (Mongolia Ministry of Construction and Urbanization, 2017).

Road transport is the most common type of transport in Mongolia. Since the city of Ulaanbaatar is the capital of Mongolia, the transportation sector is highly developed here. In Ulaanbaatar, the main transportation is provided by road, and there are also railways and airlines (Mongolia Ministry of Construction and Urbanization, 2017). There is a total of 592 accommodation facilities in Ulaanbaatar, 271 hotels, and 321 concept facilities. There are 227 hotels with an operating license from the Capital Tourism Authority, 146 hotels with investment certificates, and 220 hostels (Ulaanbaatar Governorate Implementation Unit, 2017). The importance of capital Ulaanbaatar in terms of Mongolia's GDP production can be seen in the examples below. For instance, Ulaanbaatar produced 46.9% of the country's GDP in 2007, 50.6% in 2008, 59.4% in 2009, 62.7% in 2010 and 65.4% in 2016 (Baigalmaa, 2017).

Mongolia is a big country with its history, culture, and natural beauty. Nomadic culture, medieval political power, and its connection with Tibetan Buddhism are among the country's most popular tourist attractions. Ulaanbaatar is a gateway to Mongolian cultural heritage, and this location is crucial for tourism. While these potentials are an essential attraction for Mongolia, they are also important for creating a unique and recognizable brand for international travelers and investors.

With the end of the communist regime and the country's opening in the 1990s, tourism developed rapidly in Mongolia. In 2016, the number of international tourists reached 450,000, three times 2000 (Ulaanbaatar Tourism Department, 2017). China and Russia are the leading countries of origin of tourists, accounting for more than half of foreign tourists in Mongolia. Russian tourists numbered 84,065, or 21% of the total number. It can be seen that in the past two years, with the promotion of "One Belt and One Road," incoming tourism to Mongolia is growing rapidly and the tourism deficit is gradually decreasing (Zhiming, Pustokhin & Pustokhina, 2020).

In recent years, Mongolia has given more importance to tourism as an important way to develop its economy. At the International Silk Road Forum on Nomadic Tourism and Sustainable Urban Development, the Mongolian Parliament declared that making Mongolia an international center of nomadic tourism would be the goal of developing the tourism industry in the country for the near future (UNCTAD, 2019). According to statistics, tourism provides more than 50,000 jobs in Mongolia. Furthermore, Mongolia set a target of increasing the number of inbound tourists to one million by 2020 (UNCTAD, 2019). In recent years, Mongolia's trade in tourism services has also grown rapidly, with its tourism exports increasing from US \$ 225 million in 2008 to US \$ 316 million in 2018, its imports from US \$ 172 million in 2008 to US \$ 47 million and the total trade in tourism services reaching US \$ 787 million in 2018. Since 2016, the growth rate of tourism exports has exceeded imports, reflecting the good dynamics of the development of inbound tourism to Mongolia over the past two years.

According to the Capital Ministry of Culture, more than 200 historical and cultural artifacts have been recorded in Ulaanbaatar. Ulaanbaatar's cultural and historical heritage is divided into two parts: the state and the capital. There are 14 immovable historical and cultural heritage protected by the state and 11 historical and cultural heritage protected by the capital (Sukhbaatar, Ariunbold & Hujildmay, 2006).

Of over 205,000 historical and cultural monuments in museums in Mongolia, 289 are unique and exceptional works. There are over 8800 historical and cultural monuments registered in the Cultural Heritage Registration Center. As intangible cultural resources, Mongolia's national festivals and festivities are essential values that attract tourists. Mongolian people celebrate the Tsagaan Sar Festival, Naadam Festival, Eagle Festival, and similar festivals. The state has developed traditional handicraft products for tourists and supported their trade in this direction. Also, traditional handicraft exhibitions are organized during the summer months when most of the tourists come. In Mongolia, meat-based dishes have been consumed depending on the climatic conditions for a long time. Dishes belonging to different regions and cultures of the world have also become widespread in Ulaanbaatar. However, Mongolian dishes that can only be tasted in Mongolia are; Buuz (ravioli), Khuushuur (pastry), khorhog, boodog, bortstoi shul (dried broth soup), airag (kumis), milk tea, and fried meats (Ulaanbaatar City Tourism Department, 2018).

Today, Mongolia is attracting tourists' attention by combining Buddhism and Shamanism with other forms of tourism in terms of religious tourism. Religious tourism in Mongolia did not develop under a single religious roof.

Ulaanbaatar is the main center of Buddhism and Shamanism in Mongolia as most of the large monasteries and religious places of worship are located in Ulaanbaatar (Altaibaatar & Badral, 2012).

Although there are many routes where adventure tours can be organized in Ulaanbaatar, other than nature tourism, it is also predicted that special interest tourism can be developed. There are suitable natural areas (especially streams, steep slopes, and elevations) for adventure tours in the Terelj District of Ulaanbaatar, Bogd Han Mountain, and Tuul River. Ulaanbaatar can host the adventure tourism type, one of the alternative tourism types, in terms of landforms and cultural values (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, 2012).

In terms of Mongolia's winter tourism, horse and camel tours, sleigh tour, dog sledding, ski tour, ice climbing, reindeer tour, Mongolian Traditional Holiday Tour / also known as Lunar New Year - Tsagaan sar /, a tour to meet the winter life of the shepherd family, hunting tour and shaman ritual recognition tour as many authentic excursions are organized. Events such as the Eagle Festival, Steppe Horse Festival, Ulaanbaatar Winter Festival, Blue Pearl / Khukh Suvd / Ice Festival, Camel Festival, and International Conferences are also important events in Mongolia to improve winter tourism and extend the visiting time of tourists. Most of these events are held in the city of Ulaanbaatar (Batbold, 2018).

According to a study conducted in 2012 by the "Mongolia National Tourism Center," 69.6% of foreign tourists visiting Mongolia go to Mongolia for entertainment and relaxation, 42.8% of them visit for its natural beauty and experience the nomadic culture. This study shows that Mongolia has an ancient past with a unique cultural heritage potential. Therefore, these cultural heritage elements should be used as an essential resource for developing tourism activities (Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism, 2012).

As mentioned previously, nowadays, religious, nature, and winter tourism types are the factors that reveal the tourism potential of the city of Ulaanbaatar. Since Ulaanbaatar is the central city (capital city) of Mongolia, it is rich in its tourism potential.

### **Purpose of the Research**

This study aimed to determine how tourism affects Ulaanbaatar's city economically and socio-culturally explaining the natural and anthropological tourism potential of Ulaanbaatar, its tourism infrastructure, and existing tourism types and how local people and sector representatives perceive all these. It is also aimed to determine whether local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar perceive the effects of tourism and whether their views on tourism development differ according to their demographic characteristics. For this purpose, the following hypotheses have been tested in the study.

H.1: There is a difference between local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the age difference.

H.2: There is a difference between local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the age difference.

H.3: There is a difference between the perceptions of local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the age difference.

H.4: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the age difference.

H.5: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.

H.6: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.

H.7: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.

H.8: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.

H.9: There is a difference between the perceptions of local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the income variable.

H.10: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the income variable.

H.11: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the income variable.

H.12: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the income variable.

## **Research Method**

In the research, the data obtained to determine the perceptions of local people and sector representatives about Ulaanbaatar's tourism potential was analyzed by applying the survey method of primary data collection techniques. As the most common form of nonprobability sampling, the convenience sampling method was preferred. The reason why this sampling method was preferred in the study is that since the researchers were not physically located in Ulaanbaatar for the data collection, they relied on data collection from population members who were conveniently available to participate in study. This sampling method enabled the involvement of participants through online platforms and typically wherever was convenient. In convenience sampling, no inclusion criteria identified prior to the selection of the participants. All volunteer local residents and tourism stakeholders in Ulaanbaatar were invited to participate until reaching the desired size in the study. The universe of the research is composed of local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar. The survey questions were delivered to 604 people via social media platforms (Facebook, Whatsapp, and Instagram) using Google Forms between 01.09.2019 and 01.03.2020. In the end, 536 surveys were completed entirely found valid for further analysis. In order to obtain primary data in this study; A Five-point Likert type scale consisting of 18 items was used. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for the sub-dimensions and total reliability of the scales.

