

## Impacts of perceived risks on tourists' revisit intentions

Burçin Cevdet Çetinsöz<sup>a\*</sup> and Zehra Ege<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Tourism, Travel and Entertainment Services, Anamur Vocational Graduate High School, Mersin University, Anamur Meslek Yüksekokulu, Kalinören, Anamur, Mersin 33640, Turkey; <sup>b</sup>Department of Hotel Management, School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Adnan Menderes University, Turizm İşletmeciliği ve Otelcilik Yüksekokulu, Cumhuriyet Mah. Candan Tarhan Bulv. No. 6, Aydın 09400, Turkey

(Received 27 June 2012; final version received 23 October 2012)

The tourism industry is easily influenced by external events such as global political disputes, diplomatic relations, natural disasters, outbreaks of disease, and economic crisis. This vulnerability negatively affects the economies of underdeveloped countries whose main incomes come from tourism. The purposes of this study were to determine the risk level perceived by the tourists visiting Alanya County, Antalya, during their stay and to determine how their revisit intention is being affected. This study examined the views of 559 tourists visiting Alanya during July 2010 to August 2010. Correlation and regression analyses were applied to evaluate perceived risk levels about Alanya and the effect on revisit intention. As a result of the study, several important risk dimensions were determined and it was shown that some of them were affecting their revisit intention.

**Keywords:** international travel; perceived risk; Alanya County; revisit intention

### Introduction

As in other sectors, internal and external developments in the tourism industry directly or indirectly produce both advantages and threats in relation to tourist attractions. Successful tourism authorities follow these developments and take precautions in advance. Gray and Wilson (2009) argue that many international travellers make an economic contribution to the destinations they visit. In addition to economic and commercial factors, social and environmental factors also affect travel behaviours. According to Taylor (1974), in the context of consumer behaviour, the particular choice made out of all the available options becomes an important issue. Since the result of this choice impacts on the future, consumers perceive the future as hazy, which brings a certain level of risk. Those pushed to make choices without knowing the outcome of their selection may experience anxiety. The extent to which tourists overcome this anxiety, and the associated risk, is related to the individual's will.

Recently, it has been highlighted that risk behaviour is an important factor in evaluating international travel, and risk is considered a crucial concern in relation to international travel in general (Kozak, Crofts, & Law, 2007; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Qi, Gibson, & Zhang, 2009; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Sönmez, 1998; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a, 1998b; Yavaş, 1987). Due to perceived risks and hazards, a significant number of visitors were found to be likely to cancel travel plans to a variety of destinations in recent years (Kozak et al., 2007; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998b).

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [cetinsoz@mersin.edu.tr](mailto:cetinsoz@mersin.edu.tr)

Risk is an essential element of perception in terms of consumer behaviour (Odabaşı & Barış, 2007). The theory of risk perception, well studied in psychology for more than four decades, has been adopted and applied to the field of tourism (Korstanje, 2011; Kozak et al., 2007; Reichel, Fuchs, & Uriely, 2007). Although perceived risk has been studied since the 1960s, basic perceived risk elements (financial risk, performance risk, time risk, physical risk, political risk, social risk, and psychological risk) were not identified, measured, or described in terms of dimensions and value until the 1970s.

The perception of safety and security is a major determinant when travellers make their decision about visiting a place (Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009). Pizam (1999) states that each minute a new crime or assault is being committed towards tourists at any one destination. Despite these risks, tourism has been a fast-growing global industry. According to the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2011), the number of people who are contributing to the international tourism movement has reached 935 million, with a 7% increase in 2009. The UNWTO estimates that the number of international tourists will reach 1.6 billion people by 2020. To be able to manage the flourishing demand in the tourism and travel industry appropriately, it is essential to comprehend the possible effects of the risk factors associated with the relevant destinations.

The results of this study will provide additional information about consumer behaviour in tourism. This will aid the tourism industry in making specific marketing decisions. In countries where there is economic dependence on tourism, the results and the written report could make a valuable contribution to their decision-making processes. Specifically, the purposes of this study were to identify the perceived vacation risks by tourists visiting Alanya, which is a popular tourist destination in Turkey, and to determine how this risk is likely to affect their intention to revisit this destination.

### Literature review

The etymological roots of the word “risk” go back to ancient times to the period when Homer’s *Odyssey* was written. Niklas Luhmann stated that the term was a neologism. It is believed that the word was derived from the ancient Greek word “rhiza”, related to the danger of navigating close to the rocks in the sea. The word “risk” was added to the English language in the seventeenth century as a maritime concept. It entered the German language in the eighteenth century as “risiko” (Soydemir, 2011). The Italian word “risco” was also derived from “rhiza”, that is, recalling danger (Erel, 2008). The word first appeared in Turkish as “riziko” but has now evolved into “risk”. It represents the probability of the emergence of an event that may cause loss or damage (Turkish Language Association, 2010).

The basic definition of risk in the Oxford English Dictionary is that of “the chance of injury or loss”. This definition ignores the relative contribution of the two essential risk factors: the magnitude of potential losses and the chance of them occurring (Weber & Milliman, 1997). According to Korstanje (2009), risk should be considered as the cognitive probabilities that could be incurred either partially or totally, or alternatively felt as unexpected negative consequences since fear takes on an emotional nature based on reactions towards a specific object.

