

EVALUATION OF PARADOXICAL COMMUNICATION CRITERIA IN DESTINATION MANAGEMENT: A STUDY ON HOTEL MANAGERS

Avaliação de Critérios da Comunicação Paradoxal na Gestão de Destino:
Um Estudo sobre Gestores Hoteleiros

HAKAN AKYURT¹ & ŞERIF AHMET DEMİRDAĞ²

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18226/21789061.v14i3p618>

ABSTRACT

Relevant in every field, communication also plays a critical role in destination management. The sustainability of tourism destinations, and all touristic establishments, rely on clear and effective communication between decision-makers and managers. On the other hand, paradoxical communication arises from problems in communication channels within the organizations. This study aims to determine which of the paradoxical communication criteria hotel managers attach more importance in terms of destination management. Ordering these criteria by their degree of importance is an effective source of information to increase the establishments' efficiency and, thus, the destinations' efficiency. The Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) was used in this context to rank the paradoxical communication criteria according to their importance. The results obtained from the data analysis have determined that the most important paradoxical communication criterion is "system", and the criteria of "trust, listening, work distribution, friendship, self-expression, anxiety, work stress, and workplace goals" are also important for hotel managers in destination management, respectively. With the effective management of paradoxical communication criteria, it will be possible to provide a sustainable structure in hotel staff commitment to the establishments and, therefore, in the touristic demand in the destinations.

KEYWORDS

Tourism; Hotels; Destination Management; Paradoxical Communication; AHP.

RESUMO

Relevante em todos os campos, a comunicação também desempenha um papel importante na gestão dos destinos turísticos. A sustentabilidade dos destinos turísticos, assim como de todos os estabelecimentos do setor, depende de uma comunicação clara e eficiente entre tomadores de decisões e gestores. Por outro lado, a <comunicação paradoxal> emerge de problemas nos canais de comunicação dentro das organizações. O objetivo deste estudo é determinar qual dos critérios da comunicação paradoxal os gerentes de hotéis dão mais importância em termos de gestão de destinos. Ordenar esses critérios pelo seu grau de importância é uma fonte de

¹ **Hakan Akyurt** – Doctor. Associate Professor Giresun University, Bulancak Kadir Karabaş Vocational School, Department of Tourism Management, Giresun Merkez, Giresun, Turkey. ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6522-684X> E-mail: hakan.akyurt@giresun.edu.tr

² **Şerif Ahmet Demirdağ** – Doctor. Assist. Professor Giresun University, Bulancak Kadir Karabaş Vocational School, Department of Tourism Management, Giresun Merkez, Giresun, Turkey. ORCID ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4317-5727E> E-mail: serif.demirdag@giresun.edu.tr

informação eficaz para aumentar a eficiência dos estabelecimentos e, portanto, a eficiência dos destinos. O Processo de Hierárquico Analítico (AHP) foi utilizado neste contexto para classificar os critérios da comunicação paradoxal segundo as suas importâncias. Os resultados obtidos a partir da análise dos dados determinaram que o critério de comunicação paradoxal mais importante é o "sistema", e os critérios de "confiança, escuta, distribuição do trabalho, amizade, auto-expressão, ansiedade, estresse no trabalho e objetivos no local de trabalho" também são importantes para os gerentes de hotelaria na gestão de destinos, respectivamente. Com a gestão eficaz de critérios da comunicação paradoxal, será possível prover uma estrutura sustentável no comprometimento de funcionários de hotel com os estabelecimentos e, portanto, na demanda turística nos destinos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Turismo; Hotelaria; Gestão de Destinos, Comunicação Paradoxal, AHP.

INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector is one of the today's most important sectors with its human-oriented structure and income generating effect. Due to the direct service and product presentation to customers, it is in a structure where communication elements are used and should be used continuously. Communication between people has a structure that directly affects the productivity and working conditions of establishments in business life. Hotels, which play a primary role in touristic demands in destinations, have a significant impact on the communication between customers and employees. Sustainable working status and efficiency of hotels are possible with the create of an effective communication network by hotel managers. Therefore, forms of communication have an important place for hotel managers. Developing and managing a clear and effective communication channel in organizations will improve the service quality and increase the satisfaction level, trust and loyalty of employees. In this way, each staff member working in the hotel establishments will appear in front of the tourists as the promotional face of the hotel, and the customers who leave the hotel will make significant contributions to revisit and transfer a positive image to their acquaintances. Tourism establishments have an important role in terms of tourism destinations being an important tourism center. For example, tourists who are not satisfied with the accommodation facilities are likely to be satisfied with the destination where the establishment is located. Therefore, in order for a destination to be a sustainable tourism center of attraction, effective communication elements must be implemented, starting from the hotels and other accommodation facilities.

Effective management of communication elements in tourism has a positive effect on the

sustainability of tourism establishments and on their income. The effective creation of communication elements between tourists and establishments is important for both the tourism sector and the future of touristic destinations. Due to the direct interaction of tourism with people, communication elements should be constantly examined. The main reason for this is the changing demands and expectations of tourists. Due to the touristic behaviors that are in a constant change, it is seen as a necessity to investigate the communication elements with a different perspective to each destination (Tölkes, 2018). The types of communication carried out in tourism establishments directly affect the touristic demands of destinations. For this reason, it is necessary to examine the communication types applied in tourism sector in detail and to determine their effects on destinations.

