

# The Effect of Risk Perceptions on Tourists' Revisit Intentions

Savaş Artuğer (Corresponding author)

Faculty of Tourism, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, 48170 Kötekli / Muğla, Turkey

E-mail: artugersavas@yahoo.com

## Abstract

It is evident that the risk element has a significant impact on the intention of tourists to travel as well as on their destination selection criteria. Therefore, the determination of risk perception particularly for a destination will be beneficial for the management of that destination. The objective of this study is to reveal the risk perceptions of foreign tourists visiting Marmaris district of Muğla province which is one of the major tourism centers in Turkey and determine the impact these risks have on their intention to revisit the area. The sampling group of the study consisted of foreign tourists visiting Marmaris district during June and August in 2014. Data was obtained from a total of 387 foreign tourists for the application. The study revealed that the risk perception of tourists in Marmaris was minimal. Furthermore, it was determined that the perceived highest risk involved financial risks while the lowest risk was perceived in terms of socio-psychological dimensions. The study revealed that the risks (socio-psychological risk, time risk, physical risks, financial risks and performance risk) perceived by tourists during their holiday in Marmaris did have an impact on their intentions to visit again.

**Keywords:** Perceived risk, revisit intention, Marmaris district

## 1. Introduction

Tourism and international tourism in particular is very sensitive in terms of security issues. Fragile changes incurring in the world can cause a change in the purchasing behavior of tourists. The security issue has a major influence on the purchasing behavior and decision making processes of tourists. Travelers select destinations which will fulfill their expectations in the best possible way, be more beneficial and which are low risk and low cost. If a tourist does not feel safe at his destination this will generate a negative impression (Seabra, Dolnicar, Abrantes, & Kastenholz, 2013). Due to the nature of some of its unique characteristics (intangibility, variability, inseparability and perishability) tourism is more prone to risk perceptions than other products. In addition to these characteristics the tourism product is threatened by elements such as poor weather conditions, unfriendly attitude of local folk, strikes by airline employees, terror, political unrest, epidemics and natural disasters. All these factors increase the perceived risk level in terms of tourism (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006).

Risks regarding tourism are the risks perceived during the purchasing process of tourists in terms of a destination and the travel process. Perceived risk in tourism has been processed by many studies (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006). Many studies regarding perceived risk in tourism have been carried out particularly during the 1990's (Yang & Nair, 2014). Some of the studies regarding risks in tourism concern risks perceived in terms of travel while others concern risks perceived at the relevant destinations. Executed studies (Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998b; Qi, Gibson, & Zhang, 2009; Maritz, Yeh, & Shieh, 2013; Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013; Lee & Chi, 2014; Chew & Jahari, 2014) show that perceived risks have an impact on the purchasing behavior of tourists and their intention to revisit.

The objective of this study was to determine the impact of risks perceived by foreign tourists visiting Marmaris which is one of the major tourism destinations in Turkey on their intention to revisit within the framework of the above information. It is believed that the results from the study will contribute to literature as well as marketers and managers of destinations.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Perceived risk in tourism

The purchasing decisions of consumers can be affected by many factors. Especially uncertainties and concerns have a major impact on the purchase decisions of consumers. In addition risk perceptions have gained importance recently in the purchasing decisions of consumers (Lacey, Bruwer, & Li, 2009). A high risk perception may cause consumers to postpone their purchasing decisions or completely abandon them (Cunningham, Gerlach, Harper, & Young, 2005).

Many researchers carrying out studies on consumer behavior have demonstrated different types of risks. A study by Roselius (1971) demonstrated that consumers perceived four different risks. These risks are Time risk, danger risk, ego risk and money risks (Lacey et al, 2009). Jacoby and Kaplan (1972) demonstrated that perceived risk is determined in five dimensions which are psychological, social, financial, physical and performance risks. Mitchell (1992) determined six types of risk. These are social, financial, physical, performance, time and psychological risks. A study carried out by Stone and Gronhaug (1993) revealed six types of risk. These are financial, performance, physical, psychological, social and time risks (Lin & Chen, 2009).

In tourism related literature there are many studies regarding the risks perceived by tourists in terms of travel (Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a; Maser & Weiermair, 1998; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Floyd et al., 2004; Dolnicar, 2005; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2006; Kozak et al., 2007; Carlton & Jacobson, 2013) as well as risks perceived at the destination (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006; Eitzinger & Wiedemann 2007; Fuchs & Reichel, 2011; Schroeder et al., 2013; Karamustafa et al., 2013; Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013).