Risk in tourism has been defined as a phenomenon that is experienced and perceived by a tourist while purchasing and consuming services at a destination (Tsaur, Tseng, & Wang, 1997). Tarlow (2011) states that there is no standard or predictable risk determined for the tourism industry. Instead, risks associated with tourism have a dynamic nature that changes over time and varies from one location to another. Risks in tourism include acts of

violence, natural disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes, and public health issues such as epidemic outbreaks.

Risk perception in tourism can be differentiated based on an individual tourist's characteristics (Korstanje, 2009; Lepp & Gibson, 2003). Stanley Plog, a pioneer in the study of personality associated with travel, argued that travellers experience fear or attraction depending on their personality. By means of a continuum, Plog classifies travellers along with their motivations into three types: (a) people who have been socialized in a context of security and comprise allo-centric types, seeking adventure and the chance to make contact with others; (b) psycho-centric travellers who only travel the beaten paths, organize their journeys after investigating any security concerns, and often avoid personal contact with hosts and local communities; and (c) mid-centric travellers who are a combination of both typologies and represent the largest segment of travellers (Korstanje, 2009).

Lepp and Gibson (2003) studied Cohen's (1972) four different tourist typologies. These are characterized as the organized mass tourist, the individual mass tourist, the explorer, and the drifter. This study found that all types of tourist groups look for novelties while they travel. Nonetheless, explorer and drifter types have lower risk perception tendencies regarding international travel. It was found that there are other differences among the organized mass tourists, the independent mass tourists, the drifter, and the explorer types of tourists as well. Despite the great historic importance of perceived risk as an academic subject, risk has gained additional importance in the travel and tourism literature in recent years (Fuchs & Reichel, 2004). The literature suggests that perceived risk influences the evaluation of destination alternatives and information acquisition (Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a).

### **Research on perceived risk in tourism**

Risk is rather comprehensive in the travel literature and has penetrated into related research fields; for instance, risk perceptions at destinations (Carter, 1998; Fuchs & Reichel, 2006; Kozak et al., 2007; Simpson & Siguaw, 2008), risk perception in tourist characteristics and typology (Dolnicar, 2005; Gray & Wilson, 2009; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Reichel et al., 2007; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992), risk perception and security (Fischhoff, Bruin, Perrin, & Downs, 2004; Floyd, Gibson, Gray, & Thapa, 2003; Gut & Jarrell, 2007; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009; Tarlow, 2011), demographic and cultural differences in risk perception (Fuchs & Reichel, 2004; Mitchell & Vassos, 1998; Özer & Gülpınar, 2005; Simpson & Siguaw, 2008), efforts to decrease the perceived risk (Fuchs & Reichel, 2004; Mitchell & Vassos, 1998; Quintal, Lee, & Soutar, 2009; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a), the effect of past experiences on risk perception (Kozak et al., 2007; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Qi et al., 2009; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a, 1998b), and the effect of risk on purchasing and repurchase intention (An, Lee, & Noh, 2010; Korstanje, 2009; Law, 2006; Qi et al., 2009; Rittichainuwat, Qu, & Leong, 2003; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a, 1998b).

The perceptions of safety and security are determinant factors during the decision-making process of tourists about their destinations (Gut & Jarrell, 2007; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009). While it is widely known why people prefer certain destinations, it is not always clear why people avoid visiting some geographic locations. Nonetheless, the impact of perceived negative factors is generally understood relative to travel and tourism choices (Gray & Wilson, 2009). This understanding has been reinforced in recent years with the reaction to the perceived risks associated with political unrest, health threats, crime, violence, war, natural disasters, and terror as important risk factors for a destination (Kozak et al., 2007; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Qi et al., 2009; Tarlow, 2011). Gut and Jarrell

(2007) confirm the existence of a significant negative effect on national and international tourism due to terrorism and political unrest (For example, the September 11 terrorist attack in the USA, the 2003 SARS outbreak in Hong Kong, the 2003 bombings in Istanbul, the 2004 earthquake and tsunami in South Asia, HIV and other health issues in Africa, and food safety and poor drinking water quality in Africa and Asia were well-known security-related incidents that had a negative impact on tourism.) (Bahar & Kozak, 2012; Gray & Wilson, 2009; Gut & Jarrell, 2007; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Tarlow, 2011). Following the September 11 terrorist attacks, security became increasingly prominent. Thus, studies on perceived risk in tourism have become more numerous since this incident (Fischhoff et al., 2004; Floyd et al., 2003; Uriely, Maoz, & Reichel, 2007).

In particular, as a result of many studies on terror, it was found that after the September 11 attacks, American tourists have had a higher risk perception tendency compared with tourists from other countries (Dolnicar, 2005; Korstanje, 2009; Reichel et al., 2007; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005). Risk in tourism has been investigated in many fields (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Roehl & Fessenmaier, 1992; Yavaş, 1987), including tourism-related consumer behaviours (Dolnicar, 2005). As risk is viewed as an important concern of international travellers, it is not surprising that security, accepted as a basic need, has resulted in the cancellation of travel plans because of security concerns in recent years (Kozak et al., 2007).

