

**THE OPINIONS OF THE TURKS LIVING IN GERMANY
RESPECTING OF THE TURKEY TOURISM***

*Turhan ÇETİN***

Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to elucidate the opinions of Turkish people about the tourism of Turkey and their contribution to it. This is a descriptive study. The data were collected by a qualitative survey method. The working group of the study was constituted by 210 Turkish citizens living in Frankfurt and Stadallendorf cities of Hesen state and Mainz city of Renanya-Palatina state of Germany. The data collection tool was a survey prepared by the researcher to determine the opinions of the participants about the tourism values of Turkey. The age, occupation, educational level, citizenship status, the period spent in Germany, the frequency of their visit to Turkey and the vehicle used in these visits were not found to be effective on the opinions of the Turkish citizens living abroad about the Turkish tourism sector.

Key words: Turkish Citizens, Germany, Turkey, Tourism Sector.

INTRODUCTION

Anatolia has been the cradle of so many civilizations throughout the history and endowed with rich cultural heritage. The land is full of customs, cuisines, history, music, picture, religion, architecture, hand crafts, outfits, coming from various civilizations dominated the region throughout the history such as Hittites, Phrygians, Sumerians, Urartu, Lycians, Lydians, Ionians, Assyrians, Trojans, Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Byzantines, Seljuks and Ottomans. This cultural diversity made Turkey a very important country as regards to tourism (Doğanay, 2001; Kozak et al., 2011; Emekli, 2006; Doğaner, 2001; Karagöz, 2008).

The richness of culture and traditions in Europe (Duran, 2011; Kaya, 2005; Kaya et al., 2005) made the European Union the most important region of touristic activity. These countries have almost half of the tourism income of the world and carry out 60% of the touristic activity (Emekli, 2005). Almost 40% of the total tourists of the world belong to these countries.

* A part of this research presented as an oral presentation at "250. Year Second Turkey with International Historical and Cultural Aspects - German Relations Symposium (Germany, 2013)".

** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Gazi University Faculty of Education Department of Social Sciences Education - Ankara/Turkey cetin.turhan@gmail.com

The large part of the touristic demand for Turkey comes from Western Europe countries and Germany occupies the first place among them (Uğuz, 2012; Türsab, 2009). This was largely due to the fact that 75% of the German population goes regularly on holiday every year.

According to 2012 data there are 3,965,150 Turkish citizens living in Europe. Among this population 63.1 % or 2,502,000 of them live in Germany (Yurt Dışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı, 2011a). Turkish citizens constitute almost 25% of the foreign people living in Germany (Auslanderzahlen, 2009).

Yılmaz (1994, p. 337) listed the advantages of the Turkish citizens living in Germany spending their holidays in Turkey as follows:

- ✓ The money they spent during their holidays are twice of the other tourists,
- ✓ They spend at least 3-4 weeks for their holidays,
- ✓ They are not affected by the negative social and political activities,
- ✓ They are not affected by the adverse propaganda against Turks in Europe,
- ✓ They are evenly distributed all around the country and not agglomerated in certain regions.

Due to these features of the Turkish citizens living in Germany, the tourism organizers started to prepare special tours and holiday packages specially designed for them.

The number of visits of the Turkish citizens living in abroad constitutes 18% of the total number of the visits made to Turkey and the money spent by the Turkish citizens living in abroad is nearly 23% percent of the touristic income of the country (Mutluer & Südaş, 2008). Thus, the Turkish citizens living in Germany should be encouraged to become the volunteering cultural and touristic attaché of Turkey informing their German friends about the transport facilities, accommodation and cultural and touristic capacity of the country. If every up to 30 million German tourists every year (Yılmaz, 1994, p. 336). If we consider the total number of Turks living in Europe it may mean up to 50 million tourists for the country coming from Europe. In order to reach to that level, the ministry of culture and tourism should organize seminars and workshops for the Turkish people living in Germany and provide them opportunities of cheap holidays in the country.

The touristic attitudes of the Turkish citizens living abroad have shown a drastic change in recent years (Mutluer & Südaş, 2008). The places where they spend their annual holidays have changed and their average expenditure

showed a marked increase. The major cause of this situation was the generation difference (Şahin, 2010; Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü, 2007). The first generation of the Turkish people use to spend their holidays in the cities, towns or the villages they were born (Yılmaz, 1994, p. 332). However, the second generation want to recognize the cultural and natural richness of the country as well as visiting their elders who remained in Turkey. The third generation is to buy mass touristic packages for Turkey and countries to spend their holidays.

