

The Effect of Destination Image Factors on Foreign Tourists' Revisit Intention: The Example of Istanbul

Dr. Mehmet Ömer ÖZÜÇAGLIYAN

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of destination image perceptions of tourists visiting Istanbul in terms of entertainment venues, travel environment, cultural experience, city life and free life on their intention to revisit Istanbul. The data were collected by questionnaires from 448 foreign tourists. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity, and multiple linear regression was used for impact analysis. Findings showed that destination image factors, open-air entertainment venues, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, micro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience, culture learning experience, city life, adult-oriented free life and LGBT and drug-oriented free life, explained a 13% variance on revisiting Istanbul. Among these nine factors, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment and visual cultural experience had a positive significant effect, and the culture learning experience had a negative significant effect on the intention to revisit.

Keywords: Tourism, Tourist, Destination Image, Intention to Visit, Istanbul.

Introduction

Tourism is an industry that is defined as a "smokeless industry", is highly sensitive to economic, social, cultural, political, technological and ecological developments. The tourism sector, which can provide significant foreign exchange inflow to countries with less resources and effort compared to other sectors, is one of the fastest growing sectors in the globalizing world (Beijing, 2011). The tourism sector, which contributes 10.4% of the world economy and provides approximately 10% of employment worldwide as of 2018, continues its growth trend (WEF, 2019). According to the data of the United Nations World Tourism Organization, the number of global tourists, which was 1.5 billion in 2019, experienced a major decrease during the Covid-19 epidemic and experienced a recovery in 2022, is reaching around 900 million (UNWTO, 2023).

As the importance and awareness of tourism increase day by day all over the world, tourism destinations are competing with other destinations more than ever before. The increase in global mobility in tourism means the emergence of new competitors not only on a regional but also on a global scale. The long-term development and profitability of tourism destinations depends on their ability to gain superiority over their competitors at national and international levels (Boz, 2019). In addition, the tourist profile is also changing. Today's tourists are people who are more conscious, more sensitive about quality, care about environmental quality and tourist safety, want to integrate with nature, have the habit of traveling frequently and are in search of different things (Ege and Demir, 2002). It is suggested that tourists, who are increasingly becoming more conscious and experienced consumers, will be more selective and seek higher quality when purchasing a new product/service in the future (WTO, 2004).

In the tourism sector, where there is fierce competition, one of the most prominent concepts that enables the sustainability of the competitiveness of destinations and in the destination preferences of tourists is destination image. Since tourism products are abstract and similar to each other, competition between destinations takes place through their images (Baloğlu and Mangaloğlu, 2001). The concept of destination image is defined as the expression of all the information, impressions, prejudices and emotional thoughts that an individual or group has about a certain place (Baloğlu and McCleary, 1999). Destination image can be a determining factor in making a purchasing decision before travelling, the perception of experience at the destination, and shaping tourist behavior and intentions after the experience (Chen and Tsai, 2007; Kaşlı and Yılmazdoğan, 2012). Since potential tourists who will visit a destination that has not been visited in the past have limited knowledge about that destination, the concept of destination image that consumers create in their minds is a more decisive factor in the destination selection decision (Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000). Previous researches have supported the idea that destination image has a positive impact on tourists' behavioral intentions (Üner, Evren and Taşçı, 2006; Prayag, 2009; Asseker, Vinzi and O'Connor, 2011; Artuğer et al., 2013; Özdemir, 2020).

Istanbul is a city that can meet all kinds of needs with its modern face, cultural events, shopping opportunities, congress centers and medical services (Seçulmuş and Köz, 2015). Istanbul, which has a history of 8000 years, has a very important potential in terms of tourism. Istanbul, which served as the capital of the Roman, Byzantine and Ottoman Empires for approximately 1600 years, bears deep traces of cultures that are very different from each other. Being located in the geographical region connecting the European and Asian

continents and serving as a bridge between the east and the west attracts the attention of tourists (İçellioğlu, 2014). Istanbul hosts a significant number of tourists every year. By the end of 2022, the number of foreign tourists visiting Istanbul has reached 16 million 18 thousand 726, and this figure corresponds to approximately one third of the tourists coming to Turkey (Istanbul Culture and Tourism Directorate, 2023). Istanbul was the 3rd most visited destination in Europe after Paris and London in 2021 (Statista, 2023).

It can be seen that there are various studies in the literature examining the destination image of Istanbul. In some studies, the destination image of Istanbul was discussed from the perspective of travel intermediaries, hotel managers (Yamaç and Zengin, 2019) and university students (Sağdıç, 2014), while in some studies it was evaluated from the perspective of foreign tourists visiting the city (Üner et al., 2006; Altınbaşak and Yalçın, 2010; Sahin and Baloglu, 2011; Maden, Köker, and Topsümer, 2012; Albayrak and Özkul, 2013; Oran, 2014; Açıkgöz, 2018; Özdemir, 2020; Torlak, 2020). The rapid change in the image of destinations and tourism demand due to tourism being quickly affected by external factors necessitates continuous tourism development efforts. However, when the studies in the literature are examined, it is seen that the number of studies conducted in recent years regarding the destination image of Istanbul is quite limited.

In this research, it is aimed to examine the effects of the destination image perceptions of tourists visiting Istanbul on their intentions to revisit. In this context, the effects of destination image perceptions of tourists visiting Istanbul in terms of entertainment venues, travel environment, cultural experience, city life and free life criteria on their intention to revisit Istanbul were investigated.

In accordance with the research purpose, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1: Tourists' destination image related to entertainment venue affects their intention to revisit.

H2: Tourists' destination image related to travel environment affects their intention to revisit.

H3: Tourists' destination image related to cultural experience affects their intention to revisit.

H4: Tourists' destination image related to city life affects their intention to revisit.

H5: Tourists' destination image related to free life affects their intention to revisit.