The literature on risk in tourism is fairly extensive and may be divided into several research streams (Simpson & Siguaw, 2008). In the travel and tourism literature, some research channels have focused on risk perceptions at specific travel destinations (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006); at specific tourism events, such as the Olympic Games (Qi et al., 2009); and after acts that violate personal security, such as terrorism or war (Floyd et al., 2003; Simpson & Siguaw, 2008). Researchers have also studied the impact of crime and personal security on travel, travel intentions, and travel satisfaction (Dolnicar, 2005; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a).

Research on risk perception in tourism has been pioneered by Roehl and Fesenmaier (1992). They studied the relationship between vacation travel and perceived risk and identified seven types of perceived risk dimensions (performance risk, financial risk, physical risk, psychological risk, satisfaction risk, social risk, and time risk). Using factor analysis, they defined the perceived risk in three dimensions (physical equipment risk, vacation risk, and destination risk) for pleasure travel.

Later, Mäser and Weiermair (1998) examined travel risks associated with diseases, crime, natural disasters, problems with hygiene, transportation, culture/language barriers, and uncertainty related to destination-specific laws and regulations. Sönmez and Graefe (1998a) defined four different risk types: financial, psychological, satisfaction, and time. The risk categories in tourism are consolidated by Reisinger and Mavondo (2005) into 13 travel risk factors. These are cultural, equipment/functional, financial, health, physical, political, psychological, satisfaction, social, hijacking, bombing, biological attack, and time risk. However, Simpson and Siguaw (2008) propose 10 different perceived risk categories. These are health and well-being, criminal harm, transportation performance, travel service performance, travel and destination environment, generalized fears, monetary concerns, property crime, concern for others, and concern about others.

### **Revisit intention**

As the importance of revisits by tourists has grown, the concept has been increasingly publicized. The majority of studies attempt to understand why a destination is visited more

than once (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984; Opperman, 1977). Gitelson and Crompton (1984) studied the socio-economic differences between repeat and non-repeat tourists. According to Opperman (1997), it is the economic benefits of tourism that make the revisit intention significant to both researchers and practitioners. It is argued that repeat tourists are important in providing a stable source of income, more so than the role they play in dissemination of information to potential visitors. Repeat tourists are not sensitive to competitive destinations or pricing strategies. Many authors report that previous behaviour will eventually affect future purchasing trends and intentions.

Petrick, Morais, and Norman (2001) state that the best estimation of future behaviour and intent will directly correlate to the frequency of estimated behavioural intentions. The repeat tourist represents more than half the total of all the tourists to a given destination (Wang, 2004). Repeat tourists are an important concept for maturing destinations, and their continuance is an essential element in an attraction remaining competitive (Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Huang & Hsu, 2009).

Further studies focus on the effects of the repeat tourist's attitude to perceived risk. An et al. (2010) determined the risks of natural disaster, physical risk, political risk, and performance risk. After regression analysis, it was found that the risks associated with natural disasters, politics, and performance affect whether tourists will revisit. Physical risk was not a consideration.

In a study by Sönmez and Graefe (1998b), 10 risk types were determined as follows: equipment, financial, health, physical, political stability, psychological, satisfaction, social, terrorism, and time. They investigated whether these risk types affected future travel plans for different destinations, focusing mainly on political unrest and terrorism. It was found that tourists avoided revisit plans to Asia and South America due to political unrest. The same applied to the Middle East and Africa because of the high risk of terrorism.

Some perceived risk factors do not affect intentions to revisit some destinations. For example, Rittichainuwat (2006) found that tourists returned to a tsunami-hit region because of the personal relationships previously formed with the area. Similar research suggests that as contact with and experience of a destination increase, risk perception levels decrease, leading to a more positive attitude towards international tourism (Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a).

The purposes of this study were to identify the perceived vacation risks by tourists visiting Alanya, a popular tourist destination in Turkey, and to determine how this risk affects their intention to revisit. Based on the study model, a list of five basic hypotheses is proposed:

- H1: Perceived physical risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.
- H2: Perceived satisfaction risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.
- H3: Perceived time risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.
- H4: Perceived socio-psychological risk affects the revisit intention of tourists.
- H5: Perceived performance risk affects the revisit intention of tourists

## **Methodology**

This study was carried out between July and August 2010 using a research method for data collection based on the development of a research instrument composed of the following four sections. The first section of the form consisted of a series of questions designed to measure tourists' purchasing attitudes. Section two measured perceived risks and dangers using a 29-question scale derived from risk-related literature (An et al., 2010; Dolnicar,

2005; Fuchs & Reichel, 2004, 2006; Han, 2005; Lepp & Gibson, 2003; Özer & Gürpınar, 2005; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009; Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992; Simpson & Sigauw, 2008; Sönmez, 1998; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a, 1998b; Tsaour et al., 1997). The third section was designed to measure the tourists' intention to revisit Alanya. Based on the studies of Conner and Sparks (1996), Lam and Hsu (2004), Hui, Wan, and Ho (2007), and Kozak (2001), the data collection instrument contained a 5-point Likert scale (1 – certainly disagree to 5 – certainly agree) and included a means for tourists to describe activities to reduce risk. In the fourth section, the demographic characteristics of the tourists visiting Alanya were measured.

