

Social Tourism in the World and Turkey

Murat Duymaz

Graduate Student, Selçuk University, Turkey

Gamze Temizel

Associate Professor, Selçuk University, Turkey

Abstract: In European countries, social tourism is a well-known tourism strategy implemented to provide a better life by involving disadvantaged groups in social activities. Tourism, which is a need of developed societies, continues its development by spreading to social strata that are large and have limited economic power. This phenomenon has been identified as “Social Tourism”, which is a type of institutionalized private tourism that gained importance rapidly after the Second World War. Social tourism; It covers the participation of the masses with relatively insufficient economic power in tourism with some special precautions and aids and all the relations created by this. Social tourism has an important place in today's tourism policies. Among the special purposes of social tourism are the transportation of tourism to large masses and the benefit of these masses from all kinds of opportunities such as vacation, rest and entertainment. Social tourism environment in Turkey has positive and negative features. In terms of natural opportunities, there are wide opportunities for social tourism as well as for traditional tourism.

Keywords: Social tourism, Tourism in the World, Tourism in Turkey

Introduction

Tourism is changing its shape from high-income masses to large social masses with limited economic power day by day. As a result of the rapid change in the structure of tourism after the First World War, possibilities of traveling, seeing, having fun and resting, unlike the past centuries, were not specific to specific strata and became the property of common strata with limited income and economic power. These possibilities have been realized by the special measures taken by the state or have been presented in different ways by the organizations where people work. Organizations that determine the positive effects of rest and vacation on the physical and morale of working people have seen that productivity has increased compared to the past with the vacation and rest opportunities they provide.

In European countries, social tourism is a well-known tourism strategy implemented to provide a better life by involving disadvantaged groups in social activities. These disadvantaged groups include the disabled, low-income families, young people, the elderly, workers or people with chronic diseases (McCabe, 2015:12). There are various practices and organizations although there is not a large academic literature on social tourism. The current literature consists of applied practices and the needs of disadvantaged groups.

Social tourism literature in Turkey is at an early stage. There are only a few studies on the management of social tourism or the meaning of social tourism (Saribaş and Akbaba, 2018:196-197). Social tourism practices in Turkey are also limited, compared to the diversity of social tourism practices in Europe. For this reason, social tourism cases studied academically in Turkey can make a significant contribution to the literature. As a matter of fact, there is a social tourism project called “Alternative Camp” carried out by the Alternative Life Association in Turkey. The camp is Turkey's first free-of-charge camp for people with disabilities and provides holiday opportunities for disadvantaged groups. Although the camp model is similar to the European social tourism models (Hall and Brown, 2012:37), the camp has never been the subject of academic research as a social tourism application. The camp is a social entrepreneurship project that cooperates with international organizations and is carried out entirely by volunteers. For this reason, the research aims to examine the potential of social tourism to create an inclusive tourism form, a non-governmental social tourism organization and management model.

Social Tourism Concept

The Roots of Social Tourism

The roots of the concept of social tourism go back to the modernization of tourism in the early twentieth century. In the literature, the term social tourism was first used in 1844 for Thomas Cook's group tours.

However, in reality, the concept of social tourism, as it is understood today, started to evolve as a labor movement (Haulot, 1983:588). In the context of tourism activities, labor movement means having the right to paid vacation. Workers' right to 'paid rest' was proposed on the agenda of the International Labor Office (ILO) Executive Board in Geneva, and the ILO proclaimed the 'Annual Paid Holidays Convention'. With this contract, 'resting the body' has become a social problem because it includes workers' rights. This situation has led to a rapid development in all kinds of tourism, including the opening of social tourism facilities in Europe (International Labor Organization, 1936). Initially, social tourism was perceived as more beneficial as it provided the workers with the opportunity to rest as a human right. However, when the other benefits of social tourism began to be recognized by government agencies, social tourism opportunities began to develop. To illustrate, Ouvry-Vial states that after understanding the importance of holidays on mental and physical development in France, there are some practices such as bringing animation shows to social tourism facilities and increasing the benefits of social tourism (as cited in Richards, 1996: 157).

Not only the labor movement but also other environmental factors have triggered the increasing interest in social tourism practices. During the First World War, tourism was domestic and the main theme was usually going to the countryside or beaches and spending the hours relaxing after work (Richards, 1996, p. 7). After the First World War, countries began to pay attention to the welfare of communities (especially Scandinavian and Southern European countries), which became a key factor in the further development of social tourism (Leibfried, 1988:125-133). Immediately after the Second World War, the demand for mass tourism increased rapidly and new foundations (for example, non-governmental organizations, unions, associations and youth groups) paved the way for international or national networks and increased attention was paid to the need for social services (Belanger and Jolin, 2011: 476). As a matter of fact, after the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, various countries started to prepare social tourism policies based on Article 24 stating that "Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic paid holidays" (United Nations, 1948). To sum, the 1950s were important years in terms of social tourism in countries such as Germany, Belgium, France and Spain, where social structures such as health institutions and unions developed (Diekmann and McCabe, 2013:21).

First Definition of Social Tourism and Foundation of ISTO

Three years after the declaration of Human Rights, Hunzicker made the first definition of social tourism: "Relations and phenomena in the field of tourism resulting from the participation of economically weak or disadvantaged elements in the society" (Hunzicker, 1951:1). In 1957, Hunzicker added comments to specify the terms of the definition and argued that social tourism is "a special type of tourism characterized by the participation of low-income people, providing them with special services" (Minnaert, Maitland and Miller, 2011:404).