One of the first studies regarding risk perception in tourism literature was done by Roehl and Fesenmaier (1992). The study carried out by the authors demonstrated the risks perceived by tourists during their holidays. The authors determined seven types of risk. These were equipment risk, financial risk, physical risk, social risk, satisfaction risk and time risk. (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006). Sönmez and Graefe (1998) determined four types of risk regarding tourism. These risks are financial, psychological, satisfaction and time related risks. Maser and Weiermair (1998) determined risks such as illness, crime, natural disasters, hygiene problems and cultural/language related problems, the inadequacy of the laws and order of the relevant destination. A study by Lepp and Gibson (2003) on American born adults revealed seven types of risk. These are health, political uncertainties, terrorism, foreign food, cultural handicaps, political and religious rules and crime risks. Floyd et al. (2004) carried out a study regarding the affiliation between the travel intentions and perceived risk among New Yorkers after 9/11. The study carried out by the authors revealed that there was a significant affiliation with the intention of the participants to participate in a holiday tour during the next year and the perceived social risk, security concerns, travel experience and income. Dolnicar (2005) determined five types of risk in a study involving tourists travelling domestically and internationally. These risks are political, environmental, health, planning and property related risks. Reisinger and Mavondo (2006) carried out a study to determine whether the nationality of tourists had an impact on perceived risk. The study determined thirteen initial travel risks. These are cultural, equipment/functional, financial, health, physical, political, psychological, satisfaction, social, missing flights and detonating explosives, biological attacks and time related risks. The authors demonstrated a significant affiliation between the nationality of tourists and risk perception. According to the results of the study the risk perception of tourists from the US, Hong Kong and Australia was higher than the risk perception of tourists from the U.K., Canada and Greece.

A study carried out by Fuchs and Reichel (2006) with 760 tourists in Israel demonstrated that the risks perceived by tourists were defined in six dimensions. These risks consisted of human resources, financial risks, service quality, socio-psychological risks, natural disasters and traffic accident related risks, food safety and weather conditions. Schroeder et al (2013) carried out a study with 4000 American citizens to determine the perceived risks in the summer Olympics of 2012 which took place in London. The study revealed that the risk perception of American citizens in London concerned natural disasters, SARS, food safety, financial crises, infrastructural problems, poor weather conditions, political problems and terror incidents. The study also demonstrated that American citizens perceived increasing crime rates and terror activities as the highest risks. Eitzinger and Wiedemann (2007) carried out a study with 103 tourists who had come to participate in winter sports in Tyrol, Austria to determine the risks perceived by the tourists. The results of the study revealed that the risks perceived by the tourists consisted of ski lift accidents, storms, avalanches, traffic accident risks, ski injuries and risk of getting lost on a skiing tour. A study carried out by Karamustafa et al. demonstrated the perceived risks of 551 tourists visiting Turkey in 2009. The perceived risks regarding Turkey as a tourism destination have been defined in six dimensions. These are time and social risk, financial risk, physical risks geopolitical risks, risks involving holiday experiences, weather conditions and risks regarding hotels (Karamustafa et al, 2013). A study by Çetinsöz and Ege (2013) demonstrated the perceived risks of foreign tourists during their holidays while visiting Alanya. According to the authors the perceived risks of the 559 tourists included in the study could be interpreted in 5 dimensions. These risks consisted of physical risks, satisfaction, time risk, socio-psychological risks and functional risks.

## *2.2. Perceived risk and revisit intention*

The importance of repeat visitors in the tourism industry is accompanied with the development of literature regarding repeat visitor phenomenon. A study of the relevant literature shows that the number of articles regarding the views of repeat visitors has increased significantly. The objective of most of the studies was to understand what made tourists revisit a destination (Çetinsöz, 2011). The impact of perceived risks on the purchasing and intention to revisit a destination in the future has been studied by various authors (Sönmez & Gaefe, 1998a; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998b; Qi et al, 2009; George, 2011; Maritz et al., 2013; Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013; Lee & Chi, 2014; Chew & Jahari, 2014).

