Turkish Studies *Social Sciences*

Volume 14 Issue 4, 2019, p. 1237-1253

DOI: 10.29228/TurkishStudies.23299

ISSN: 2667-5617

Skopje/MACEDONIA-Ankara/TURKEY

INTERNATIONAL
BALKAN
UNIVERSITY

EXCELLENCE FOR THE FUTURE
IBU.EDU.MK

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

Article Info / Makale Bilgisi

✍ *Received/Geliş:* 24.06.2019

✓ *Accepted/Kabul:* 10.08.2019

📅 *Report Dates/Rapor Tarihleri:* Referee 1 (22.07.2019)-Referee 2 (23.07.2019)

This article was checked by iThenticate.

PERCEIVED IMAGE OF GAZIANTEP PROVINCE AS A DESTINATION BRAND*

*Nalan ALBUZ***

ABSTRACT

This study examines the differences between the brand image of the Gaziantep destination brand image and the dimensions of the brand image according to the demographic characteristics, and then the relationship between the degree of satisfaction of the tourists and the other dimensions. Due to the fact that the official holidays on May 1 and 19 increased the participation rate in tourism, the surveys were conducted in May 2015 and reached 510 national tourists and 884 inhabitants. According to the results of the study, the element correlation values of all scale elements were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The analysis of the Lawshe validity method was carried out by 11 experts. The Content Validity Ratio (CVR) values calculated for each item showed a statistically significant validity ($p < 0.05$). The results of the factor analysis showed that there were a total of seven dimensions on the research scale and the factor loads of the substances of each dimension were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The perception of the destination of locals and foreign tourists differed significantly according to demographic characteristics ($p < 0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant correlation was found between perception of the destination image and tourist satisfaction among local tourists ($p < 0.05$). The scale, which was developed according to the findings obtained in the study, examines the brand image in seven dimensions as Tourist Values, Public and Private Facilities, Accessibility, Human Resources, Image and Character, Purchasing Power and Satisfaction. When the results of the correlation analysis are examined, it is seen that the most image and character are effective on the satisfaction of the tourists. This is followed by human resources, touristic values, purchasing power, accessibility and public and private sector opportunities. This shows that image and character

* Yazarın aynı ismi taşıyan doktora tezinden derlenmiştir.

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi, E-posta: nalanalbuz83@hotmail.com;

have a significant impact on the perception of destination brand image and will be important in studies in this field.

STRUCTURED ABSTRACT

Introduction and Objective

Destination brand image is the most important key factor for destination managers (Beritelli and Laesser, 2018: 2-3; Kladou et al, 2017; 427-428; Bigne vd., 2001: 614). The perceived level of perception of the brand through the image of a brand also depends on the tourist sector and the characteristics of the tourists. For example, in the area of cultural tourism, it is reported that demographic and social characteristics of tourists have an influence on the perception and evaluation of the image of a destination (Öter and Özdoğan, 2005: 135-136). A socially responsible environment and local people are very important to bring tourists to destinations. The locals can be considered the showcase of the destination as they are the first face and friendly ambassadors of the area. Without the local people, a destination is not strong enough and it is not possible to have a versatile appeal (Lee and Xie, 2011: 11).

This study aims to explain the differences between the brand image of the Gaziantep destination brand image and the dimensions of the brand image according to the demographic characteristics, and then the relationship between the degree of satisfaction of the tourists and the other dimensions.

Literature review

The brand is an important management tool that shows the difference between competitors and companies offering the same product or service when marketing products or services. Therefore, it is possible to value the brand as a valuable and long-term working capital (Wood, 2000: 662). The question of what a company does what its competitors produce or what customers think about variables associated with that product or service is related to the perception of the brand. Therefore, the brand is an important element that communicates between the customer and the company (Yang et al., 2015: 12). Brand image is a branding component that enables customers to visually perceive, differentiate a brand from other brands, and show different aspects of the brand (Montana et al., 2007: 837).

In destination marketing, all brand values and destination image components of the destination are addressed as a marketing element. Destination Marketing; The aim is to strike a balance between the economic benefits and the environmental costs of local people, to ensure the satisfaction of local people, to ensure the satisfaction of the visitors, to increase the profits of the local business and to increase the socio-cultural costs (Karabıyık and İnci, 2012: 2-3).

Methods

The population of the study consists of two persons living in two central districts of Gaziantep province and Gaziantep people in two central districts of Gaziantep. According to 2014 population data, the

total population of Gaziantep province is 1,889,438, while the total population of the two central districts is 1,556,381. In two central districts, 82.4% of the total population is considered a research universe. 5 places were selected by simple sampling. In the first three weeks of May 2015, surveyors were sent to the locations identified in the first three weeks of May 2015, taking into account the increase in attendance in previous periods and the increase in demand caused by the holidays from May 1 to May 19. In total, 30 clusters were formed. Since only the tourists can be reached, the duration of the surveys has been extended to 6 days. The goal was to reach more tourists. However, as the tourists did not want to take the time to question themselves while resting and eating, 607 tourists could be reached, missing answers were received and 510 questionnaires were evaluated. The population of the local population was 884 people. 2.1 times (221%) of the minimum number of participants in the study achieved with a large number of participants.