Following this, the first congress on social tourism was held in Bern in 1956. Then two more congresses were held in Vienna (1959) and Milan (1962). With a joint decision from these congresses, the agencies participating in the Milan Congress met in Brussels in 1962 and agreed to establish the International Social Tourism Bureau (now ISTO; International Social Tourism Organization; formerly BITS). The purpose of ISTO was to create an international association for discussions, research, conferences and to generate support for those who are already involved or will be involved in social tourism activities (Haulot, 1983:559). A few years later, ISTO gained strong partnerships with UNESCO, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), the International Labor Organization, the International Cooperation Alliance, and the International Committee for the Preservation of Historic Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) (Haulot, 1981:210). Although ISTO's initial definition for social tourism is relatively general, according to Belanger and Jolin (2011), it is "Impacts and phenomena resulting from participation in tourism, and more specifically, the participation of low-income groups" (BITS, 2003). Moreover, ISTO has had a vital impact on the concept of social tourism (ISTO, 2016:477). The first reason is that the organization influenced the WTO while preparing the Manila Declaration on the principles of social tourism. The second reason is that ISTO influences third world countries and defines the provisions and objectives of social tourism internationally (Minnaert, Diekmann and McCabe, 2012:23). For example, in 1972 ISTO introduced social tourism as a fundamental social phenomenon of our age after the General Assembly in Vienna (cited in Belanger and Jolin, 2011:477). This promotion has encouraged governments around the world to include social tourism in their tourism plans and policies. According to Belanger and Jolin (2011:477), ISTO has defined social tourism and paved the way for the development of today's social tourism. In fact, before the ISTO was established, many countries defined and used social tourism according to their own political ideologies (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006:1200). For example, according to Allcock and Przeclawski, the main purpose of social tourism in Eastern Europe, where revolutionary socialist ideologies were on the rise, was to increase productivity by giving workers rights such as paid travel. In addition, at that time, Eastern Europe

organized tours to communist countries under the name of socialist education tours for the young population in order to strengthen communist ideologies. Meanwhile, capitalist countries such as England and France used social tourism as a symbol of individualism, freedom and propaganda tools parallel to human rights (cited in Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006:1200). In addition, Western European countries such as Portugal and Switzerland and Scandinavian countries offered social tourism in the form of funds for youth travel and social resorts. In the United States (a neo-liberal country) social tourism was represented by organizations such as the Young Farmers Association, which promoted youth travel and made tourism more accessible. Although different terms are used today for the concept of social tourism, there is a worldwide consensus on its purposes (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006:1200). To clarify the impact of ISTO and WTO on determining and disseminating the provisions of social tourism, it would be appropriate to refer to Article 14 of the Manila Declaration (WHO, 1980): "Modern tourism arises from the adoption of a social policy. Workers earn annual paid vacations and it represents the recognition of man's fundamental right to rest and leisure."

The Transformation of the Concept of Social Tourism during the Rapid Development of Mass Tourism

The spread of neo liberalization to most countries, the idea of free competition and the loss of power of the states deeply affected the tourism sector worldwide (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006:1200). The crucial effect of neoliberalism for the tourism sector was the rapid development of mass tourism. With the spread of mass tourism, many positive expectations have arisen. The first expectation from mass tourism was that it would increase the standard of living and new job opportunities in rural areas. Based on this, it was expected that disadvantaged communities would have the chance to develop their economies (Minnaert et al., 2012:21). The second expectation from the spread of mass tourism was an overall increase in the travel and vacation frequencies of current travelers, while expanding the target market by adding inexpensive packages for low-income families and individuals. As expected, people became more able to travel than in the past, and those who were in the workforce and could not go on vacation due to unsuitable prices began to take part in tourism activities.

However, the situation was not as democratic as it seems. The rural population still could not contribute equally to tourism as hosts or benefit from tourism as guests. From a guest perspective, tourism packages could be afforded by the middle class. From the host's point of view, the local community has not been able to reap the benefits of tourism development for various reasons. Therefore, mass tourism development has had no effect on reducing unemployment and raising the living standards of local people. However, the development of mass tourism has caused large hotel chains to enter rural areas, and this has also been the cause of the unequal distribution of incomes as hotels outsource their employment and facilities from the local area. (Minnaert et al., 2012:20). For this reason, the concept of social tourism has developed in parallel with the age of mass tourism. As a matter of fact, as can be understood from the following statement of the WTO in the Manila Declaration, the unexpected consequences of mass tourism were one of the most important issues to be discussed:

Tourism has become a contributing factor to social stability, mutual understanding between individuals and people and individual recovery. In addition to its known economic aspects, it has gained a cultural and moral dimension that needs to be supported and protected against harmful distortions that may be brought by economic factors. Public authorities and travel agencies should participate accordingly in the development of tourism by formulating guidelines aimed at promoting appropriate investments (WTO, 1980, article 15).

Due to the concerns of tourism-related authorities such as the WTO, Haulot (1981:212) a year after the Manila Declaration improved the definition of social tourism by adding some keywords ('justice', 'dignity' and 'for all'): Social tourism justifies its individual and collective goals to be consistent with the view that all measures taken by modern society should ensure greater justice, greater dignity and greater enjoyment of life for all citizens.

Describing this process as the modernization of the definition of social tourism, Minnaert argues that ethical values are included in the understanding of social tourism with this definition, which was put forward as a result of the damages caused by mass tourism. (Minnaert et al., 2012:20).

The Development of the Concept of Social Tourism after the Spread of Mass Tourism

After the rapid development of mass tourism, although the meaning of the concept of social tourism has been redefined by the relevant tourism institutions, a consensus has not yet been reached on a single definition of social tourism. During this period, three important events took place that had a significant impact on the definition of social tourism:

I. After the 1990s ISTO considered changing the term 'social tourism' to 'tourism for all' to reflect equal tourism participation, which is the hallmark of social tourism compared to mass tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006:1201). For this reason, the concept of 'tourism for all' was published worldwide in 1996 with the Montreal Declaration. The paper begins with the best-known definition of social tourism (1996): social tourism is all relationships and phenomena that result from participation in tourism, and especially from the participation of social strata with modest incomes. This participation is made possible or facilitated by well-defined measures of a social nature (article 3).