A tourist who is not satisfied with his visit or holiday is unlikely to visit the same destination again in the future or recommend it to his acquaintances. In order for destinations to achieve a sustainable tourism demand, communication channels must be clear and used effectively. Therefore, it would be appropriate to reveal the communication criteria of each destination in order to increase the demands of destinations. Due to the differences between the destinations, it is seen as a scientific necessity to carry out these studies separately for each destination and to compare the results obtained (Amin & Priansah, 2019). In this context, there are many different types of communication in the field of tourism. Based on the fact that these varieties will be different for each destination, revealing the communication elements is seen as an important issue in terms of destination management. Since it will be possible to determine how a destination is perceived by the tourists and to learn their expectations by revealing the communication elements, communication is important in terms of achieving a sustainable structure of the destination.

Paradoxical communication, which is among the types of communication, is shown among the important social problems in terms of relations between people. The continuous demand for a tourism destination requires reaching tourists with the use of the right communication channels. An effective communication management will both have a positive effect on the demand of the destination in the future and will create a positive image in the perceptions of tourists in tourism establishments. On the other hand, tourism accommodation facilities, which are the basic building blocks of tourism destinations, should be evaluated in terms of paradoxical communication and the problems related to this situation should be eliminated. In this way, first of all, an effective communication will be provided with the tourists staying in tourism

establishments, and then positive perceptions about the visited destination will be established in the minds of the tourists. In order for the destinations to be promoted, attract demand and achieve a sustainable structure, the main problems in the communication channels in the destination must be solved absolutely. Seamless communication is one of the most necessary elements for the spread of tourism in a destination.

In paradoxical communication, which is caused by different problems in communication channels, there is a situation where the messages directed by more than one message source to the recipients cannot be fully understood (Watzlawick, Weakland & Fisch, 1974). In hotel establishments, it is a common situation to provide communication between both employees and managers from two or more sources. This situation can be explained by the dynamic and complex structure of hotel establishments and the fact that there are too many departments in hotels. Because, the fact that there are many different departments in hotels can cause communication channels to become complicated in some cases. Therefore, in cases where there is paradoxical communication, the origin of the messages from different places can lead to complexity of communication and problems in perceptions. This situation, which occurs in communication channels, creates the situation of not understanding and fulfilling the messages given by the managers. As a result, conflicts or problems may arise in serving customers or between managers and employees. So, hotel managers need to solve paradoxical communication problems in these and similar situations. The paradoxical situation in communication leads to a decrease in the quality of service and thus a decrease in organizational efficiency. The existing of messages coming from multiple sources at the same time harms the working environment and causes dissatisfaction and unrest in organizations.

A strong communication environment in organizations will directly affect many organizational factors. In order to increase the productivity of the employees and to provide good service to the customers, mutual communication should be achieved in an effective structure. Solving paradoxical communication problems in organizations will not only improve the communication between employees and customers, but will also eliminate disagreements with management. For this reason, many different departments within the hotel need a working environment away from a paradoxical communication problem. One of the other effective methods in solving these kinds of problems is to provide training to the personnel in the field of tourism and communication (Akyurt & Ültay, 2021). It is a fact that the communication of trained personnel in tourism establishments reflects more positively on customers. For this reason, it is possible

to state that there is a need for a continuous training process on communication.

The role of hotels in destination management is constantly increasing. Because, hotel management has a great impact on increasing the attractiveness of destinations and making them sustainable. In this context, an accurate destination management is only possible with an effective communication structure. Considering that communication is the most valuable system in hotel managements from past to present, the absence of a paradoxical communication problem will help the profitability of the establishments and a sustainable personnel employment.

It can be said that paradoxical communication is generally more popular in psychology and medicine and more academic studies have been done on this subject. In the field of tourism, which has an important income-generating effect, no academic study has been found on this subject kind of communication. The fact that there is no academic study on this subject, both in terms of contribution to the literature and being original, reveals the importance of this study. However, studies on communication problems, paradoxical communication, etc. are very important especially for the tourism sector and hotel establishments, which require continuous face-to-face communication. In this study, information about the paradoxical communication problem and how to reduce or eliminate it in the hotel establishments where the most personnel are employed proportionally in the tourism sector is presented. In this context, the perspectives of hotel managers on paradoxical communication were determined and their feelings, thoughts and ideas about this problem were interpreted. Although the paradoxical communication encountered in hotels seems to be a common situation due to the characteristic structure of the tourism sector, it is an organizational problem that needs to be dealt with. This paper offers solutions according to the thoughts of hotel managers in paradoxical communication and some suggestions are presented according to these results. In this context, it is expected that this study will make positive contributions to the increase of the productivity of the employees working in the hotels, to put forward the solutions for the paradoxical communication problems, to the improvement of the relations with the customers and to the general efficiency of the hotels.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Destination is defined as a piece of land where geographically perceived variables are similar, geological structure, soil, climate, fauna and flora, and some of which has been shaped by

humans (Friedmann & Weaver, 1980). According to another definition, a destination is expressed as a place where a community with the particular purpose of travel meets its needs (Gunn, 1994). In terms of tourism, the concept of destination is defined as a mixture of elements that must be found together in order to obtain a satisfying holiday experience and are interconnected with each other at different levels. A touristic destination is a piece of land that creates a demand on its own with the attractions it creates and offers, and also meets the secondary requirements of this demand that arise during the main visit purpose. The ability of a place to be called a destination depends on the existence of one or more of the basic requirements of tourism demand such as natural, historical and cultural values. Having elements that will meet the needs such as accommodation, nutrition, entertainment and other services, and in addition to these needs, factors such as the approach of the people of the region to tourism and the distance to the tourism market are the general characteristics of the destination (Usta, 2008).