In addition, factor analysis tests, KMO, and frequency analysis were used. In order to determine the participants' perceptions about the tourism in Ulaanbaatar and to examine whether these perceptions change according to demographic variables, the normality of the data was examined. The data sets that did not show normal distribution,



Kurtosis and Skewness values were examined, and the non-parametric tests were used since the values were not between +2/-2 (George & Mallery, 2010). Since the data did not have a normal distribution, the groups' differences were determined using Mann-Whitney-U and Kruskal-Wallis H tests. All findings in the study were tested at a significance level of  $p < 0.05$ .

**Data collection tool**

The questionnaire form consists of 2 parts, and the first part includes questions to determine the participants' demographic information. The second part includes questions about the tourism potential of the region. The questionnaire format and its questions were inspired by the subjects determined in the case studies used in doctoral and master's theses prepared by Kim (2002), Uluer (2009), Şahiner (2012), and Akgün (2016). The scale used in the research is a Likert-type scale, which is one of the multiple scale types that consist of many items, and the items are evaluated according to the whole scale. It is generally used to measure multi-dimensional concepts that cannot be measured in one dimension.

The Likert scale is a type of scale developed by Rensis Likert and is widely used in social science research. The Likert-type scale is generally used to measure the research participants' tendencies and attitudes. The questionnaire questions are closed-ended and 5-Likert type (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Can't decide, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree) 18 questions. It was determined that 18 questions in the questionnaire form consist of 4 separate groups by performing factor analysis in SPSS program. When the questions in the created groups are classified, four dimensions have emerged as positive economic effects of tourism, positive socio-cultural effects of tourism, negative economic effects of tourism, and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism.

**Scale Reliability Study**

Factor analysis is the analysis technique used to reduce the relationship between many variables to basic dimensions. KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) sample adequacy test value has been found to be 0.869, which shows the data set obtained in the study is suitable for factor analysis. It is concluded that this value is greater than 0.5, and the data set has a high value for factor analysis.

Table 1 shows the matrix values of the research questions according to the factor analysis.

**Table 1:** Matrix Table of the Survey Questions According to the Factor Analysis

Survey Questions	Dimensions			
	1	2	3	4
6. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator provides the development of tourism infrastructure and superstructure possibilities.	<b>.757</b>			
4. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator increases per capita income.	<b>.711</b>			
1. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator increases the economic development of the region.	<b>.696</b>			
3. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator provides an increase in tourism investment for the region.	<b>.689</b>			
5. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator creates new employment opportunities.	<b>.671</b>			
8. Tourism will provide employment opportunities for the people in Ulaanbaator.	<b>.608</b>			
2. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator increases wealth by causing domestic and foreign capital inflows.	<b>.605</b>			

**Table 1:** Matrix Table of the Survey Questions According to the Factor Analysis (Continuation)

7. The shopping made by the tourists visiting Ulaanbaator positively affects the city tradesmen.	.597
11. Tourism will contribute to the marketing of Ulaanbaator 's local products.	<b>.471</b>
17. Tourism will increase the parks and green areas in Ulaanbaator.	<b>.779</b>
18. Tourism will ensure the development of environmental awareness in Ulaanbaator.	<b>.723</b>
13. Tourism will positively change the perceptions of the Ulaanbaator citizens towards other people from different cultures.	<b>.694</b>
12. Tourism will enrich the citizens of Ulaanbaator socially and culturally.	<b>.630</b>
16. Tourism will ensure the protection of Ulaanbaator's natural, cultural and historical resources.	<b>.566</b>
9. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaator will cause an increase in the prices of goods and services in the city.	<b>.809</b>
10. Tourism will be effective in increasing real estate rents and prices in Ulaanbaator.	<b>.785</b>
15. Tourism will deteriorate the family structure of the local people.	<b>.831</b>
14. Tourism will increase the crime rate in Ulaanbaator.	<b>.792</b>

As seen in Table 1, it is shown that 4 different groups in the table emerge by applying factor analysis in order to reveal the similarity of the survey questions with each other. Considering the general structure of the questions in these groups, it has been determined that they have similar characteristics. The questions in each group were named according to their general characteristics. In the subsequent analyzes, research results were obtained by using these 4 factors. The groups that emerged were named as follows:

- Dimension 1- Positive Economic Effects of Tourism
- Dimension 2 - Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism
- Dimension 3 - Negative Economic Effects of Tourism
- Dimension 4 - Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism

In order to test the validity of the survey questions, a pilot study was performed with 30 people at first, and according to the reliability analysis, the Cronbach Alpha value was determined as 0.815. According to this result, it has been determined that the questionnaire would give valid results in the research since the reliability coefficient in the pilot application is greater than 0.70. According to the Cronbach Alpha value, the general reliability analysis results of the questionnaire are indicated in Table 2.

**Table 2:** General Reliability Analysis Results of the Scale Questions

	Number of questions	Cronbach' Alpha ( $\alpha$ )
<b>General Scale</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0,852</b>

The Cronbach alpha value is 0.852 in Table 2, showing that the study's scale is highly reliable. According to factor reliability analysis, it was found that they could also be analyzed within themselves, and the structure of the research could be established in this context. The reliability results of the four factors were analyzed according to the Cronbach Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) coefficient. According to the reliability results in terms of the dimensions of the study, respectively; Positive economic effects of tourism are considered to be highly reliable with an alpha value of 0.849, positive socio-cultural effects of tourism with an alpha value of 0.763, and good, negative economic effects of tourism with an alpha value of 0.657 and acceptable levels, negative socio-cultural effects of tourism with an alpha value of 0.699. It has been concluded that it is at an acceptable level.

Before the study's analysis, whether the distribution of the data set was normal or not was checked. Since Kurtosis and Skewness values were not between  $+2/-2$ , the data set did not show a normal distribution, and non-parametric tests were used (George & Mallery, 2010). At the same time, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test values of the distribution were examined, and the resulting P-value (0.000) was found to be less than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) in all dimensions, so it was concluded that the distribution was not normal (Kalaycı, 2010; Pallant, 2007). Since the variables do not meet the normality assumption of ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U statistics were used to determine whether the scores of two unrelated groups differ significantly from each other (Cramer & Howitt, 2004).

The data were tested with Mann-Whitney-U analysis for binary independent variables and Kruskal-Wallis H Test analysis for three and more independent variables. Instead of comparing the means of the two groups, as in the case of the t-test, the Mann-Whitney-U test compares medians. It then evaluates whether the ranks for the two groups differ significantly. As the scores are converted to ranks, the actual distribution of the scores does not matter (Pallant, 2007). Normally, this test has the great advantage of possibly being used for small samples of subjects (five to 20 participants). However, it can also be used when the measured variables are of ordinal type and were recorded with an arbitrary and not a very precise scale. The Mann-Whitney-U test compares differences from the same population when the dependent variable is ordinal (Leech, Barrett & Morgan, 2005). Given the non-parametric nature of this statistical analysis, there are fewer assumptions to assess. The data must come from random samples of the population. The data are independent, meaning that scores from one participant are not dependent on scores of the others, and the measure of the two samples have at least an ordinal scale of measurement (Brace, Kemp & Sneglar, 2006).