A questionnaire was prepared according to the literature. This process was based on the six factors identified by the World Tourism Organization. 70 items were prepared based on Boo et al. (2009), Konecnik & Gartner (2007), Pike (2008), Myagmarsuren & Chen (2011) and Mok Kim Man (2010). Two different questionnaires were prepared for the local population and the second for the tourists who came to Gaziantep. Along with these 70 articles, five questions were asked to tourists visiting Gaziantep and their satisfaction with Gaziantep residents.

Results

Item correlation values of all scale items were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Lawshe method analysis for scope validity was obtained from 11 experts. Scope Validity Ratio (CGO) values calculated for each item showed statistically significant validity ($p < 0.05$). Factor analysis results showed that there were a total of seven dimensions in the research scale and the factor loadings of the substances of each dimension were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Cronbach Alpha values calculated for each dimension are above the accepted value of 0.60. Therefore, the scale developed has adequate validity and reliability. The perceptions of destination brand image of locals and foreign tourists differ significantly according to demographic characteristics ($p < 0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant relationship was found between the perception of destination brand image and tourist satisfaction levels for local tourists ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion

Depending on the level of education of the tourists; It is observed that satisfaction increases with increasing formation the selectivity increases. In other words, education increases selectivity of individuals. By gender of tourists; Tourism values, image and character, as well as satisfaction dimensions, were statistically significant and all these averages were higher among women. After the marital status of tourists; Accessibility, human resources and purchasing power showed statistically significant differences between the groups. It is generally observed that married and divorced visitors are happier and their perceptions are higher. Depending on the income level of the visitors; It

was found that there were statistically significant differences between all image components of the destination. When the income level rises, the expectations are higher. The average values of the lower income groups are higher. According to the arrival frequency of the visitors; The tourist values, the possibilities of the public and private sector and all dimensions except satisfaction are statistically significant. In general assessment, assessment ratings decrease with increasing frequency of visits. According to the purpose of the visit, it was found that all image components of the destination had statistically significant differences between the groups. The general assessment found that the tourists who came to a cultural trip had a higher perception of the destination image.

Keywords: Destination, Tourism, Gaziantep, Brand Image.

GAZİANTEP İLİNİN BİR DESTİNASYON MARKASI OLARAK ALGILANAN İMAJİ

ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, Gaziantep'in destinasyon marka imajının yerel halk ve yerli turistler tarafından nasıl algılandığı, bu algıya hangi demografik özelliklerin etki ettiği ve destinasyon marka imajı boyutlarının turist memnuniyetleri üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. 1 ve 19 Mayıs'taki resmi tatillerin insanların turizme katılım oranını artırması nedeniyle anketler Mayıs 2015'te yapılmış, 510 yerli turist ve 884 yerel halka ulaşılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre, tüm ölçek elemanlarının korelasyon değerleri istatistiksel olarak anlamlıdır ($p < 0.05$). Lawshe geçerlilik yönteminin analizi 11 uzman tarafından yapılmıştır. Her madde için hesaplanan İçerik Geçerlilik Oranı (CVR) değerleri istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir geçerlilik göstermiştir ($p < 0.05$). Faktör analizi sonuçları, araştırma ölçeğinde toplam yedi boyut olduğunu ve her boyuttaki maddelerin faktör yüklerinin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı olduğunu göstermiştir ($p < 0.05$). Yerel halk ve yerli turistlerin destinasyon imaj algısı demografik özelliklere göre anlamlı farklılık göstermiştir ($p < 0.05$). Ek olarak, yerli turistler arasında destinasyon marka imaj algısı ile turist memnuniyeti arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur ($p < 0.05$). Araştırmada elde edilen bulgulara göre geliştirilen ölçek; Turistik Değerler, Kamu ve Özel Sektör İmkânları, Erişilebilirlik, İnsan Kaynakları, İmaj ve Karakter, Alım Gücü ve Memnuniyet olmak üzere marka imajını yedi boyutta incelemektedir. Korelasyon analizi sonuçları incelendiğinde, turistlerin memnuniyetinin üzerinde en fazla imaj ve karakterin etkili olduğu görülmektedir. Bunu sırasıyla insan kaynakları, turistik değerler, alım gücü, erişilebilirlik ve kamu ile özel sektör imkânları izlemektedir. Bu durum, imaj ve karakterin destinasyon marka imajı algısı üzerinde çok fazla etkili olduğunu, bu alanda yapılacak çalışmalarda da önem arz edeceğini göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Destinasyon, Turizm, Gaziantep, Marka İmajı.

1. Introduction

Destination brand image is the most important key factor for destination managers. The image of the destination has a direct impact on the perceived quality, the positive evaluation of the visit, the tendency for a return visit and the recommendation of the destination to friends and relatives. Thus, destination managers should focus on the topic of destination brand image and work on this topic (Beritelli and Laesser, 2018; Kladou et al, 2017; Bigne vd., 2001). The perception of customers by a brand determines the behavior of the customer and has become more important for organizations from the past to the present day. Positive brand perceptions help organizations achieve a stronger sustainable competitive advantage over their competitors (Dedeoğlu et al, 2019: 212).