In summary, the declaration asserted that 'tourism for all is the key to economic power', 'society shaper', 'a tool for social cohesion', 'an opportunity for personal enrichment', 'a partner in global development programs'. The declaration stated that developing and developed countries should recognize social tourism. In addition, with the 13th, 14th and 15th articles of the declaration, the frameworks to be defined as social tourism organization were determined. In summary, in articles 13, 14 and 15, it is stated that all non-profit organizations related to tourism management are members of the social tourism movement, which has the vision of making tourism accessible to all people without any discrimination (ISTO, 2016:3-5).

II. Moral and ethical values gained importance in all tourism types with the adoption of the Global Tourism Ethics Code by UNWTO in 1999. The main idea of adapting the Global Code of Ethics to tourism was to provide free and liberal tourism without any discrimination, by clarifying tourism as a source of sustainable development at both the individual and societal level.

We aim to promote responsible, sustainable and universally accessible tourism within the framework of the right of all people to enjoy their leisure time or to travel while respecting the preferences of their society (UNWTO, Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, 1999).

With this new development, social tourism has become a part of existing international tourism strategies.

III. Considering the past failure to provide opportunities to rural communities with the development of mass tourism, ISTO began to focus more on host communities rather than meeting visitor needs or the demand side of social tourism. Indeed, ISTO has revised the position of communities by incorporating the host perspective into social tourism practices. In 2003, they defined social tourism as: Effects and phenomena resulting from participation in tourism, more specifically low-income groups. This participation is made possible or facilitated by initiatives of a well-defined social nature (as cited in Minnaert et al., 2012:21).

Following this, in 2006 ISTO revised the Montreal Declaration to highlight the new aspect of the concept of social tourism, emphasizing the importance of the host perspective while implementing social tourism practices. New phrases were added to the declaration and the term 'solidarity' was introduced. For example, Article 13 states that the word 'social' evokes the words 'solidarity' and 'fraternity'. The main ideology of solidarity was to motivate tourists to participate in local developments or volunteer activities. Another example is the acceptance of the idea of improving the living standards of local communities through social tourism practices with Article 14 (ISTO, 2016:6-7).

Sustainability of Social Tourism

Sustainability ideology emerged after the Brundtland report in 1987 (Dresner, 2008:73). As a result, social tourism has integrated a sustainability approach, as most other types of tourism or other sectors do. The nature and characteristics of social tourism already had the necessary qualifications to embrace sustainability. In the Lisbon Strategy of 2002, tourism aimed at sustainable development through lowering unemployment rates, increased knowledge and increased social integration, all of which was already addressed by social tourism (Dumitru, Negricea and Slapac, 2009:90). Evidence of addressing the concept of sustainability from the earliest stages of social tourism practices can also be seen in basic approaches to social tourism such as 'tourism for all' and 'accessible tourism'.

In addition, social tourism's earlier focus on integrating host community perspectives into social tourism practices to enhance the financial and social well-being of local people can be found in the United Nations World Tourism Organization's later definition of sustainable tourism as a form. Therefore, by its very nature, social tourism follows the proposed principles of sustainable forms of tourism. As a matter of fact, some academics have argued that community-based and pro-poor tourism, which is defined as sustainable tourism activities, are subcategories of social tourism (Minnaert et al., 2012:21). Arguing that the host perspective makes social tourism practices sustainable, Almedia (2011:484) defined social tourism as follows: Social

tourism is socio-politically promoted by the state with clearly defined goals for psychophysical recovery and socio-cultural uplift for individuals.

Like Almedia (2011), Minnaert et al. also argue that host and community perspectives are important elements that make social tourism sustainable. Emphasizing that social tourism is not a kind of commercial or mass tourism, Minnaert et al., express that "tourism with added moral value aiming to benefit the host or visitor in tourism exchange" (Minnaert, Maitland and Miller, 2007: 9). Indeed, after the definition, Minnaert et al. (2007:9) adds: Unlike the rest of the tourism industry, social tourism sees holidays not just as a product but as an expression of a certain moral belief. Vacation can be seen as a universal right or as a means to achieve goals other than commercial tourism.

According to Baumgartner (2013), there are three similarities between sustainable tourism and social tourism. First, both types of tourism seek to increase equality and involve all layers of society in tourism activities. This is a profound way of creating social synergy. Second, both have strategies to increase economic welfare, such as expanding the tourist season and increasing local employment in tourism. Thirdly, according to Baumgartner (2013:169-170), while protecting the environment is one of the main principles of sustainable tourism, CO₂ emissions from transportation are lower than mass international tourism activities as social tourism supports domestic tourism. The reason for this is that the means of transportation in domestic tourism are buses, not cars or planes. Additionally, many types of social tourism offer nature-based accommodation such as campsites or bungalows. However, there are also differences between sustainable and social tourism, as the primary purpose of social tourism is never to create a market to profit from disadvantaged groups (Baumgartner, 2013:176).

Other evidence of the partnership between sustainable and social tourism can be given from existing social tourism practices. As a matter of fact, the 2030 Agenda, which mentions 17 sustainability goals, deals with the integration of disadvantaged people into tourism activities to prevent inequality and the inclusion of local people in tourism processes to prevent poverty (United Nations, 2015). Looking at ISTO members, it is seen that there are many social tourism associations that focus on disadvantaged groups and rural citizens and integrate sustainability and responsibility dimensions into their current practices. For example, in France, there is an ISTO member association called Acteurs du Tourisme Resistance, which was established as an umbrella association to promote sustainable tourism and protect nature by promoting responsible tourism within the country. In Brazil, an ISTO member association called Arariba Turismo and Cultura organizes study tours to integrate youth and adults into community-based tourism practices. In Costa Rica, the Asociacion Comunitaria Conservacionista de Turismo Alternativo y Rural works for the coordination of tourism-related organizations and collaborates on sustainable development and responsible tourism that engages and encourages the public in tourism. In Morocco, an ISTO member called Association Amoud pour le Developmentpement organizes workshops and campaigns to promote responsible and sustainable tourism. The Istituto Cooperazione Economica Internazionale in Italy uses sustainable tourism for a more human rights neutral society through promotions and environmental protection. There is also an additional association, Ente Nazionale Demokrico di Azione Sociale, created in Italy, as in Portages, to improve the well-being and health of young people and workers, and to create social cohesion using social tourism as a tool. Another application in social tourism is Tunisia Solidarity Tourism Association. The association encourages tourists to participate in social developments. The Confederacion Autonoma Sindica Clasista is an organization dedicated to protecting the human rights of workers, and they have recently used social tourism as a tool to improve workers' well-being. Finally, the Brussels-based European Alliance for Responsible Tourism and Hospitality was established to create a working network for responsible tourism. The aim of the alliance is to promote responsible tourism in the framework of sustainability for the benefit of communities and solidarity against poverty.