**Results**

**Participant Profiles**

The demographic information of the local people and the people working in the tourism sector in Ulaanbaatar is being discussed in that part, and the results are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3:** Demographic Information on Local People and Sector Representatives Participated in the Study

Demographic Information		f	%
<b>Gender</b>	Male	302	56,3
	Female	234	43,7
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	288	53,7
	Single	248	46,3
<b>Age</b>	18-24	116	21,6
	25-34	154	28,7
	35-44	173	32,3
	45 and more	93	17,4
<b>Education status</b>	Primary education	6	1,1
	High school	122	22,8
	University	408	76,1
<b>Profession</b>	Student	78	14,6
	Educator	154	28,7
	Hotel employee	107	20,0
	Travel agency employee	104	19,4
	Restaurant employee	93	17,4
<b>Income</b>	320000 MNT	85	15,9
	320001-500000 MNT	112	20,9
	500001-800000 MNT	144	26,9
	800001-1000000 MNT	122	22,8

Table 3 contains percentage-frequency distributions regarding local people's personal information and sector representatives participating in the research. This table's information constitutes an essential source of data, especially in other analyzes to be made to identify differences. Accordingly, the local people and sector representatives participating in the survey; 56.3% are men, and 43.7% are women. Local people and sector representatives answered the questionnaire; 53.7% are married, and 46.3% are single. Local people and sector representatives; 21.6% of them are in the age group of 18-24, 28.7% of them are in the age group of 25-34, 32.3% of them are in the age group of 35-44, and 17.4% of them are in the age group of 45 and over. Local people and sector representatives; 1.1% of them are primary school graduates, 22.8% are high school graduates, and 76.1% are university graduates. Local people and sector representatives; 14.6% are students, 28.7% are educators, 20.0% are hotel employees, 19.4% are travel agency employees, and 17.4% are restaurant employees. Considering the income status of the local people and sector representatives, 15.9% of them earns 320000 MNT, 20.9% of them earns 320001-500000 MNT, 26.9% of them earns 500001-800000 MNT, 22.8% of them earns 800001-1000000 MNT, and 13.6% of them earns 1000001 MNT and above. Mongolia's currency is Tugrik, and its currency code abbreviation is MNT. In July 2020, 1 TRY was 400 MNT, and 1 USD is 2830 MNT.

### Participants' Views on the Items in the Scale

The average and standard deviation values of the survey participants' evaluations regarding the items in the scale of perceptions towards tourism are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Views of the Survey Participants Regarding the Items in the Scale

	Average x	Std. deflection s.s.
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>		
1. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar increases the economic development of the region.	4,27	0,72
2. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar increases wealth by causing domestic and foreign capital inflows.	4,32	0,70
3. Development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar provides an increase in tourism investment for the region.	4,24	0,67
4. Development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar increases per capita income.	4,21	0,68
5. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar creates new employment opportunities.	4,21	0,66
6. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar provides the development of tourism infrastructure and superstructure possibilities.	4,15	0,68
7. The shopping made by the tourists visiting Ulaanbaatar positively affects the city tradesmen.	4,18	0,61
8. Tourism employs the people of Ulaanbaatar	3,99	0,72
11. Tourism will contribute to the marketing of Ulaanbaatar's local products.	4,40	0,72
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>		
12. Tourism will enrich the citizen of Ulaanbaatar socially and culturally.	3,91	0,67
13. Tourism will positively change the perspective of the Ulaanbaatar citizens towards people from different cultures.	3,89	0,67
17. Tourism will ensure the protection of Ulaanbaatar's natural, cultural and historical resources.	3,89	0,66
18. Tourism will increase the parks and green areas in Ulaanbaator.	3,71	0,74
19. Tourism will ensure the development of environmental awareness in Ulaanbaatar.	3,48	0,80
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>		
9. The development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar will cause an increase in the prices of goods and services in the city.	3,49	0,82
10. Tourism will be effective in increasing real estate rents and prices in Ulaanbaatar.	3,31	0,83
<b>Negative Socio-cultural Effects of Tourism</b>		
15. Tourism will increase the crime rate in Ulaanbaatar.	3,05	0,80
16. Tourism will deteriorate the family structure of the local people deteriorate.	2,68	0,84

In Table 4, among the items related to the positive economic effects of tourism by the survey participants, the item that the participants most participated in the survey is "Tourism will contribute to the marketing of Ulaanbaatar's local products" (x = 4.40, p.s. = 0.72). The participants' least agreed item is the item "Tourism will employ the people of Ulaanbaatar" (x = 3.99, p.s. = 0.72).

Among the items related to the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism, most respondents agreed that "Tourism will enrich Ulaanbaatar people socially and culturally" (x = 3.91, p.s. = 0.67). The participants' least agreed item is that "Tourism will enable the development of environmental awareness in Ulaanbaatar" (x = 3.48, p.s. = 0.80).

Among the items related to the negative economic effects of tourism, most of the respondents agreed that "Development of tourism in Ulaanbaatar will cause the prices of goods and services to increase in the city" (x = 3.49, p.s. = 0.82). The participants' least agreed item is the item "Tourism will be effective in increasing the real estate rents and prices in Ulaanbaatar" (x = 3.31, p.s. = 0.83).

Among the items related to the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, the item most agreed upon by the participants is "Tourism will cause an increase in the crime rate in Ulaanbaatar" (x = 3.05, p.s. = 0.80). The participants' least agreed item is the item "Tourism will cause the deterioration of the local people's family structure" (x = 2.68, p.s. = 0.84).

In order to understand whether Ulaanbaatar people's perceptions regarding the scale of tourism potential changed significantly according to gender, Mann-Whitney-U test was used. The findings obtained are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Mann-Whitney-U Test Results Concerning the Differences in Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives towards Tourism in Ulaanbaatar City by Gender Variable

Factors	Gender	n	Average Rank	Total Rank	U	p
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Female	234	253,6	59343,0	31848	<b>0,048*</b>
	Male	302	280,0	84573,0		
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Female	234	266,0	62236,0	34741	0,735
	Male	302	270,5	81680,0		
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Female	234	274,4	64215,5	33948	0,422
	Male	302	263,9	79700,5		
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Female	234	253,2	59244,5	31750	<b>0,037*</b>
	Male	302	280,4	84671,5		

\*p<0,05

According to the Mann-Whitney-U test results shown in Table 5; Significant gender differences have been found between local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar in terms of positive economic effects of tourism (p = 0.048; p <0.05) and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism (p = 0.037; p <0.05). Local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar do not differ significantly in terms of positive socio-economic cultural effects of tourism (p = 0.735; p > 0.05) and negative economic effects of tourism is (p = 0.422; p > 0.05). It has been concluded that men's participation level is significantly higher than women's for the positive economic effects of tourism and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism sub-dimensions of the local people and sector representatives participating in the survey. When looking at the gender variable for the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism and the negative economic effects of tourism sub-dimensions, it is seen that both groups have similar perceptions.

Whether the Ulaanbaatar people and sector representatives' perceptions on the factor dimensions change significantly according to the marital status were examined with the Mann -Whitney-U test. The findings obtained are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6:** Mann-Whitney-U Test Results Regarding the Differentiation of Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives towards Tourism in Ulaanbaatar by Marital Status

Factors	Marital status	n	Average Rank	Total Rank	U	p
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Married	288	276,78	79711,5	33328,5	0,179
	Single	248	258,89	64204,5		
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Married	288	270,65	77948,0	35092	0,725
	Single	248	266,00	65968,0		
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Married	288	277,33	79871,0	33169	0,143
	Single	248	258,25	64045,0		
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Married	288	277,64	79959,5	33080,5	0,128
	Single	248	257,89	63956,5		

According to the Mann-Whitney-U test results given in Table 6, the perceptions about the positive economic effects, positive socio-cultural effects, negative economic effects, and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism are analyzed according to the marital status variable. It can be said that perceptions about sub-dimensions of the potential tourism scale are the same for single and married participants (the dimension of positive economic effects of tourism is (p = 0179; p> 0.05), the dimension of positive socio-cultural effects of tourism is (p = 0.725; p> 0.05), the dimension of negative economic effects of tourism is (p = 0.143; p> 0, 05) and the dimension of the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism (p = 0.128; p> 0.05)).