Assessing how and how the image of the destination brand is perceived by the local community is fundamental to improving the local contribution to image studies of the destination and demonstrating local participation most effectively. In addition to the tourist attractions, the sustainability of the benefits of these tourist attractions is also important to create a destination image and to carry a target value. The understanding of the image of the locals from their own cities is equally important for understanding the image that tourists have regarding the tourist destination. Studies on the attitudes of local people show that the positive attitude of the population towards tourism is necessary for the success of tourism experience (Nickerson and Berry, 2014: 2).

Factors that are important in creating destination images include many factors, including tourist, geographic, economic, social, and cultural characteristics of the region in which the destination image is to be created. The important point here is to analyze the tourist attractions of the region where the destination image is desired and to analyze the infrastructures needed to create the brand image of the destination. Effective communication is required for image creation and image management, targeting the image development process as well as actors influencing and influencing the image (Öter and Özdoğan, 2005: 129).

The perceived level of perception of the brand through the image of a brand also depends on the tourist sector and the characteristics of the tourists. For example, in the area of cultural tourism, it is reported that demographic and social characteristics of tourists have an influence on the perception and evaluation of the image of a destination (Öter and Özdoğan, 2005: 135-136). A socially responsible environment and local people are very important to bring tourists to destinations. The locals can be considered the showcase of the destination as they are the first face and friendly ambassadors of the area. Without the local people, a destination is not strong enough and it is not possible to have a versatile appeal (Lee and Xie, 2011: 11).

This study aims to explain the differences between the brand image of the Gaziantep destination brand image and the dimensions of the brand image according to the demographic characteristics, and then the relationship between the degree of satisfaction of the tourists and the other dimensions.

2. Literature Review

In order to understand the insights gained from measuring destination brand images of local and local tourists, general information on the topic must first be mentioned. In this part of the research general terms on the subject are mentioned.

2.1. Destination and Tourist Destination Concepts

Destination is considered as a tourism product mix that brings integrated experience to the destination consumers (Karabıyık and İnci, 2012: 2). In order to increase the number of potential tourists for a destination and to ensure the development of tourism, tourism should be supported by tourism images (Jager, 2010: 367). The World Tourism Organization (WTO) is defined as the local tourism

destination as a physical space where a tourist spends at least one night. This definition includes tourism products such as support services, attractiveness and tourist resources (WTO, 2007: 1).

For an effective destination management, very different requirements and practices are required and one of the important stages is information from the destination or destination marketing department. This information enables realization of realistic goals that are effective in the success of destination management and making plans for these purposes (Özer, 2012: 164-165).

2.2. Brand Image Concept

The brand is an important management tool that shows the difference between competitors and companies offering the same product or service when marketing products or services. Therefore, it is possible to value the brand as a valuable and long-term working capital (Wood, 2000: 662). The question of what a company does what its competitors produce or what customers think about variables associated with that product or service is related to the perception of the brand. Therefore, the brand is an important element that communicates between the customer and the company (Yang et al., 2015: 12).

Brand image is a branding component that enables customers to visually perceive, differentiate a brand from other brands, and show different aspects of the brand (Montana et al., 2007: 837). The recognition of the positive or negative image generated by the brand owner products in the consumer spirit is of great importance to the companies. Removing the unwanted image or turning the negative image into a positive image or maintaining the positive image is only possible if the consumers' thoughts are measured. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the brand value for the consumer to determine whether the brand image is positive or negative (Aktepe and Şahbaz, 2010: 70).

Berger et al. (2007); reported that product diversity plays an important role in the perception of the product's brand image. Jansson (2013) in his study; reported that gender is important for the perception of the brand image in the automotive industry, and how women and men directly impact the brand on the success of the brand image. Similar in the studies of Özgüven and Karataş (2010: 139); In the fast food sector, gender is an important factor in the perception of the brand image.

2.3. Destination and Brand Image Concepts

In destination marketing, all brand values and destination image components of the destination are addressed as a marketing element. Destination Marketing; The aim is to strike a balance between the economic benefits and the environmental costs of local people, to ensure the satisfaction of local people, to ensure the satisfaction of the visitors, to increase the profits of the local business and to increase the socio-cultural costs (Karabıyık and İnci, 2012: 2-3). The attractiveness of a destination indicates that the following features are important for the destination (WTO, 2007: 1):

- Tourist values
- Public and private opportunities
- accessibility
- Human resources
- Image and character
- takeover performance

The basis of the image activity in destination marketing is a strong, consistent, different and easily recognizable brand image that generates positive impulses for the destination (Özdemir, 2008: 105). In highly competitive markets, the relationship between destination and brand image is important to highlight tourist destinations and highlight their differences (Klabi, 2012: 310).

