**I**JHMT **Editorial**

International Journal Of Health Management And Tourism

# DETERMINATION OF THE FACTORS AFFECTING THE REVISIT OF FOREIGN TOURISTS TO KUŞADASI

**Ferda Esin Gülel[1]\*, Emre Kılıç[2]**

[1]Assist. Prof., Department of Econometrics, Pamukkale University, Turkey
[2]Department of Econometrics, Pamukkale University, Turkey
*E-mail:fegulel@pau.edu.tr*

**Abstract:** The customer satisfaction has become the primary concern and creating a satisfied customer image has taken its place among the tourist destinations of tourist sites. The satisfied customer prefers the same place/region again and this brings about loyalty. The aim of this survey is to set forth the result of destination image on destination loyalty. Sampling, used in this analyze, has been identified according with the bit of tourists that came to Kuşadası in 2016. In the analyses, first the structure of destination image and destination loyalty variables is examined by the factor analysis. Then the relation between the factors obtained through the factor analysis is examined by Pearson's correlation coefficients and multivariate regression analysis. Lastly, the effect of gender, marital status, nationality, destination loyalty and destination image variables on revisiting to Kuşadası is examined by binary logistic regression analysis. Findings obtained shows that there is a linear relationship between destination image and destination loyalty.

**Keywords:** Destination Image, Destination Loyalty, Factor Analysis, Pearson Correlation, Logistic Regression

## Introduction

Tourism involves the activities that individuals join -without any political or commercial purpose- within a certain period of time by using the tourism industry elements for recreation, entertainment, education, health, pleasure, curiosity, sports, religion, culture, etc. (Karataş, Babür, 2013).

Human needs in the developing world show a rapid alteration. Elements such as the growth in economic standard of societies, technological advance, facilitate of transportation have shorten distances and made even the most distant places accessible. Thanks to the developments, considering a vacation cease to be a luxury and become a necessity, and consequently this has contributed to a considerable increase in the tourism industry. By the influence of these ongoing developments, tourism has become a rapidly growing industry in the world marketplace, a potential market for investors and a means that enhances the cultural interaction. Besides, due to the several reasons like hot money flow, increasing of employment area, improving of cross-cultural communication and contribution to political relations, tourism has drawn World countries' attention, and so they placed more importance to this industry.

The increase of the emphasis that countries put on tourism, established a global competitive environment. In this highly competitive environment, cities develop strategies to reach their tourist attractions. The difficulty of gaining the consumer, who have a great deal of options to select a vacation spot, has nowadays led tourism cities to keep the existing customers instead of raising the number of new customers. The customer satisfaction has become the primary concern and creating a satisfied customer image has taken its place among the tourist destinations of tourist sites.  Satisfied customers would like to go to places which they have seen and pleased before, instead of taking the risk of choosing a tourist destination for the first time, and this commitment will deliver the loyalty.

In point of the tourism potential, Turkey is one of the most important countries of the world with its climatic conditions, geographical location, rich history and natural affluence. Turkey has a share of 3.7% in the world tourism market and 7.1% of the European tourism market (URL-1). Turkey also ranked 6th among the most visited countries in the world in 2014 and 11th among the countries with the highest tourism revenue (URL-2).

Turkey, which consist of seven geographical regions, in point of the richness and the characteristics it has, features different types of tourism. Aegean Region, as one of these regions, both with its cultural heritage wealth, and the marine tourism opportunities provided by its coast to the Aegean Sea, and with its climatic conditions, have a remarkable share in Turkey's tourism industry. In this study, the influence of the destination image to the destination loyalty in Kuşadası, Aydın, which is one of the most important tourist attractions of the Aegean Region, will be examined.