Whether the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar's city on the factor dimensions differ significantly from the non-parametric tests according to the age variable is examined with the Kruskal-Wallis H test, and the results are given in Table 7.

**Table 7:** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results Regarding the Difference of Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives towards Tourism in Ulaanbaatar by Age Variable

Factors	Age	n	Average Rank	Chi-Square	sd	p	Significant Difference
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	18-24	116	238,38	7,6643	3	0,053	No
	25-34	154	275,19				
	35-44	173	268,09				
	45 and more	93	295,76				
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	18-24	116	283,53	4,5949	3	0,204	No
	25-34	154	281,75				
	35-44	173	254,89				
	45 and more	93	253,13				
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	18-24	116	266,14	0,1402	3	0,986	No
	25-34	154	266,20				
	35-44	173	270,17				
	45 and more	93	272,13				
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	18-24	116	241,91	8,7562	3	<b>0,032*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	25-34	154	266,63				
	35-44	173	293,18				
	45 and more	93	258,86				

According to the Kruskal-Wallis H test results shown in Table 7, the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism (p = 0.032; p < 0.05) sub-dimension of the potential tourism scale, local people, and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar

differ significantly according to age groups. In terms of positive economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.053$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), positive socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.204$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and negative economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.986$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), there is no significant difference according to age groups. According to the comparisons made to determine which group the difference originates for the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, sub-dimension shows a remarkable difference. It has been found that the participation level of the 35-44 age group people is significantly higher than the people in the 18-24 age group.

Whether the sub-dimensions of the tourism potential perception scale of the local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar city differ significantly according to the education level was examined with the Kruskal-Wallis H test, and the results are given in Table 8.

**Table 8:** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results Regarding the Differentiation of Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives towards Tourism in Ulaanbaatar by the Variable of Educational Status

Factors	Education	n	Average Rank	Chi-Square	sd	p	Significant Difference
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Primary education	6	110,08	7,440	2	<b>0,024*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	High school	122	258,06				
	University	408	273,95				
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Primary education	6	150,00	5,498	2	0,064	No
	High school	122	253,34				
	University	408	274,77				
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Primary education	6	144,67	4,209	2	0,122	No
	High school	122	266,23				
	University	408	271,00				
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Primary education	6	193,83	7,653	2	<b>0,022*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	High school	122	239,84				
	University	408	278,17				

According to their education level, the sub-dimensions of the tourism potential scale of the local people and sector representatives in the city of Ulaanbaatar are examined in Table 8. There is a significant difference in the positive economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.024$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and in the negative socio-cultural effects dimension of tourism ( $p = 0.022$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) according to education level, ( $p = 0.064$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) and the negative economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.122$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) according to educational status.

The paired comparisons were made to determine which group the difference originated from for sub-dimensions. For the positive economic effects of the tourism sub-dimension, it is seen that university graduates' participation level is significantly higher than primary and high school graduates. For the negative socio-cultural effects of the tourism sub-dimension, university graduates' level of participation in statements about the negative socio-cultural effects of the tourism sub-dimension is significantly higher than that of high school graduates.

Whether the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar's city on the factor dimensions differ significantly according to the income level variable was examined with the Kruskal-Wallis H test, and the results are given in Table 9.

**Table 9:** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives towards Tourism in Ulaanbaatar by Income Status Variable

Factors	Income	n	Average Rank	Chi-Square	sd	p	Significant difference
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Below 320000 (MNT)	85	199,55	26,882	4	<b>0,000*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	320001-500000 (MNT)	11	269,39				
	500001-800000 (MNT)	14	291,41				
	800001-1000000 (MNT)	12	261,54				
	1000001 and more	73	313,86				
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Below 320000 (MNT)	85	228,48	18,051	4	<b>0,001*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	320001-500000 (MNT)	11	249,42				
	500001-800000 (MNT)	14	279,29				
	800001-1000000 (MNT)	12	267,74				
	1000001 and more	73	324,34				
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Below 320000 (MNT)	85	255,69	8,716	4	0,069	No
	320001-500000 (MNT)	11	259,90				
	500001-800000 (MNT)	14	297,03				
	800001-1000000 (MNT)	12	268,46				
	1000001 and more	73	240,39				
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Below 320000 (MNT)	85	232,79	13,035	4	<b>0,011*</b>	<b>Yes</b>
	320001-500000 (MNT)	11	278,19				
	500001-800000 (MNT)	14	294,84				
	800001-1000000 (MNT)	12	272,20				
	1000001 and more	73	237,06				

Table 9 shows the Kruskal-Wallis H test results of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism, the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism, the negative economic effects of tourism, and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, according to the income variable. According to Kruskal-Wallis H test results, the sub-dimensions of the tourism potential scale differ significantly according to income; In the dimension of positive economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.000$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), in the dimension of positive socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.000$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and in the dimension of negative socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.011$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). Whereas in the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.069$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ), sub-dimension does not differ significantly according to income. According to the paired comparisons made to determine which group the difference originated from for sub-dimensions, it has been found that in the positive economic effects of the tourism sub-dimension, the average of those with an income below 320000 MNT is significantly lower than other income groups. It has been also found that those with an income of 1000001 MNT and above has a significantly higher level of participation in the statement than those with a level of 320001-500000 MNT and 800001-1000000 MNT.



For the positive socio-cultural effects of the tourism sub-dimension, those whose income is below MNT 320000 and whose income is between 320001-500000 are significantly lower than those with an income of 1000001 and above. In addition, it has been found that the level of participation in the statement of those whose income is 1000001 and above is significantly higher than those with an income of 800001-1000000 MNT and those with an average income of 500001-800000 MNT below 320000 MNT.

For the negative socio-cultural effects of the tourism sub-dimension, the level of participation in the statement of those whose income is below 320000 MNT is significantly lower than that of other income groups. It has also been observed that the level of participation in the statement of those whose income was 500001-800000 MNT is significantly lower than the expression participation level of those whose income is 1000001 MNT and above.

Whether the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar's city on the factor dimensions differ significantly according to the occupational status variable was examined with the Kruskal-Wallis H test. The results are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10:** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of Perceptions of Local People and Sector Representatives in Ulaanbaatar Regarding Tourism Potential According to Occupational Status Variable

Factors	Job groups	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	z	p
<b>Positive Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Local people	232	239,95	55668,50	-3,754	<b>0,000*</b>
	Sector	304	290,29	88247,50		
	Representative					
	Total	536				
<b>Positive Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Local people	232	292,31	67816,00	-3,152	<b>0,002*</b>
	Sector	304	250,33	76100,00		
	Representative					
	Total	536				
<b>Negative Economic Effects of Tourism</b>	Local people	232	257,40	59716,00	-1,493	0,135
	Sector	304	276,97	84200,00		
	Representative					
	Total	536				
<b>Negative Socio-Cultural Effects of Tourism</b>	Local people	232	231,83	53784,00	-4,950	<b>0,000*</b>
	Sector	304	296,49	90132,00		
	Representative					
	Total	536				

Table 10 shows the Mann-Whitney-U test results made for the comparison of the positive economic effects of tourism, the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism, the negative economic effects of tourism, and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, according to the occupational status variable of the local people and sector representatives in the city of Ulaanbaatar. When this data examined according to income variable, it has been found that there is a significant difference in the positive economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.000$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ), in positive socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.02$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and in negative socio-cultural effects of tourism ( $p = 0.000$ ;  $p < 0, 05$ ), while the sub-dimensions of the negative economic effects of tourism ( $p = 0.135$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) do not differ significantly according to the occupation.