Current Trends in Social Tourism

It is generally accepted that current economic and social developments are centered around sustainability concerns that lead to the rise of new concepts, practices and governance perspectives in the field of tourism. For example, the latest trend of inclusive tourism is accessible tourism evolved with the work of Scott Rains. He observed that tourism providers make the physical environment and virtual communication resources accessible to the blind, deaf and wheelchair users, and that although these places are accessible to a disadvantaged individual, the activities and experiences that a place offers are often not accessible. He argues that for a place to be called accessible, it is not enough to build yellow roads for the visually impaired or to build ramps next to stairs in public places. The concept of accessibility used in tourism should include accessible activities, accessible communication and accessible experiences (Rains, 2009). Rains defines inclusive tourism as follows: Inclusive tourism is a global movement to ensure the full social participation of all persons with disabilities in

travel, citizenship and cultural contribution, and in the process do the same for everyone else. The word 'inclusive' refers to the concept.

This definition dates back to 2009, but recently academics and international organizations such as UNDP and UNWTO have developed the concept and started to develop guidebooks for hotels and restaurants to make tourism accessible to all by redefining disadvantaged tourism users from a broader perspective. For example, the Queensland Government's Department of Tourism (2017:6) redefined disadvantaged groups as: Persons with physical disabilities; persons using wheelchairs or mobility scooters, persons using a walking frame or crutches, or persons with difficulty with finger or hand coordination, persons with visual impairments, persons with hearing impairment or deafness, persons with perceptual or cognitive impairments affecting communication, caregivers of persons with disabilities, prams and people with strollers.

Considering all the debates about what social tourism is and current developments in its relationship with sustainable tourism and social tourism, the latest conceptualizations of social tourism can be grouped into the following approaches:

- i. Differentiation,
- ii. Integration,
- iii. Sub-categorization,

The differentiation approach to the definition of social tourism aims to distinguish it from other types (Scheyvens and Biddulph, 2018: 7). According to Scheyvens, social tourism has the same concerns and target market as accessible or fair tourism. However, Scheyvens argues that social tourism differs from other types of tourism, and that it primarily focuses on all disadvantaged groups, including economically disadvantaged people who cannot afford a vacation, and that social tourism is different from other types of tourism (Scheyvens and Biddulph, 2018: 7).

In the integrated approach, similar types of tourism are combined under inclusive concepts such as "accessible social tourism" (Soler, Diaz and Vera, 2018: 155). Soler et al. (2018) argues that the barriers people face are not just about accessibility to facilities, but also economic and knowledge-based problems. Barriers to economic concerns such as finding a budget to train staff in tourism facilities or making information accessible in hotels or tourism destinations and offering low-priced packages are solved by social tourism. From this point of view, the following definition was made by Soler et al. (Soler, Diaz and Vera, 2018:155). In order to create a new comprehensive definition of social tourism, we can state that Accessible Social Tourism is a series of initiatives aimed at facilitating the active participation of people with special needs in tourism and at the same time achieving social networks for its users and economic benefits for society.

The subclassification approach for the definition of social tourism was made by ISTO. According to ISTO, accessible, young, old, responsible and family tourism are subcategories of social tourism, and social tourism is an umbrella concept that encompasses all types of alternative tourism appealing to disadvantaged groups. ISTO has recently defined social tourism as "social tourism includes all activities that contribute fairly and sustainably to greater access to holidays and tourism activities for all".

In summary, the definitions of social tourism vary depending on different perspectives in different countries or institutions and are open to discussion with its subcategories or more recent types of tourism. Despite ISTO's efforts to define the boundaries of social tourism, the meaning of social tourism is still changing today and there is no consensus on its exact meaning as it has been since the beginning (Minnaert et al., 2012:23). The final article of the Montreal Declaration explains the complexity of social tourism definitions. The Declaration suggests that there are many social tourism models in the world that have developed according to the purposes of countries to implement these models. Therefore, the definitions of social tourism will differ according to the cultures of the countries without deviating from the 'tourism for all' vision.

Social Tourism Models and Implementations

Considering the evolution of the concept of social tourism throughout history, it can be said that social tourism has become more inclusive with a wider target group such as poor youth, low-income families, workers, those with chronic diseases, those with psychological problems, the disabled and the elderly, and the unemployed. Since demand and regulatory policies differ in each country, social tourism practices are also different (Diekmann, McCabe, & Minnaert, 2012:35). In other words, there cannot be a single social tourism practice; however, countries can choose the most suitable for them to implement social tourism (ISTO, 2016). Therefore,

in the second part of the first chapter, various social tourism practices in the world and the common features of social tourism models in Europe are explained.

The Reasons of Implementing Social Tourism Model of EU

According to McCabe (2015), European countries implement social tourism practices for three reasons. First, improvements in the sustainability framework and further political improvements are common in European countries. Since social tourism provides the social and economic dimensions of sustainability, European countries prefer to implement social tourism. Secondly, human rights and the rights of persons with disabilities are critical issues in European countries. Social tourism has gained in value in Europe as 'tourism for all' and 'accessible tourism' are compatible with government regulations and ideologies. Third, during the First World War, the socialist eastern part of Europe applied social tourism to increase the welfare of the society and to spread socialism through youth travel. For this reason, the concept of social tourism naturally spread all over Europe. However, the benefits of social tourism to the state and its users are strong (McCabe, 2015).