A study carried out by Sönmez and Gaefe (1998a) concluded that risk perception and income level were effective in the selection of an international holiday destination. Sönmez and Graefe (1998b) carried out a study about the impact of previous travel experiences and risk perceptions of tourists on their future travel behavior. The study showed that previous travel experiences and risk perceptions were effective in determining travel behavior. Qi et al. (2009) reported that a study carried out with 350 American born tourists under the age

of 30, and registered at an American university revealed that violence and socio-psychological risks had a negative impact on the intentions of tourists to revisit China. George (2011) carried out a study regarding the impact that the perception risk of crime had on the intention to revisit by tourists who were in South Africa to attend the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The study revealed that the perceived risk of crime did not have an impact on the intention to revisit.

A study by Maritz et al (2013) with 274 tourists visiting the National Park in Taiwan concluded that the perceived risk was partially effective on the intention of tourists to revisit. A study carried out by Çetinsöz and Ege (2013) in 2010 with 559 tourists visiting Alanya Turkey revealed that perceived physical, satisfaction and time risk were effective in terms of the intention to revisit. On the other hand the authors concluded that socio-psychological and performance risks were not effective in terms of the intention to revisit. Lee and Chi (2014) carried out a study with tourists visiting Taroko National Park in Taiwan. The authors studied whether the perceived risk of falling rocks would have an impact on the tourists' intention to revisit. The study concluded that the risk perception of falling rocks was not directly responsible for having an impact on the intention to revisit although it did have a non-direct impact. Chew and Jahari (2014) carried out a study with Malaysian tourists who had visited Japan before and concluded that only a perceived physical risk would affect their intention to revisit.

The objective of this study within the framework of the above mentioned literature was to determine the impact of perceived risks of foreign tourists visiting Marmaris district of Mugla province on their intention to revisit. Within this context the hypotheses of the study are indicated below:

Hypothesis 1: Perceived physical risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.

Hypothesis 2: Perceived financial risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.

Hypothesis 3: Perceived time risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived socio-psychological risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.

Hypothesis 5: Perceived performance risk affects the revisit intention of tourists

### 3. Methodology

The population for this study which intended to determine the impact of perceived risk on the revisit intentions of tourists consisted of foreign tourists visiting Marmaris district of Mugla province in 2014 between June and August. The convenience sampling method was used to determine the characteristics of the representative population to be used in the study. Accordingly the size of the sample was calculated as ( $N > 10000$ ) for large populations while the formula  $n = \sigma^2 \cdot Z_{\alpha}^2 / d^2$  was recommended for quantitative research (Özdamar, 2003:116-118). In terms of parameters for the formula  $\sigma=1$  was used for standard deviation; the theoretical value  $Z_{0,05}=1,96$  corresponding to a significance level of  $d=0,10$  and  $\alpha=0,05$  as the maximum allowable difference between the population and the sample and the minimum sample size was calculated as 385 with the formula. In this context a survey which was used as a data collection technique was applied on 400 people taking into consideration survey forms which would be incomplete, erroneous and not returned and a total of 387 survey forms were assessed.

The survey which was used as a data collection technique consisted of three sections. The first section involved individual characteristics of the participants (gender, age, marital status, education level, nationality), the second section consisted of 29 items and five basic dimensions in terms of perceived risk scales (socio-psychological risk, time risk, physical risk, financial risk, performance risk). The statements regarding this scale were taken from the study carried out by Fuchs and Reichel (2006). 5 statements in this scale were deleted before the survey forms were filled after obtaining the expert opinions of three academicians. According to Hair et al. (2009:116) factor loads less than 0.40 are evaluated as low factor loads. For this reason the factor loads for 6 statements were deleted from the factor analysis because their factor loads were less than 0.40. Therefore the perceived risk scale for this study consisted of 5 dimensions and 18 statements. The third section of the survey consisted of 3 statements regarding the intention to revisit. The statements regarding this scale were taken from the study carried out by Pike et al. (2010). The statements of the participants regarding both perceived risk as well as the intention to revisit were graded on a participation level of Strongly disagree=1", "Disagree=2", "Neutral=3", "Agree=4" and "Strongly agree=5" in line with a 5 point likert scale.

The average arithmetical values were calculated in order to describe the perceived risks of the participants in the study and their intentions to revisit. Furthermore, in order to determine the affiliation between perceived risk and intention to revisit a Pearson correlation analysis was applied and a multi-variable linear regression analysis was applied to determine the impact of the risk dimensions on the intention to revisit. On the other hand, a factor analysis was applied for the structural validity of the perceived risk scale in the study. In addition, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated in order to test the reliability of the internal consistency of the perceived risk and intention to revisit scales. IBM SPSS 19.0 for Windows software program was used to analyze the obtained data.