**Table 11:** Rejection and Acceptance Status of Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses	Rejection	Acceptance
H.1: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the age difference.	X	
H.2: There is a difference between the perceptions of local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the age difference.	X	
H.3: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the age difference.	X	
H.4: There is a difference between the perceptions of local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the age difference.		X
H.5: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.		X
H.6: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.	X	
H.7: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.	X	
H.8: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the educational status difference.		X
H.9: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive economic effects of tourism according to the income variable.		X
H.10: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the income variable.		X
H.11: There is a difference between local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative economic effects of tourism according to the income variable.	X	
H.12: There is a difference between the perceptions of the local people and sector representatives in Ulaanbaatar regarding the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the income level variable.		X

According to the research hypotheses' acceptance and rejection status in Table 11, it is understood that the participants generally agree that tourism has a positive economic contribution. There will be economic development, investments in the region will increase, national income will increase, and so on. They agree that these issues will contribute to Ulaanbaatar. They have stated that in terms of the positive socio-cultural effects of tourism, they would contribute to developing a positive perspective towards foreigners, protecting cultural and historical values, and improving individuals' social life standards. In terms of the negative economic effects of tourism, it has been understood that they have doubts on issues such as the increase in the prices of goods and services and the increase in real estate rents and prices with tourism development. It has also seen that there is an uncertainty about negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, especially in terms of issues such as the deterioration of the family and social life of the people, the deterioration in language and speech, and the destruction of traditions and customs.

**Conclusion and Suggestions**

Considering the impact of the tourism industry on the economy, tourists mostly stay in Ulaanbaatar for an average of 2 to 4 days and spend 58% of their budget for shopping. The foreign currency that tourists spend during the tour should be directed to other tourism resources. In the SWOT analysis of the city of Ulaanbaatar's tourism potential, Ulaanbaatar's extensive lands suitable for tourism management, a deep-rooted past, and rich culture constitute its

strengths in terms of cultural tourism. However, some weaknesses, such as domestic tourism in Mongolia, have not fully developed yet. The Mongolian culture is not well known in the world. The tourism service quality and accommodation sector are inadequate. Transportation problems, lack of infrastructure, and the absence of an independent Ministry of Tourism in Mongolia are other serious issues that need to be dealt with. Ulaanbaatar is home to many cultural tourism opportunities with untouched lands, unique landscapes, a newly recognized and attractive cultural structure, a historical line like Mongolia's first city, and its developing tourism structure. However, the popularity of passive foreign tourism, relatively expensive accommodation businesses, and lack of qualified tourism personnel are some of Ulaanbaatar's biggest threats (Ulaanbaatar Municipality Economic and Development Unit, 2014).

According to the gender variable of the local people and sector representatives participating in the study, considering the positive economic effects of tourism and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism, men's participation is significantly higher than women's. At the same time, it is understood that women entrepreneurs pay less attention to economic and socio-cultural effects than men. In Mongolia, the people working in management positions in the tourism sector and other sectors are primarily men, and men work more actively in society, increasing men's participation levels. According to the study made by Uspanova (2017) on the subject of "Investigation of Kazakhstan's Tourism Potential and Cultural Tourism as a Type of Development", a significant difference has been found between genders. It has been determined that men perceive the economic and socio-cultural effects of tourism more positively than women.

According to Ulaanbaatar's local people and sector representatives' marital status variable, no significant difference has been detected in any dimension in the perceptions of the positive economic effects of tourism and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism. Accordingly, it has been understood that married and single participants have similar opinions about the positive and negative economic effects of tourism and the positive and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism. The research results support the "Determination of How Local People Perceive Tourism Activities in Kayseri Example" conducted by Şanlıoğlu and Erdem (2017). In this study, no significant difference was found in terms of the positive and negative economic, social and environmental effects of tourism. Eslami et al. (2018) found that the perceived environmental impacts of tourism as a non-economic factor do not affect residents' living spaces; however, they are effective in their means of entertainment. Uslu, Alagöz and Güneş (2020) also stated that negative environmental impacts perceived by the local community reduce their satisfaction with tourism development. Perceived negative socio-cultural impacts were found not to influence local community satisfaction with tourism development.

Furthermore, Kim et al. (2013) argued that the local community is influenced by tourism economically, socio-culturally and ecologically and that these effects affect their living environment. They stated that economic influence significantly predicts the feeling of material well-being, social influence the feeling of social well-being and cultural effect the feeling of emotional well-being. In addition, negative perceptions of environmental impacts significantly predict the local community's sense of health and safety. In terms of tourism benefits for local residents, income is a crucial factor for increasing job opportunities and quality of life. Alrwajfah and his colleagues (2019) and Obradovic, Tesin, Bozovic and Milosevi (2020) found similar findings for the economic effects of tourism. Economic

development is often assumed to promote tourism automatically, and therefore residents' perceptions and satisfaction are important.

It has been determined that local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar think differently about the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the age variable. Accordingly, it is understood that the lower the age group, the less the participants consider the socio-cultural effects of tourism. This is because most of the 18-24 age range surveyed are students and did not fully understand tourism disadvantages. On the other hand, as the age increases, the education level and knowledge increase, so the participants can better analyze the harmful and beneficial effects of tourism. In the related study conducted by Gökçe (2016) on "The Perception and Support of the Indigenous People for the Development of Tourism: The Case of Afyonkarahisar", it is determined that the support given by the participants to tourism development differs significantly according to age groups. In the relevant study, it is observed that the participants between the ages of 31-40 support the development of tourism more than the participants in the younger age groups. It is a well-known fact that as people get old, their socio-cultural perspective awareness also increase. According to the findings, there is a lack of communication and interaction between the locals and the tourism representatives. However, this situation needs to be dealt with to achieve sustainable tourism development in the regions.

According to the local people's educational status and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar, a significant difference was found in the dimensions of the positive economic effects of tourism and the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism. For the positive economic effects of tourism and the negative socio-cultural sub-dimensions, university graduates' participation level is significantly higher than primary and high school graduates. Thus, it has been understood that participants with higher education levels will contribute more to tourism development. This is because those working in the tourism sector in Ulaanbaatar are usually university graduates and, therefore, they have more knowledge about tourism than other participants. In the study on "Perception of Local People in Edremit District Towards Tourism Development" conducted by Şentürk (2019) related to the subject, it has been determined that the perception of tourism's negative environmental effects by the local people differs significantly according to their educational status. The participants have a university degree and have a higher perception of tourism's environmental impacts than others. It can be said that as the education level increases, the awareness of tourism increases as well.

It has been revealed that local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar think differently about the positive economic effects of tourism and the positive and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the income variable. In this context, it has been understood that entrepreneurs with high-income levels can support tourism investment. That is because tourism in Mongolia is one of the developing sectors and it has been attracting more investors in recent years. Therefore, those with a high level of income and education level already know the tourism business among the participants. These results also support the research titled "Determination of Tourism Potential of Giresun Province, Perception of Local People and Sector Representatives". It also confirmed a significant difference between the sector representatives and the local people according to income status. In this context, it can be said that local people and sector representatives are willing to provide more tourism investment support as their income levels increase (Akgün, 2016).