Attraction factors of a destination are expressed as natural factors, cultural factors, economic factors, transportation factors, political factors and religious factors (Olalı & Timur, 1988). In this context, the most important establishments that are effective in destinations are hotels. Hotels have an important place in the economic and social use of destinations for tourism purposes. Communication between employees-co-workers and employees-customers in hotels plays an active role in the attractiveness of the destination. For this reason, it is important that communication structures are effectively established and systematized. Due to the intense human relations in the tourism sector, which is a kind of service sector (Demirdağ, 2019), the communication process, communication problems and communication improvements should be considered as a priority issue.

Along with issues such as long working hours and seasonality in the tourism sector, communication problems experienced in intercultural interaction also cause work stress to be experienced intensely. Job stress stands out as a factor that negatively affects job performance (Matyushchenko, 2006). However, not only verbal communication, but also non-verbal communication is very important in the tourism sector. For example, in studies examining the communication styles of hotels between service providers and tourists, it has been determined that customers give importance not only to verbal communication skills of service providers, but also to non-verbal communication skills (Mattsson & Haring, 1998). In another study, it is stated that social interaction rules are extremely important in hotel establishments where face-to-face

communication is at the forefront, and customers are careful about communication in terms of evaluating service delivery and management (Gabbott & Hogg, 2001).

The effectiveness of the communication channels that hotel managers try to establish within the organization is a critical issue in the continuous work of the employees and customer relations. The right perception of the communication system by the employees in organizations also directly affects the productivity of the organizations. However, communication styles are important for employees to respond to customers' requests and needs. Positive communication with every customer staying or receiving service at the hotel is also necessary in terms of the general image and brand value of the hotel. In terms of creating a sustainable demand, it is obligatory to establish communication channels within the hotel in a way that is understandable by all parties. Otherwise, it is highly likely that the hotel management will have problems with suppliers, employees and customers, which will hinder the productivity of the hotel. Since the communications at the destination will not be limited to the effective communications of the hotel management, establishing a seamless communication structure at the highest level is important for the future of the destinations.

There are numerous studies and definitions in the literature on communication. Among the different definitions, it can be stated that the most general definition of communication can be as "a mechanism in which relations between people are realized" (Evers, 2010, p. 14). Communication is an important concept used by today's businesses in a wide variety of channels such as advertising, public relations, personal sales and information, and the success level of communication can be determined by providing the desired level of sales of the goods and services of the establishments (Giritlioğlu & Avcıkurt, 2010). Communication is a social activity that is needed both in the private life and in the business area of human life. In almost all of the activities carried out in tourism, the communication element becomes more valuable than other many activities. Communication in tourism is an indispensable element not only between consumers and producers (suppliers), but also for all other stakeholders. The communication styles and behaviors of the employees, which directly affect the image and sales of the organizations, among themselves, with the customers and with the management are important. For this reason, a clear and good communication environment, especially in the tourism sector, is of vital importance for the sustainable operation of hotels and therefore destinations.

Although paradoxical communication is a concept within the communication models between

people, it also emerges as one of the communication problems. Paradoxical communication, which expresses the problems that arise in the perception of more than one message by the recipient in communication between people, is stated as the complexity of information and the inability to understand the messages given (Dehasse, 2001). Paradoxical communication has a structure that affects communication between people, especially in business life. People can communicate with many different people in their daily lives, and at the same time, there is the opportunity to organize these communication channels. However, this situation may be slightly different in business life. For instance, employees have to communicate verbally or non-verbally with many supervisors, they have to perceive these messages correctly and apply them to their work. In other words, in some cases in business life, these communication channels may not always be controllable. Therefore, paradoxical communication problems are a problem that is frequently encountered in business life and needs to be solved.

Paradoxical communication, which occurs as a result of the emergence of contradictions in the verbal and non-verbal transmission of messages between people's communications, creates problems when the messages are perceived by the receivers. The existence of paradoxical communication complicates both communication within organizations and communication between people. The hidden contents underlying the messages or the implications in the movements in non-verbal communication are accepted as the basic indicators of paradoxical communication. It is known that as a result of people being affected by paradoxical communication, problems such as anxiety, worry and loneliness arise, and these negative effects, especially in business life, have effects on business efficiency. The decrease in social interaction between people or the development of an insincere way leads to negative effects on both people's happiness and the uneasiness of the working environment (Papa, Singhal, Law et al., 2006).

The existence of paradoxical communication within organizations is generally stated as a communication problem revealed by verbal and non-verbal expressions that are hiddenly stated. It is also stated that if this problem is not resolved, people will be in an unhappy psychology both in their working and private lives. It is clear that people who are in a paradoxical communication environment will have more anxiety and stress, and this may negatively affect the operation of the organizations (Prescott & Wilson, 2012). Therefore, paradoxical communication generally emerges with verbal expressions, encodings, signs, interpretations and non-verbal movements among employees in establishments. Bonenberger (2007) states

that the main factors of paradoxical communication in the business environment are trust, work distribution, self-expression, friendship, work stress, workplace goals, listening, system and anxiety. Paradoxical communication in organizations results in an uneasy working environment for employees and managers. At this point, paradoxical communication has a more critical importance for tourism establishments.

The management styles of the hotels in the destinations affect the touristic demands and thus the recognition of the destinations. Since the role of hotels has an important place in the destinations that are thought to be brought to tourism, the communication elements in the internal structure of the hotels are also important. The presence of paradoxical communication will primarily lead to inefficient work of employees and problems in communicating with customers. In addition, the large number of departments in hotels and, accordingly, the high number of managers in each department increase the possibility of paradoxical communication. For this reason, in terms of effective management of destinations in tourism, predetermining and solving paradoxical communication elements that will arise in hotels will be a valuable resource in terms of touristic demand.