The questionnaire was prepared in four languages (English, German, Russian, and Dutch) based on the available demographic information, indicating that the majority of incoming tourists were from European and English-speaking countries. A pilot study was then performed to assess the validity of the questions using 48 randomly selected tourists on their last day of stay at one of the several hotels in Alanya during the first 2 weeks of June 2010. The data collection phase consisted of distributing 700 questionnaires to the six participating incoming travel agencies; 600 were returned representing a response rate of 85%. The returned questionnaires were then reviewed for completeness and appropriateness, which resulted in the exclusion of 41 forms (i.e. 559 usable questionnaires were collected). The number of questionnaires can be considered sufficient according to the sampling size chart determined by Sekaran (2000).

To ensure higher reliability and validity, the respondents' age was set at 16 and above. A simple random sampling method was employed. The research was carried out in the county of Alanya and several municipalities in the Alanya territory. The questionnaires were administered to the customers of the six incoming travel agencies using a simple random sampling method and were conducted by the employees of the travel agencies during the return transfers of customers. In this research, a stratified sampling method based on probability was not employed. However, the fact that the majority (50%) of incoming tourists comprised those from Germany and Russia (Alanya Municipality, 2010) was taken into consideration.

Parametric hypothesis tests assume that data should be discrete or proportional, that it should comply with normal distribution, and that the group variances must be equal (Kalaycı, 2008). In this study, the basic data were acquired from a discrete scale. It complied with normal distribution as the kurtosis and deformity values of the data were in the range of  $-1$  and  $+1$ . Also, there was group variance equality as the variance factors were equal. Therefore, parametric tests were applied to the data in this study.

## **Results**

The research results were analysed using SPSS, a statistical analysis software package specifically developed for the social sciences. Reliability analysis of perceived risk resulted in a reliability value (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient) of 0.9555. Reliability analysis of the tourists' intention to revisit produced a reliability value (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient) of 0.92.

As a result of the factor analysis, factors were classified based on their original names. In the tourism literature, although the risk factor (physical, performance, satisfaction, political, financial, time, and socio-psychological) that is used by Fuchs and Reichel (2004, 2006), Roehl and Fesenmaier (1992), and Sönmez and Graefe (1998a, 1998b) was determined, it was found that the financial risk variable was under the satisfaction risk dimension since the respondents perceived the financial risk factor together with the

satisfaction risk. Furthermore, even though the respondents perceived the political risk variable rather insignificantly, the political risk dimension was not included because its factor loads are low and it deviates the significance of the factor elements.

In the inferential statistical context, reliability analysis was applied to the gathered data. In the research, as a result of the reliability analysis of the scale of the perceived risk section, the general reliability value of the data (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient) was determined as 0.9284. Since this value occurred above the Alpha value of 0.80 that is recognized for social sciences research, it can be said that the scale used in the research is quite reliable (Nunnally, 1967). The mean of the perceived risk was 2.12.

In the study, factor analyses to explain the validity of the structure were also performed. To obtain a more significant and measurable solution, it was necessary to remove expressions with low weight or the ones that give weight to multiple factors at the same time (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The results of the factor analyses are included in Table 1.

There are 29 items in the scale for the risk perception in a vacation period. Based on the factor analysis, the Bartlett test result was determined as 5679.761 and the  $p$  significance value was determined as 0.000. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) sampling value was 0.914, which indicated that the data were appropriate for the factor analysis (Kalaycı, 2008). The principal components analysis and varimax rotation (vertical rotation) techniques were used to determine the factor structure and to obtain significant interpretable factors. The data with eigenvalue higher than 1 and the data with factor load higher than 0.50 were taken into consideration.

In summary, Factor 1 “*Physical Risk*” comprised 10 items (0.89 alpha,  $p = 0.000$ ) and explained 36.29% of the variance. The eigenvalue was 9.074 and the mean was 1.88. For Factor 2 “*Satisfaction Risk*”, there were seven items (0.81 alpha,  $p = 0.002$ ) explaining 7.88% of the variance, the eigenvalue being 1.972 with a mean of 2.36. There were three items under the heading Factor 3 “*Time Risk*” (0.83 alpha,  $p = 0.000$ ), which explained 6.36% of the variance. The eigenvalue of this factor was 1.591 and the mean was 1.90. Factor 4 “*Socio-Psychological Risk*” was composed of three items (0.83 alpha,  $p = 0.0003$ ) and explained 5.81% of the variance, 1.453 being the eigenvalue and 2.47 the mean. Lastly, two items (0.74 alpha,  $p = 0.000$ ) explained 4.22% of the variance under the section Factor 5 “*Performance Risk*”. The eigenvalue was 1.057 and the mean was 2.28.

As a result of the reliability analysis, the general reliability value of the data relevant to the dependent variable’s scale about the intention to revisit for Alanya (Cronbach Alpha Coefficient) was found to be 0.89. As shown in Table 2, the overall mean was 3.42. This situation shows that the participants have a tendency to visit Alanya again, but their intention is still in question.

Table 3 provides the correlation coefficients between the variables that were examined in this study. Accordingly, it can be observed that there was a negative significant relationship between revisit intention and perceived risk dimensions. That is, as the level of risk dimensions decreases, the revisit intention increases. As shown below, there is a moderate and negative correlation between the revisit intention and the following perceived risks:  $-0.517$  time risk,  $-0.500$  satisfaction risk,  $-0.479$  physical risk, and  $-0.389$  socio-psychological risk. There is, however, a low level ( $-0.153$ ) negative correlation with the performance risk.