Literature Review

Destination Image

Destination stands for the final target, the anticipated end when directing something. It means the anticipated last stop of a trip (Webster, 2023). Tourism destination is defined as "the area where tourists spend at least one night" (World Tourism Organization, 2007). In another definition, tourism destination is expressed as the whole of products, services and experiences provided in a region (Buhalis, 2000). Destination image "is a description of all the information, impressions, prejudices and emotional thoughts that an individual has about a place or object" (Lawson and Baud-Bovy, 1977). Destination image can also be defined as the sum of the beliefs, ideas and impressions that tourists have about the physical, historical, cultural and geographical features of the region, as well as the people living in the region, employees, tradesmen and other tourists (Crompton, 1979; Gallarza et al., 2002).

Destination image reflects all the impressions formed by individuals' emotional and cognitive concept evaluation (Kazancıoğlu, 2020). The image that is mostly accepted by potential and existing customers due to its impact on destination choice is considered the success of that tourism destination. Considering that it is very difficult to change an existing image, a lack of image about a tourist destination is considered a better situation than a bad image (Üner et al., 2006).

Although the concept of destination image is a relatively new term in marketing studies for the tourism sector, it has been the subject of numerous studies over the last decade. Studies on destination image first started under the leadership of Hunt (1975) and showed a significant increase after 1990. Bonn et al. (2005), Blumberg (2005), O'Leary and Deegan (2002), Obenour Lengfelder and Groves (2004) focused on measuring tourists' perceptions of destination image in their studies. Baloglu and McCleary (1999), Beerli and Martin (2004), Echtner and Ritchie (1991) and Gallarza et al. (2002) examined the factors that cause image perception in people. Recent studies have mainly examined the effects of destination image on destination loyalty, visit satisfaction, visit recommendation and revisit intention (Kani et al., 2017; Chaulagain, Wiitala and Fu, 2019; Styliadis et al. 2020; Gün and Kılıç, 2022; Pan, Rasouli and Timmermans, 2021; Ateş, 2022; Bekar, Kocatürk and Çözüm, 2023).

The Importance of Destination Image in Terms of Tourism

Travel decisions made by the consumer require subjective evaluation rather than objective criteria, since tourism products cannot be experienced before travel. However, potential visitors often have limited knowledge about a destination they have not been to before. Therefore, the image of the destination created by the consumer in his mind is more effective in the consumer's decision about where to go (Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000). Research shows that people pay more attention to and choose destinations with positive and strong

images when making travel decisions (Woodside and Lysonski, 1989). Fakeye and Crompton (1991) argue that destinations with a positive image can develop, whereas destinations with a less positive or negative image may never reach their tourism potential.

Today, the travel decision-making process for consumers is much more complex due to the ever-changing consumer profile. It is very important for marketers to examine the motivations that are effective in choosing the destination the consumer wants to travel to and the process of choosing the destination. Destination marketing organizations allocate high amounts of resources to some features that are incompatible with consumers' beliefs, expectations and motivations (Bornhorst, Ritchie and Sheehan, 2010). However, Matos, Mendes and Pinto (2012) state that the real competition is to gain a place in the minds of consumers, because the image perceived by tourists affects consumers' tendencies, behaviors and attitudes.

In order to achieve success in targeted marketing, it is necessary to implement an effective destination positioning strategy and differentiate the destination from rival businesses in the mind of the consumer. For this reason, the goals of destination positioning strategies should be to strengthen the positive image of potential visitors, correct the negative image and create a new positive image (Pike and Ryan, 2004). In this sense, it is suggested that destination image constitutes the main element of destination positioning strategy (Kotler, Irving and Haider, 1993). Destination image is effective in choosing the place to go and is effective in satisfaction with the place, revisiting the place and recommending this place to others (Afshardoost and Eshaghi, 2020; Martín-Santana, Beerli-Palacio and Nazzareno, 2017; Kani et al., 2017).

The origin of tourist destination image can differ greatly from their real situation. The greater the difference between the real situation and the image, that is, the difference between experiences and expectations, the greater the dissatisfaction with the differences will be (Avcıkurt, 2003). The image of the destination in tourists' minds is more important when that destiny is realized. If the deterioration of the destination is desired to be present in their minds, the destination should be brought to the fore with that image, and this image should be the locking point in how the rest will remember that place (Doğanlı, 2006). Because image is a phenomenon that makes destinations different from each other and is an important factor in the decision-making process of leaving (Tarakçıoğlu and Aydın, 2003).

The image that tourists have about that destination is the main factor that directs the future of the destination. Since tourism products are similar and intangible, competition between destinations is carried out through images (Özdemir, 2007). Therefore, examining the factors that may be effective in tourists' holiday destination selection and determining how these factors are formed is very important in terms of destination marketing (Baloğlu and Bringberg, 1997).

Destination Image Components

Destination image is a phenomenon formed by the combination of many elements that affect people's travel behavior. For this reason, the process of image formation in the tourism sector and the image components of destinations vary. Factors that have an impact on the formation of destination image are listed as the facilities and services of destinations, attraction power, infrastructure, cost and hospitality (Tarakçıoğlu and Aydın, 2003), and they are also listed as feelings, thoughts, knowledge and perceptions about any destination (Gartner, 1993). Past travel experiences of tourists, information acquired by tourists, demographic characteristics of tourists and socio-psychological travel behaviors also come to the fore (Ersoy, 2004).

Baloğlu and McCleary (1999) divided the factors affecting destination image formation into two groups: stimulating and personal factors. Stimulating factors are the external forces that affect the formation of evaluations and perceptions. Personal factors are the psychological and social characteristics of the person perceiving the image.

Stimulating Factors

Primary image is the image formed by the person's own experience as a result of visiting the destination, and the image created in the person's mind by many different and various information sources without visiting the destination is defined as secondary image (Yaraşlı, 2007). The image created as a result of visiting a destination is different, realistic and complex than the image formed without visiting that destination and using secondary information sources (Beerli and Martin, 2004). Primary information sources obtained as a result of visiting the destination affect the perceived destination image in proportion to the visitor's interest in the destination, visit duration and number of visits (Yaraşlı, 2007).

When creating a conceptual model for the destination image, it is necessary to take into account the distinction between tourists who will visit the destination for the first time and tourists who have visited before. Because there are some differences between the destination image perceived by both visitor groups. The relationship between perceived image and secondary information sources can only be revealed by tourists visiting for the

first time. Therefore, the fact that different knowledge and motivations regarding the destination will occur in both groups should not be ignored (Yaraşlı, 2007).