#### 4. Study Findings

The distribution of the individual characteristics of the sample group of the study are presented in Table1.

**Table 1: Distribution of the participants according to demographical characteristics**

Variable	Group	Number (f)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	192	49.6
	Female	195	50.4
Age	20 and under	85	21.7
	21-30	105	27.1
	31-40	63	16.3
	41-50	37	9.6
	51-60	57	14.7
	61 and over	41	10.6
Marital status	Married	155	40.1
	Single	232	59.9
Education	Elementary school	11	2.8
	High school	132	34.1
	Associate degree	12	3.1
	Undergraduate	204	52.7
	Postgraduate	28	7.2
Nationality	British	88	22.7
	Dutch	30	7.8
	French	48	12.4
	Belgian	31	8.0
	German	86	22.2
	Russian	84	21.7
	Polish	20	5.2
<b>Total</b>		<b>387</b>	<b>100.0</b>

According to the findings in Table 1 50.4% of the participants were women while 49.6% were men. The majority of the participants were 40 years of age and less (65.1%). An evaluation of the education level of the participants reveals that 52.7% had undergraduate degrees. 22.7% of the tourists participating in the survey were British, 22.2% were German, 21.7% were Russian, 12.4% were French, 8.0% were Belgian, 7.8% were Dutch and 5.2% were Polish.

The arithmetical average values regarding the views of the participants risk perception and the results of the reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha) applied to the risk perception of the tourists are presented in Table 2. As a result of the factor analysis it was observed that the eigenvalue of the perceived risk scale was greater than 1 and had gathered under five factors which explained 61.079 % of the total variance. All of the factor loads related to the articles were over 0.40 in value. On the other hand the result of the Bartlett's test applied for the factor analysis of the scale revealed that factor analysis was applicable ( $p < 0.01$ ) and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value (0.810) showed that the sample volume was of a sufficient level. Furthermore it was determined that all of the Cronbach's Alpha values calculated for the dimensions in the scale were over 0.60. These values indicate that the reliability of the scale is of a sufficient level. A study of the arithmetical averages in Table 2 shows that the average value for the perceived risk dimensions of foreign tourists in Marmaris is less than 3 on a scale of 1-5 points. These values show that the risks perceived by foreign tourists in the sample group in Marmaris was low. The highest perceived risk dimension for the tourists was determined as "financial risk" ( $\bar{X}=2.44$ ) while "socio-psychological risk" ( $\bar{X}=1.69$ ) was included in the lowest risk dimension.

**Table 2: Factor analysis for perceived risk**

Items and factor labels	Factor loadings	Eigenvalues	% of variance	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean (1-5)
<b>Factor 1: Socio-psychological risk</b>		<b>5.172</b>	<b>15.708</b>	<b>0.631</b>	<b>1.69</b>
Holiday in Marmaris doesn't suit my personality.	0.566				
I am worried that my holiday in Marmaris will change my friends' opinions about me.	0.748				
I am worried that my holiday in Marmaris will change my family's opinions about me.	0.660				
<b>Factor 2: Time risk</b>		<b>1.936</b>	<b>15.631</b>	<b>0.755</b>	<b>1.72</b>
In general, I think that my holiday in Marmaris is a waste of time.	0.580				
I think that a holiday is a waste of time.	0.677				
I think that my holiday plan and program in Marmaris is a waste of time.	0.553				
<b>Factor 3: Physical risk</b>		<b>1.501</b>	<b>11.314</b>	<b>0.623</b>	<b>2.08</b>
There are food and beverage safety problems in Marmaris.	0.754				
There are infectious diseases (H1N2 Influenza, HIV etc.) in Marmaris.	0.752				
There is theft and snatching in Marmaris.	0.557				
There are terror actions in Marmaris.	0.790				
There is political unrest in Marmaris.	0.842				
<b>Factor 4: Financial risk</b>		<b>1.250</b>	<b>10.138</b>	<b>0.769</b>	<b>2.44</b>
I do not think I received sufficient service for the amount I paid for the holiday.	0.625				
There are extra expenditures (extra hotel expenditures etc.) during my holiday in Marmaris.	0.669				
The holiday in Marmaris is more expensive than any holiday in my country.	0.785				
The holiday in Marmaris cost too much for my budget.	0.790				
<b>Factor 5: Performance risk</b>		<b>1.136</b>	<b>8.289</b>	<b>0.687</b>	<b>1.91</b>
The hotels in Marmaris aren't satisfactory in terms of service quality.	0.606				
The people in Marmaris aren't friendly.	0.819				
The personnel in hotels in Marmaris aren't kind.	0.748				
<b>Total Annual Variance (61.079)- Total Scale Reliability (0.833)</b>					
<i>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: KMO = 0.810; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: <math>\chi^2 = 2305,9</math>; P = 0.000</i>					