### *General Information about Kuşadası*

Kuşadası, Aydın is in Aegean Region. The location of town renders this place a favoured holiday center. It has about 20 km long coastline. Sedentary population is 103,849 (URL-3). According to the distribution by county of annual number of tourists who visited Aydın, the

biggest share is owned by Kuşadası (URL-4). The number of foreign tourists visiting Kuşadası in the last 8 years is given in Table 1:

*Table 1. Number of Foreign Tourists Visiting Kuşadası Between 2006-2016*

| Years | Number of Foreign Tourists Staying Only One Night | Number of Foreign Tourists Staying Two or More Nights | Grand Total |
|-------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 2016 | 1.500.040 | 427.007 | 1.927.047 |
| 2015 | 2.516.340 | 673.102 | 3.189.442 |
| 2014 | 2.922.297 | 905.002 | 3.827.299 |
| 2013 | 2.890.754 | 875.924 | 3.766.678 |
| 2012 | 3.054.368 | 973.040 | 4.027.408 |
| 2011 | 3.326.010 | 983.163 | 4.309.173 |
| 2010 | 2.421.233 | 626.068 | 3.047.301 |
| 2009 | 2.252.739 | 585.046 | 2.837.785 |
| 2008 | 2.164.203 | 492.770 | 2.656.973 |

Source: T.C. Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism department of research and assessment

The county, located on the northwest of Aydın, attracts tourists who prefer Turkey in respect to the proximity to Ephesus, Virgin Mary, Pamukkale and touristic places like Bodrum, Marmaris and Didim. Owing to the proximity to the Virgin Mary Chapel, Kuşadası is one of the first places where tourism has become apparent in Turkey.

## *Loyalty Concept and Definition*

The lexical meaning of "loyalty" is "a feeling or attitude of devoted attachment and affection" (URL-6). According to Dick & Basu (1994), loyalty is a situation related to frequency of selecting a good or service and the continuity of bearing positive feelings to these goods or services. Customer loyalty is a fact that customer satisfaction has created. Satisfying the expectations in vacation spot will people to induce to develop a loyalty concept. And this will make a contribution in many aspects.

## *Destination Image*

Crompton (1979) described the destination image as an attitudinal concept which consists of beliefs, thoughts, and impressions of a tourist at an arrival point. Baloglu & McCleary (1999) stated that the destination image is the result of perceptual/cognitive and affective evaluation of that place. Destination image has become a focused scale within the context of tourism researches. The influence of the image (or the landscape) on the perceived quality and satisfaction is an undeniable factor. In this context, destination image will effect satisfaction and quality, while satisfaction and quality will affect people's opinion about the touristic place. A positive destination image will mean a positive feedback.

## Literature

Some of the researches encountered in literature about the loyalty concept are mainly as follows:

Niininen, Szivas, & Riley (2004) report on a study of customer loyalty in the process of selecting a vacation spot. The optimum stimulation level (OSL) method is used in this study. The results show that tourists, who are seeking diversity of vacation spot preferences, might present various patterns.

Yoona & Uysal (2003), examined the influence of incentivize (motivation) and satisfaction on destination loyalty by using structural equality approach. They came to a conclusion that a higher tourist satisfaction level should establish to create a positive tourist behavior.

In their study, Alegre & Juaneda (2006) examined to revisit a vacation spot in respect of affordability by using various hypothesis. They concluded that tourists' inclination to spend depends on to revisit, to be familiar with and the quality of the place.

Chia & Qu (2007) purposed to offer an integrated approach to understand destination loyalty. The analyze is made by using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) method, and it has been proved that the findings obtained support the destination loyalty.

Özer & Günaydın (2010) explored the relationship between client satisfaction and customer loyalty at departmental level in hotels. They used factor analysis and regression estimation in their inquiry. It has been concluded that the reception and kitchen departments are the most effective units in creating customer satisfaction and loyalty.

Prayag & Ryan (2011), evaluate the four structures (location, personal participation, destination image, customer satisfaction) which they determined as loyalty pioneer, by using a theoretical pattern. The pattern is based upon the presupposed relations between these four structures. In their study, they used factor analysis, hypothesis testing and structural equality model approach. As a result, they discovered that destination image, personal interest and sense of belonging factors is the loyalty pioneers of visitors and this relationship was indirectly connected to satisfaction level.

Artuğer, Çetinsöz, & Kılıç (2013), analyzed the effect of destination image of Alanya, Antalya, on creating destination loyalty. As a result of the survey, they found that there is a confident and substantial relationship between the destination image positively reported by participants and destination loyalty. They also concluded that, to create the destination loyalty, the beliefs or information about the touristic place had a greater influence than the feelings towards that position.