Personal Factors

The concept of personal characteristics in consumer behavior includes the person's socio-demographic qualities (education level, age, gender, family life cycle, place of residence, social class, etc.) and psychological structure (lifestyle, motivations, character, values, etc.). These personal characteristics also affect the individual's mental perception of the image (Beerli and Martin, 2004; Pan et al., 2023; Ünal and Çakır, 2020). Thanks to these features, people create a picture of the destination in their minds. This is called personal perceived image (Ashworth and Voogd, 1990). When the literature is examined, there are three basic elements that determine the image of a destination before visiting it: the individual's tourism motivation, socio-demographic characteristics and various information sources come to the fore.

Motivation is an important element that affects destination selection and image formation (Stabler, 1988). People with different motivations evaluate their perceptions and thoughts about that destination similarly, as long as their needs are met and they are satisfied (Beerli and Martin, 2004). Emotional component of destination image; it is an additional value that strengthens the destination based on the motivation and satisfaction of the person (Gartner, 1993). Since the emotional image is effective on the general image perception, it can be said that motivations are also directly or indirectly effective on the general image.

Tourist's socio-demographic characteristics such as education level, age, gender, profession, marital status are effective in the formation of the destination image (MacKay and Fessenmaier, 1997; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Saçlı et al., 2019; Ünal and Çakır, 2020). The images of some destinations vary according to the age and gender of tourists (Yaraşlı, 2007). There are also studies showing that the perceived destination image changes according to the education level, marital status and profession of tourists (Baloğlu, 1997; Baloğlu and McCleary, 1999; MacKay and Fessenmaier, 1997; Saçlı, 2019; Ünal and Çakır, 2020). Perception of destination image may change depending on income level, as well (Baloğlu and McCleary, 1999). Pan et al. (2021) stated that social networks create the destination image of tourists and change the existing image of the destination, if any, and that the level of influence of tourists from social networks varies according to the type of these social networks, type of profession, age, marital status, education level and monthly income level.

The information sources used by tourists also affect their perception of the destination image. With developing technology, changes are observed in information sources (Öztürk and Şahbaz, 2017). Nowadays, use of media tools, such as magazines, newspapers, television, internet, etc. has increased significantly. Additionally, specialized units such as tour operators and travel agencies are used as information sources. Tourists' experiences and the sensations they receive from their surroundings are among the most important sources of information, as well.

It is possible to consider information research in two parts: external and internal. Internal research is defined as mentally scanning relevant product information for a long time. External research occurs when the individual feels the need to collect information from the outside world when internal research cannot reach accurate and sufficient information (Dae-Young, Lehto, & Morrison, 2007). Evaluations and comments of spouses, friends, relatives, acquaintances and the environment about the destination are also very important in choosing a destination (Yaraşlı, 2007). When tourists are undecided about which destination they will be more satisfied with and which carries less risk among many alternatives, they trust more in the information they obtain from the social environment (Özdemir, 2007; Tatık, 2022). Tourists' previous experiences are also an important source of information. Since experience is more important for people than other information, the information that tourists obtain through their personal experiences about the destination can be more effective than the information they obtain from external sources (Yaraşlı, 2007).

Method

Quantitative research methods were used in the research. The data was collected by questionnaires. Survey forms were completed by meeting face to face with the research sample in October and November 2021. Data were collected only from volunteers, and before the survey was administered, all participants were informed about the purpose of the research, how the scale forms should be marked, and the confidentiality of their information.

Population and Sample

The population of the research consists of foreign tourists coming to Istanbul. The number of foreign tourists visiting Istanbul was slightly more than 9 million in 2021 (Istanbul Directorate of Culture and Tourism, 2021). Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan (2004) stated that if the population size is 1,000,000 and above, 384 samples may be sufficient. A sample size of 448 was reached for the study using the convenience sampling method.

Measurement

The survey form consists of three parts: introductory information form, visit evaluation scale and destination image scale. In the introductory information form, participants were asked questions such as their country of origin, age, gender, marital status, education level, monthly income and occupation.

The level of intention to revisit Istanbul was measured with a single question on the visit evaluation scale. The question is a 7-point Likert type, and participants score the statements between 1 and 7 (strongly disagree: 1, strongly agree: 7). This question is taken from Sungkatavat (2013).

The destination image scale in Sungkatavat's (2013) was used to evaluate the participants' destination image perceptions. Sungkatavat (2013) generated the scale using Echtner and Ritchie (1991, 1993), Henkel et al. (2006), Lertputtarak (2012), Rittichainuwat, Qu and Brown, (2001) and Tapachai and Waryszak (2000). In his validity analysis using exploratory factor analysis, Sungkatavat (2013) eliminated 6 items of the 36-item scale and determined that the 30-item scale consisted of a five-factor structure and that these five factors could explain 55.64% of the total variance. As a result of the reliability analysis conducted by Sungkatavat (2013), Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for the scale were determined to be in the range of 0.72-0.86. The scale is a 5-point Likert type scale and participants score the statements between 1 and 5 (strongly disagree: 1, strongly agree: 5). In this study, the original version of the destination image scale with 36 questions was used. The scale was translated from English into Turkish by experts.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 program. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation were used for analysis. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to test the validity of the scales. To test the reliability of the scales, Cronbach's Alpha internal consistency coefficients were calculated. Normality of data distributions was analyzed using skewness and kurtosis values. Pearson product moment correlation test was used for relationship analyses. Multiple linear regression analysis was used for impact analysis. Statistical significance was sought within the 95% confidence interval.