In the relevant literature, no study has been found on paradoxical communication in destination management, hotels or tourism establishments. However, although there is no study related to the aforementioned variable, it has been observed that many studies have been conducted to determine the communication elements in hotel establishments. It is known that the literature on paradoxical communication is generally concentrated in the fields of medicine and psychology, and it was first studied by Watzlawick, Weakland and Fisch in 1974. The study, which examines the effects of paradoxes on communication in general, is accepted as the basis of paradoxical communication. The thesis on paradoxical communication for the office environment was found in 2007 by Bonenberger, where paradoxical communication criteria were taken for this study in terms of similarity. On the other hand, there are differences in terms of the method of the subject and the research area. However, in Bonenberger's study, "listening" was identified as the most effective paradoxical communication criterion. Similarly, in another study by Ünüvar (2009), the effects of interpersonal communication on hotel businesses were investigated. In this study, he concluded that verbal and non-verbal communication was effective especially in the front office. The similarity of Ünüvar's (2009) study with this study is that it was conducted in the field of communication and on hotels, but it differs in terms of paradoxical communication and method. Regarding the subject and method

of the study, no similar study could be found, which is important in terms of the originality of the study.

METHODOLOGY

Purpose and importance of the study - This paper aims to reveal which of the paradoxical communication criteria are more important in hotels, which are the most important establishments in destination management, and to improve the communication of hotels with internal and external customers by reducing paradoxical communication problems. Paradoxical communication problems in hotels cause a decrease in touristic demand, an increase in personnel turnover, and thus negatively affect the management of destinations in tourism. Therefore, understanding and solving which paradoxical communication elements are important in hotel establishments will increase the tourist potential of destinations. The aim of this study is to sort the paradoxical communication criteria in hotel establishments according to the degree of importance, and to resolve the communication with hotel managers, employees and customers.

Sample group of the study - The study was conducted on chain hotel establishments in the provinces of Ordu, Giresun, Trabzon, Rize, Artvin, Gümüşhane and Bayburt in the Eastern Black Sea Region of Turkey. In this context, there are 3 international chain hotels in Ordu, 2 international chain hotels in Giresun, 4 international chain hotels in Trabzon, and 1 international chain hotel each in Rize and Gümüşhane. A questionnaire was prepared for the general managers of all these hotels in accordance with the AHP method, and online surveys were conducted with 5 hotel managers and 6 hotel managers face to face. In the Analytical Hierarchy Process Method, expert opinion is sufficient and important. Although the entire universe has been reached, even a single expert opinion meets the universe of the research in this method (Erdal & Korucuk, 2018).

Validity and reliability of the study - The criteria used in the research were taken from previous studies with validity and reliability results. Therefore, there is no problem regarding the validity and reliability of the research. The questionnaire used in the study was adapted for hotel establishments from the study on paradoxical communication for the office environment conducted by Bonenberger in 2007. In his study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated as $\alpha=0.891$, and this value shows that the application of the study is within reliable limits. The

fact that this coefficient is found in the range of 0.8-1 in studies in the field of social sciences indicates that the research practice is highly reliable (Cronbach, 1951). However, the CR value, which is the result of the study's own reliability, was determined as CR=0.0742. Therefore, since the reliability result is less than 0.1, it is accepted that the survey and answers of the study are reliable (Saaty, 1980). The fact that the criteria applied in the study is for business life makes it reasonable to apply in hotel establishments. The criteria were adapted according to the AHP method. In the study, 9 criteria for paradoxical communication thoughts of international chain hotels general managers are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Analytical Hierarchy Process Method Scale Basic Criteria Table

Criteria	Basic Criteria
1	Self-Expression (C1)
2	Friendship (C2)
3	Listening (C3)
4	Work Distribution (C4)
5	Anxiety (C5)
6	Trust (C6)
7	Workplace Goals (C7)
8	System (C8)
9	Work Stress (C9)

Analysis - The Analytical Hierarchy Process [AHP] Method, which is one of the popular Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Methods, was used in the study. This method was developed by Thomas L. Saaty in the 1970s and is an analysis method used in solving decision problems. AHP is used to show the ideas of decision makers in multi-dimensional decision-making processes and creates a hierarchical model that shows the connection between the problem's goal, criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives (Uğur & Sarioğlu Uğur, 2019). AHP is an effective method for the decision maker to rank the decision alternatives, make pairwise comparisons and choose the best among them. This method is among the most preferred methods because it is easy to understand in solving complex and multidimensional problems. AHP is an analysis method that aims to reveal the prioritization and foresight among the factors predetermined by the researcher in terms of importance levels (Yiğit & Demirtaş, 2020).

The mathematical theorems and operations given in the study are important in terms of

understanding the AHP scale and revealing how the application is made. In every academic study in which the AHP method is used, the following mathematical operations and formulas should be specified in the method section. The aforementioned structure has to be presented in order to reveal the order in which the results are obtained and with which processes they are found. Since the AHP method is a technical analysis, giving the order of the equations and formulas provides a better understanding of the method. In similar academic studies (Fabac & Zver, 2011; Lee & Lee, 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Tian et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2021), the ordering of these equations and formulas is given. The application steps in the AHP method are listed as follows:

Step 1 – Creating a Hierarchical Structure: In the AHP method, a hierarchical structure must first be created for solving the problem. After determining the aim of the study in this structure, appropriate criteria should be selected for this aim. It is possible to determine more than one criterion related to the study, as well as to have sub-criteria for these criteria (Tulga, Çeliker, & Yağız, 2016).