To effectively market a tourism destination and gain a competitive advantage, destination managers must effectively apply the integrated marketing method, not just elements of the advertising mix, but also all elements of the marketing mix to convey the messages that affect the target groups (Dereli and Baykasoğlu, 2007: 119). In a destination, it is of great benefit that every tourist product is a brand that creates brand value and wins an identity. Therefore, the brand image of a destination is a crucial point for the marketing success of the destination (İlban et al, 2008: 122). The success of tourism destinations depends on the emotional ways of creating different and unique products that can attract potential tourists to the destination. Therefore, a positive image development, also known as marking of travel destinations, is indispensable to classify a destination and distinguish it from other destinations (Schwaighofer, 2014: 7). The image of the destination, which arises after a complex process, is influenced by friends such as friends, newspapers, magazines, etc. This is a process that includes written media such as TV channels and audiovisual media. All these processes and the information gained from the information and destination brand image are formed (Matos et al., 2012: 106). Identification of the main sources and characteristics of tourist destinations, creation of marketing strategies, creating an attraction with their values and visiting a specific target group, satisfying the need to travel with the product mix they have, as common characteristics of tourist destinations can be given (Sarı and Kozak, 2005: 254).

3. Methods

This research was designed in a descriptive survey model. In this method, the researcher presents an existing situation with qualitative and / or quantitative data (Karasar, 2017). The study revealed the public's perception of Gaziantep's brand image on the basis of quantitative data.

3.1. Sampling

The population of the study consists of two groups which include people living in two central districts of Gaziantep province and Turkish people travelling to Gaziantep. According to 2014 population data, the total population of Gaziantep province is 1,889,438, while the total population of the two central districts is 1,556,381. In two central districts, 82.4% of the total population is considered a research universe. 5 places were selected by simple sampling. In the first three weeks of May 2015, surveyors were sent to the locations identified, taking into account the increase in attendance in previous periods and the increase in demand caused by the holidays from May 1 to May 19. In total, 30 clusters were formed. Since only the tourists can be reached, the duration of the surveys has been extended to 6 days. The goal was to reach more tourists. However, as the tourists did not want to take the time to question they while resting and eating, 607 tourists could be reached, missing answers were received and 510 questionnaires were evaluated. The population of the local population was 884 people. 2.1 times (221%) of the minimum number of participants in the study achieved with a large number of participants.

3.2. Data Collecting

A questionnaire was prepared according to the literature. This process was based on the six factors identified by the World Tourism Organization. 70 items were prepared based on Boo et al. (2009), Konecnik & Gartner (2007), Pike (2008), Myagmarsuren & Chen (2011) and Mok Kim Man (2010). Two different questionnaires were prepared for the local population and the second for the tourists who came to Gaziantep. Along with these 70 articles, five questions were asked to tourists visiting Gaziantep and their satisfaction with Gaziantep residents. In the last chapter questions about demographic information and "What are the first three things that come to your Gaziantep, known or in the sense?", Gaziantep What are three characteristics that it is from other provinces in the region and in Turkey?"

3.3. Research Hypotesis

The following hypotheses were sought in the study:

H1: The scale developed for Gaziantep's destination image is valid and reliable in order to uncover the brand image.

H2: The perception of the destination of the local population differed considerably depending on demographic characteristics.

H3: The perception of the brand image of domestic tourists differs considerably depending on demographic characteristics.

H4: There is a statistically significant correlation between the perception of the image of the destination and the level of satisfaction of the local tourists.

3.4. Statistical Method

To validate the scale, the Lawshe Scope Validity method and factor analysis were used. For the reliability of the scale, item correlations and internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach alpha) and splitman half tests were used. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the Lillye for correction were used for the normality test before the difference analysis. Mann-Whitney-U was used in the difference analysis of the two groups for the parameters that did not correspond to the normal distribution, whereas the Kruskal-Wallis analysis was used in the difference analysis of more than two groups. The normal distribution data was analyzed with the Independent Sample T-Test and the difference between two groups with the one-way ANOVA. Correlation analysis used Spearman's rho correlation analysis. All analyzes were performed in SPSS 17.0 for Windows package programs with a confidence interval of 95% and a significance level of 0.05.

4. Results

The first hypothesis of the study was as follows:

“H1: The scale developed for the destination brand image of Gaziantep is valid and reliable in revealing the brand image.” The results of validity and reliability analysis for hypothesis testing are given in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 1: Test-retest material correlation values of scale items

TOURISTIC VALUES	r	p
1. Gaziantep has important historical values.	0,517	0,003
2. The historical places of Gaziantep are quite attractive.	0,643	0,000
3. Gaziantep has important cultural values.	0,704	0,000
4. Gaziantep is rich in handicrafts.	0,613	0,000
5. Gaziantep has a rich culinary culture.	0,412	0,024
6. Gaziantep is very interesting with its museums.	0,551	0,002
7. The climate of Gaziantep is suitable for all seasons.	0,537	0,002
8. Gaziantep is an important destination for cultural tourism.	0,557	0,001
9. Gaziantep is an important destination for gastronomy (eating and drinking) tourism.	0,644	0,000
10. Gaziantep has sufficient infrastructure in terms of congress tourism.	0,834	0,000
11. There are interesting cultural events in Gaziantep (fairs, festivals, exhibitions, concerts etc.).	0,610	0,000
12. Gaziantep is a city rich in parks and green areas.	0,680	0,000
13. There are adequate facilities for evaluating alternative tourism activities (health tourism, sports tourism etc.) in Gaziantep.	0,865	0,000
14. There are enough recreation areas in Gaziantep.	0,536	0,002
15. The zoo is an important attraction center.	0,475	0,009
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR FACILITIES		