Results

Findings Regarding the Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

According to the findings in Table 1, 45.8% of the participants are male and 53.8% are female. 26.6% of the participants are aged 25 and under, 41.3% are aged between 26-35, 15.2% are aged between 36-45 and 17.0% are aged 46 and over. While 47.1% of the participants are single, the rate of those who are married is 52.7%. Slightly more than half of the participants (58.3%) are university graduates. While the rate of high school graduates is 31.7%, the rate of secondary school graduates is 9.8%. The monthly income of nearly half of the participants (46.7%) is between 1201-2200 Euros. The monthly income of 29.0% of the participants is between 2201-3200 Euros. While the rate of those whose monthly income is 1200 Euros and below is 13.2%, the rate of those whose monthly income is 3201 Euros and above is 11.2%. It was found that the majority of participants (39.3%) were private sector employees. The rate of public employees is 32.6%. The rate of business owners is 12.9%, the rate of students is 9.8%, the rate of retired people is 1.1%, the rate of housewives is 2.7% and the rate of unemployed people is 1.6%.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Participants

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Female	241	53.8
	Male	205	45.8
Age	25 and below	119	26.6
	26-35	185	41.3
	36-45	68	15.2
	46 and above	76	17.0
Marital Status	Single	211	47.1
	Married	236	52.7
Education	Elementary School	44	9.8
	High School	142	31.7
	College	261	58.3
Monthly Income	1200 Euro and below	59	13.2
	1201-2200 Euro	209	46.7

	2201-3200 Euro	130	29.0
	3201 Euro and above	50	11.2
Occupation	Student	44	9.8
	Private employee	176	39.3
	Business owner	58	12.9
	Public employee	146	32.6
	Retired	5	1.1
	Housewife	12	2.7
	Unemployed	7	1.6

According to the findings in Table 2, participants came to visit Istanbul from 27 different countries. The participants were mostly from Russia (16.7%), Iran (14.3%), Ukraine (10.9%), Germany (10.9%), Iraq (6.9%) and the USA (5.4%).

Table 2. Countries the Participants Come From

Variables	Groups	f	%
Country	Russia	75	16.7
	Iran	64	14.3
	Germany	49	10.9
	Ukraine	49	10.9
	Iraq	31	6.9
	USA	24	5.4
	France	17	3.8
	Azerbaijan	17	3.8
	UK	16	3.6
	Uzbekistan	10	2.2
	Israel	9	2.0
	Holland	9	2.0
	Bulgaria	9	2.0
	SaudiArabia	8	1.8
	Afghanistan	7	1.6
	Suriya	6	1.3
	Italy	6	1.3
	Sweden	5	1.1
	Finland	5	1.1
	Romania	5	1.1
	Hungry	5	1.1
	Norway	5	1.1
	Kuwait	5	1.1
	Libia	3	0.7
	Armenia	2	0.4
	UAE	2	0.4
	Austria	2	0.4

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Adhering to the original scale, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the SPSS program on 36 items. Factor analysis was performed using the principal component method and Varimax factor rotation technique. It was determined that KMO values were higher than 0.60 and *p* values for Bartlett's sphericity test were lower than 0.05. 1.00 was accepted as the criterion for Eigenvalue. Items with extraction values below 0.40

were removed from the scale and the factor analysis was repeated. If the difference between the factor loadings of the items loaded on two separate factors was less than 0.20, the relevant item was removed from the scale. Following a series of factor analyses, 14 items were removed from the scale. Contrary to the 5-factor structure predicted in the scale (Sungkatavat, 2013), a 9-factor structure consisting of 22 items was obtained (Table 3). The new factors by taking into account the nomenclature in the original scale are named as open-air entertainment, sea-related entertainment, macro-scale travel environment, micro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience, culture learning, city life, adult-oriented nightlife and LGBT and drug-oriented nightlife. Cronbach's Alpha values of the factors in the scale were found to vary between 0.59 and 0.94. These values, determined as 0.59, 0.60 and 0.69, appear to belong to factors consisting of two items. Since Cronbach's Alpha values are affected by the number of items in the scale (Byrne, 2010), the reliability scores of these two-item factors were considered acceptable.

Table 3. Exploratory Factor Analysis

Factor	Item	Factor Loadings	Explained variance	Cronbach's Alpha
Open-air entertainment	Various outdoor activities	0.95	47.03	0.94
	Adventure opportunities	0.94		
Sea-related entertainment	Beautiful beaches and islands	0.97	47.67	0.82
	Beautiful dive sites	0.94		
Macro-scale travel environment	Stable political situation	0.88	35.43	0.71
	Unpolluted environment	0.90		
Micro-scale travel environment	Cleanness	0.80	47.35	0.83
	Nice climate	0.90		
	Efficient local transportation system	0.93		
Visual cultural experience	Beautiful architecture and buildings	0.90	49.26	0.88
	Interesting traditions and cultures	0.87		
	Cultural and historical attractions	0.85		
	Landscape and natural beauty	0.80		
Culture learning	Provide opportunities for learning	0.85	25.22	0.60
	Traditional festivals	0.81		
City life	Friendly people	0.78	41.95	0.79
	Various world cuisines	0.85		
	Quality accommodation opportunities	0.86		
Adult-oriented nightlife	Adult oriented nightlife	0.84	25.22	0.59
	Nightlife, party and adult entertainment	0.83		
LGBT and drug-oriented nightlife	LGBT friendly	0.89	35.59	0.69
	Easy access to drugs	0.86		

Descriptive Statistics and Normality

From the findings in Table 4, it is understood that the participants generally evaluate destination image factors at a high level. It was determined that the destination image factors evaluated at the highest level were visual cultural experience (4.59) and city life (4.55). It was determined that the destination image factors evaluated at the lowest level were LGBT and drug-oriented free life (2.72) and sea-related entertainment venues (3.77). Since the skewness and kurtosis values of the scales were between -2 and +2, the data distribution was considered normal (George and Mallery, 2010).

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Scales and Normality

Variables	Min.	Max.	\bar{X}	Sd.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Open-air entertainment	3.00	5.00	4.18	068	-0.19	-1.02
Sea-related entertainment	1.00	5.00	3.77	1.01	-0.39	-0.77
Macro-scale travel environment	2.50	5.00	4.06	0.62	0.38	-0.95

Micro-scale travel environment	3.00	5.00	4.24	0.52	0.45	-1.19
Visual cultural experience	4.00	5.00	4.59	0.42	-0.39	-1.51
Culture learning	3.00	5.00	4.14	0.64	-0.55	-0.85
City life	4.00	5.00	4.55	0.42	-0.15	-1.62
Adult-oriented nightlife	3.50	5.00	4.37	0.42	0.40	-1.30
LGBT and drug-oriented	1.00	4.50	2.72	0.82	-0.50	-0.37

Relationship and Impact Analyzes

According to the findings in Table 5, there are positive and significant relationships between revisit intention and outdoor entertainment venues, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, micro-scale travel environment, culture learning experience and LGBT and drug-oriented free life destination image factors ($r=0.21$ and $p<0.05$; $r=0.29$ and $p<0.05$; $r=0.25$ and $p<0.05$; $r=0.15$ and $p<0.05$; $r=0.18$ and $p<0.05$; $r=0.29$ and $p<0.05$; respectively). No significant relationships were detected between revisit intention and visual cultural experience, city life and adult-oriented free life, and the level of destination image factors.