Current Tourism Models in Europe

Hall and Brown (2012) identify some similarities between European countries in terms of social tourism practices. Indeed, Hall and Brown (2012) provide an organizational model that illustrates the commonalities of European social tourism systems.

Financing structures and intermediaries that will implement social tourism practices are essential elements of all European countries. According to Diekmann et al. (2012:43), intermediaries are important because they are bridges between demand and supply that support the operational management of social tourism practices. Regarding the importance of financing mechanisms, Diekmann and McCabe (2013) state that social tourism would be impossible without a public, private or charitable organization that implements it. The other two factors (demand and supply) in Hall and Brown's (2012) model are the ones that differ. The common aspect of the demand is that all groups (young people, families, the elderly, the disabled) included in the European Union policy are disadvantaged groups (McCabe, 2015: 12):

- Young adults with fewer opportunities (Ages between 18-30),
- Families facing financial pressure,
- Disabled people,
- Retired people aged over 65.

Political conditions, the state's economy, ideologies or basically the size of each group create differences in demand (Hall & Brown, 2012). For example, Austria focuses on families, while Belgium focuses on young people and low-income families. While Cyprus supports the elderly and disabled, Romania supports the elderly, young, disabled and workers (McCabe, 2015:16-21).

The treatments or budget allocations applied while performing social tourism practices also differ between countries. For example, Italy gives social tourism users a voucher that pays 20% or 45% of their holiday expenses based on family income. Denmark supports all holiday expenses of disadvantaged families. In the United Kingdom, the Family Holiday Association Charity pays the amount and arranges the holiday, and sometimes gives additional money to social tourism users when they have extra funds (Kassa, 2012:143). Like treatments, the purposes of applying social tourism practices also differ between countries. For example, The Sunshine Fund in Ireland aims to create a social synergy for disadvantaged children (MacMahon, 2012:105). However, Cyprus aims to extend the tourism season with its social tourism practices (McCabe, 2015:16-21).

According to Hall and Brown, the type of financing mechanism in European countries is similar (Hall and Brown, 2012). However, there are differences from country to country. According to McCabe (2015), there are five types of financing schemes in Europe:

- I. State-financed subsidized packages: Examples exist in Spain, Portugal and Greece. In these countries, the state allocates a budget for social tourism practices. A successful example of this practice is the IMERSO program in Spain, which sends groups of seniors on vacation. However, the risk in this system is the possibility of the government's budget cut, which was previously experienced in Spain and Portugal. Nevertheless, this program means an advanced organization for social tourism.
- II. Government-supported coupon programs: Government-supported coupons mean giving coupons to disadvantaged people so that they can have a holiday experience. Example countries are France, Hungary and Romania. A good example is the Hungarian National Holiday Foundation's program, which gives a certain amount in spa vouchers.

III. Regional government programs: Regional or state-level organizations or offices determine how social tourism is implemented and make agreements with intermediary organizations for operational processes. Example countries are Belgium, Brussels, Austria and Lithuania. An exemplary program is the Holiday Participation Support Center in Brussels, which has a tourism office that organizes every step for social tourism.

IV. Charity provision: Charities or NGOs finance social tourism practices. This program is available in countries where there is no government support and where tourism takes place on a small scale. Examples can be found in the UK, Malta, Latvia, Ireland and Bulgaria. A well-known example of this type is the Family Holiday Association in the United Kingdom.

V. Private foundation programs: When related or unrelated organizations donate to social tourism, it means private foundation. Examples are found in Denmark and Finland. For example, the Slot Machine Association in Finland donates a certain amount of money from gambling to social tourism foundations.

According to Diekmann and McCabe (2013:25), the financing system and the amount of financing are the main factors that determine the application method of social tourism in countries and all social tourism applications depend on financing mechanisms. For example, while some countries use a single type of financing, other countries may combine their financing systems (Gabruc, 2016:99). For example, countries usually have specific social tourism facilities if the financing scheme is government funded and the budget allocation is high. In addition, if the budget allocated by the state for social tourism practices is limited, in most cases, countries give coupons to the target audience while implementing social tourism. However, the dependence of social tourism on monetary purposes may cause potential managerial risks for social tourism organizations in the future. For example, in most European countries, especially in the United Kingdom, the social tourism practices supported directly or indirectly by the states have started to receive less budget due to the economic crises in the countries (Diekmann et al., 2013:25).

Another similarity between European countries in applying social tourism is social tourism services such as transportation, accommodation, destination services and visitor attraction centers. The services to be provided by social tourism organizations vary according to the political environments and economic systems of the countries. For example, while low-income families have their own hotels in Germany (Hall and Brown, 2012:38), family caravan trips are organized in England (Kassa, 2012:142). In addition, Diekmann et al. (2012), the number of intermediaries affects the diversity of the service to be provided. The reason for this is that intermediaries are stakeholders who support social tourism practices by providing tourism services. For example, a social tourism organization creates a network with hotels to find accommodation for its target audience, and to define its target market, the social tourism organization receives support from charities and serves the disadvantaged.

While considering the supply and demand dimensions of the similarities between European countries in the implementation of social tourism practices suggested by Hall and Brown (2012), Minnaert et al. (2011) address the complexity of social tourism definitions.

First, the participation model encourages disadvantaged individuals to participate in standard tourism activities on their own. Second, the inclusion model aims at the simultaneous use of standardized tourism products by disadvantaged groups and all other users in order to increase overall tourism participation at all times. The products are specially designed for social tourism users and used by them only. For example, making a hotel accessible to wheelchair users. The latest model is the incentive that proposes that specially designed products can be offered to all groups at the same time to increase the economic benefits of social tourism for the host community.