1. An adequate number of accommodation facilities are available.	0,629	0,000
2. A sufficient number of food and beverage companies are available.	0,551	0,002
3. There are enough entertainment venues.	0,510	0,004
4. There are enough shopping centers, shops and shops.	0,555	0,001
5. It is problematic in terms of infrastructure. Example: road, water, electricity, sewage etc ..	0,491	0,006
6. Comprehensive in terms of superstructure. Example: external view of buildings, parks, recreation areas etc.	0,834	0,000
7. Tourist information offices are available.	0,552	0,002
8. The municipality has adequate work in terms of informing tourists.	0,563	0,001
ACCESSIBILITY		
1. The transportation facilities of Gaziantep from other countries and cities are sufficient.	0,649	0,000
2. Easy access to the city center from the airport or terminal.	0,716	0,000
3. The necessary procedures for travel (ticket finding, reservation etc.) are quite easy.	0,638	0,000
4. The possibilities of transportation from one place to another in the city are quite developed.	0,536	0,002
HUMAN RESOURCES		
1. The number of people who speak foreign languages in Gaziantep is sufficient for tourists.	0,735	0,000
2. The education level of the people of Gaziantep is high.	0,643	0,000
3. The people of Gaziantep are polite and helpful to tourists.	0,689	0,000
4. The people of Gaziantep are hospitable.	0,693	0,000
5. Employees of food and beverage companies are well equipped.	0,523	0,003
6. Accommodation facility employees are well equipped.	0,604	0,000
7. Official personnel are adequately equipped.	0,650	0,000
8. The employees of the transport sector are well equipped.	0,574	0,001
9. The employees of the shopping centers, stores and shops have sufficient equipment.	0,573	0,001
IMAGE AND CHARACTER		
1. Gaziantep is a brand destination.	0,904	0,000
2. Gaziantep is a city of culture and history.	0,514	0,004
3. Gaziantep is an industrial city.	0,520	0,003
4. Gaziantep's logo is the best option for Gaziantep.	0,816	0,000
5. Gaziantep has a positive image.	0,711	0,000
6. Gaziantep is the city to live in.	0,546	0,002
7. Gaziantep is a safe city.	0,709	0,000
8. Gaziantep is a city with a low crime rate.	0,604	0,000
9. Gaziantep has a high quality of life.	0,546	0,002
10. Gaziantep is a modern city.	0,736	0,000
11. Gaziantep has a clean environment.	0,401	0,028
12. Gaziantep is a suitable city for family holidays.	0,621	0,000
13. Gaziantep is a city that has announced its name with its regional dishes and baklava.	0,397	0,030
14. Gaziantep is a city that can be visited even for gastronomy (eating and drinking) tourism.	0,449	0,013
15. Shopping opportunities in Gaziantep are good.	0,829	0,000
16. Food and beverage companies in Gaziantep provide quality service.	0,585	0,001
17. Gaziantep accommodation facilities are of high quality.	0,486	0,007
18. Souvenirs and souvenirs sold in Gaziantep are original and worth buying.	0,614	0,000
19. Tourist guidance services in Gaziantep are adequate and satisfactory.	0,599	0,000
20. Gaziantep has world-famous brands.	0,712	0,000
21. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep in the national press.	0,549	0,002
22. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep on the internet.	0,439	0,017
23. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep in travel agencies.	0,366	0,047
24. The promotional activities for Gaziantep are adequate.	0,413	0,023
25. Gaziantep has a relaxing and relaxing atmosphere.	0,542	0,002
PURCHASING POWER		
1. Accommodation fees are eligible.	0,729	0,000
2. Fees for food and beverage businesses	0,576	0,001
3. Museum entrance fees are eligible.	0,396	0,030
4. Transportation fees from other countries and cities are eligible.	0,431	0,017
5. Local transportation fees are eligible.	0,445	0,014
6. Souvenir charges are eligible.	0,537	0,002

7. Handicraft products are eligible.	0,610	0,000
8. Gaziantep, precious jewelry, clothing and so on. it is a city where the purchasing power of personal belongings is appropriate for the price.	0,601	0,000
9. Visiting Gaziantep is generally economic.	0,684	0,000
SATISFACTION		
1. Tourists visiting this city make an economic contribution to the city.	0,569	0,001
2. Tourists visiting this city contribute to the city in a social and cultural sense.	0,568	0,001
3. Thanks to tourists, the quality of local services (municipal services, etc.) is increasing.	0,622	0,000
4. Thanks to the tourists, the quality of special services (accommodation, restaurants, shopping centers) increases.	0,603	0,000
5. Thanks to the tourists, the knowledge and quality of the public is increasing.	0,539	0,002