The reliability analysis, mean and standard deviation value results regarding the scale for intention to revisit Marmaris are given in Table 3. According to Table 3 the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient determined for the scale is 0.902. Furthermore the mean arithmetical value for the scale regarding the intention to revisit Marmaris has been calculated as ( $\bar{X}=3.88$ ). This result shows that the intention of the participants to revisit Marmaris is high.

**Table 3: Revisit intention for Marmaris**

Items	n	Mean	Std. Dev.	Cronbach Alpha
<b>Tourist revisit intention</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.902</b>
If I come to Turkey again my first choice will be Marmaris.		3.60	0.98	
I plan to come to Marmaris again in the future.		4.08	0.84	
The probability that I come to Marmaris again for holidays is high.		3.95	1.02	

The results for the Pearson correlation analysis applied to determine the affiliation between the perceived risk and the intention to revisit in the study are displayed in Table 4. According to the findings in Table 4 all the correlation coefficients between the perceived risk dimensions and intention to revisit are negative and significant ( $p < 0.01$ ). In other words it has been determined that as the risk dimension level decreases the intention of the participants to revisit increases. While a negative medium level affiliation was determined between financial risk ( $r = -0.623$ ), performance risk ( $r = -0.560$ ) and time risk ( $r = -0.543$ ) and the intention to revisit of the participants a negative weak affiliation was determined between socio-psychological risk ( $r = -0.441$ ) and physical risk ( $r = -0.353$ ).

**Table 4: Correlation Analysis**

Factor elements	Revisit intention	Socio-psychological risk	Time risk	Physical risk	Financial risk	Performance risk
Revisit intention	1	-0.441**	-0.543**	-0.353**	-0.623**	-0.560**
Socio-psychological risk		1	0.502**	0.117*	0.372**	0.405**
Time risk			1	0.215**	0.370**	0.535**
Physical risk				1	0.318**	0.239**
Financial risk					1	0.550**
Performance risk						1

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$

The multivariate linear regression analysis results applied in terms of the impact of the perceived risk sub-dimensions used as an independent variable in the study on the intention to revisit are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: Effect of risk perceptions on revisit intention**

	Standard $\beta$	Std. Error	t	p	ANOVA
Constant	6.906	0.169	40.894	0.000*	
Socio-psychological risk	-0.182	0.073	-2.501	0.013*	F=89.542
Time risk	-0.364	0.067	-5.462	0.000*	P=0.000*
Physical risk	-0.249	0.068	-3.655	0.000*	
Financial risk	-0.467	0.055	-8.423	0.000*	
Performance risk	-0.224	0.067	-3.324	0.001*	

\*  $p < 0.05$   $R^2 = 0.540$

The findings in Table 5 show that the multivariate linear regression model between the variable is significant ( $F = 89.542$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). In addition, it is observed that the coefficients of the sub-dimensions regarding the perceived risk have a significant impact on the regression model ( $p < 0.05$ ). The calculated  $R^2 = 0.540$  value reveals that 54.0% of the dimensions (socio-psychological risk, time risk, physical risk, financial risk and performance risk) related to the perceived risk of the model are explained. A study of the t values regarding the coefficients with an impact on the model reveals that the major risk factors effecting the intention of tourists to revisit were 'financial risk', 'time risk', 'physical risk', 'performance risk' and 'socio-psychological risk' respectively.

According to the results obtained from the correlation and regression analysis it was determined that in line with the basic hypothesis of the study the intention of tourists coming to Marmaris district to revisit is effected by the financial, time, physical, performance and socio-psychological risk dimensions perceived by the tourists during their stay (significance level of 0.05).