Another result is that local people and sector representatives of Ulaanbaatar think differently about the positive economic effects of tourism and the positive and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism according to the

occupation variable. In this context, the sector representatives' level of participation in expression is significantly higher than the local people. At the same time, it is understood that the level of participation of the sector representatives in the statements about the positive economic effects of tourism and the positive and negative socio-cultural effects of tourism is higher than the local people. That is because people working in the tourism sector in Ulaanbaatar have more knowledge of tourism than the local people. In the study conducted by Akgün (2016), a significant difference has also been found between local people and sector representatives according to occupational status. Accordingly, it has been observed that the tourism sector representatives have a more positive attitude toward tourism. Similarly, as a result of the researches conducted by Uslu, Alagöz & Güneş (2020) and Nunkoo & Ramkissoon (2007) it has been determined that the socio-cultural, environmental and economic positive effects of tourism perceived by the local community increase the local community's satisfaction with tourism development.

Furthermore, Riberio et al. (2017) stated that economic factors have a direct impact on the behavior of the local community in favor of tourism development. They also emphasized that tourism should be planned in a sustainable way to reflect the economic benefits to the people and society and promote the local economy. Boley et al. (2014) argued that allowing the local community to express their views on tourism can make the perceived effects of tourism more positive and ultimately increase their likelihood of supporting tourism.

When the findings are summarized as a whole by both groups, it is seen that most of the participants believe that the tourism sector will contribute to the economy of the city of Ulaanbaatar, increasing employment, the income of the local people foreign exchange inflows, and social welfare. Regarding the negative economic effects of tourism, it has been determined that traditional products, services, and real estate values will increase. In contrast, the local people's purchasing power will weaken. At the same time, it can be said that tourists will be viewed positively in social and cultural terms. Natural and historical values will be protected, and social living standards will increase. Most of the participants have doubts about the negative socio-cultural effects of tourism. When looking at the previous studies, unwanted visitor behavior, resident disruption and frustration, host / visitor hostility, increased crime and violence, change of lifestyle, loss of cultural identity, lack of stakeholder participation in tourism development, overcrowding in high season and at peak times, as well as negative perception and dissatisfaction of tourists are some of the negative socio-cultural impacts (Peeters, Gössling & Klijs, 2018). According to Wang and his colleagues (2020), improving transportation, labor, and facilities may increase the city's tourism potential, but will increase costs and competition and ultimately result in a lower value of tourism economic growth than in the current scenario. Therefore, environmental management and tourism management strategies are suggested as the best approach for tourism economic growth. Thus, it is crucial to study those negative impacts to overcome the obstacles of tourism development from the local residents of a destination (Bhat & Mishra, 2020; Almeida-García et al., 2016; Diedrich & GarcíaBuades, 2009; Harrill, 2004; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002).

Tourism development can create and provide employment opportunities, generate foreign exchange earnings, and boost the income of the destination community. These benefits can improve the community's daily standards, which gives rise to a better quality of life for individuals. That is why tourism promoters and managers must help residents understand how tourism development can improve their life by giving them access to better facilities. Furthermore, as stated by Sugiarto and his colleagues (2020), the institutional management in tourism potential is also an important

part that needs to be considered, such as improving the quality and capacity of human resources, the synergy of the city government with the collaboration of community groups and partnerships with external stakeholders.

The limitation of this study is that it only focuses on the perception of residents and the tourism representatives, while the perception of visitors and managers are also crucial to count on (Sugiarto et al., 2020; Adongo, Taale & Adam, 2018; Abdelgadir, Halis & Halis, 2017). Therefore, it is necessary to continue future research on developing this area (planning, management- questionnaire or interview, and perception and satisfaction of tourists).

According to the research results, the following suggestions have been developed regarding the tourism sector for Ulaanbaatar.

- Planning and developing the desired infrastructure to start alternative tourism types in the region.
- Establishing efficient cooperation between the public and the tourism sector.
- Increasing the number of package tours by expanding the tour routes.
- Natural wealth, historical and cultural heritage elements, fauna structure, rivers, etc. in Ulaanbaatar should be taken under protection.
- Focus on promotional activities aimed at increasing touristic demand for the contribution of income from tourism to the region's economy.
- Providing the necessary infrastructure for the development of winter tourism and promoting superstructures.
- Increasing the number of in-service training to improve the education level of employees in the tourism sector.
- Increasing the number of festivals and festivities to be held in winter to eliminate the seasonality problem in tourism.
- Tourism enterprises operate without disturbing the natural structure and without polluting the environment.
- Developing pricing policies to increase touristic demand.
- Paying attention to environmental cleanliness and doing this regularly.

Institutional elements and partnerships with external stakeholders are the solutions that need to be taken in developing Ulaanbaatar's tourism potential. The innovation in tourism development based on the community will expand if further research includes other community-based tourism attractions in Ulaanbaatar or other objects contributing positively to the communities' social, economic, and environmental conditions. In future research, priority should be given to determining the correct methods for developing tourism in the region according to these results. The findings obtained here are expected to contribute to Ulaanbaatar's long-term tourism development strategy and the literature about Mongolia's tourism.

### **Declaration**

All authors of the article contribute equally to the article process. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

**REFERENCES**

- Abdelgadir, F. A. A., Halis, M., & Halis, M. (2017). Tourism stakeholders attitudes toward sustainable developments: Empirical research from Shahat city. *Ottoman Journal of Tourism and Management Research*, 2(3), 182–200.
- Adongo, C., Taale, F., & Adam, I. (2018). Tourists' values and emphatic attitude toward sustainable tourism development in tourism. *Ecological Economics*, 150, 251–263.
- Akgün, A. (2016). *Giresun ilinin turizm potansiyelinin belirlenmesi, yerel halk ve sektör temsilcilerinin algısı üzerine bir araştırma* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi) Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Nevşehir.
- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17, 481–494.
- Aktymbayeva, B., Koshkimbayeva, U., Abisheva, Z., Tokbergenova, U., & Tumazhanova, M. (2020). Tourism industry development and governance: A comparative stage review of Kazakhstan's experience for the years of independence, 1991-2020. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 34(1), 69–76.
- Albu, R. (2020). Study on the effects of tourism development on the local community of Brasov. *Series V – Economic Sciences*, 12 (2), 37–42.
- Altundaş, Y. (2013). *Akçakoca ilçesinin turizm potansiyelinin değerlendirilmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Düzce Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Düzce
- Alrwajfah, M. M., Almeida-Garcia, F., & Cortes-Macias, R., et al. (2019). International aid to tourism planning and stakeholder participation in the Petra region. *Cogent Social Sciences* 5(1), 1616362.
- Armenski, T., Dwyer, L., & Pavluković, V. (2018). Destination competitiveness: Public and private sector tourism management in Serbia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(3), 384-398.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.
- Assaf, A. G., & Josiassen, A. (2012). Identifying and ranking the determinants of tourism performance: A global investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 388-399.
- Batbold, S. (2018). Ulaanbaator the city of happiness, *Time Journal*, (1), 60-68.
- Bhat, A., & Mishra, R. (2020). Demographic characteristics and residents' attitude towards tourism development: A case of Kashmir region. *Journal of Public Affairs*. 1-13
- Bello, F. G., Carr, N., & Lovelock, B. (2016). Community participation framework for protected area-based tourism planning. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 13(4), 469–485.
- Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. P., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a weberian lens, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33-50.
- Bramwell, B., & Sharman, A. (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policy making. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 392–415.
- Brace, N., Kemp, R., & Snelgar, R. (2006). *SPSS for psychologists*. 3rd edn. Reviewed by R S Hinman. Palgrave Macmillan: Australia.