Item correlation values of all scale items were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). Lawshe method analysis for scope validity was obtained from 11 experts. Scope Validity Ratio (CGO) values calculated for each item showed statistically significant validity ($p < 0.05$). The results of the Basic Component Analysis for explanatory factor analysis are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Factor Analysis Results	
TOURISTIC VALUES	Factor Loads
1. Gaziantep has important historical values.	,814
2. The historical places of Gaziantep are quite attractive.	,754
3. Gaziantep has important cultural values.	,782
4. Gaziantep is rich in handicrafts.	,734
5. Gaziantep has a rich culinary culture.	,696
6. Gaziantep is very interesting with its museums.	,755
7. The climate of Gaziantep is suitable for all seasons.	,677
8. Gaziantep is an important destination for cultural tourism.	,796
9. Gaziantep is an important destination for gastronomy (eating and drinking) tourism.	,665
10. Gaziantep has sufficient infrastructure in terms of congress tourism.	,691
11. There are interesting cultural events in Gaziantep (fairs, festivals, exhibitions, concerts etc.).	,660
12. Gaziantep is a city rich in parks and green areas.	,653
13. There are adequate facilities for evaluating alternative tourism activities (health tourism, sports tourism etc.) in Gaziantep.	,706
14. There are enough recreation areas in Gaziantep.	,746
15. The zoo is an important attraction center.	,750
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR FACILITIES	
1. An adequate number of accommodation facilities are available.	,740
2. A sufficient number of food and beverage companies are available.	,808
3. There are enough entertainment venues.	,715
4. There are enough shopping centers, shops and shops.	,680
5. It is problematic in terms of infrastructure. Example: road, water, electricity, sewage etc ..	,799
6. Comprehensive in terms of superstructure. Example: external view of buildings, parks, recreation areas etc.	,779
7. Tourist information offices are available.	,780
8. The municipality has adequate work in terms of informing tourists.	,766
ACCESSIBILITY	
1. The transportation facilities of Gaziantep from other countries and cities are sufficient.	,761
2. Easy access to the city center from the airport or terminal.	,712
3. The necessary procedures for travel (ticket finding, reservation etc.) are quite easy.	,767
4. The possibilities of transportation from one place to another in the city are quite developed.	,763
HUMAN RESOURCES	
1. The number of people who speak foreign languages in Gaziantep is sufficient for tourists.	,707
2. The education level of the people of Gaziantep is high.	,754
3. The people of Gaziantep are polite and helpful to tourists.	,746
4. The people of Gaziantep are hospitable.	,753
5. Employees of food and beverage companies are well equipped.	,778
6. Accommodation facility employees are well equipped.	,723
7. Official personnel are adequately equipped.	,737
8. The employees of the transport sector are well equipped.	,768
9. The employees of the shopping centers, stores and shops have sufficient equipment.	,628
IMAGE AND CHARACTER	
1. Gaziantep is a brand destination.	,690
2. Gaziantep is a city of culture and history.	,780
3. Gaziantep is an industrial city.	,724
4. Gaziantep's logo is the best option for Gaziantep.	,653
5. Gaziantep has a positive image.	,745
6. Gaziantep is the city to live in.	,768

7. Gaziantep is a safe city.	,750
8. Gaziantep is a city with a low crime rate.	,727
9. Gaziantep has a high quality of life.	,750
10. Gaziantep is a modern city.	,699
11. Gaziantep has a clean environment.	,571
12. Gaziantep is a suitable city for family holidays.	,512
13. Gaziantep is a city that has announced its name with its regional dishes and baklava.	,728
14. Gaziantep is a city that can be visited even for gastronomy (eating and drinking) tourism.	,738
15. Shopping opportunities in Gaziantep are good.	,700
16. Food and beverage companies in Gaziantep provide quality service.	,408
17. Gaziantep accommodation facilities are of high quality.	,661
18. Souvenirs and souvenirs sold in Gaziantep are original and worth buying.	,455
19. Tourist guidance services in Gaziantep are adequate and satisfactory.	,675
20. Gaziantep has world-famous brands.	,541
21. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep in the national press.	,666
22. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep on the internet.	,785
23. It is possible to find enough information about Gaziantep in travel agencies.	,745
24. The promotional activities for Gaziantep are adequate.	,721
25. Gaziantep has a relaxing and relaxing atmosphere.	,707
PURCHASING POWER	
1. Accommodation fees are eligible.	,721
2. Fees for food and beverage businesses	,705
3. Museum entrance fees are eligible.	,666
4. Transportation fees from other countries and cities are eligible.	,709
5. Local transportation fees are eligible.	,745
6. Souvenir charges are eligible.	,800
7. Handicraft products are eligible.	,775
8. Gaziantep, precious jewelry, clothing and so on. it is a city where the purchasing power of personal belongings is appropriate for the price.	,785
9. Visiting Gaziantep is generally economic.	,747
SATISFACTION	
1. Tourists visiting this city make an economic contribution to the city.	,695
2. Tourists visiting this city contribute to the city in a social and cultural sense.	,795
3. Thanks to tourists, the quality of local services (municipal services, etc.) is increasing.	,741
4. Thanks to the tourists, the quality of special services (accommodation, restaurants, shopping centers) increases.	,788
5. Thanks to the tourists, the knowledge and quality of the public is increasing.	,724
KMO: 0,921; X²: 60644,438; df: 2775; p: 0,000	

Factor analysis results showed that there were a total of seven dimensions in the research scale and the factor loadings of the substances of each dimension were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$). The Cronbach Alpha values calculated for each dimension are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Cronbach Alpha values calculated for each dimension

DIMENSIONS	Number of items	Cronbach Alpha
Touristic Values	15	0,861
Public and Private Sector Facilities	8	0,820
Accessibility	4	0,742
Human resources	9	0,843
Image and Character	25	0,918
Purchasing power	9	0,914
Satisfaction	5	0,868
TOTAL	75	0,960

Cronbach Alpha values calculated for each dimension are above the accepted value of 0.60. Therefore, according to the data in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3, the scale developed has adequate validity and reliability. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the study was accepted.