In addition, moderate and low levels of correlation were found among risk dimensions. The moderate correlation level of the physical risk dimension with the satisfaction risk is at 0.625, 0.556 with the time risk, and 0.474 with the socio-psychological risk. On the other hand, a low correlation level of 0.251 was associated with the performance risk.

Table 1. Results of factor analysis.

Items and factor labels	Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Cronbach Alpha	Means ( $\mu$ )	F	p
<b>Factor 1: Physical risk</b>		9.074	36.29	0.8902	1.88	7.4011	0.000
Fear of natural disaster	0.770						
Witnessing/experiencing violent riots	0.747						
Affected by traffic accidents	0.703						
Loss of baggage and other belongings	0.689						
Experiencing/encountering pickpocketing and robbery	0.687						
Affected by infectious diseases	0.656						
Negative weather conditions	0.578						
Sexual harassment	0.563						
Affected by cultural conflicts	0.558						
Negative attitudes of local people	0.527						
<b>Factor 2: Satisfaction risk</b>		1.972	7.88	0.8179	2.36	3.4310	0.002
Urban pollution	0.688						
Unsafe nightlife	0.676						
Poor hygiene and environmental conditions	0.650						
More expensive compared with the other places	0.614						
Feeling uncomfortable about food safety	0.601						
Overvalued Turkish Lira	0.593						
Unexpected expenses	0.533						
<b>Factor 3: Time risk</b>		1.591	6.36	0.8352	1.90	8.6752	0.000
Wasting vacation time	0.797						
Wasting general time	0.766						
Feeling disappointment after vacation	0.631						
<b>Factor 4: Socio-psychological risk</b>		1.453	5.81	0.8303	2.47	5.5934	0.003
Worrying about security of the family during the vacation	0.808						
Insufficient urban transportation	0.786						
Unfulfilled expectations during the vacation	0.763			0.7422	2.28	29.9588	0.000
<b>Factor 5: Performance risk</b>		1.057	4.22				
Language problems	0.888						
Experiencing faults in tour organization	0.832						
<i>Total announced variance (60.588)</i>							

Note: Basic components factor analysis with varimax rotation KMO sampling sufficiency = 0.914, Bartlett's test of sphericity:  $p < 0.000$  ( $\chi^2$  5679.761;  $df = 300$ ).

Table 2. Revisit intention for Alanya.

Dependent variable	<i>N</i>	Mean ( $\mu$ )	Std. Dev.	Cronbach Alpha
<i>Tourists' revisit intention</i>	547	3.42	0.99	0.8929
Probability of revisiting Alanya		3.33	1.19	
It is worthwhile to revisit Alanya		3.39	1.12	
I will recommend Alanya to my friends		3.49	1.13	
Alanya is safe to revisit again		3.46	1.11	

Moreover, the satisfaction risk has a moderate positive correlation with the time risk of 0.589 and with the socio-psychological risk of 0.475, and a low correlation with the performance risk of 0.194. Socio-psychological risk has a positive moderate correlation with the time risk of 0.584 and a low level of correlation with the performance risk of 0.206. A low level (0.274) of positive correlation was observed between the time risk and performance risk. It was found that risk dimensions are able to affect each other at low or moderate levels.

The model presented in Table 4 comprised a dependent variable the revisit intention, and five independent variables consisting of physical risk, satisfaction risk, socio-psychological risk, time risk, and performance risk ( $F = 51.540$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ). The perceived risk dimension factor accounts for 35.5% of the change in the revisit intention.

There was a negative relationship between revisit intention and physical risk, satisfaction risk, socio-psychological risk, time risk, and performance risk. In other words, as perceived risk increases in physical, satisfaction, and time risk dimensions, revisit intentions will tend to decrease. In the interpretation process, we can list the variables based on effectiveness as “perceived time risk” ( $\beta = -0.28$ ), “physical risk” ( $\beta = -0.20$ ), and “satisfaction risk” ( $\beta = -0.16$ ). Overall, perceived physical, satisfaction, and time risk dimensions affect the tourists’ revisit intention at a 0.05 significance level. Furthermore, socio-psychological and performance risk dimensions did not affect the tourists’ intention to revisit Alanya (significance level of 0.05). The studies of Crompton (1992) and Kozak et al. (2007) indicate that the majority of the participants change their travel plans due to the perceptions of high risk. Sönmez and Graefe (1998a, 1998b) conclude that previous travel experiences and risk perception will eventually affect future travel behaviours.

### Conclusion and implications

In this study, the perceived risks of tourists visiting Alanya County were determined and revisit intentions were measured. Perceived risk dimensions of participants were determined by factor analysis. Factor analysis was also used to examine physical risk, satisfaction risk, socio-psychological risk, time risk, and performance risk dimensions.

Although physical, performance, satisfaction, political, financial, time, and socio-psychological risk factors have been extensively studied by Fuchs and Reichel (2004, 2006), Roehl and Fesenmaier (1992), and Sönmez and Graefe (1998a, 1998b), financial risk was included in the satisfaction risk dimension since participants more closely associated financial risk with satisfaction risk. Moreover, although participants typically perceived the political risk variable to be rather low, the political risk dimension was not included in this study because their factor loads are low and they distort the significance of the factor dimensions. In his study, Cunningham (1967) assessed the risk groups as

Table 3. Multiple correlation analysis.