Table 5. Relationships Between Destination Image Factors and Revisit Intention

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1									
2	0.42**	1								
3	0.31**	0.76**	1							
4	0.50**	0.40**	0.31**	1						
5	0.27**	-0.41**	-0.49**	0.10*	1					
6	0.67**	0.66**	0.60**	0.52**	-0.06	1				
7	0.43**	-0.35**	-0.33**	0.17**	0.80**	0.08	1			
8	-0.11*	0.53**	0.63**	0.05	-0.69**	0.28**	-0.62**	1		
9	0.58**	0.73**	0.58**	0.59**	-0.04	0.67**	0.08	0.20**	1	
10	0.21**	0.29**	0.25**	0.15**	0.04	0.18**	0.0	0.05	0.29**	1

1: Open-air entertainment, 2: Sea-related entertainment, 3: Macro-scale travel environment, 4: Micro-scale travel environment, 5: Visual cultural experience, 6: Culture learning, 7: City life, 8: Adult-oriented nightlife, 9: LGBT and drug-oriented nightlife, 10: Revisit intention.

*. The relationship between variables is significant at the 0.05 level.

**. The relationship between variables is significant at the 0.01 level.

The findings in Table 6 indicates that outdoor entertainment venues, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, micro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience, culture learning experience, city life, adult-oriented free life and LGBT and drug-oriented free life destination image factors explains a 13% variance on the revisit intention and this amount of explained variance is statistically significant ($F=8.41$, $p<0.01$). It was found that the destination image factors of sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience and culture learning experience had a significant effect on the level of revisit intention ($\beta=0.23$ and $p<0.05$, $\beta=0.24$ and $p<0.05$, $\beta=0.29$ and $p<0.05$, $\beta=-0.20$ and $p<0.05$). While the effect of sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment and visual cultural experience culture learning experience destination image factors on the revisit intention level is positive, the culture learning experience destination image factor's effect on the revisit intention level is negative. On the other hand, it was determined that outdoor entertainment venues, micro-scale travel environment, city life, adult-oriented free life and LGBT and drug-oriented free life destination image factors did not have a significant effect on revisit intention.

Table 6. Effect of Destination Image Factors on Revisit Intention

Dependent Variable: Revisit Intention							
Independent Variables	B	S. E.	β	t	p	VIF	D-W
Sabit	6.18	0.34		18.21	0.00		
Open-air entertainment	0.03	0.03	0.08	1.09	0.28	2.89	1.71

Sea-related entertainment	0.06	0.03	0.23	2.37	0.02	5.04
Macro-scale travel environment	0.10	0.03	0.24	3.00	0.00	3.34
Micro-scale travel environment	-0.02	0.03	-0.03	-0.56	0.57	1.67
Visual cultural experience	0.18	0.05	0.29	3.44	0.00	3.55
Culture learning	-0.08	0.03	-0.20	-2.52	0.01	3.07
City life	-0.08	0.05	-0.13	-1.45	0.15	4.01
Adult-oriented nightlife	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	-0.89	0.37	2.71
LGBT and drug-oriented nightlife	0.04	0.03	0.12	1.43	0.15	3.47
R: 0.38		F: 8.41				
Adjusted R²: 0.13		p:0.00				

Discussion

Tourism is an extremely important tool for the growth of a country's economy and development. Thanks to tourism, not only foreign currency flows into the country, but also hundreds of thousands of people are employed in the tourism sector. Tourism also contributes to the development of tourist cities and regions. Thanks to tourism, awareness about the protection of national, cultural and historical values is increasing. Cultural and social changes also occur with the dynamism provided by tourism. In order to achieve all these benefits of tourism, it is necessary to attract tourists to the country. The tourist attraction of a country or area depends on the destination image of that place, along with a number of other factors. Destination image is the expression of knowledge, experience, perception, judgment and thoughts that an individual has about a place. Destination image is related to how a tourist area is perceived by a tourist and the tourist's impressions about that place. The destination image that the tourist has is of critical importance as it is an effective factor in the tourist visiting that place again and recommending that place to others. Destination image about a place plays a critical role in making choices and decisions about that place. For this reason, in order for a touristic place to attract more tourists and for that place to be visited again, the perception of the destination image about that place must be kept high.

In this research, the effects of the destination image perceptions of tourists visiting Istanbul on their intention to revisit Istanbul were investigated. Findings showed that the destination image factors evaluated at the highest level by foreign tourists visiting Istanbul were visual cultural experience (4.59) and city life (4.55), and the destination image factors evaluated at the lowest level were LGBT and drug-oriented free life (2.72) and sea-related entertainment venues (3.77) factors. In addition, it has been determined that the level of intention of foreign tourists visiting Istanbul to revisit Istanbul is very high.

Findings indicated that the destination image perceptions of the foreign tourists visiting Istanbul related to open-air entertainment venues, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, micro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience, culture learning experience, city life, adult-oriented free life and LGBT and drug-oriented free life explained a significant variance of 13% on the intention to revisit Istanbul. Among these nine factors, sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment, visual cultural experience and culture learning experience had a significant effect on the revisit intention. While the effect of the first three destination image factors is positive the effect of the cultural learning experience destination image factor is negative. Based on these findings it concluded that when foreign tourists' perception levels concerning sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment and visual cultural experience culture learning experience destination image factors increase, their intention to revisit also increases, and on the contrary, when their perception levels concerning culture learning experience destination image factor increase their level of intention to revisit Istanbul decreases.