Social Tourism in Turkey

Academic Studies about Social Tourism in Turkey

According to Yılmaz (1984), social tourism in Turkey started to develop in the 1960s with paid leave to workers, and continued with the reduction of working hours in 1965 with a law enacted for civil servants. However, considering the 58 years since its inception, academic studies on social tourism are still limited (Saribaş and Akbaba, 2018:196-197). Indeed, most of the studies are doctoral or master's theses written in the 1980s and 1990s. Since then, it seems that there are very few conference papers and articles on social tourism in Turkey. The most recent study is from 2016 and is not yet completed; It is a doctoral thesis and is expected to be completed in 2019. Therefore, according to Saribaş and Akbaba (2018), social tourism in Turkey is still in its infancy in terms of academic contribution.

Usta (1982:71) defines social tourism as “the relations formed by the economically weak people's contribution to tourism activities by being supported with special provisions and facilities”. The definition of social tourism was criticized by Demirkol (1988:4), who mentioned the similarities between the definitions of mass tourism, public tourism, worker tourism and social tourism in 1988. Until 2012, there are hardly any academic studies on social tourism. There has been an increase in social tourism studies in 2012 and 2013, and the concept of social tourism has been defined by Özgökçeler and Bıçkı (2013:560) as social tourism with a human rights perspective: Social tourism includes all activities that increase accessibility to tourism activities for people with special needs, including different sectors, activities. It is a type of tourism that produces social and economic benefits for groups.

According to Özgökçeler and Bıçkı (2013: 560), the general motto of social tourism is sustainable tourism for everyone, and in this way, one of the main purposes of social tourism is to make tourism social integration, family unity, personal development and secondly, travel accessible to everyone. In addition, in 2012 and 2013, the needs of the target group's social tourism practices, the obstacles they encounter, and recommendations for developing social tourism have been the subject of several academic studies (Kızılırmak & Ertuğrul, 2012; Özgökçeler et al., 2013; Uğurlu & Ar, 2014). As a matter of fact, a case study was conducted to better understand the difficulties families face while integrating into tourism activities (Uğurlu et al. 2014). In addition, the importance of local governments in the development of social tourism has been emphasized in several studies by Kızılırmak et al. He stated the responsibilities of tourism-related state institutions such as financial support in the implementation of social tourism (Kızılırmak et al., 2014). Although there are few academic studies on social tourism, there are ongoing social tourism practices in Turkey. For this reason, academic studies in Turkey lag behind developing social tourism practices (Saribaş and Akbaba, 2018:200): Only definitions have been made over the years and the subject has been examined around similar dimensions. It did not go beyond expressing a general meaning. Turkey is close to the concept of social tourism in terms of its economic, social and religious structure. It is a country with an economic and social structure that heavily includes social tourism components. There is a strong belief that academic studies and government support for social tourism are not sufficiently known by individuals.

Implementations of Social Tourism in Turkey

According to Demirkol (1988:13-14), the government's tourism strategies do not directly include social tourism development strategies for various reasons. The reasons Demirkol mentions are Turkey's economic situation and being late for such tourism developments. However, with paid holidays and the increase in business tourism from Ankara to Istanbul, the civil servants' travel to hot beaches in the summer triggered the social tourism practice (Demirkol, 1988:12).

Social tourism practices in Turkey have started with holiday loans, holiday checks, discounted tickets for transportation and holiday payments in installments given by banks with the support of the government. In addition, there are public camp areas for civil servants, which set an example for social tourism. However, the fact that these facilities are closed is not a good environment for social tourism to benefit from social integration (Demirkol, 1988:37; Yılmaz, 1984:28-29). On the other hand, according to Bıçkı (2013:66), public camp facilities were privatized after 1993, and then the facilities were converted into luxury hotels, serving a higher segment of the society. From 1988 to 2012, social tourism practices could not develop or diversify in Turkey, as there was no reflection on social tourism. For example, the only different practices related to social tourism are partial holiday expense payments and opening dormitories for students in the summer season (Kızılırmak and Ertuğrul, 2012:6). Dormitories and other facilities that offer discounted vacation opportunities to students have been promoted by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism as a travel guide for young people since 1992.

According to Kızılırmak et al. (2012:43), the government has an indirect positive effect on the development of social tourism due to 2023 tourism policies. Actions are indirect because the purpose of policies is not explicitly to promote social tourism. Among the measures to be taken for 2023 tourism strategies is the development of domestic tourism with affordable prices and services, since Turkish people travel less and the average income of the target market is not high (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2007: 9-10). The reason for this is that Turkey always sees domestic tourism as an alternative to outbound tourism and the government takes measures to develop domestic tourism only in times of economic crisis (Bıçkı, Ak and Özgökçeler, 2013:65). On the other hand, after 1992, the government started to take an interest in the travel of young people and made effective programs such as Interrail, Euro Mini group, Euro Domino, Student Discount, train travel packages to Southeast Turkey and International Youth Transport, including state railways (Bıçkı et al., 2013:66).

Local governments also have important contributions in terms of the type of social tourism practices. However, due to the centralization of tourism management in Turkey and the fact that social tourism is not included in tourism policies by the state, the realization of social tourism is at the initiative of the municipalities (Kızilirmak and Ertuğrul, 2012:47). Examples are İzmir Gaziemir municipality, which receives children in the 9-14 age group every day during the summer months. In addition, Karabağlar municipality of İzmir takes 150 families who cannot take a vacation to Çeşme and Ilıca Beach (Bıçkıcı et al., 2013:67). In Istanbul, several local authorities take disadvantaged groups to campsites. Beyoğlu Municipality and Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality organize one-week camps twice a year in Kefken and Çiroz under the name of social service. However, the activities of Beyoğlu municipality are limited to sea, sand and sun tourism. Within the scope of social services, Ankara Metropolitan Municipality has been providing camp services for the elderly, disabled and successful students who cannot take a vacation since 2015, in order to motivate children to work for higher classes. Mavi Işıklar Education, Recreation and Rehabilitation Center in Samsun is another business. The facility was built by Samsun Metropolitan Municipality and has been serving the disabled and their caregivers or their families throughout the year since 2013. The total number of beds of the facility is 30 and it provides training for swimming, sports, business and social life. However, according to Arslan's (2017) case study, Mavi Işıklar Education, Recreation and Rehabilitation Center only serves to make a good impression on citizens without disabilities. According to a case study, only 64 out of 156 disabled participants actually suggested using the facility (Arslan, 2017:197-220). For this reason, Arslan suggests that the quality level of social tourism practices of municipalities should be questioned.