The second, third and fourth hypotheses of the study are given as follows:

“H2: Perceptions of the local people's destination brand image differed significantly according to their demographic characteristics.

H3: Native tourists' perception of destination brand image is significantly different according to their demographic characteristics.

H4: There is a statistically significant relationship between the perception of destination brand image and the satisfaction level of local tourists.”

The results of the analyzes for hypothesis testing are given in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Differential analysis and relational survey model results

According to Figure 1, the perceptions of destination brand image of locals and foreign tourists differ significantly according to demographic characteristics ($p < 0.05$). In addition, a statistically significant relationship was found between the perception of destination brand image and tourist satisfaction levels for local tourists ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, two, three and fourth hypotheses of the study were accepted.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study examines how the image of the destination is assessed in terms of locals and tourists in the field, whether this rating differs according to the demographics of the natives and tourists and the relationship to the satisfaction of tourists. Freire's study also highlights the importance of local people for branding tourist destinations and building the image of a destination. According to research, having all the attractions of a destination is not enough to gain competitive advantage. With good climate, beautiful nature and high-quality tourism businesses, these factors do not provide the basic conditions, but they do not guarantee that tourists will arrive at destinations. Today hundreds of regions have the same charm and the same presentations. For this reason, the most fundamental factor is to make a

difference, to become a brand in the destination and to create an image of the destination brand in this similar and intensely competitive market (Freire, 2007: 17). According to the study of 142 studies targeting the year 1973-2000, 59 of them were applied to the tourists who were in the visiting phase and 55 of them to the tourists who returned to their place of residence, and only two of them were on the local population applied (Pike, 2002: 542).

In general, the relationship between the views of the local population and the demographic characteristics of the provincial brand image components in the province; Gender, age and monthly income have an impact. Results of the correlation analysis are examined; this effect is seen in the positive direction for women in advanced age and in the negative direction for increasing monthly income. In other words, women from the local population, who are older and have a lower income, say they are more satisfied with the image of the provincial destination. It is noted that the locals, who are younger and more male and have more income, are not satisfied with the province's brand image. For this reason, studies should be undertaken to improve the perception of young, low-income male citizens in order to fully exploit the public's image of the destination.

With increasing age of the tourists, the perception level of the image components of the destination brand increases. Depending on the level of education of the tourists; It is observed that satisfaction increases with increasing formation the selectivity increases. In other words, education increases selectivity of individuals. By gender of tourists; Tourism values, image and character, as well as satisfaction dimensions, were statistically significant and all these averages were higher among women. After the marital status of tourists; Accessibility, human resources and purchasing power showed statistically significant differences between the groups. It is generally observed that married and divorced visitors are happier and their perceptions are higher. Depending on the income level of the visitors; It was found that there were statistically significant differences between all image components of the destination. When the income level rises, the expectations are higher. The average values of the lower income groups are higher. According to the arrival frequency of the visitors; The tourist values, the possibilities of the public and private sector and all dimensions except satisfaction are statistically significant. In general assessment, assessment ratings decrease with increasing frequency of visits. According to the purpose of the visit, it was found that all image components of the destination had statistically significant differences between the groups. The general assessment found that the tourists who came to a cultural trip had a higher perception of the destination image.

In addition, the relationship between the satisfaction of tourists coming to Gaziantep and the perception of the brand image of the destination was examined. When examining the results of the correlation analysis, it can be seen that most images and characters contribute to tourist satisfaction. This is followed by human resources, tourist values, purchasing power, accessibility and opportunities for the public and private sectors. This situation shows that image and character are very effective in influencing the perception of the destination image and will be important for the studies to be carried out in this area.

REFERENCES

- Aktepe, C. and Şahbaz, R. P. (2010). "Türkiye'nin en büyük beş havayolu işletmesinin marka değeri unsurları açısından incelenmesi ve Ankara ili uygulaması", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(2), p. 69-90.
- Berger, J., Draganska, M. and Simonson, I. (2007). "The influence of product variety on brand perception and choice", *Marketing Science*, 26(4), p.460-472.