Step 2 – Determining the Priorities: After the hierarchical structure is established, the pairwise comparison matrix is made as the second step. It is aimed to compare the criteria with each other in the pairwise comparison matrix (Erdal & Korucuk, 2018). The criteria on the 1 to 9 importance scale developed by Saaty (1980) take the value of 1 when they are equally important and 9 when they are extremely important [See Table 2].

Table 2. AHP Scale Severity Table

Severity	Description	Explanation
1	Equally Important	Two criteria of equal importance
3	Moderately Important	The situation where one criterion is slightly more important than the other
5	Strongly Important	The situation where one criterion is more important than the other
7	Very Strongly Important	The situation where one criterion is very more important than the other
9	Absolutely Important	The situation where one criterion is strongly more important than the other
2, 4, 6, 8	Intermediate Values	Intermediate values of the importance levels determined above

Step 3 – Determination of the Eigenvector: Column vectors are used to reveal the percent importance distributions of the criteria expressed. B column vector of type “n x n” is created. In the calculation of B column vectors, the following “Equation 1” is used (Saaty, 1994).

Equation 1.

$$b_{ij} = \frac{a_{ij}}{\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}}$$

C matrix is obtained by arranging n number of B column vectors in matrix format.

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & \dots & c_{1n} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} & \dots & c_{2n} \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ c_{n1} & c_{n2} & \dots & c_{nm} \end{bmatrix}$$

Along with the created C matrix, there are percent importance distributions that reveal the importance values between the criteria. In order to reach this result, it is necessary to take the arithmetic average of the row components by using Equation 2. The W column vector specified as the Priority Vector is reached.

Equation 2.

$$w_i = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n c_{ij}}{n}$$

Step 4 – Calculation of the Consistency Ratio (CR): The eigenvalue vector and the maximum eigenvalue are calculated for each matrix. Then the consistency indicator (CI) is calculated. The basis of the CR calculation is the comparison of the number of criteria and a coefficient called the Base Value (λ). In order to calculate λ , firstly, the D column vector is obtained from the matrix multiplication of the comparison matrix A and the priority vector W.

Equation 3 shows that the base value (E) for each evaluation criterion is obtained from the

division of the reciprocal elements of the obtained column vector D and column vector W.

Equation 3.

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & & \cdot \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ w_n \end{bmatrix}$$

The arithmetic means of these values, Equation 4, gives the basic value (λ) for the comparison.

Equation 4.

$$CI = \frac{\lambda - n}{n - 1}$$

After calculating the λ value, the Consistency Indicator (CI) is calculated by Equation 5.

Equation 5.

$$\lambda = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n E_i}{n}$$

When it comes to the last step, CI is divided by the standard correction value expressed as Random Indicator (RI), and the CR value is obtained by Equation 6.

Equation 6.

$$CR = \frac{CI}{RI}$$

It is necessary to obtain data indicating that the answers given to the questionnaires applied in the study are consistent. The fact that the CR value is less than 0.1 as a result of the analyzes with the AHP method shows that the participants who answered the questionnaire responded consistently and the study was reliable. If the CR value is greater than 0.1, it indicates that there is a calculation error in the AHP method or that the respondents gave inconsistent answers. For

these reasons, it may be possible to repeat the AHP analysis (Saaty, 1980; Karaatlı and Davras, 2014).

FINDINGS

In the Analytical Hierarchy Method [AHP], a pairwise comparison matrix of the previously specified criteria was created. Then, by taking the geometric averages, the obtained findings were evaluated in “Super decision V 3.2.”. In the study, the pairwise comparison matrix as a result of the analyzes made by AHP method is presented in detail in Table 3.

Table 3. Pairwise Comparisons Matrix

	Self-Expression	Friendship	Listening	Work Distribution	Anxiety	Trust	Workplace Goals	System	Work Stress
Self-Expression	1,00	2,70	1,07	2,16	0,91	1,35	0,18	0,95	0,20
Friendship	0,21	1,00	0,28	0,56	0,38	0,32	0,17	0,60	0,19
Listening	1,63	2,43	1,00	3,97	1,72	4,51	0,26	2,05	0,31
Work Distribution	0,32	1,79	0,25	1,00	0,53	0,34	0,11	0,64	0,17
Anxiety	1,62	2,65	0,58	1,89	1,00	1,98	0,17	2,00	0,19
Trust	4,74	3,13	3,33	5,90	2,52	1,00	0,30	1,25	0,18
Workplace Goals	0,52	0,80	0,83	1,05	0,74	5,80	1,00	5,66	0,52
System	5,05	5,66	3,72	8,55	3,50	0,80	0,35	1,00	5,42
Work Stress	0,94	0,20	0,27	0,70	0,38	0,38	0,18	0,31	1,00

610

Using the pairwise decision matrix Table 3, the weights of the criteria in Table 4 were obtained by dividing each cell by its column total.