When the findings of the studies in the literature are examined, it is understood that they are parallel to the findings of this research in terms of the positive effect of destination image on revisit intention. Öztürk and Şahbaz (2017) found that destination image factors have a positive and significant effect on revisit intention and recommending a visit. Bezirgan, Köroğlu, and İlban (2017) found that the cognitive destination image positively affects behavioral intention, while the emotional image does not have a significant effect on behavioral intention. Kaya (2022) showed that the destination image, consisting of travel environment, natural attraction, entertainment and activities, historical places, infrastructure, accessibility, relaxation and price/value sub-dimensions, positively affected the intention to revisit. Bilgi (2022) found that the sub-dimensions of the destination image (geographic and social structure, historical and touristic values and transportation services) positively affected the intention to revisit. Gün and Kılıç (2022) found that perceptual image, emotional image, behavioral image and holistic image, which are the sub-dimensions of destination image, positively affected the

intention to revisit the destination. Bekar et al. (2023) determined that there was a positive and significant relationship between destination image and revisit intention. However, while the economic and socio-cultural sub-dimensions of the destination image had a significant effect on revisit intention, no significant effect of the promotional dimension was detected. Öztürk and Şahbaz (2019), Chaulagain et al. (2019), Saçlı et al. (2019), Afshardoost and Eshaghi (2020), Çeti and Atay (2020), Ahmad et al., (2020), Styliadis et al. (2020), Savaşçı and Yıldırım (2021) and Tatık (2022) showed that destination image perception has a positive and significant effect on revisit intention.

Based on the findings of the research it can be said that in order to ensure that tourists visit Istanbul again, it is necessary to increase their perception levels regarding the factors that determine the destination image. Efforts should be made to increase the image of the destination, especially in terms of sea-related entertainment venues, macro-scale travel environment and visual cultural experience. In this research, it was determined that learning the culture negatively affected revisiting. The reasons for this should be examined in future research. If there are inaccuracies in the media tools and methods used to learn culture, these should be corrected. Future studies should study destination image and its effects on revisit intention in different locations and with different sample groups. Additionally, since the destination image scale used in this research is a newly used scale in Turkish, more studies should be conducted on the validity and reliability of this scale.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- [1]. Açıkgoz, F. (2018). *Destinasyon İmajı, Alışveriş Değeri ve Yerel Halk Özelliklerinin Yabancı Turistlerin Tutum ve Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkileri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- [2]. Afshardoost, M., & Eshaghi, M. S. (2020). Destination image and tourist behavioral intentions: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 81, doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104154.
- [3]. Ahmad, A., Jamaludin, A., Zuraimi, N. S. M., & Valeri, M. (2020). Visit intention and destination image in post-Covid-19 crisis recovery, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–6, 2020, doi:10.1080/13683500.2020.1842342.
- [4]. Albayrak, A. & Özkul, E. (2013). Y Kuşığı Turistlerin Destinasyon İmaj Algıları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 8(6), 15-31.
- [5]. Altınbasak, I. & Yalçın, E. (2010). City Image and Museums: The Case Of Istanbul. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(3), 241-251.
- [6]. Artuğer, S. & Çetinsöz, B. C. (2014). Destinasyon İmajı ile Destinasyon Kişiliği Arasındaki İlişkiyi Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(1), 366-384.
- [7]. Ashworth, G. J. & Voogd, H. (1990). *Selling The City: Marketing Approaches in Public Sector Urban Planning*. London: Belhaven Press.
- [8]. Assaker, G., Vinzi, V. E. & O'Connor, P. (2011). Examining the Effect of Novelty Seeking, Satisfaction, and Destination Image on Tourists' Return Pattern: A two factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism management*, 32(4), 890-901.
- [9]. Ateş, A. (2022). *Destinasyon İmajı, Algılanan Değer, Turist Tatmini ve Davranışsal Niyet Arasındaki İlişki: Safranbolu Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Karabük Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Anabilim Dalı.
- [10]. Avcıkurt C. (2003). *Turizm Sosyolojisi*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- [11]. Baloglu, S. & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A Model of Destination Image Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26, 868–897.
- [12]. Baloglu S. & Bringberg, D. (1997). Affective Image of Tourism Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 35(4), 11-15.
- [13]. Baloglu, S. & Mangaloğlu, M. (2001). Tourism Destination Images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece and Italy as Perceived by US-Based Tour Operators and Travel Agents. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 1-9.
- [14]. Beerli A. & Josefa M. (2004). Tourist's Characteristics and The Perceived Image of Tourist Destinations: A quantitative analysis- a case study of lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management*, 25(5), 623-636.
- [15]. Bekar, A., Kocatürk, E. & Sürücü, Ç. (2023). The Impact of Gastronomy Festivals Intended to Visit the Perceived Destination and Visit Again: Fethiye Yeşilüzümlü and Region Morel Mushroom Festival Example. *Journal of Tourism & Gastronomy Studies*, 5(2), 28–36.
- [16]. Bezirgan, M., Köroğlu, A. & İlban, M. O. (2017). Destinasyon İmajı, Algılanan Değer, Aidiyet ve Davranışsal Niyetler Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesi. *Kesit Akademi Dergisi*, (12), 387-418.