There are also some individual practices on social tourism as individual social responsibility projects of hotel owners or other people. Some of the hotel owners do this for religious purposes, such as helping people in the name of Allah, or for volunteering purposes. Another example is the holiday village opened by a Turkish doctor in Fethiye for dialysis patients.

In summary, social tourism practices in Turkey develop with the initiative of institutions, local governments, private foundations or individuals.

Advantages of Social Tourism Generally and Contribution to Society

Much of the research on social tourism has focused on understanding the benefits of practicing social tourism. Most of these studies focus on understanding the benefits for social tourism users. These studies are mainly concerned with the benefits of social tourism on low-income families and people with disabilities (Morgan, Pritchard, & Sedgley, 2015:8). In addition, the topics of social tourism studies are often related to improving the quality of life or social equality by involving people in tourism activities.

According to Minnaert, Stacey, Quinn, and Griffin (2010), social tourism has two benefits. The first is social welfare and well-being. Minnaert et al. (2010) state that making tourism accessible to all individuals is an investment in building a happier and self-developing individual who will create a larger society with qualified employees who will return to the system. There are few studies of low-income families in the UK to support this position, as social tourism associations in the UK often serve disadvantaged families. The primary result of such research is that the quality of life of the participants increases and family ties are strengthened, as families have the chance to spend free, comfortable and quality time together (Bos, McCabe, & Johnson, 2015; Smith & Hughes, 1999; Minnaert, 2012). According to McCabe's (2009:678-679) research conducted in England, family members also look to the future more optimistically and can cope with the situation they are in. So taking a vacation helps family members recover from depreciation. By taking a vacation, families can take a break from their daily routine, which is important for their lifelong happiness (McCabe, 2009, p. 678-679). Another thing is that holidays can be an important opportunity for unplanned learning and behavior change for low-income families. This is because tourism offers an experiential learning opportunity, especially for children. Children can experience the subjects they learned in the classroom and in the real world re-learn the information (Bos et al., 2015:866; Minnaert, 2012). Another learning benefit that Minnaert (2012) refers to is communities of practice. In other words, communities that are taken on vacation can then arrange their own vacations because they are familiar with the travel planning processes. Finally, social tourism offers an important opportunity for family members to develop social skills. Family members can easily minimize problems among themselves and children can be more active at school (Bos et al., 2015). Vacations can also teach people new skills, such as swimming. In addition, the holiday can improve the senses such as being more attentive to the environment or animals (Smith and Hughes, 1999:125).

In addition, social tourism has some benefits on the well-being of the elderly. According to some scientists (e.g. Morgan, Pritchard, and Sedgley 2015; Farrell, 2015), social tourism can contribute to the mental and physical health of the elderly and their self-confidence increases after the holidays.

Disabled individuals also benefit from social tourism in terms of increasing their quality of life. According to Pagan (2015:374), who compared disabled and non-disabled people who go on vacation, "The contribution of vacation trips in the fields of health, work and housework satisfaction for disabled people is higher than those who take a vacation."

The second benefit of social tourism (2010) according to Minnaert et al. is "social inclusion". According to Jolin, "social tourism, with its ambition to democratize tourism, contributes to the fight against inequality and exclusion and promotes social cohesion" (as cited in Minnaert et al., 2010). Due to economic insufficiency, most families are excluded from tourism activities and social tourism includes these individuals in the market. In addition, since the families or people excluded from the society are not fully integrated into the society, tourism activities can be a tool to revive the integration process (Minnaert et al., 2010). From the point of view of the disabled, it is difficult to travel due to insufficient facilities. And the lack of these facilities starts all over. Looking at the "accessible tourism" literature, there are many studies to develop a website where people with disabilities can make reservations for their holidays (Loi and Kong, 2016). However, there are also talented or disabled people with financial disabilities. In this case, social tourism is the key to include these people in life by using tourism as a tool (Small and Darcy, 2010:13; Kastenholz, Eusebio, & Figueiredo, 2015:1263; Pagan, 2015:376). According to Gabruc (2016:99), in order to increase the social inclusion effect of social tourism, relevant institutions should adopt innovative approaches in terms of financing systems. Because social tourism organizations, depending on only one type of financing plan, can result in failures in operational efficiencies.

Conclusion

Tourism, which is a need of developed societies, continues its development by spreading to social strata that are large and have limited economic power. This phenomenon has been identified as "Social Tourism", which is a type of institutionalized private tourism that gained importance rapidly after the Second World War. Social tourism; It covers the participation of the masses with relatively insufficient economic power in tourism with some special precautions and aids and all the relations created by this. Social tourism has an important place in today's tourism policies.

Among the special purposes of social tourism are the transportation of tourism to large masses and the benefit of these masses from all kinds of opportunities such as vacation, rest and entertainment.

Social tourism environment in Turkey has positive and negative features. In terms of natural opportunities, there are wide opportunities for social tourism as well as for traditional tourism. Especially the long summer season ensures that participation in tourism takes place over a long period of time. In addition, the legal existence of paid leaves, the forcing of working conditions to take a vacation, and the increase in income are factors that enable social tourism. Among other factors, there are issues such as the predominance of the agricultural structure in Turkey, the low level of income, and the fact that tourism has not turned into a social organization.