Zhang, Fu, Cai, & Lu (2014) reveals –by using meta-analysis- that the importance of the destination image effect on destination loyalty is at varying stages.

Frangos et al. (2015), aimed to determine the elements that predict the tourist loyalty to Athens. They have found that there is a divergence in the nature of the agents that effect first time and revisiting visitors. They have found that the first-time visitor influence from the monetary value of the trip, historical monuments and the sunny natural environment of

Athens, while the revisiting visitor generally influence from the sunny natural environment of Athens and Greece and the monetary value of the trip.

In his written report, Wu (2016) examined the destination loyalty factors in a travel context together with the relation between these factors and destination image, customer travel experience and destination satisfaction by using Fuzzy Set/Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). Study results justify that the destination image, customer traveling experience and destination satisfaction are important determinants of destination loyalty.

Lisa, Noor, & Azila (2016), aimed to determine the factors that could affect the tourists loyalty in historic sites in Malaysia. They also examined the tourist satisfaction which is important on destination loyalty. This conceptual study in question is as to be a pathfinder for further researches what reveal the relations between the structures.

## Data and Methodology

### Data

The data of this study are obtained from foreign tourists, who visited Kuşadası in the summer of 2016, by face to face and online surveys. The survey consists of three episodes. In the first part, along the demographic information, tourists were asked whether they come to Kuşadası before, with whom and how did they come. In the second part, there were questions about destination image, and the last part's questions measured the destination loyalty. Due to the proximity of Kuşadası to the sites of Ephesus and Virgin Mary ruins, to determine the effect of these places on Kuşadası visits, questions about these places are included in the survey. Statements in destination image scale are arranged by using Baloğlu & Mangaloğlu (2001), Parker, Morrison, & Ismail (2003), Byon & Zhang (2009) studies. And the statements in destination loyalty scale are adapted by citing from Bridson, Evans, & Hickman (2008), Pike, Bianchi, Kerr, & Patti (2010) studies. Destination image and loyalty questions are prepared with 5 point Likert scale, 1 "absolutely disagree" to 5 "completely agree". Survey questions were asked in English for all the tourists in the sample. The confidence interval approach which mentioned in the studies of Burns & Bush (1995) is used for the sample size to be drawn from the target group which consists of foreign tourists visiting Kuşadası in the summer of 2016. The formula used in calculating 95% confidence and 5% acceptable error level is as follows:

$$n = \frac{Z^2(pq)}{e^2}$$

$Z$ is with standard error (1.96) with 95% confidence level, $e$; the acceptable error (5%), $p$; the estimated variability in the population and $q = 1 - p$. In social studies, the amount of variability in the population is generally assumed to be 50% (Chia & Qu, 2007). With this information, the sample size to be used in the survey is calculated as 385. A total of 303 people have been reached. Unanswered questions, outliers and the distribution of measured variables have been examined for data clearance and systematic error reduction. As a result of this examination, 25 survey, which were problematic were excluded and the analyze is made through 278 survey data.

## Methodology

Factor analysis is a body of methods used in situations where it is sought, whether a large number of variables could be explained with a few basic variables. The method has some assumptions such as the data have multivariate normal distribution, there are meaningful relationships between variables (Alpar, 2013). Since the large number of questions in the survey is aimed to be expressed in fewer variables, the factor analyze was placed at the outset of the study. The logistic regression method was used to find what effects tourists to visit Kuşadası again. The required assumptions cannot be provided for prediction of the classical regression model in situations that dependent variable is binary (yes-no, etc.). Therefore, if the dependent variable has qualitative data which includes two or more categories, it is analyzed by logistic regression method. Since it doesn't require essential assumptions, such as multivariate normal distribution and homogeneity of variances, it's a frequently used prediction model in social scientific researches.

### Empirical Analysis

In this study, explanatory factor analysis to determine the dimensions of the destination image and loyalty. The effects of dimensions in question and demographic variables on revisiting to Kuşadası are examined by logistic regression analyses. For destination image and loyalty scale, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found at 0.937 and 0.920 respectively. SPSS 21.0 was used for all analyzes in the study.