Factor elements	X	S.S.	Revisit intention	Physical risk	Satisfaction risk	Socio-psychological risk	Time risk	Performance risk
Revisit intention	3.42	0.99	1	-0.479(**)	-0.500(**)	-0.389(**)	-0.517(**)	-0.153(**)
Physical risk	1.88	0.71		1	0.625(**)	0.474(**)	0.556(**)	0.251(**)
Satisfaction risk	2.36	0.77			1	0.475(**)	0.589(**)	0.194(**)
Socio-psychological risk	2.47	1.10				1	0.584(**)	0.206(**)
Time risk	1.90	0.90					1	0.274(**)
Performance risk	2.28	1.00						1

Note: \*\*The correlation = 0.01 significance level.

Table 4. Effects of perceived risk on revisit intention.

	Standard $\beta$	$R^2$	Adjusted $R^2$	$F$ -test	$p$ -Value	$t$ -test	$p$ -Value
Revisit intention		0.355	0.348	51.540	0.000		
Physical risk	-0.20					-4.138	<b>0.000</b>
Satisfaction risk	-0.16					-3.116	<b>0.002</b>
Socio-psychological risk	-0.08					-1.759	0.079
Time risk	-0.28					-5.538	<b>0.000</b>
Performance risk	0.42					1.077	0.282

performance and socio-psychological risks since most of the risk dimensions have been perceived together. Furthermore, a dependent variable was composed to measure the participants' revisit intention.

Physical, satisfaction, and time risk dimensions affected the revisit intention of tourists. Moreover, it was found that the socio-psychological risk and performance risk dimensions did not affect tourists' intention to revisit Alanya. This implies that physical, satisfaction, and time risk dimensions must be given special consideration by host tourism planners and developers because of their effects on revisit intention.

In their study of the effects of risk factors related to repurchasing, An et al. (2010) found that perceived risk factors affect participants' repurchasing intention. Similarly, Sönmez and Graefe (1998a) stated that perceived risks associated with tourist destinations may affect purchasing decisions (e.g. cancellations or reservations). Crompton (1992), Rittichainuwat et al. (2003), and Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty (2009) specified that purchasing or repurchasing may not be desired for destinations with high-risk perceptions. Gudykunst and Hammer (1988) proposed anxiety/risk reduction management theory that when a sojourner's anxiety and risk level are high (and confidence is low), he or she is likely to perceive an environment as less safe and to withdraw from it (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005). Moreover, Sönmez and Graefe (1998a, 1998b) stated that relative to destinations, the higher the risk, the less likely the destination to be visited by individuals. Floyd et al. (2003) found basic risk dimensions to be important estimators of revisit intentions.

The study results support previous studies noting a correlation between perceived risks and intention to revisit (An et al., 2010; Crompton, 1992; Floyd et al., 2003; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005; Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2009; Rittichainuwat et al., 2003; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998a, 1998b). As such, tourism authorities should focus on identifying ways to mitigate perceived risks to promote revisit intentions. Finally, tourism planners need to identify the risks causing stress among tourists (Lepp & Gibson, 2003). The more domestic and foreign investors making substantial investments in popular tourism destinations, the more tourists revisit these destinations. Thus, these regions can attract masses of visitors in the future, both individuals and organized package tours, and consequently the regional economy can pick up. Furthermore, a popular destination is required to take effective precautions to defend itself against or mitigate the risks which may occur in the future. Past events such as terrorist attacks (America's September 11 attack, the attack on India's Mumbai Financial District, etc.), natural disasters (tsunamis, earthquakes, etc.), political unrest (China's Tiananmen Square, Greece's austerity riots, etc.) may seriously threaten tourist destinations. Therefore, the consequences can be disastrous for those attractions that rely solely on tourism in an economic context. Since

tourism is a sector that is structurally sensitive to negative external incidents, tourism planners are required to take precautions against unexpected events in terms of national and regional marketing dimensions.

Similarly, businesses must also consider corporate dimensions. According to Law (2006), although risks may be defined in different ways, risks are referred to as the shocks, threats, and disasters that can negatively impact on the tourism industry. Sönmez and Graefe (1998a) state that it may benefit travel professionals to better understand these influences to plan and implement marketing activities to set against them.

The possible risk factors affecting tourist destinations should be well defined so that marketers and suppliers can assure potential tourists that their concerns are understood and have been addressed. By doing so, they minimize risks related to barriers to visiting destinations by reducing the level of perceived risk factors (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005).

When the risk perception literature in tourism is reviewed, perceived risk studies usually fall into one of two distinct categories. The first category is pre-purchase, where the perceived risks associated with attractions are considered by customers before making the purchase (Qi et al., 2009). The second category considers the effects of the tourists' past experiences on the repurchasing intention (Fuchs & Reichel, 2006; Mitchell & Vassos, 1998; Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005). This study is unique in that it examines the risk perceived by tourists on a repeat visit to the destination of Alanya, thus combining elements of pre-purchase perceived risk with past experiences and repurchase intention. This type of study of perceived risk associated with destinations was applied for the first time to a destination in Turkey. For subsequent studies, it is recommended that tourists' perceived risk during the purchasing process be investigated to determine how Turkey is viewed before the vacation visit (i.e. examine the perceived risks associated with both the pre- and post-visit destination image).