Table 4. Determining Weights According to Criteria

	Self-Expression	Friendship	Listening	Work Distribution	Anxiety	Trust	Workplace Goals	System	Work Stress	Significance Level
Self-Expression	1	0,1658	0,0944	0,1100	0,0621	0,0626	0,0718	0,4656	0,0947	0,0991
Friendship	0,1133	1	0,1246	0,1894	0,0758	0,0949	0,0783	0,5085	0,0835	0,2091
Listening	0,1395	0,3856	1	0,2382	0,2172	0,2099	0,1034	0,6135	0,3384	0,3050
Work Distribution	0,0197	0,0632	0,0222	1	0,1362	0,1158	0,1440	0,5440	0,0209	0,2329

Anxiety	0,1010	0,0933	0,0514	0,0656	1	0,0924	0,1060	0,4340	0,0227	0,0902
Trust	0,1464	0,1104	0,2289	0,2662	0,3152	1	0,5683	0,3743	0,4222	0,3555
Workplace Goals	0,0440	0,0145	0,0084	0,0132	0,0547	0,0200	1	0,7401	0,0739	0,0387
System	0,4656	0,5085	0,6135	0,5440	0,4340	0,3743	0,7401	1	0,5316	0,5850
Work Stress	0,0082	0,0832	0,0883	0,0985	0,0666	0,0504	0,0718	0,4656	1	0,0544

Table 5 shows the weight values of the answers given by the hotel managers for the basic criteria for paradoxical communication.

Table 5. Weighting Values Table of Basic Criteria

	Self-Expression (C1)	Friendship (C2)	Listening (C3)	Work Distribution (C4)	Anxiety (C5)	Trust (C6)	Workplace Goals (C7)	System (C8)	Work Stress (C9)
Weighting	0,0991	0,2091	0,3050	0,2329	0,0902	0,3555	0,0387	0,5850	0,0544

CR value= 0.0742

When Table 5 is examined, it is understood that the criterion with the highest weighting is "system" (0,5850). After this criterion, the criteria of "trust (0,3555), listening (0,3050), work distribution (0,2329), friendship (0,2091), self-expression (0,0991), anxiety (0,0902), work stress (0,0544) and workplace goals (0,0387)" were determined in order of importance. The criteria specified by the hotel managers of paradoxical communication according to the degree of importance are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Ranking the Basic Criteria in order of Importance

Criteria	Level of Importance	Weighting Values
System (C8)	1	(0,5850)
Trust (C6)	2	(0,3555)
Listening (C3)	3	(0,3050)
Work Distribution (C4)	4	(0,2329)
Friendship (C2)	5	(0,2091)
Self-Expression (C1)	6	(0,0991)
Anxiety (C5)	7	(0,0902)
Work Stress (C9)	8	(0,0544)
Workplace Goals (C7)	9	(0,0387)

According to the data in Table 6, it is revealed that the most effective criterion in solving the paradoxical communication problems of the hotels is the order in the workplace system in the hotels. It is thought that the systematic structuring of the chain of command in the workplace will help to eliminate paradoxical communication and to effectively manage the communication elements in the destination.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Destination management is an important concept in terms of increasing the demand for tourism and making it sustainable. For an effective destination management, the communication methods of the tourism establishments in the destination must be designed correctly and effectively. In this context, communication problems within hotel establishments affect both the customers and the general operation of the hotel. In other words, experiencing communication problems directly affects the touristic demand and the efficiency of the hotel. For this reason, it is possible to state that communication structures within hotels need a systematic and planned structure. The arrangement of the communication structures of the hotels directly affects the touristic demand and therefore determines the place of the destination in tourist perceptions.

In this study, it has been tried to include the situation of paradoxical communication in hotel establishments, which is one of the most important image factors of tourist destinations. As a result of the analysis of the data, it has been revealed that the most important element in the paradoxical communication structure of the hotel is the hotel's organization and working system. Due to the general structure of the hotels, they consist of many departments, there is more than one lower-level manager, and the general operation style requires that all departments work in coordination, so the communication system should be established in a planned manner. Hotel general managers, who were evaluated as participants within the scope of the study, agreed that there would be no paradoxical communication if hotel communication and operation were systematic. However, it was concluded that the trust of employees and managers to each other would not reveal a paradoxical communication situation. In addition, it was stated that hotel employees listening to each other would eliminate paradoxes in communication. As a result of the study findings, it was revealed that the workplace goals criterion is one of the least important communication effects. Especially, the fact that workplace stress does not have a very important place in communication is one of the remarkable results of the study. The hospitality industry is a sector where work stress is intense due to the necessity

of meeting people's wishes and needs and its own way of functioning. However, the findings of the study revealed that job stress does not create a paradoxical communication environment.

As mentioned before, a study that was directly applied in the tourism sector or hotels with the subject of the study could not be found in the relevant literature. On the other hand, the most similar study on the subject of the paradoxical communication is the study conducted by Bonenberger (2007) on office workers. However, his study was conducted with a different statistical method and it was determined that the most basic criterion affecting paradoxical communication was the "listening" criterion. In this study, the "listening" criterion was among the most important criteria. However, such a difference can be considered within the normal results due to the fact that the establishments where the studies are carried out are different, the differences in the methods and the difference in the universes. However, although there is no study on direct paradoxical communication in hotels, there are many studies evaluating communication criteria. In one of these studies, Kang and Hyun (2012) examined the effect of communication on hotel employees and customers as the main subject in the study on effective communication efforts in hotels. In the study, the importance of the communication of the employees with the customers in the promotion and image of a destination is included. Although the study is similar to this study in terms of destination management, it can be stated that it is different in terms of method, paradoxical communication subject and research universe.

In Ünal's (2019) study on guest communication in hotels, guests form the study universe and an evaluation is made within the scope of customer relations management. In his study, the importance of customer relations in communication was mentioned. Likewise, although the main subject of this study and the present study is communication, there are completely differences in terms of method and handling of communication. In a different study, Kılıç et al. (2019) studied communication skills in hotels and concluded that professionalization is the most important factor in communication. This study differs from the present study in terms of paradoxical communication subject and method again. In terms of mentioning the importance of communication in the destination, it is possible to state that this study is similar to the related study in terms of the literature dimension.