The fact that the Germans and the Turks spending their holidays together in Turkey may have an alleviating effect upon the cultural, religious, custom and outfit clashes between the Germans and the Turks in Germany (Abadan Unat, 2011; Argun, 2003; Constant et al., 2007). This will also pave the way for the recognizance of the cultural and the natural touristic sites of Turkey located in Mediterranean and Aegean shores other than Istanbul. It will also have a positive effect on the elimination of the biased view the European people have towards Turkey and the Turks (Yılmaz, 1994, p. 337).

The spa tourism has been one of the major touristic options of the European people since the 18th century. Turkey ranks seventh in the world and first in Europe as regards to her geothermal sources. She ranks third in Europe as regard to spa tourism (Özgüç, 2003; Çetin, 2010, p. 121). If we take the rapidly ageing population of Europe, especially Germany, the importance of spa tourism becomes apparent. There are 10 million people in Germany using 69 million days of spa therapy. If we think that the expenses of these people are largely met by the insurance companies, the thermal tourism of Turkey for the ageing European population becomes doubly important (Çetin, 2010, p. 11).

The preference of the Germans, who constitute one out of every five tourists coming to Turkey, may be influenced by their friends, relatives and Turkish friends (Avcıkurt, 2009, p. 131). If we consider the intensive socio-cultural interaction between the Turks and Germans in Germany (Türkiye Araştırmalar Merkezi, 2000, p. 2-3) the Turks should assume an important task of introducing the cultural and natural richness of Turkey to their German friends. They are already contributing to the introduction of the diversified culture and natural beauties of Turkey in Germany (Uğuz, 2012).

The research show that the education and the briefing of the tourists about the culture of the country the intent to go would be very beneficial (Pearce, 1982, p. 78). Thus, the Turkish citizens living in Germany would be highly effective on the choice of German people to spend their holidays in Turkey.

Economically, the Turkish emigrants are well adapted to Europe (Küçükcan, 2009) and they prefer to utilize their investments in Europe rather than transferring them to Turkey (Kaya, 2008). As a result, there are numerous Turkish investors with sound knowledge, skills and capacity in Germany (Özpolat, 2012; Şen et al., 1999; Çımat et al., 2003; İnaltekin, 2009). These investors should be provided incentives to increase their share in the tourism sector of Turkey since they are well acquainted both with the Turkish and the European culture, so that nearly 20% of the German tourists come to Turkey through the tourism companies run by Turkish people.

1. METHOD

This is a descriptive study where the data were collected by the quantitative research model. The sample of the study as constituted by 210 Turkish citizens living in Frankfurt and Stadallendorf cities of Hessen state and Mainz city of Renanya-Palatina state of Germany.

The data were collected by the use of a 23 item survey with 5-likert choice scale developed by the worker to determine the opinions of the Turkish people living in Germany about the touristic values of Turkey. The data were analyzed by the SPSS (17.00) statistical software. The sub problems of the research was analyzed by using frequency (f), percentage (%), mean (\bar{x}), standard deviation (sd), and the independent groups were subjected to t- test and one way variance analysis (ANOVA) tests.

2. FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

This part of the study is devoted to the relations between the final scores of the participants and their gender, age, occupation, place of birth, the citizenship status and their period in Germany, frequency of their visits to Turkey, the type of holiday they prefer, the vehicle they use to go to Turkey. Their opinions about the cultural sites of Turkey have also been determined.

Table 1: The Touristic Values of Turkish Citizen Visitors Living in Germany.

Tourism value	f	Tourism value	f
Sultanahmet mosque	83	Pamukkale- Hierapolis	28
Topkapı palace	82	Troy antique city	24
Antalya and its environments	82	Spas	23
St. Sophia	76	Heaven and hell	21
Bursa city	57	Safranbolu city	14
Bodrum-Fethiye-Marmaris regions	55	Divriği great mosque	12
Ankara city	44	Hattuşaş-Çorum region	12
Çanakkale battle ground	43	Ihlara valley	12
Western Black sea highlands	41	Urfa city	12
Selimiye mosque	39	Haji Bektash Veli foundation	11
Ephesus	38	Mardin city	11
Sümela monastery	35	Nemrut mountain national park	9
Mevlana museum	32	Amasra region	6
Ürgüp-Göreme region	31		