- Beritelli, P. and Laeser, C. (2018). "Destination logo recognition and implications for intentional destination branding by DMOs: A case for saving Money". *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8(1), p. 1-13.
- Bigne, J. E., Sanchez, M. I. and Sanchez, J. (2001). "Tourism Image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship", *Tourism Management*, (22), p.607-616.
- Boo, Soyoung, James Busser and Şeyhmus Baloglu, "A model of customer-based brand equity and its application to multiple destinations", *Tourism Management* 30, 2009, p. 219–231.
- Dedeoğlu, B. B., Niekerk, M. V., Weinland, J. and Celuch, K. (2019). Re-conceptualizing customer-based destination brand equity". *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 11(1), p.211-230.
- Dereli, T. and Baykasoğlu, A. (2007). *Toplam Marka Yönetimi, (1. Edt.)*, İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları.
- Freire, J. R. (2007). "Local people a critical dimension for place brands", *Journal of Brand Management*, (doi: 10.1057/palgrave.bm.2550097), p.1-19
- İlban, M. O., Köroğlu, A. and Bozok, D. (2008). "Termal turizm amaçlı seyahat eden turistlerde destinasyon imajı: Gönen örneği", *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(13), p.105-129.
- Jager, A. E. (2010). "How dull is dullstroom? Exploring the tourism destination image of dullstroom", *Tourism Geographies*, 12(3), p.349-370.
- Jansson, E. (2013). "Cross-cultural differences in brand image perception – an exploration of the volvo brand, university of Gothenburg", University of Gothenburg, Master of Communication Thesis, Sweden.
- Karabıyık, N. and İnci, B. S. (2012). "Destinasyon pazarlamasında pazarlama stratejisi ve konumlandırma çalışmalarına kavramsal yaklaşım", *İstanbul Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2012/1, p.1-19.
- Karasar, N. (2017). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. İstanbul: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Klabi, F. (2012). "The predictive power of destination-personality-congruity on tourist preference: a global approach to destination image branding", *Leisure/Loisir*, 36(3-4), p.309-331.
- Kladou, S., Kavaratzis, M., Rigopoulou, I. and Salonika, E. (2017). "The role of brand elements in destination branding". *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(4), p. 426-435.
- Konecnik, Maja and Gartner, W. C. (2007) "Customer-based brand equity for a destination", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), p.400-421.
- Lee, J. and Xie, K. L. (2011). "Cognitive destination image, destination personality and behavioral intentions: an integrated perspective of destination branding", *16th Annual Graduate Student Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism, Houston, Texas*, p.1-12
- Marangoz, M. (2006). "Tüketicilerin marka fonksiyonu algılamaları ile satın alma sonrası davranışları arasındaki ilişki", *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(2), p.107-128.
- Matos, N., Mendes, J. and Valle, P. (2012). "Revisiting the destination image construct through a conceptual model", *Dos Algarves, A multidisciplinary e-journal*, 2(1), p.101-117

- Mok Kim Man, Mandy. (2010). "Developing a brand of the Sabah state in Malaysia: empirical research among its tourists", *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, 16(1), p.118-129.
- Montaña, J., Guzmán, F. and Moll, I. (2007). "Branding and design management: a brand design management model", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 23(9-10), p.829-840.
- Myagmarsuren, O. and Chen, Ching-Fu (2011). "Exploring relationships between destination brand equity, satisfaction and destination loyalty: a case study of Mongolia", *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts*, 3(2), p.81-94.
- Nickerson, N. P. and Berry, M. (2014). "Comparison of resident vs visitor community image", *Unmasking the Voice of the Consumer Conference*, Denver, Colorado, ABD, 16-18 April.
- Öter, Z. and Özdoğan, O. N. (2005). "Kültür amaçlı seyahat eden turistlerde destinasyon imajı: Selçuk-Efes örneği", *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16(2), p.127-138.
- Özdemir, G. (2008). *Destinasyon Pazarlaması, (1.Edt.)*, Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.
- Özer, Ö. (2012). "Destinasyon tercihinde pazarlama karması bileşenlerinin rolü: Dalyan örneği", *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(1), p.163-182.
- Özgüven, N. and Karataş, E. (2010). "Genç tüketicilerin marka kişiliği algılamalarının cinsiyete göre değerlendirilmesi: Mcdonald's ve Burger King", *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1(11), p.139-143.
- Pike, S. D. (2002). "Destination image analysis- a review of 142 papers from 1973 to 2000", *Tourism Management* 23, (5), p.541-549.
- Pike, Steven D. (2008). "Destination branding: analysing brand equity for queensland's coral coast", In: 18th Annual Council for Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education Conference: Where the Bloody Hell Are We?, 11–14 February, Gold Coast International Hotel, Queensland.
- Sarı, Y. and Kozak, M. (2005). "Turizm pazarlamasına internetin etkisi: destinasyon web siteleri için bir model önerisi", *Akdeniz Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (9), p.248-271.
- Schwaighofer, V. (2014). *Tourist destination images and local culture*, (1st Ed.), ISBN 978-3-658-04521-0, Almany: Springer Gabler.
- Wood, L. (2000). "Brands and brand equity: definition and management", *Management Decision*, 38(9), p.662-669.
- World Tourism Organization (WTO). (2007) "A practical guide to tourism destination management", *World Tourism Organization, Calle Capitán Haya, Madrid, Spain*, ISBN: 978-92-844-1243-3.
- Yang, D., Sönmez, M., Li, Q. and Duan, Y. (2015). "The power of triple contexts on customer-based brand performance—a comparative study of Baidu and google from Chinese netizens' Perspective", *International Business Review*, 24(1), p.11–22.