As a result of the findings obtained as a result of the study, the following suggestions are presented in order to guide future studies and contribute to the related literature:

- In order for the image of the destinations to have a sustainable structure, the communication

system in the hotels should be carried out effectively.

- In order to increase the touristic demands of the hotels, a trust-based communication should be established between the hotel employees and the management.
- Hotel managements need to listen to their personnel and produce solutions for problems so that a paradoxical communication problem does not arise.
- In order to avoid paradoxical communication problems, it would be appropriate to have a fair distribution of work within the organization.
- Establishing a friendly relationship between hotel management and employees will ensure loyalty to the hotel's purposes and will reflect positively on tourists in terms of the image of the destination.
- In order to prevent paradoxical communication within the hotel, it is necessary to improve the working conditions of the employees, to establish a systematic hotel structure and to design the workplace in a way that does not create stress.
- In order to avoid paradoxes in communication, sincere environments should be created where personnel and managers can listen to each other and express themselves, and it will be appropriate to effectively manage the command system between departments.
- In the promotion of destinations and achieving a sustainable structure, it is necessary to solve the communication problems in accommodation establishments and to use effective communication channels against tourists. Because a systematic communication structure will increase the satisfaction level of tourists and thus, they will have good perceptions about the destination and the establishments.
- Solving paradoxical communication problems will strengthen the ties between the tourist and the local people living in the destination, cultural exchange and socialization.
- By addressing the paradoxical communication criteria, it will contribute to the sustainable formation of future touristic demand.
- The criteria to prevent the paradoxical communication identified in this paper and to be evaluated in solving the problems may not give the same results for every destination. Therefore, it would be appropriate to conduct similar studies in different destinations using the method of this study. Thus, paradoxical communication studies to be carried out by different

researchers in different destinations will reveal the communication differences between destinations and will enrich the literature in terms of academic tourism research.

- Since the expectations and needs of the tourists who come to visit the destinations will change according to the characteristics of the destinations, communication channels will also differ. For this reason, paradoxical communication criteria should be evaluated by using different methods in order to reveal the similarities or differences between destinations. The comparison of the current study and the results in different destinations by researchers who want to study on this subject will also reveal the differences or similarities in tourist expectations and needs in destinations in terms of communication.

- The effect of communication elements between tourists, local people and employees is important in creating brand image in destinations. In this context, reanalyzing the paradoxical communication criteria obtained in this study with certain intervals and revealing the results will reveal the change in the communication skills of the tourists. It is thought that future studies similar to this one will contribute to the tourism literature. Therefore, the paradoxical communication problems in the destinations will be resolved and the touristic sustainability of the destinations will be ensured.

- It is also thought that with the application of the study in destinations in different countries or regions, it will contribute to both tourism sector supervisors/managers, destination managers and researchers who conduct research on a similar subject in communication, which is one of the most fundamental problems of today.

It is seen that paradoxical communication problems in hotel establishments are an important communication problem in terms of destination management. In addition, when it is considered that the satisfaction of the tourists in the facilities where they stay in the creation of the image of the destinations directly affects their holiday preferences, it becomes necessary to resolve the paradoxical communications within the hotel. The solution of paradoxical communication problems will increase the touristic demand for hotel establishments; therefore, it will have a positive effect on the recognition and image of the destinations. It is expected that the study will guide both hotel management and researchers who will conduct academic studies on this issue by revealing which of the criteria related to paradoxical communication are more important.

REFERENCES

Akyurt, H., & Demirdağ, S. A. (2022). Evaluation of paradoxical communication criteria in destination management: a study on hotel managers. *Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 14(3), 596-618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18226/21789061.v14i3p618>

- Akyurt, H., & Ültay, E. (2021). Üniversite düzeyinde turizm eğitiminin mevcut durumu ve turizm sektörü beklentileri. In: Ayşe Çatalcalı Ceylan, Ferhat Özbay, Zafer Özomay, Mustafa Batuhan Kurt (Eds.), *Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimlerde Araştırma ve Değerlendirmeler Cilt-2*, pp. 160-187. Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.
- Amin, M. A. S. & Priansah, P. (2019). Marketing communication strategy to improve tourism potential. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 2(4), 160-166. [Link](#)
- Bonenberger, N. R. (2007). *Paradoxical communication in office space*. Master Thesis, University of Maine, USA. [Link](#)
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient Alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334. [Link](#)
- Dehasse, J. (2001). The role of paradoxical inter-specific communication in the development of family-pack hierarchical instabilities. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Veterinary Behavioural Medicine, ESVC & CABTSG, Birmingham, UK, April 1 & 2, pp. 52-57. [Link](#)
- Demirdağ, Ş. A. (2019). Possible causes of burnout and burnout syndrome in tourism businesses. In: Pelit, E., Soybalı, H. H. & Avan, A. (Eds.), *Current Issues in Services Management – Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 99-114). Berlin: Peterlang.
- Erdal, H. & Korucuk, S. (2018). İmalat işletmelerinde yeni ürün geliştirme kriterleri: Karadeniz Bölgesi örneği. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(1), 99-112. [Link](#)
- Evers, H. (2010). *"Medya etiği"*. *Televizyon haberciliğinde etik*. Ankara: Fersa Matbaacılık.
- Fabac, R., & Zver, I. (2011). Applying the modified SWOT–AHP method to the tourism of Gornje Međimurje. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 17(2), 201-215. [Link](#)
- Friedmann, J., & Weaver, C. (1980). *Territory and function, the evolution of regional planning*. California: California University Press.
- Gabbott M., & Hogg, G. (2001). The role of non-verbal communication in service encounters: a conceptual framework. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17, 5-26. [Link](#)
- Giritlioğlu, İ. and Avcıkurt, C. (2010). Şehirlerin turistik bir ürün olarak pazarlanması, örnek şehirler ve Türkiye'deki şehirler üzerine öneriler (derlemeden oluşmuş bir uygulama). *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3(4), 74-89. [Link](#)
- Gunn, C. A. (1979). *Tourism planning*. New York: Crane, Russak & Company Inc.
- Kang, J., & Hyun, S.S. (2012). Effective communication styles for the customer-oriented service employee: Inducing dedicational behaviors in luxury restaurant patrons. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(3), 772-785. [Link](#)