Although the literature contains a substantial number of sources examining the relationship between perceived risk and behavioural decisions, studies addressing the perceived risk in countries such as Turkey and in specific tourist destinations are either non-existent or quite rare. Because of the lack of research on destinations in Turkey such as those located on the Mediterranean and Aegean shores, apart from Alanya, an opportunity exists to add to the body of knowledge in this area. For instance, Akkuyu Nuclear Power Plant, planned to be built in Mersin City, provides an important opportunity to examine the effect of controversial technology on the perceived risk of domestic and foreign tourists.

To date, perceived risk in tourism has been studied primarily as it pertains to risk-averse tourists. However, those tourists who consider themselves to be risk seekers should also be taken into account in future studies, and corresponding "high-risk" tourism destinations identified and evaluated for potential impact on future, yet to be understood tourism trends.

Tourists may perceive several risks before purchasing a tourism product/service or during consumption of this product/service. At this point, tourism marketing specialists must determine the risks that can be perceived by tourists through scientific studies, and they are required to take appropriate precautions to restrain transmission of these risks to tourists. In particular, places of tourist attraction where security issues have become increasingly important can easily be affected by this situation.

In industries such as tourism, where products rely on service provision, there are several shortcomings and differences in marketing compared with other industries. These are due to the abstract characteristics of the product, the lack of durability, standardization issues, and the not to be abandoned characteristic. While studies on risk in marketing

traditionally focused on industrial products, today, there is an increase in the number of studies relating to the service industry.

Study results will contribute to the smoothing and accelerating of this process by minimizing the uncertainty that is experienced by tourists during their purchasing and will contribute to the appropriate promotion policies to the tourists' risk concerns, especially relating to the county of Alanya. According to the concern/uncertainty theory of Gudykunst and Hammer (1988), when people feel uncertainty, they make their decisions under the influence of concern and they experience difficulty in adapting themselves to a new environment. When the uncertainty is kept under control, people adapt themselves more easily (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005). To attract international travellers to a certain destination, possible risk factors that may arise could be better defined. Thus, marketers and suppliers could encourage tourists to come to places of tourist attraction by reducing the levels of perceivable risk factors (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2005).