## 5. Conclusions and Discussion

The objective of this study was to determine the impact of risks perceived by tourists on their intention to revisit and as a result of the factor analysis it was determined that the risks perceived by tourists have five dimensions. These risks are socio-psychological risks, time risk, financial risks and performance risks. The results of the study concluded that the risks perceived by the tourists in Marmaris are minimal. Nevertheless it was determined that the highest perceived by tourists was the financial risk dimension while the socio-psychological risk dimension was the lowest. Although the risks regarding Marmaris are low the fact that the dimensions of financial risk are higher than the other risks means that tourists are subjected to a financial risk during their holiday. Fuchs and Reichel (2006) carried out a study in Israel with 760 tourists and determined that human resources risks, financial risks, service quality risks, socio-psychological risks, natural disaster and traffic accident risk, food safety and weather conditions were perceived as risks by the tourists. Schroeder et al (2013) carried out a study with 4000 US citizens to determine the perceived risks during the summer Olympics of 2012 in London. According to the results of the study the risks perceived by American citizens in London were natural disasters, SARS virus, food safety, financial crises, infrastructural problems, poor weather conditions, political problems and acts of terror. Eitzinger and Wiedemann (2007) carried out a study with 103 tourists who had come to Tyrol in Austria to participate in winter sports and the risks perceived by the tourists were ski lift accident risks, storm risks, avalanche risk, traffic accident risks, the risk of skiing injuries and getting lost on a skiing tour. A study carried out by Çetinsöz and Ege (2013) determined that foreign tourists holidaying in Alanya perceived relevant risks as physical risks, satisfaction risks, time risk, socio-psychological risk and functional risks.

The study revealed that the intention of tourists visiting Marmaris to revisit was affected by the socio-psychological risk, time risks, physical risks, financial risks and performance risk dimensions they perceived during their stay. It was also determined that the most significant risk factor with an impact on the intention of the tourists to revisit was financial risk while the least impressive factor was socio-psychological risks. In literature there are studies by different researchers on the impact of perceived risk on the intention of tourists to revisit (Qi et al, 2009; George, 2011; Maritz et al, 2013; Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013; Lee & Chi, 2014; Chew & Jahari, 2014).

Qi et al. (2009) carried out study on 350 American borne tourists in China under the age of 30 and registered at universities in the US and determined that violence and socio-psychological risks had a negative impact on intention of the tourists to revisit China. George (2011) carried out a study with the tourists attending the 2010 FIFA World Cup Games in South Africa to determine the impact of crime risk on the intentions of the tourists to revisit. The study revealed that the perceived crime risk did not affect the intention to revisit. A study carried out by Maritz et al. (2013) determined that perceived risk was partially effective in the intention of 274 tourists who had been visiting the National Park in Taiwan to revisit. A study carried out by Çetinsöz and Ege (2013) with 559 tourists visiting Alanya Turkey in 2010 determined that perceived physical, satisfaction and time risks had an impact on the intention of revisiting. On the other hand the researchers concluded that socio-psychological and performance risks did not have an impact on the intention of the tourists to revisit. A study by Lee and Chi (2014) with tourists visiting the Taroko National Park in Taiwan revealed that the risk perception of falling rocks did not have a direct impact on the intention of the visitors to revisit although it did have an indirect impact. Chew and Jahari (2014) carried out a study on Malaysian tourists who had visited Japan before and determined that only a physical perceived risk would affect their intention to revisit.

In conclusion the fact that the tourists visiting Marmaris perceived minimal risks during their stay at the destination is a positive and significant result for Marmaris. The reason for this is that being low risk and the safety of a destination is one of the main elements for the development of that destination. Furthermore it is a significant result for the managers/marketers of a destination as well as tourism operators that perceived risks by the tourists had a significant impact on the intention to revisit. At this point important tasks fall on both destination managers as well as tourism operators. Managers and tourism operators should take necessary action to maintain the determined risk for Marmaris at the lowest level and ensure that it stays that way.

A study of the relevant literature reveals that in many countries risk perceptions for touristic destinations are disclosed. However, the number of studies disclosing risk perception for touristic destinations in Turkey are few. Studies to be carried out in the future should disclose the risk perceptions of different touristic destinations in Turkey.