References

- McCabe, S. (2015). *Is the UK being left behind? Current trends in social tourism in Europe and beyond*, commissioned by Family Holiday Association. UK: Laurance Paper Co.
- Hall, D., & Brown, F. (2012). The welfare society and tourism: European perspectives. In D. Hall, & F. Brown, *Social Tourism in Europe; Theory and Practice* (pp. 108-121). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Sarıbaşı, Ö. & Akbaba, A. (2018). Sosyal turizm literatürüne genel bir bakış. 3. Uluslararası Doğu Akdeniz Turizm Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri İskenderun, Türkiye. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324706453_A_General_Overview_of_Social_Tourism_Literature_in_Turkey_A_Bibliometric_Study_on_Social_Tourism_Researches adresinden alınmıştır.
- Richards, G. (1996). *Cultural Tourism in Europe*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Diekmann, A., & McCabe, S. (2013). Systems of social tourism in the European Union: a critical review. In L. Minnaert, R. Maitland, & G. Miller, *Social Tourism; Perspective and Potential* (pp. 19-32). New York: Routledge.
- Belanger, C., & Jolin, L. (2011). The International Organisation of Social Tourism (ISTO) working towards a right to holidays and tourism for all. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(5), 475-482.

- Leibfried, S. (1988). Towards a European welfare state? On integrated poverty regimes into the European Community. In C. Jones, *New perspectives on welfare state in Europe*, (pp. 120-142). London, UK: Routledge.
- Haulot, A. (1981). Social Tourism: Current dimensions and future developments. *International Journal of Tourism Management*, 2(3), 207-212.
- ISTO. (2016). *Montreal Declaration; Towards a humanist, social vision of tourism*. Retrieved from International Social Tourism Organization: <http://www.oitsisto.org/oits/public/section.jsf?id=44>
- Hunziker, W. (1951). *Social tourism: Its nature and problems*. Geneva: International Tourists Alliance Scientific Commission.
- Minnaert, L., Maitland, R., & Miller, G. (2011). What is social tourism? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(5), 403-415.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192–1208.
- Minnaert, L., Diekmann, A., & McCabe, S. (2012). Defining social tourism and its historical context. In L. Minnaert, A. Diekmann, & S. McCabe, *Social tourism in Europe; Theory and practice* (pp. 18-30). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- DTÖ. (1980). *Manila declaration on world tourism*. <http://www.world-tourism.org/sustainable/concepts>
- UNWTO. (1999). *Global code of ethics for tourism*. <http://www.unep.org/bpsp/Tourism/WTO%20Code%20of%20Conduct.pdf>.
- Dumitru, N., Negricea, C., & Slapac, A. (2009). Social Tourism; a factor in cultural, social and economic change. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 4(2), 89-94.
- Baumgartner, C. (2013). Social tourism and sustainability. In L. Minnaert, R. Maitland, & G. Miller, *Social tourism; Perspectives and potential*, (ss. 166-176). New York: Routledge.
- Rains, S. (11 Kasım 2009). *What is inclusive tourism*. https://www.slideshare.net/srains/what-is-inclusive-tourism-by-scottrains?qid=a4aad01b-4eee-4232-97ba-7ded354d3808&v=&b=&from_search=10 adresinden alındı.
- Scheyvens, R., & Biddulph, R. R. (2018). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(4), 1-22.
- Soler, J., Diaz, M., & Vera, P. (2018). The Accessible Social Tourism: A new tourist model. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, 41, 139-155.
- Kassa, C. (2012). Case study 8: The family fund, UK. In L. Minnaert, A. Diekmann, & McCabe, S., *Social tourism in Europe; Theory and practice*, (pp. 142-145). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Gabruc, J. (2016). Multi-channel funding of social tourism programs: The case of the association of friends with youth, *Academica Turistica*, 2.
- Özgökçeler, S. ve Bıçkı, D. (2013). Bir turizm hakkı olarak sosyal turizm ve engelliler. *Yeni Toplumsal Yapılanmalar: Geçişler, Kesişmeler, Sapmalar, Bildiri Kitabı 3: 7. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi* içinde, (ss. 549-565). Muğla: Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi.
- Usta, Ö. (1982). Sosyal turizm. İzmir: İstiklal Matbaası.
- Demirkol, Ş. (1988). Sosyal Turizm ve Türk Turizmindeki Yeri (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Bıçkı, D., Ak, D. & Özgökçeler, S. (2013). Avrupa’da ve Türkiye’de sosyal turizm, *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 31, 49-73.
- Yılmaz, Y. (1984). *Sosyal turizm ve Türkiye* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Kızılırmak, İ. ve Ertuğrul, M. S. (2012). Sosyal turizmin sınırlandırılması yerel yönetimlerin rolü ve yapılan uygulamalar. *Manas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1(2), 34-53.
- Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı. (2007). *Türkiye turizm stratejisi 2023*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.
- Arslan, A. (2017). *Belediyelerin engelli hizmetleri ve kurum imajı*. Bursa: Ekin Yayınevi.
- Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Sedgley. (2015). Social tourism and well-being in later life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 1-15.
- Smith, W., & Hughes, H. (1999). Disadvantaged families and the meaning of the holiday. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 1, 123-133.
- Bos, L., McCabe, S., & Johnson, S. (2015). Learning never goes on holiday: an exploration of social tourism as a context for experiential learning. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(9), 859-875.
- Pagan, R. (2015). The impact of holiday trips on life satisfaction and domains of life satisfaction: Evidence for German disabled individuals. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(3), 359–379.
- Small, J. & Darcy, S. (2010). Tourism, disability and mobility. In S. Cole, & N. Morgan, *Tourism and inequality; problems and prospects* (pp. 1-48). UK: CABI.
- Kastenholz, E., Eusebio, C., & Figueiredo, E. (2015). Contributions of tourism to social inclusion of persons with disability. *Disability and Society*, 30(8), 1259-1281.