## References

- Alanya Municipality (2010). Alanya with numbers. Retrieved July 15, 2010 from <http://www.alanya.bel.tr>
- Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2006). Repeat visitation in mature sun and sand holiday destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(3), 288–297.
- An, M., Lee, C., & Noh, Y. (2010). Risk factors at the destination: Their impact on air travel satisfaction and repurchase intention. *Service Business*, 4(2), 155–166.
- Bahar, O., & Kozak, M. (2012). *Tourism and competitiveness*. Ankara: Detay.
- Carter, S. (1998). Tourists and traveler's social construction of Africa and Asia as risky locations. *Tourism Management*, 19(1), 349–358.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a Sociology of International Tourism. *Sociological Research*, 39, 164–182.
- Conner, M., & Sparks, P. (1996). The theory of planned behavior and health behaviors. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting health behavior* (pp. 170–222). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Crompton, J. L. (1992). Structure of vacation destination choice sets. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(3), 420–434.
- Cunningham, S. M. (1967). The major dimensions of perceived risk. In D. F. Cox (Ed.), *Risk taking and information handling in consumer behavior* (pp. 82–108). Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dolnicar, S. (2005). Understanding barriers to leisure travel: Tourist fears as a marketing basis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(3), 197–208.
- Erel, C. (2008). Perceived risk on internet shopping: An empirical investigation (Unpublished master thesis). Hacettepe University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Fischhoff, B., Bruin, W. B., Perrin, W., & Downs, J. (2004). Travel risks in a time of terror: Judgments and choices. *Society for Risk Analysis*, 24(5), 1301–1309.
- Floyd, M. F., Gibson, H., Gray, L. P., & Thapa, B. (2003). The effect of risk perceptions on intentions to travel in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Safety and Security in Tourism: Relationships, Management and Marketing*, 15, 19–38.
- Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2004). Cultural differences in tourist destination risk perception: An exploratory study. *Tourism*, 52(1), 21–37.
- Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2006). Tourist destination risk perception: The case of Israel. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 14(2), 83–108.
- Gitelson, R. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1984). Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 199–217.
- Gray, M. J., & Wilson, M. A. (2009). The relative risk perception of travel hazards. *Environment and Behavior*, 41(2), 185–204.
- Gudykunst, W., & Hammer, M. (1988). Strangers and Hosts: An Uncertainty Reduction Base Theory of Intercultural Adaptation. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Adaptation: Current Approaches*, (pp.106–139). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Gut, P., & Jarrell, S. (2007). Silver lining on a dark cloud: The impact of 9/11 on a regional tourist destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 147–153.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- Han, J. Y. (2005). The relationships of perceived risk to personal factors, knowledge of destination and travel purchase decisions in international leisure travel (Unpublished PhD thesis). Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia.
- Huang, S., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2009). Effects of travel motivation, past experience, perceived constraint and attitude on revisit intention. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 29–44.
- Hui, T. K., Wan, D., & Ho, A. (2007). Tourists' satisfaction, recommendation and revisiting Singapore. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 965–975.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2008). *Multi-variable statistical techniques with SPSS applications* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Asil Publication.
- Korstanje, M. E. (2009). Re-visiting risk perception theory in the context of travel. *e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR)*, 7(4), 68–81.
- Korstanje, M. E. (2011). The fear of traveling: A new perspective for tourism and hospitality. *Anatolia*, 22(2), 222–233.
- Kozak, M. (2001). Repeaters' behavior at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 785–808.
- Kozak, M., Crofts, J. C., & Law, R. (2007). The impact of the perception of risk on international travelers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(1), 233–242.
- Lam, T., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2004). Theory of planned behavior: Potential travelers from China. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 28(4), 463–482.
- Law, R. (2006). The perceived impact of risks on travel decisions. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 8(4), 289–300.
- Lepp, A., & Gibson, H. (2003). Tourist roles, perceived risk and international tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 606–624.
- Mäser, B., & Weiermair, K. (1998). Travel decision-making from the vantage point of perceived risk and information preferences. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(4), 107–121.
- Mitchell, V. W., & Vassos, V. (1998). Perceived risk and risk reduction in holiday purchases: A cross-cultural and gender analysis. *Journal of Euromarketing*, 6(3), 47–79.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (1st ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Odabaşı, Y., & Barış, G. (2007). *Consumer behavior* (7th ed.). Istanbul: MediaCat.
- Opperman, M. (1997). First-time and repeat visitors to New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 18(3), 177–181.
- Özer, L., & Gülpınar, S. (2005). Risks perceived by the consumers in the service sector: An investigation on airlines industry. *Journal of Commercial and Tourism Education Faculty*, 12(1), 49–65.
- Petrick, J. F., Morais, D. D., & Norman, W. C. (2001). An examination of the determinants of entertainment vacationers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 41–48.
- Pizam, A. (1999). A comprehensive approach to classifying acts of crime and violence at tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(1), 5–12.
- Qi, C. X., Gibson, H. J., & Zhang, J. J. (2009). Perceptions of risk and travel intentions: The case of China and the Beijing Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 14(1), 43–67.
- Quintal, V. A., Lee, J., & Soutar, G. N. (2009). Tourists' information search: The differential impact of risk and uncertainty avoidance. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(4), 321–333.
- Reichel, A., Fuchs, G., & Uriely, N. (2007). Perceived risk and the non-institutionalized tourist role: The case of Israeli student ex-backpackers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 217–226.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel anxiety and intentions to travel internationally: Implications of travel risk perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(1), 212–225.
- Rittichainuwat, B. N. (2006). Tsunami recovery: A case study of Thailand's tourism. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 390–404.
- Rittichainuwat, B. N., & Chakraborty, G. (2009). Perceived travel risks regarding terrorism and disease: The case of Thailand. *Tourism Management*, 30(3), 410–418.
- Rittichainuwat, B. N., Qu, H., & Leong, J. K. (2003). The collective impacts of a bundle of travel determinants on repeat visitation. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 27(2), 217–236.

- Roehl, W. S., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1992). Risk perceptions and pleasure travel: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(4), 17–26.
- Sekaran, U. (2000). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Simpson, P. M., & Siguaw, J. A. (2008). Perceived travel risks: The traveler perspective and manageability. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 315–327.
- Sönmez, S. F. (1998). Tourism, terrorism, and political instability. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(2), 416–456.
- Sönmez, S. F., & Graefe, A. R. (1998a). Influence of terrorism risk on foreign tourism decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 112–144.
- Sönmez, S. F., & Graefe, A. R. (1998b). Determining future travel behavior from past travel experience and perceptions of risk and safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 171–177.
- Soydemir, S. (2011). The dark side of modernism: Risk society. *Journal of Social and Human Sciences*, 3(2), 169–178.
- Tarlow, P. E. (2011). Tourism risk management in an age of terrorism. *Economía Autónoma*, IV(7), 18–30.
- Taylor, J. W. (1974). The role of risk in consumer behavior. *The Journal of Marketing*, 38(2), 54–60.
- Turkish Language Association (2010). Up-to-date Turkish dictionary. Turkish Language Institution. Retrieved May 20, 2010, from <http://tdkterim.gov.tr>
- Tsaur, S. H., Tseng, G. H., & Wang, K. C. (1997). Evaluating tourist risks from fuzzy perspectives. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 796–812.
- UNWTO (2011). Quick overview of key trends. UNWTO Trends World Tourism Barometer, Advance Release, January 2011.
- Uriely, N., Maoz, D., & Reichel, A. (2007). Rationalising terror-related risks: The case of Israel tourists in Sinai. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(1), 1–8.
- Wang, D. (2004). Tourist behavior and repeat visitation to Hong Kong. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(1), 99–118.
- Weber, E. U., & Milliman, R. A. (1997). Perceived risk attitudes: Relating risk perception to risky choice. *Management Science*, 43(2), 123–144.
- Yavaş, U. (1987). Foreign travel behavior in a growing vacation market: Implications for tourism marketers. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(5), 57–69.

Copyright of *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Research* is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.