## References

- Carlton, J. S., & Jacobson, K. S. (2013). Climate change and coastal environmental risk perceptions in Florida. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 130(30), 32–39.
- Chew, T. Y. E., & Jahari, A. S. (2014). Destination image as a mediator between perceived risks and revisit intention: A case of post-disaster Japan. *Tourism Management*, 40, 382-393
- Cunningham, F. L., Gerlach, H. J., Harper, D. M., & Young, E. C. (2005). Perceived risk and the consumer

- buying process: internet airline reservations. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 16(4), 357-372.
- Çetinsöz, B., & Ege, Z. (2013). Impacts of perceived risks on tourists' revisit intentions. *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 24(2),173–187.
- Çetinsöz, C. B. (2011). *Uluslararası seyahatlerde turistlerin çekim yerinde algıladıkları risklerin tekrar ziyaret etme niyetlerine etkileri: Alanya ilçesine yönelik bir araştırma*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: Aydın
- Dolnicar, S. (2005). Understanding barriers to leisure travel: tourist fears as a marketing basis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(3), 197–208.
- Eitzinger, C., & Wiedemann, P. (2007). Risk perceptions in the alpine tourist destination Tyrol— An exploratory analysis of residents' views. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 911–916.
- Floyd, M. F., Gibson, H., Pennington-Gray, L., & Thapa, B. (2004). The effect of risk perceptions on intentions to travel in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Journal of Tourism and Travel Marketing*, 15(2–3), 19–38.
- Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2006). Tourist destination risk perception: the case of Israel, *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 14 (2), 83-108.
- Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2011). An exploratory inquiry into destination risk perceptions and risk reduction strategies of first time vs. repeat visitors to a highly volatile destination. *Tourism Management*, 32 (2),266–276.
- George, R. (2011). International Tourists' Perceptions of Crime-Risk and their Future Travel Intentions During the 2010 FIFA World Cup™ in South Africa. 7th Annual International Conference on Tourism, 13-16 June, 2011, Athens, Greece.
- Hair, J. F., Black, C. W., Babin, J. B., & Anderson, R. E. (2009). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Karamustafa, K., Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2013). Risk Perceptions of a mixed-image destination: the case of Turkey's first-time versus repeat leisure visitors. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 22(3), 243–268.
- Kozak, M., Crotts, C. J., & Law, R. (2007). The impact of the perception of risk on international travellers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(4),233–242.
- Lacey, S., Bruwer, J., & Li, E. (2009). The role of perceived risk in wine purchase decisions in restaurants. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, 21(2), 99-117.
- Lee, Y-F., & Chi, Y-Y. (2014). Structural equation model of risk perception of rockfall for revisit intention. *International Journal of Social, Management, Economics and Business Engineering*, 8(3), 657-661.
- Lepp, A., & Gibson, H. (2003). Tourist roles, perceived risk and international tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 606–624.
- Lin, Y. L., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). A study on the influence of purchase intentions on repurchase decisions: the moderating effects of reference groups and perceived risks. *Tourism Review*, 64(3), 28-48,
- Maritz, A., Yeh, P. S., & Shieh, J. C. (2013). Effects of personality trait on perceived risk and travel intention in tourism industry. <http://researchbank.swinburne.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/swin:33455/SOURCE1>
- Maser, B., & Weiermair, K. (1998). Travel decision-making: from the vantage point of perceived risk and information preferences. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7, 107–121.
- Özdamar K. (2003). *Modern bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*, Kaan Kitabevi: Eskişehir.
- Pike, S., Bianchi, C., Keer, G., & Patti, C. (2010). Consumer-based brand equity for Australia as a long-haul tourism destination in an emerging market. *International Marketing Review*, 27(4), 434–449.
- Qi, X. C., Gibson, J. H., & Zhang, J. J. (2009). Perceptions of risk and travel intentions: the case of china and the beijing olympic games. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 14(1), 43–67.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2006). Cultural differences in travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 20(1),13–31.
- Roehl, W. S., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1992). Risk perception and pleasure travel: an exploratory analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(4),17–26.
- Schroeder, A., Pennington-Gray, L., Kaplanidou, K., & Zhan, F. (2013). Destination risk perceptions among U.S. residents for London as the host city of the 2012 Summer Olympic Games. *Tourism Management*, 38, 107–119.
- Seabra, C., Dolnicar, S., Abrantes, L. J.,& Kastenholz, E. (2013). Heterogeneity in risk and safety perceptions of international tourists. *Tourism Management*, 36, 502–510.
- Sönmez, F. S., & Graefe, R. A. (1998a). Influence of terrorism risk on foreign tourism decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25 (1), 112–44
- Sönmez, S., & Graefe, A. R. (1998b). Determining Future Travel Behavior from Past Travel Experience and Perceptions of Risk and Safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 172-177.
- Yang, L. C., & Nair, V. (2014). Risk perception study in tourism: Are we really measuring perceived risk?. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 322-327.



The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

## CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

## MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

## IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