The demographic information about the survey participants is given in Table 2:

*Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

| Variable | Group | Frequency | Rate(%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 104 | 37.4 |
| | Female | 174 | 62.6 |
| | | | |
| Age | 20 and younger | 27 | 9.7 |
| | 20-30 | 93 | 33.5 |
| | 31-40 | 51 | 18.3 |
| | 41-50 | 50 | 18.0 |
| | 51-60 | 29 | 10.4 |
| | 61 and older | 28 | 10.1 |
| | | | |
| Marital Status | Married | 108 | 38.8 |
| | Single | 164 | 59.0 |
| | Divorced | 6 | 2.2 |
| | | | |
| Nationality | French | 18 | 6.5 |
| | Belgian | 18 | 6.5 |
| | Irish | 62 | 22.3 |
| | British | 82 | 29.5 |
| | Dutch | 18 | 6.5 |
| | Other | 80 | 28.8 |
| | | | |
| Education Status | Primary | 10 | 3.6 |
| | High School | 127 | 45.7 |

|  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | Vocational High School | 40 | 14.4 |
|  | University | 50 | 18.0 |
|  | Master | 51 | 18.3 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Occupation | Employee | 87 | 31.3 |
|  | Self-employed | 39 | 14.0 |
|  | Government officer | 24 | 8.6 |
|  | Housewife | 9 | 3.2 |
|  | Retired | 29 | 10.4 |
|  | Student | 39 | 14.0 |
|  | Unemployed | 4 | 1.5 |
|  | Other | 47 | 16.8 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Income(monthly) | 750 € and lower | 61 | 21.9 |
|  | 751-1500 € | 42 | 15.1 |
|  | 1501-2250 € | 83 | 29.9 |
|  | 2251-3000 € | 38 | 13.7 |
|  | 3001-3750 € | 11 | 4.0 |
|  | 3751-4500 € | 36 | 12.9 |
|  | 4501 € and higher | 7 | 2.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Have you ever been to Kuşadası before? | Yes | 165 | 59.4 |
|  | No | 113 | 40.6 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Who did you come to Kuşadası with? | Alone | 12 | 4.3 |
|  | Friends | 71 | 25.5 |
|  | Family | 130 | 46.8 |
|  | Spouse | 48 | 17.3 |
|  | Family and spouse | 9 | 3.2 |
|  | Family and friends | 8 | 2.9 |
|  |  |  |  |
| How did you get to Kuşadası? | Individual tour | 103 | 37.1 |
|  | Inclusive tour | 175 | 62.9 |
| **Total** |  | 278 | 100.0 |

According to Table 2, 37.4% of the participants are male and 62.6% are female. The vast majority of participants are single (59.0%) and their ages are between 20-30 (33.5%). When it is scrutinized the tourists who participate the survey with regard to their nationality, it is seen that 51.8% of the participants are British and Irish, while the remaining 48.2% are of other nationalities (Belgian, French, Dutch etc.).45.7% of the participants are high school graduates and 31.3% are employee. The rate of participants who earn more than € 4,500 (2.5%) is very small. The income level of the majority is between 1501-2250 € (29.9%). 59.4% of the sample tourists have been in Kuşadası before. 40.6% of them are coming to Kuşadası for the first time. Participants mostly preferred to come to Kuşadası with a comprehensive readiness (62.9%). The percentage of those who prefer to have a vacation with the family is 46.8%.

Participants were asked purposive questions to determine the effect of Virgin Mary Chapel and Ephesus (near Kuşadası) for choosing Kuşadası as a vacation spot. The obtained answers distribution by gender is given in Table 3. The results prove that the Virgin Mary Chapel and

Ephesus have more impact on male tourists than females of choosing Kuşadası as a vacation spot ($\chi^2 = 13.693, p = 0.008$).