- Brohman, J. (1996). New directions in tourism for third world development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1), 48-70.
- Buckley, R., Ollenburg, C., & Zhong, L. (2007). Cultural landscape in Mongolian tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), 47-61.
- Buono, F., Padiaditi, K., & Carsjens, G. (2012). Local community participation in Italian national parks management: Theory versus practice. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 14(2), 189–208.
- Buyunbadrah, C. (2019). *General guide about Mongolia*, 2nd edn. Internom: Ulaanbaator
- Castela, A. (2018) Impacts of tourism in an urban community: The case of Alfama. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 5(2), 133–148.
- Cavus, S., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2003). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study in Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis*, 7(3/4), 259-269.
- Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident's attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 575–594.
- Соёл Спорт Аялал Жуулчлалын Яам, (2012). Тусгай сонирхлын аялал жуулчлалын нэр төрөл, бүтээгдэхүүн, чиглэлийг тодорхойлох судалгаа, төлөвлөлт. 2012-2016 он. *Улаанбаатар сэтгүүл* 1(82).
- Croes, R. (2011). Measuring and explaining competitiveness in the context of small island destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(4), 431-442.
- Crompton, J. L. (2004). *The proximate principle: The impact of parks, open space and water features on residential property values and the property tax base*, Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Park Association
- Сүхбаатар, О., Ариунболд, Х., & Хөгжилдмая, Ц. (2006). Монголын аялал жуулчлалын нэвтэрхий толь, *Интерном: Улаанбаатар*.
- Ministry of Nature, Environment and Tourism, (2011). *Ulaanbaator visitor guide*, 1st edn, Kapital Mas Media: Ulaanbaator.
- Dogru, T., Suess, C., & Sirakaya-Turk, E. (2020). Why do some countries prosper more in tourism than others? Global competitiveness of tourism development. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 109634802091170.
- Eslami, S., Khalifah, Z., Mardani, A., & Streimikiene, D. (2018). Impact of noneconomic factors on residents' support for sustainable tourism development in Langkawi Island, Malaysia. *Economics and Sociology*, 11(4), 181-197.
- Fakhrana, A., & Zafran, R. (2020). Sustainable cultural tourism development: A strategic for revenue generation in local communities. *Journal of Economic and Tropical Life Science*, 4(2), 47–56.
- Ferreira, F. A., Castro, C., & Gomes, A. S. (2021). Positive and negative social-cultural, economic and environmental impacts of tourism on residents. In: de Carvalho J.V., Rocha Á., Liberato P., Peña A. (eds) *Advances in Tourism, Technology and Systems*. ICOTTS 2020. *Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*, Vol. 208, Springer, Singapore.



- Garcia, F. A., Vazquez, A. B., & Macias, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13(1), 33–40.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *Spss for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 17.0 update. 10th Edn., Boston: Pearson.
- Gilbert, D., & Clark, M. (1997). An exploratory examination of urban tourism impact, with reference to residents attitudes, in the cities of Canterbury and Guildford. *Cities*, 14(6), 343-352.
- Gökçe, F. (2016). *Yerli halkın turizmin gelişimine yönelik algısı ve desteği: Afyonkarahisar örneği* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Afyon Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Afyonkarahisar.
- Graymore, M., Sipe, N., & Rickson, R. (2010). Sustaining human carrying capacity: A tool for regional sustainability assessment. *Ecological Economics*, 69(3), 459-468.
- Guan, D., Gao, W., Su, W., Li, H., & Hokao, K. (2011). Modeling and dynamic assessment of urban economy–resource–environment system with a coupled system dynamics – geographic information system model. *Ecological Indicators*, 11(5), 1333-1344.
- Gunn, C. A. (1994). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases*. Washington, DC: Taylor and Frances.
- Hai, A., & Alamgir, B. (2017). Local community attitude and support towards tourism development at Saint Martin island, Bangladesh: Local community attitude and support. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management in the Digital Age*, 1(2), 32–41.
- Harrison D., & Schipani, S. (2007). Lao tourism and poverty alleviation: Community-based tourism and the private sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 10, 194-230.
- Huse, M., Gustavsen, T., & Almedal, S. (1998). Tourism impact comparisons among Norwegian towns. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(3), 721-738.
- Нийслэлийн Эдийн Засаг Хөгжлийн Газар, (2014). Улаанбаатар Хотын Эдийн Засгийн Давуу Тал, Сул Тал, Боломж, Аюул Заналын Талаарх Тайлангийн Хураангуй, *Улаанбаатар*, 11-22.
- Нийслэлийн Засаг Даргын Хэрэгжүүлэгч Агентлаг. (2017). Нийслэлийн Аялал Жуулчлалын Газрын 2017 Оны Үйл Ажиллагааны Тайлан, *Улаанбаатар*, 5-14.
- Нийслэлийн Засаг Даргын Хэрэгжүүлэгч Агентлаг Аялал Жуулчлалын Газар, (2015). Аялал Жуулчлалын Салбарын Улаанбаатар Хотын Эдийн Засагт Үзүүлэх Нөлөөллийн Судалгаа, *Маркетметрикс: Улаанбаатар*
- İçellioğlu, Ş. (2014). Kent turizm ve marka kentler: Turizm potansiyeli açısından İstanbul'un swot analizi, *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1, 37-55.
- Kapsalis, T., & Kapsalis, V. C. (2020). Sustainable development and its dependence on local community behavior. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3448.
- Khan, A., Bibi, S., Lorenzo, A., Lyu, J., & Babar, Z. (2020). Tourism and development in developing economies: A policy implication perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(4), 1618.

- Khoalenyane, N., & Ikechukwu, E. (2016). Local community and Ts'ehlanyane national park in Lesotho: Perception of participation. *African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences* 22 (2), 445–453.
- Kihima, B., & Musila, P. (2019). Extent of local community participation in tourism development in conservation areas: A case study of Mwaluganje conservancy. *Parks*, 25(2), 47–56.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?. *Tourism Management*, 36, 527-540
- Kim, K. (2002). *The effects of tourism impacts upon quality of life of residents in the community* (doctoral Thesis) Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.
- Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism. (2012). *Research to determine alternative tourism types and routes, 2012-2016*, *Journal of Ulaanbaator*, 1(82).
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2008). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Uses and interpretation*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Li, X., Hsu C. H. C., & Lawton, L. J. (2014). Understanding residents' perception changes toward mega-event through a dual-theory lens. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(3), 396–410.
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism, economic, physical and social impacts*, Essex, England: Longman.
- Mayer, M., & Vogt, L. (2016). Economic effects of tourism and its influencing factors. *Zeitschrift Für Tourismuswissenschaft*, 8(2).
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131–140.
- Meimand, S. Z., Khalifah, E., Zavadskas, A., Mardani, A., Najafipour, A., & U. Ahmad, (2017). Residents attitude toward tourism development: a sociocultural perspective. *Sustainability*, 9 (7), 1–29.
- Mitchell, R., & Eagles, P. (2001). An Integrative Approach to Tourism: Lessons from the Andes of Peru. *Journal Sustainable Tourism*, 9, 4-28.
- Mongolia Ministry of Construction and Urbanization. (2017). *Development change of Ulaanbaator city, 2030 Plan*, Ulaanbaator.
- Monterrubio, J. C., Mex. E., Gullette, G S., Mendoza-ontiveros. M M., Fernandes, J S., & Lucue, C. A. (2012). Social impacts of tourism as perceived by state-planned tourism destination residents: The case of Huatulco, México, *International Journal Tourism Anthropology*, 2(1), 34–52.
- Müze, Tiyatro Ve Kültür Merkezi, Touristinfocenter.mn. Retrieved from, [http://www.touristinfocenter.mn/cate9\\_more.aspx?ItemID=149](http://www.touristinfocenter.mn/cate9_more.aspx?ItemID=149)
- Nault, S., & Stapleton, P. (2011) The community participation process in ecotourism development: A case study of the community of Sogoog, Bayan-Ulgii, Mongolia, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19 (6), 695-712.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2007). Residents' perceptions of the socio-cultural impact of tourism in Mauritius, *Anatolia*, 18(1), 138-145.