According to Table 1, the touristic sites most frequently visited by the Turkish citizens participating in the study were Sultanahmet Mosque (83), Topkapı palace (82), Antalya and its vicinity (82) and St. Sophia (76). The touristic sites which are visited the least often were Amasra (6), Nemrut Mountain (9), Mardin city (11) and Haji Bektash Veli Complex (11). The number of visits by the Turkish citizens living abroad to the touristic sites in the UNESCO world heritage list such as Safranbolu, Divriği Great Mosque, Hattuşaş-Çorum, Nemrut mountain national park, Pamukkale-Hierapolis and Troy antique city were not at a satisfactory level. Ministry of culture and tourism should organize tours specific to Turkish citizens living abroad in order to equip them with adequate knowledge about the sites in the UNESCO world heritage list so that they can act as volunteering tourism attaches.

The most frequently visited sites of tourism by the participants were Sultanahmet Mosque, Topkapı Palace and St. Sophia. A study carried out by Yılmaz (1994) found that these are also the favorite visiting sites of the Turkish population living in Germany. The fact that these sites are also the major places visited by the foreign students living in Turkey shows that they are the most important touristic and cultural sites of the country (Çetin et al., 2012).

Table 2: The T-Test Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Gender

Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	sd	t	p
Female	94	74.68	7.88	208	.270	.787
Male	116	75.02	9.76			

Table 2 shows that there were not significant differences between the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey according to gender [$t_{(208)} = .270$; $p > .05$]. The arithmetic means of the total points of the females and males regarding the touristic values of Turkey were ($\bar{X} = 74.68$) and ($\bar{X} = 75.02$). The difference between them is not of statistical significance, which indicates that the opinions of the Turkish people living abroad are not affected by their gender.

Table 3: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions about Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Ages

variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	Ages	18 and below			27	74.96	8.55
19-30			95	74.35	8.77		
31-44			46	74.74	9.59		
45-64			25	79.24	7.62		
65 and above			17	71.53	9.25		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	Difference
Between groups		694.102	4	173.526	2.219	.068	--
Within group		16032.165	205	78.206			
Total		16726.267	209				

The results listed in Table 3 regarding the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey do not show a significant variation according to their ages [$F_{(4,205)} = 2.219$; $p > .05$]. This shows that the age does not have an important effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 4: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Educational Status

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	Educational status	Elementary			21	75.10	11.04
Secondary			26	75.19	8.29		
High school			89	74.93	9.17		
College or university			74	74.61	8.48		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		9.188	3	3.063	.038	.990	--
Within groups		16717.079	206	81.151			
Total		16726.267	209				

The analysis results listed in Table 4 show that the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey do not show a statistical relation with the education status. [$F_{(3-206)}=.038$; $p>.05$]. This shows that the educational status has no effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 5: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Occupational Status

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	Occupational status	Worker			54	77.06	9.56
Student			74	74.39	9.38		
House wives			25	75.36	7.88		
Self employed			31	72.32	8.54		
Retired			17	74.71	7.32		
Office worker			9	73.33	7.23		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		503.735	5	100.747	1.267	.280	--
Within groups	16222.532	204	79.522				
Total	16726.267	209					

The analysis data listed in Table 5 shows no significant difference between opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey

according to the occupational status [$F_{(5-204)}=1.267$; $p>.05$]. This shows that the occupational status of the Turkish citizens living in Germany does not affect their opinions about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 6: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Place of Birth

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	place of birth	Turkey			89	75.07	10.10
Germany			109	74.93	8.29		
Other countries			12	72.83	4.97		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		53.592	2	26.796	.333	.717	--
Within groups		16672.675	207	80.544			
Total		16726.267	209				

The opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey did not show a significant change according to their place of birth [$F_{(2-207)}=.333$; $p>.05$]. This shows the fact that this variable is not effective upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 7: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Citizenship Status

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	citizenship status	Citizen of Turkey			75	73.83	10.26
Citizen of Germany			109	75.54	8.22		
Trans citizenship			26	75.04	7.79		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		131.494	2	65.747	.820	.442	--
Within groups		16594.772	207	80.168			
Total		16726.267	209				

The opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey did not show a statistically significant variation according to their citizenship status [$F_{(2-207)}=.820$; $p>.05$]. This indicates that this variable does not have

an effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey (Table 7).