**Table 3. The effect of the Virgin Mary Church and Ephesus by gender:**

| | | Did The Virgin Mary Church and Ephesus have any effect when you choose Kuşadası as a vacation spot? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Undecided | Agree | Strongly agree |
| Gender | Female | 25 | 22 | 51 | 31 | 45 |
| | Male | 6 | 10 | 27 | 37 | 24 |

In order to examine the dimensional structure on data set, factor analysis was carried out on data. According to the Bartlett test results, the data were determined to be appropriate for the factor analysis ($p = 0.000$ for Destination image and $p = 0.000$ for Loyalty). Besides, the KMO values for destination image and loyalty were obtained as 0,939 and 0,929 respectively. These results also support that the data obtained from both scales have a factorable structure. When the eigenvalues are examined both in the destination image and the loyalty scales, two of them were found as greater than 1. And this suggests that both scales have two-factor structure. Varimax vertical rotation was used for a better decomposition of factor scores. The first factor in the destination image scale collects general characteristics information (TYG1) and the second factor collects the natural structure of Kuşadası (TYG2) under one factor (factors related to touristic place), and these factors together explain 56% of the total variance. When it is examined the two-factor structure in loyalty scale, it is found that the first factor collects the information about the recommendation (TYS1) under one factor, and the second factor collects the information about personal opinion (TSY2) under one factor (personal factors). Two factors in loyalty scale explain 78% of the total variance. The obtained factors are consistent with Lisa et al. (2016)'s work. The outputs of the analysis in table 4 give the results of the factor analysis:

**Table 4. Factor Analysis Results**

| | Destination Image | | | | | Loyalty | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Questions | Factor loads | | Eigenvalues | Cumulative% Variance | Average | Questions | Factor loads | | Eigenvalues | % variance | Average |
| | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| S1 | ,399 | **,515** | **8,605** | 50.616 | 3,64 | S1 | ,081 | **,872** | **6,687** | 67.790 | 3,60 |
| S2 | ,450 | **,602** | **1,014** | **56.580** | 4,12 | S2 | ,443 | **,726** | **1,290** | **80.363** | 3,99 |
| S3 | ,042 | **,816** | ,919 | 61.988 | 4,03 | S3 | ,486 | **,753** | ,522 | 85.457 | 4,12 |
| S4 | ,478 | **,581** | ,855 | 67.020 | 4,16 | S4 | ,307 | **,781** | ,385 | 89.200 | 3,99 |
| S5 | ,318 | **,719** | ,717 | 71.236 | 3,96 | S5 | **,855** | ,294 | ,263 | 91.763 | 4,41 |
| S6 | ,504 | **,431** | ,653 | 75.076 | 3,87 | S6 | **,894** | ,279 | ,245 | 94.128 | 4,32 |
| S7 | **,574** | ,536 | ,618 | 78.710 | 4,08 | S7 | **,743** | ,444 | ,191 | 95.956 | 4,04 |
| S8 | **,627** | ,405 | ,572 | 82.075 | 3,98 | S8 | **,915** | ,256 | ,179 | 97.690 | 4,28 |
| S9 | **,573** | ,319 | ,482 | 84.909 | 3,75 | S9 | **,837** | ,324 | ,125 | 98.883 | 4,22 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S10 | **,739** | ,172 | ,466 | 87.649 | 4,37 | S10 | **,882** | ,220 | ,116 | 100.00 | 4,31 |
| S11 | **,826** | ,095 | ,435 | 90.207 | 4,23 | | | | | | |
| S12 | **,723** | ,288 | ,339 | 92.202 | 4,03 | | | | | | |
| S13 | **,546** | ,324 | ,322 | 94.098 | 3,83 | | | | | | |
| S14 | **,659** | ,369 | ,293 | 95.823 | 4,08 | | | | | | |
| S15 | **,647** | ,381 | ,288 | 97.515 | 3,87 | | | | | | |
| S16 | **,645** | ,501 | ,240 | 98.926 | 4,03 | | | | | | |
| S17 | **,712** | ,387 | ,183 | 100.00 | 4,20 | | | | | | |
| KMO: 0.939 | | | Bartlett Test: 0.000 | | | KMO: 0.929 | | | Bartlett Test: 0.000 | | |

The relationship between the factors obtained in Table 5 is examined. It has been found that there is a substantive positive relation between destination image and loyalty factors. The relation between the general characteristics of Kuşadası and recommendation dimensions is stronger than the others ($r = 0.626, p = 0.000$). Any positive improvement in the general and natural structure of Kuşadası will positively affect the personal opinion of tourists coming to Kuşadası and their recommendation.