- Obradovic, S., Tesin, A., Bozovic, T., & Milosevi, D. (2020). Residents' perceptions of and satisfaction with tourism development: A case study of the Uvac Special Nature Reserve, Serbia. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1–13.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual—A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Park, E., & Kim, S. (2016) The potential of Cittaslow for sustainable tourism development: Enhancing local community's empowerment. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 13(3), 351–369.
- Peeters, P., Gössling, S., Klijs, J., et al. (2018). Research for tran committee—overtourism: Impact and possible policy responses, European Parliament, *Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies*, Brussels, Belgium.
- Prentice, R. (1993). Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management*, 14(3), 218–227.
- Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., & Naidoo, P. (2011). Residents' Attitudes Toward Perceived Tourism Benefits, *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 4(3), 45–56.
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Ringle, C. M., & Jaafar, M., et al. (2017). Urban vs. rural destinations: Residents' perceptions, community participation and support for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 60, 147–158.
- Reiser, D., & Crispin, S. (2009). Local perceptions of the reimagining process: The case of the Sullivans Cove waterfront precinct. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 2(2), 109-124.
- Riberio, M.A., Pinto, P., Silva, J. A., et al. (2017). Residents' attitudes and the adoption of pro-tourism behaviours: The case of developing island countries. *Tourism Management*, 61, 523–537.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(2-3), 231-254.
- Sharples, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49.
- Sheng, L., & Tsui, Y. (2010). Foreign investment in tourism: The case of Macao as a small tourism economy. *Tourism Geographies*, 12(2), 173–191.
- Shircliff, J. E. (2018). Nature and nomads: Service approach to Mongolia tours. *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. 2857. Retrieved from [https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp\\_collection/2857](https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/2857)
- Soykan, F. (2004). Turizm potansiyelini saptamanın önemi ve bir yöntem önerisi. *1. Balıkesir Ulusal Turizm Kongresi*, 11-31.
- Styliadis, D. (2016). The role of place image dimensions in residents' support for tourism development. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 129-139.
- Styliadis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J., & Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.
- Styliadis, D., Shani, A., & Belhassen, Y. (2017). Testing an integrated destination image model across residents and tourists. *Tourism Management*, 58, 184-195.

- Sugiarto, M., Sofyan, H., Jayadianti, H., & Wibowo, R. (2020). Mapping of village tourism potential in the framework of implementing community-based tourism. *LPPM UP "Veteran" Yogyakarta Conference Series Proceeding on Political and Social Science (PSS)*, 1(1), 218-229.
- Şanlıoğlu, Ö., & Erdem, A. (2017). Kayseri örneğinde yerel halkın turizm faaliyetlerini nasıl algıladığının tespitine yönelik bir araştırma, *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (27), 11
- Şahbaz, R. P. (2015). *Turizmin ekonomik, sosyal (toplumsal) ve fiziksel çevre etkileri*. Aslan Z (Ed.), Genel Turizm (pp. 229–255). Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları
- Şahiner, T. (2012). *İnanç turizmi potansiyeli ve halkın inanç turizmine bakışı açısından Karaman* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Karaman
- Şentürk, B. (2019). *Edremit ilçesi yerel halkının turizm gelişimine yönelik algısı* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın
- Thetsane, R. (2019) Local community participation in tourism development: The case of Katse villages in Lesotho. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 6(2), 123–140.
- Tsai, H., Song, H., & Wong, K. K. (2009). Tourism and hotel competitiveness research. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(5-6), 522-546.
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21, 613-633.
- Ulaanbaator Governorate Implementation Unit and Ministry of Tourism. (2015). *A Research concerning the economic impact of tourism on Ulaanbaator City, Marketmetriks*: Ulaanbaator
- Ulaanbaator Municipality Economy and Development Unit. (2014). *Summary of SWOT analysis on the economy and tourism of the city of Ulaanbaator, Ulaanbaator*, 11-22
- Ulaanbaatar City Tourism Department (2018). *Journal of Ulaanbaator*, Ulaanbaatar Mongolia.
- Ulaanbaatar Tourism Department (2017). *Statistics on tourism performance*. Retrieved from <http://tourism.ub.gov.mn/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2016-onii-jiliin-etses.pdf>
- Ulaanbaator Governorate Implementation Unit. (2017). *2017 Annual Report of the Ministry of Ulaanbaator City Tourism*, Ulaanbaator: 5-14, (Accessed: 15.09.2019), <http://tourism.ub.gov.mn/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/ckd-%D0%9D%D0%90%D0%96%D0%93-%D1%85%D0%B0%D0%B3%D0%B0%D1%81-%D0%B6%D0%B8%D0%BB-%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%B9%D0%BB%D0%B0%D0%BD-2017-07-19.pdf>
- Master Plan of Ulaanbaatar (2013). *Mongolia Ministry of Construction and Urban Development*, Ulaanbaator, Retrieved from <https://www.slideshare.net/bayartsend3/2-42202998>
- Ulaanbaator Ministry of Tourism. (2013). *Special purpose tourism potentials around Ulanbator*, Ulaanbaator Retrieved from <http://tourism.ub.gov.mn/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/%D0%A3%D0%9B%D0%90%D0%90%D0%9D%D0%91%D0%90%D0%90%D0%A2%D0%90%D0%A0-%D0%A5%D0%9E%D0%A2-%D0%9E%D0%A0%D0%A7%D0%9C%D0%AB%D0%9D->

%D0%A2%D0%A3%D0%A1%D0%93%D0%90%D0%99-%D0%A1-  
 %D0%9E%D0%9D%D0%98%D0%A0%D0%A5%D0%9B%D0%AB%D0%9D-  
 %D0%90%D0%AF%D0%9B%D0%90%D0%9B-  
 %D0%96%D0%A3%D0%A3%D0%9B%D0%A7%D0%9B%D0%90%D0%9B%D0%AB%D0%9D-  
 %D0%9D%D3%A8%D3%A8%D0%A6-pdf.pdf

Uluer, E. C. (2009). *Bitlis ilinin turizm potansiyeli; kamu ve özel sektör yöneticilerinin kanaatlerinin araştırılması* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

UNCTAD-United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2021). Retrieved from [https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/tdstat45\\_en.pdf](https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/tdstat45_en.pdf)

Uslu, A., Alagöz, G., & Güneş, E. (2020). Socio-cultural, Economic, and Environmental Effects of Tourism from the Point of View of the Local Community. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 21(11), 1-21.

Uspanova, B. (2017). *Kazakistan'ın turizm potansiyeli ve geliştirilebilir turizm çeşidi olarak kültür turizminin incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya

Vargas -Sánchez, A., Porras -Bueno, N., & Plaza -Mejía, M. (2011). Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism: Is a universal model possible? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38 (2), 460-480.

Wang, J., Huang, X., Gong, Z., & Cao, K. (2020). Dynamic assessment of tourism carrying capacity and its impacts on tourism economic growth in urban tourism destinations in China, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 15.

Xie, H. J., Bao, J., & Kerstetter, D. L. (2014). Examining the effects of tourism impacts on satisfaction with tourism between native and non-native residents. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(3), 241–249.

Yu, L., & Goulden, M. (2006). A comparative analysis of international tourists satisfaction in Mongolia. *Tourism Management*, 27,1331-1342.

Улаанбаатар Хотын 2030 оны Хөгжлийн Ерөнхий Төлөвлөгөө. (2017). Барилга, Хот Байгуулалтын Яам, Улаанбаатар

Zhiming, F., Pustokhin, D. A., & Pustokhina, I. V. (2020). Prospects of tourism development in China, Mongolia and Russi. *Journal of Criticcal Reviews*. 7 (12), 2199-2210.

Буянбадрах, Ч. (2019). Монгол орны лавлах. 2. Хэвлэл. *Интерном*: Улаанбаатар