Table 8: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Period of Stay in Germany

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	The period of stay in Germany	Less than 10 years			25	71.80	7.48
11-20 years			55	75.60	9.12		
21-30 years			88	74.65	8.44		
More than 30 years			42	76.19	10.30		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		342.511	3	114.170	1.436	.234	--
Within groups		16383.756	206	79.533			
Total	16726.267	209					

According to Table 8, the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey did not show a statistically significant variation according to the length of their stay in Germany [$F_{(3-206)}=1.436$; $p>.05$]. In other words, the time they stayed in Germany does not have an effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 9: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to Their Frequency of Visits to Turkey

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	The frequency of their visit to Turkey	Never			2	71.50	3.54
Once every few years			82	73.72	8.07		
Once a year			72	76.08	8.82		
More than once a year			49	75.76	10.42		
Spend six months a year			5	68.80	7.79		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	P	difference
Between groups		459.857	4	114.964	1.449	.219	--
Within groups	16266.410	205	79.348				
Total	16726.267	209					

The data listed in Table 9 are not different compared to the other findings and it reveals that the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey do not show a statistically significant variation according to the frequency of visit to Turkey [$F_{(4-205)}=1.449$; $p>.05$]. It also indicates that the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey are not dependent upon the frequency of their visit to Turkey.

Table 10: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to the Type of Holiday

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
	The type of holiday in Turkey	Going to their home town			105	74.59	9.98
Going to spas			8	71.63	8.26		
Going to sea side			37	74.05	6.16		
Both going to their country and sea side			60	76.28	8.52		
The source of the variance		KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
Between groups		236.926	3	78.975	.987	.400	--
Within groups		16489.341	206	80.045			
Total		16726.267	209				

The situation is the same as the other variables and the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey do not show a statistically significant variation according to the type of holiday spent there [$F_{(3-206)}=.987$; $p>.05$]. This shows the fact that the type of holiday in Turkey does not have any effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

Table 11: The ANOVA Results of the Participant Opinions Related to Touristic Values of Turkey According to the Vehicle Used During Their Visits

Variable				N	\bar{X}	S	
The type of vehicle used in their visits	Plane			165	75.00	9.41	
	Car			30	74.17	8.06	
	Train			7	75.14	3.34	
	Boat			8	74.50	5.88	
	The source of the variance	KT	sd	KO	F	p	difference
	Between groups	19.243	3	6.414	.079	.971	--
	Within groups	16707.024	206	81.102			
Total	16726.267	209					

The opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey do not show a statistically significant variation according to the vehicle used in their visits to Turkey [$F_{(3-206)}=.079$; $p>.05$]. This finding indicates that the type of vehicle used has no effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Half of the participants stated that they spent their holidays in their home towns, 20% of them said that they go to sea sides and 25 of them said that they go to both their home towns and sea sides. The second and especially the third generation Turkish people have different preferences than their parents and the tourism agency and investors should take this fact into account.

Almost 80% of the participants said that they recommended Turkey to their German friends. The tourism investors and agencies should seek the ways to use the Turkish citizens in Germany as the touristic attaches for the introduction of the country.

It is clear that the gender, age, educational status, birth place, citizenship status, educational status, occupational status, the period of stay in Germany, the frequency of visit to Turkey, the type of holiday spent in Turkey and the vehicle used for these visits do not have any effect upon the opinions of the participants about the touristic values of Turkey.

The substructure for the promotion of the work power, knowledge, investment power, organizational capacity, sociopolitical level of the

Turkish people in Europe should be established and sound tourism policies should be developed in order to improve the tourism sector of Turkey.

It is necessary to establish sustainable policies to strengthen the cultural ties of the Turkish citizens living abroad with Turkey, by taking the generation differences into account. Thus, the mass media tools such as music, visual arts, cinema, theater and other artistic activities should be utilized as much as possible. The Turkish media strives hard to maintain the cultural identity of the Turks living there. The fact that nearly 2/3 of the Turkish population in Europe prefer to watch the Turkish TV channels (Radyo and Televizyon Üst Kurulu, 2007) provides a wonderful opportunity for the introduction of the Turkish cultural and touristic values.

The advantages of encouraging Turkish citizens living in Germany to spend their holidays in Turkey are as follows:

✓ The fact that the Turkish citizens having their holidays in Turkey is very important to stop their children alienating from the Turkish culture without having any linguistic, cultural and feeding problems.