Akyurt, H., & Demirdağ, S. A. (2022). Evaluation of paradoxical communication criteria in destination management: a study on hotel managers. *Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 14(3), 596-618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18226/21789061.v14i3p618>

Karaatlı, M., & Davras, G. (2014). Tedarikçi seçiminde analitik hiyerarşi prosesi ve hedef programlama yöntemlerinin kombinasyonu: otel işletmelerinde bir uygulama. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(24), 182-196. [Link](#)

Kılıç, i., Çimen, H., Tunç, T., & Kan Sönmez, N. (2019). The effect of professionalization on communication skills: a study in five-star hotel establishments. *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(1), 239-255.

Lee, J., & Lee, H. (2015). Deriving strategic priority of policies for creative tourism industry in Korea using AHP. *Procedia Computer Science*, 55, 479-484. [Link](#)

Mattson J., & Haring M.J. (1998). Communication dynamics in the service encounter: a linguistic study in a hotel conference department. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9(5), 416-435. [Link](#)

Matyushchenko, N. (2006). Research of conflicts and stresses among employees of spar hotels, Turk-Kazakh. *International Tourism Conference Proceedings: New Perspectives and Values in World Tourism and Tourism Management in the Future*, Antalya, Alanya, November, 20-26. pp.1311-1324.

Olalı, H., & Timur, A. (1988). *Turizm ekonomisi*. İzmir: Ofis Ticaret Matbaacılık Şti.

Papa, M. J., Singhal, A., Law, S., Pant, S., Sood, S. Rogers, E. M., & Shefner-Rogers, C. L. (2006). Entertainment-education and social change: an analysis of Para-social interaction, social learning, collective efficacy, and paradoxical communication. *Journal of Communication*, 50(4), 31-55. [Link](#)

Prescott, D., & Wilson, R. J. (2012). Paradoxical and double-bind communication in treatment for people who sexually offend. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 18(2), 233-246. [Link](#)

Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*. USA: McGraw Hill.

Saaty T. L. (1994). How to make a decision: The Analytic Hierarchy Process. *Interfaces*, 24(6), 19-43. [Link](#)

Sun, W., Zhang, F., Tai, S., Wu, J., & Mu, Y. (2021). Study on glacial tourism exploitation in the Dagu glacier scenic spot based on the AHP–ASEB method. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 1-18. [Link](#)

Tian, C., Peng, J., Zhang, W., Zhang, S., and Wang, J. (2020). Tourism environmental impact assessment based on improved AHP and picture fuzzy PROMETHEE II methods. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, 26(2), 355-378. [Link](#)

Tölkes, C. (2018). Sustainability communication in tourism – A literature review. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 27, 10-21. [Link](#)

Tulga, İ., Çeliker, N., & Yağız, M.K. (2016). Analitik Hiyerarşi yöntemiyle destinasyon seçimine yönelik bir uygulama. *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(1), 191-199. [Link](#)

Akyurt, H., & Demirdağ, S. A. (2022). Evaluation of paradoxical communication criteria in destination management: a study on hotel managers. *Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 14(3), 596-618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18226/21789061.v14i3p618>

Uğur, U., & Sarıoğlu Uğur, S. (2019). Tatilde nereye gitsek? turizmde analitik hiyerarşi süreci yöntemi ile destinasyon seçimi. *Türk Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(3), 261-270. [Link](#)

Usta, Ö. (2008). *Turizm, genel ve yapısal yaklaşım*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Ünal, A. (2019). Otel işletmelerinde konuk iletişimi ve müşteri ilişkileri yönetimi. *In: Mesut Bozkurt (Ed.), Temel kavramı ve örneklerle modern otel işletmeciliği* (pp. 249-271). Çanakkale: Paradigma Akademi Yayınları.

Ünüvar, Ş. (2009). Kişilerarası İletişimin konaklama işletmelerindeki önemi ve beş yıldızlı otellerde bir uygulama. *Sosyal Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(18), 375-394. [Link](#)

Wang, X., Li, R. X., Zhen, F., & Zhang, J. (2016). How smart is your tourist attraction?: Measuring tourist preferences of smart tourism attractions via a FCEM-AHP and IPA approach. *Tourism Management*, 54, 309-320. [Link](#)

Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J. H., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York and London: W. W. Norton Company Inc.

Yiğit, A. and Demirbaş, M. (2020). Türkiye’de Medikal turizmin gelişimine etki eden faktörlerin Swot-Ahs Yöntemi ile tespit edilmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12(22), 173-192. [Link](#)

618

PROCESSO EDITORIAL

Recebido: 18 FEV 22 Aceito: 15 JUL 22