- [17]. Bilgi, G. E. (2022). *Destinasyon İmajının Turizm Potansiyeline Etkisi: Patara Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm Rehberliği Anabilim Dalı.
- [18]. Blumberg, K. (2005). Tourism destination marketing – a tool for destination management? A case study from Nelson/Tasman region, New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(1), 45-57.
- [19]. Bonn, M. A., Joseph, S. M. & Dai, M. (2005). International versus domestic visitors: An examination of destination image perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 294-301.
- [20]. Bornhorst T., Ritchie, JR B. & Sheehan, L. (2010). Determinants of Tourism Success for DMOs & Destinations: An empirical examination of stakeholders' perspectives. *Tourism Management*, 31(5), 572-589.
- [21]. Boz, M. (2019). The Importance of Natural and Historical Environment in Sustainable Competitive Advantage of a Tourism Destination: Çanakkale Case. *Journal of Turkish Tourism Research*, 3(2):146-158.
- [22]. Buhalis D. (2000). Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 97-116.
- [23]. Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New York: Routledge.
- [24]. Chaulagain, S., Wiitala, J. & Fu, X. (2019). The impact of country image and destination image on US tourists' travel intention, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 12, 1–11, 2019, doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.01.005.
- [25]. Chen, C. F. & Tsai, D. (2007). How Destination Image and Evaluative Factors Affect Behavioral Intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115-1122.
- [26]. Crompton, J. L. (1979). An Assessment of the Image of Mexico as a Vacation Destination and the Influence of Geographical Location Upon that Image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(4), 18-23.
- [27]. Çeti, B. & Atay, D. D. L. (2020). Destinasyon Deneyiminin İmaj Algısı ve Davranışsal Niyete Etkisi: Kapadokya Örneği. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 31(1), 31-40. DOI: 10.17123/atad.713564.
- [28]. Dae-Young, K., Lehto, X. Y. & Morrison, A. M. (2007). Gender Differences in Online Travel Information Search: Implications for Marketing Communications on Internet. *Tourism Management*, Article in Press, 423-433.
- [29]. Doğanlı, B. (2006). *Turizmde Destinasyon Markalaşması ve Antalya Örneği*, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı. Doktora Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Isparta.
- [30]. Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie, J. B. (1991). The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image. *Journal of tourism studies*, 2(2), 2-12.
- [31]. Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie J. B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31, 3-13
- [32]. Ege, Z. & Demir, O. (2002). Turistik Ürün Çeşitlendirilmesi Kapsamında Kültür Turizmi ve Aydın İlının Kültürel Varlıkları. In *First Tourism Congress of Mediterranean Countries*, 483-500.
- [33]. Ersoy N. (2004). Zeugma Mozaik Müzesini Ziyaret Eden Yerli ve Yabancı Turistlerin Destinasyon İmajı Algılamaları Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7(34), 970-980.
- [34]. Fakeye P. C. & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image Differences between Prospective, First-time, and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 10-16.
- [35]. Gallarza M. G., Saura, I. G. & García, H. C. (2002). Destination Image: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 56-78.
- [36]. Gartner C. W. (1993). Image Formation Process", *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 2(3), 191-212.
- [37]. George, D. & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step. A simple study guide and reference* (10. Edition). GEN, Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [38]. Gün, S., & Kılıç, G.D. (2022). Destinasyon imajı, bütüncül imaj ve kişisel normatif inançların yeniden ziyaret etme niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: Siirt ili örneği. *BMİJ*, 10(2), 515-529, doi: <https://doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v10i2.2040>.
- [39]. Henkel, R., Henkel, P., Agrusa, W., Agrusa, J. & Tanner, J. (2006). Thailand as a tourist destination: Perceptions of international visitors and Thai residents. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11, 269-287.
- [40]. Hunt, J. D. (1975). Image as a factor in tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 13(3), 1–7.
- [41]. İçellioglu, C. Ş. (2014). Kent Turizmi ve Marka Kentler: Turizm Potansiyeli Açısından İstanbul'un SWOT Analizi. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 1, 37-55.
- [42]. İstanbul İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü, (2023). *İstanbul Turizm İstatistikleri Raporu Aralık 2022*. Retrieved from <https://istanbul.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/112493.aralik-2022-turizm-istatistikleripdf.pdf?0> on Erişim tarihi: 31.03.2023.

- [43]. Kani, Y., Aziz, Y. A., Sambasivan, M. & Bojei, J. (2017). Antecedents and outcomes of destination image of Malaysia, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 32, 89–98, doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.05.001.
- [44]. Kaşlı, M. & Yılmazdoğan, O.C. (2012). İmajın Turistik Talebe Etkisi: Eskişehir Örneği. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2), 199-209.
- [45]. Kaya, F. (2022). *Algılanan Otantiklik ve Destinasyon İmajının Turistlerin Davranışsal Niyetlerine Etkisi: Eskişehir Örneği*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Anabilim Dalı.
- [46]. Kazancıoğlu, E. R. (2020). *Destinasyon Seçiminde Destinasyon İmajı Ve Kent Markalama: Kapadokya Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Halkla İlişkiler Ve Tanıtım Anabilim Dalı Halkla İlişkiler Bilim Dalı.
- [47]. Kotler P., Haider, D. & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States and Nations*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan Int.
- [48]. Lawson F. & Baud-Bovy, M. (1977). *Tourism and Recreational Development*. London: Architectural Press.
- [49]. Lertputtarak, S. (2012). The relationship between destination image, food image, and revisiting Pattaya, Thailand. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(5), 111-122.
- [50]. Mackay J. K. & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1997). Pictorial Element of Destination in Image Formation *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 537-565.
- [51]. Maden, D., Köker N. E. & Topsümer F. (2012). The Image of Istanbul as a Destination Center: An Empirical Research. *Global Media Journal: Turkish Edition* 3(5), 106-129
- [52]. Martín-Santana, J. D., Beerli-Palacio, A., & Nazzareno, P. A. (2017). Antecedents and consequences of destination image gap. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, 13–25, doi:10.1016/j.annals.2016.11.001.
- [53]. Matos N., Mendes, J. & Pinto, P. (2012). Revisiting the Destination Image Construct Through a Conceptual Model. *Dos Algarves*, 21, 101-117.
- [54]. O’Leary, S. & Deegan, J. (2002). Peole, pace, place: Qualitative and quantitative images of Ireland as a tourism destination in France. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 213-226.
- [55]. Obenour, W., Lengfelder, J. & Groves, D. (2004). The development of a destination through the image assessment of six geographic markets. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(2), 107-119.
- [56]. Oran, İ. (2014). *Destinasyon İmajı: İstanbul’un Destinasyon İmajı ve Destinasyon İletişim Stratejileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- [57]. Özdemir G. (2007). *Destinasyon Yönetimi ve Pazarlama Temelleri İzmir için Bir Destinasyon Model Önerisi*. Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Anabilim Dalı.
- [58]. Özdemir, M.A. (2020). *Kültür Turizminde Aktivite Seçimi, Destinasyon İmajı ve Kişiliğinin Davranışsal Niyet Üzerindeki Etkisi: İstanbul’a Gelen Yabancı Turistler Üzerinde Bir Araştırma*. Doktora Tezi. İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- [59]. Öztürk, Y. & Şahbaz, R. P. (2017). Algılanan Destinasyon İmajının Tekrar Ziyaret Niyeti ve Tavsiye Davranışı Üzerine Etkisi: Ilgaz Dağı Milli Parkı’nda Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 5(2), 3-21.
- [60]. Pan, X., Rasouli, S., & Timmermans, H. (2021) Investigating tourist destination choice: Effect of destination image from social network members, *Tourism Management*, 83, doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104217.
- [61]. Pekin, F. (2011). *Çözüm: Kültür Turizmi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- [62]. Pike S. & Ryan, C. (2004). Destination Positioning Analysis Through a Comparison of Cognitive, Affective, and Conative Perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 333-342.
- [63]. Prayag, G. (2009). Tourists Evaluations of Destination Image, Satisfaction, and Future Behavioral Intentions - The Case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel ve Tourism Marketing*, 26(8), 836-853.
- [64]. Rittichainuwat, B., Qu, H., & Brown, T. (2001). Thailand's international travel image: Mostly favorable. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42, 82-95.
- [65]. Saçlı, Ç., Ersöz, B. & Kahraman, C. Ö. (2019). Etkinlik Katılımcılarının Destinasyon İmajı Algılarının Tekrar Ziyaret Etme Eğilimleri Üzerine Etkisi: Portakal Çiçeği Karnavalı Örneği. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 28(1), 178-190.
- [66]. Sağdıç, M. (2014). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin İstanbul’a İlişkin Algılarının Şehir İmajı Açısından Analizi. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 1267-1283
- [67]. Sahin, S. & Baloglu, S. (2011). Brand Personality and Destination Image of Istanbul. *Anatolia—an International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 22(1), 69-88.