✓ The Turkish citizens living abroad, especially in Germany, are sometimes treated as second-class citizens. The necessary legal precautions should be taken as soon as possible to obviate such a situation. The maintenance of such an attitude will undoubtedly alienate the 2nd and 3rd generation Turkish people from Turkey and they will seek other destinations for their holidays. This will have a very adverse effect upon the tourism sector of the country.

✓ The foreign firms should be encouraged to make joint investments in Turkey especially in the tourism and health sectors.

✓ There should be periodic festivals and similar activities organized in Europe by the Turkish Ministry of Tourism and Culture in order to have the Turkish people living in Europe acquainted with the Turkish cultural and natural richness.

✓ Summer schools should be organized for the Turkish students studying abroad in order to introduce them to Turkish language, culture, education, history and customs.

✓ The government of the Turkish Republic should establish strong diplomatic ties with the countries where a sizable Turkish population lives, in order to ensure them to have a healthy and peaceful life. Thus, the duties of the Office of the Turkish People and Relative Communities Living Abroad should be extended and be converted into a ministry by employing experts on cultural, geographical, historical, sociological fields, Turkish language and Turkish literature. This will pave the way for establishing a

stronger Turkish lobby in the European Union and getting a larger slice from the tourism pie.

✓The necessary precautions against the racist attacks against the Turkish people in Europe especially in Germany should be taken by close coordination with the German and other authorities (Yurt Dışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı, 2011b; Hacettepe Üniversitesi Göç ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2012). The European people must be persuaded that the Turks are not there for the occupation but they came to Europe for its development.

✓If we consider the fact that the Turkish people called as the third generation were born in Germany, teaching them the Turkish culture is of paramount importance (Çetin & Ercan, 2008). Thus, it is necessary to include Turkish culture courses and teaching Turkish as a second language in the German educational curricula.

REFERENCES

- Abadan Unat, N (2011). *Turks in Europe, From Guestworker to Transnational Citizen*. Oxford: Berghahn Book.
- Argun, B. E. (2003) *Turkey in Germany: The transnational Sphere of Deutschkei*. New York: Routledge.
- Auslanderzahlen 2009. *Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge*. Nürnberg, 2009.
- Avcı, G. (2005). Religion, Transnationalism and Turks in Europe. *Turkish Studies*, 6 (2), 201-213.
- Avcıkurt, C. (2007). *Turizm Sosyolojisi; Turist-Yerel Halk Etkileşimi*. Ankara: Detay.
- Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü. (2007). *Almanya'da Yaşayan Türklerin Aile Yapısı ve Sorunları Araştırması*. Ankara: Başbakanlık Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Constant, A., Shachmurove, Y., & Zimmerman, K. F. (2007). What Makes an Entrepreneur and Does it Pay? Native Men, Turks and other Migrants in Germany. *International Migration*, 45 (4), 71-100.
- Çetin, T., & Ercan, L. (2008). Yurt Dışından Geri Dönüş Yapan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sorunlarının İncelenmesi. *Ege Üniversitesi Türk Dünyası İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 8 (2), 65-80.
- Çetin, T. (2010). *Termal Turizmin Başkenti Afyonkarahisar*. Ankara: Beyazkalem.
- Çetin, T., Karakuş, U., & Aksoy, B. (2012). “Yabancı Uyruklu Öğrencilerin Turizm Ve Türkiye'nin Turizm Değerlerine İlişkin Algıları”. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5 (3), 180-195.
- Çimat, A., & Bahar O. (2003). Turizm Sektörünün Türkiye Ekonomisi İçindeki Yeri ve Önemi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. *Akdeniz I.I.B.F. Dergisi*, (6), 1-18.
- Doğanay, H. (2001). *Türkiye Turizm Coğrafyası*. Konya: Çizgi.
- Doğaner, S. (2001). *Türkiye Turizm Coğrafyası*. İstanbul: Çantay.

- Duran, E. (2011). Turizm, Kültür ve Kimlik İlişkisi; Turizmde Toplumsal ve Kültürel Kimliğin Sürdürülebilirliği. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10 (19), 291-313.
- Emekli, G. (2005). Avrupa Birliği'nde Turizm Politikaları ve Türkiye'de Kültürel Turizm. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi*, (14), 99-107.
- Emekli, G. (2006). Coğrafya, Kültür ve Turizm: Kültürel Turizm. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi*, (15), 51-59.
- Hacettepe Üniversitesi Göç ve Siyaset Araştırmaları Merkezi. (2012). Almanya'da İrkçi ve Neo-Nazi Cinayetler: Türklerin Görüş ve Duyguları Araştırması- Almanya, 2011.
- İnaltekin, A. (2009). Almanyalı Türklerin Alman Toplumuna Siyasi, İktisadi ve Kültürel Etkileri. 1. Uluslararası Tarihi ve Kültürel Yönleriyle Türk-Alman İlişkileri Sempozyumu Bildirileri içinde (263-269). Selçuk Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, 8-10 October 2009.
- Karagöz, K. (2008). Türkiye'nin Turizm Potansiyeli: Çekim Modeli Yaklaşımı. *Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 19 (2), 149-156.
- Kaya, A. (2005). Citizenship and the Hyphenated Germans: German-Turks. In F. Keyman and A. İçduygu, (Eds.), *Citizenship and Identity in a Globalizing World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences*. London: Routledge.
- Kaya, A., & Kentel, F. (2005). *Euro-Türkler. Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü, Engel mi? Almanya Türkleri ve Fransa Türkleri Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Çalışma*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Kaya, İ. (2008). Avrupalı Türkler: Misafir İşçilikten Avrupa Vatandaşlığına. *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi*, (19), 149-166.
- Kozak, N., Kozak, M. A. ve Kozak, M. (2011). *Genel Turizm (İlkeler-Kavramlar)*. Ankara: Detay.
- Küçükcan, T. (2009). Almanya'da Türkler, Kimlik Ayırıştırılmaları ve İslam. In *Yurtdışındaki Türkler: 50. Yılında Göç ve Uyum* (303-310).
- Mutluer, M., & Südaş, İ. (2008). Yurtdışında Yaşayan Türk Vatandaşlarının Türkiye Turizmine Katkısı ve Turizm Eğilimleri. *Ege Coğrafya Dergisi*, 17 (1-2), 27-34.
- Özgüç, N. (2003). *Turizm Coğrafyası Özellikler ve Bölgeler*. İstanbul: Çantay.
- Özpolat, V. (2012). Küreselleşme Sürecinde Yurt Dışındaki Türklerin Önemi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (34), 211-219.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behavior*. Oxford; New York: Pergamum Press.
- Radyo ve Televizyon Üst Kurulu (2007). *Almanya'da Yaşayan Türklerin Televizyon İzleme Eğilimleri: Kamuoyu Araştırması*. RTÜK Kamuoyu Yayın Araştırmaları ve Ölçme Dairesi Başkanlığı.
- Şahin, B. (2010). Almanya'daki Türk Göçmenlerin Sosyal Entegrasyonunun Kuşaklar Arası Karşılaştırması: Kültürleşme. *Bilig*, (55), 103-134.
- Şen, F., Ulusoy, Y., & Öz, G. (1999). *Avrupa Türkleri (Federal Almanya ve Diğer AB Ülkelerinde Çalışan Türklerin Ekonomik Gücü)*. Cumhuriyet Kitapları.
- Türkiye Araştırmalar Merkezi. (2000). *Almanya'daki Türkler*. Zentrum für Türkeistudien-Institut an der Universität, GH Essen, Nisan 2000, pp. 1-7. Retrieved April, 13, 2011 from <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/yayinlarimiz/anadolununesi>
- Türsab. (2009). *Almanya'nın Turizm Pazarı*. TÜRSAB Ar-ge Departmanı.

- Uğuz, S. Ç. (2012). Göç ve Turizm: Türkiye-Almanya Örneği. *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10 (19), 1-30.
- Yılmaz, C. (1994). Türkiye’de Turizmin Geliştirilmesi ve Turizm Gelirlerinin Artırılmasında Batı Avrupa’daki İşçilerimizden Faydalanma İmkânları. Türkiye Kalkınma Bankası, *Turizm Yılığ-1994*, Ankara, pp. 328–342.
- Yurt Dışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı. (2011a). *Almanya ve Göç: 50. Yılında Almanya’da Türkler Sempozyumu*. Ankara: Yurtdışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı.
- Yurt Dışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı. (2011b). *Avrupa’da Yaşayan Türkler Yaz Tatili Döneminde Türkiye’ye Gelen Türkler Örneği Saha Araştırması*. Ankara: Yurtdışı Türkler ve Akraba Topluluklar Başkanlığı.