- [68]. Savaşçı, U. & Yıldırım, H. M. (2021). Destinasyon İmajı ve Algılanan Riskin, Davranışsal Niyete Etkisi: Bodrum Örneği. *GSI Journals Serie A: Advancements in Tourism Recreation and Sports Sciences*, 4(2), 115-134. DOI: 10.53353/atrss.887811.
- [69]. Seçilmiş, C. & Koz, E.A. (2015). Sürdürülebilir Kültür Turizmi Algısının Nesillere Göre Tekrar Gelme Niyetine Etkisi. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 3(3), 69-78.
- [70]. Stabler M. J. (1988). The Image of Destination Regions: Theoretical and Empirical Aspects, in *Marketing in the Tourism Industry: the Promotion of Destination Regions*, Goodall, B. & Ashworth, G., 133-161, Croom Helm, London.
- [71]. Statista, (2023). *Leading European city tourism destinations in 2019, by number of bednights*. Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/487572/leading-european-city-destinations/> on 02.04.2023.
- [72]. Styliadis, D., Woosnam, K. M., Ivkov, M. & Kim, S. S. (2020). Destination loyalty explained through place attachment, destination familiarity and destination image, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, doi:10.1002/jtr.2359
- [73]. Sungkatavat, S. (2013). *Assessment of the US travelers' destination image of Thailand*. Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.
- [74]. Tapachai, N. & Waryszak, R. (2000). An Examination of The Role of Beneficial Image in Tourist Destination Selection. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 37-44.
- [75]. Tarakçıoğlu S. & Aydın, İ (2003). Yunanistan, İtalya ve Mısır Ülkelerinin İmajlarının Türkiye'de Faaliyet Gösteren A Grubu Seyahat Acenteleri Tarafından Algılanması: Amprik Bir Uygulama. *Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 166-189.
- [76]. Tatık, E. (2022). *Turistlerin Seyahat Motivasyonlarının ve Algıladıkları Destinasyon İmajının Davranışsal Niyet Üzerindeki Etkisi: Muğla Örneği*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Turizm İşletmeciliği Anabilim Dalı.
- [77]. Torlak, M. (2020). Destinasyon İmajı, Seyahat Kalitesi, Memnuniyet ve Davranışsal Niyet Bağlamında İstanbul'un Marka Şehir Yönetimine Dair Niteliksel ve Niceliksel Bir Araştırma. *Tüketici ve Tüketim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 12(1), 61-100.
- [78]. UNWTO (2020). *International Tourism Growth Continues to Outpace the Global Economy*. Retrieved from <https://www.unwto.org/taxonomy/term/347#:~:text=1.5%20billion%20international%20tourist%20arrivals%20were%20recorded%20in%202019%2C%20globally> on 14.05.2021.
- [79]. UNWTO (2022). *International Tourism Highlights, 2022*. Retrieved from <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284421152?download=true> on 30.03.2023.
- [80]. Ünal, A. & Çakır, G. (2020). Turistlerin Destinasyon Seçim Kararlarında Destinasyon İmajının Rolünün Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma: Kaş Örneği. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 395-403. DOI: 10.18506/anemon.631097.
- [81]. Üner, M. M., Güçer, E. & Taşçı, A. (2006). Türkiye Turizminde Yükselen Destinasyon Olarak İstanbul Şehrinin İmajı. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 17(2), 189-201.
- [82]. Webster's Online Dictionary, (2023). *Destination*. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/>, on 11.02.2023.
- [83]. Woodside, A. G. & Lysons, S. (1989). A General Model of Traveler Destination Choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(4), 8-14.
- [84]. World Economic Forum (2019). *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2019*. Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TTCR_2019.pdf, on 14.05.2021.
- [85]. World Tourism Organization (2007). *A Practical Guide to Tourism Destination Management*, Madrid.
- [86]. World Tourism Organization, (2004). Boş Zamanda Yaşanan Değişimler: Turizme Etkisi (Çeviren A. B. Ahıska). İstanbul: Set Systems Tercümanlık Reklamcılık Yayıncılık Ltd.
- [87]. Yamaç E. Z. & Zengin, B. (2019). İstanbul'un Tarihi ve Kültürel Değerleri Kapsamında Arz Sağlayıcılar Perspektifinden Destinasyon İmajının Değerlendirilmesi ve Analizi. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 8(1), 409-424.
- [88]. Yaraşlı, G. Y. (2007). *Destinasyon İmajı ve Trabzon Yöresine Dönük Bir Çalışma*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı.
- [89]. Yazıcıoğlu, Y. & Erdoğan, S. (2004). *SPSS Uygulamalı Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.