**Table 5. Pearson Correlation Test Results between Destination Image and Loyalty**

| | | | Destination Image | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | TYG1 | TYG2 |
| Loyalty | TYS1 | Pearson Correlation | ,626 | ,255 |
| | | p value | ,000* | ,000* |
| | TYS2 | Pearson Correlation | ,303 | ,269 |
| | | p value | ,000* | ,000* |
| | significance level *0.01 | | | |

In the next section of the analysis, "revisiting to Kuşadası" is taken as a dependent variable; effects of gender, marital status, nationality, both loyalty and destination image factors on revisiting Kuşadası is examined by using two-category logistic regression analyses. In order to scrutinize the goodness of fit of data, Hosmer and Lemeshow test has performed before starting logistic regression analysis. In accordance with the results, it has been concluded that the model fits the data ($\chi^2 = 4.759; p = 0.783$). Model estimates are given in Table 6.

**Table 6. Binary Logistic Regression Analysis Results**

| | B | S.E. | Wald | Df | p | Exp(B) | EXP(B) 95% Confidence Interval Lower Limit | Upper Limit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender(1) | .471 | .265 | 3.150 | 1 | .076** | **1.061** | .952 | 2.693 |
| Marital Status | | | .325 | 2 | .850 | | | |
| Marital Status(1) | -.099 | .272 | .133 | 1 | .715 | .906 | .532 | 1.542 |
| Marital Status(2) | -.434 | .901 | .232 | 1 | .630 | .648 | .111 | 3.787 |
| Nationality | | | 7.892 | 2 | .019* | | | |
| Nationality(1) | -.862 | .374 | 5.301 | 1 | .021* | **.422** | .203 | .880 |
| Nationality(2) | -.746 | .296 | 6.371 | 1 | .012* | **.474** | .266 | .846 |
| TYS1 | -.155 | .192 | .652 | 1 | .419 | .856 | .588 | 1.248 |
| TYS2 | -.325 | .157 | 4.260 | 1 | .039* | **.723** | .531 | .984 |
| TYG1 | .047 | .192 | .061 | 1 | .805 | 1.049 | .719 | 1.528 |
| TYG2 | .132 | .151 | .758 | 1 | .384 | 1.141 | .848 | 1.534 |
| Fixed | .026 | .270 | .009 | 1 | .923 | 1.027 | | |

TYS1; Personal opinion, TYS2; Recommendation, TYG1; General characteristics, TYG2; Natural structure.

Significance level *0.05, **0.10

The significance of the coefficients predicted by the logit model was examined by the Wald test. If this value is bigger than 2, it indicates that it has a significance. So, the effect of "Personal opinion" (TSY2) variable (gender, nationality and second loyalty factor) on revisiting Kuşadası is found significant. Odds ratios (Exp (B)) obtained from logistic regression analysis can be interpreted for these variables: If the odds ratio is greater than 1, it strengthens the probability of occurrence, and in the other case weaken. The probability of men revisiting Kuşadası is 1.061 times more than women. The probability of Irish tourists revisiting Kuşadası is 0.422 times less than British. And the probability of other nations (Dutch, Belgian, French, etc.) revisiting Kuşadası is 0.474 times less than British. Besides, any improvement in tourists' personal opinions about Kuşadası is reducing the probability of revisiting 0.723 times. It also has been researched that whether the answers regarding the Kuşadası image (general characteristics and natural structure) and loyalty (personal opinion and recommendation) vary by gender and age. Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis tests were performed for this purpose. The hypotheses examined and the results obtained are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. Comparisons of TYG1, TYG2, TYS1, TYS2 by gender and age**

| Research Question | Test Statistic | P value |
|---|---|---|
| **H1:** By gender, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of the tourists who come to Kuşadası against its general characteristics. | $Z = -1.846$ | 0.065** |
| **H2:** By gender, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of the tourists who come to Kuşadası against its natural structure. | $Z = -0.221$ | 0.825 |
| **H3:** By gender, there is no significant difference in the personal opinions of the tourists who come to Kuşadası. | $Z = -1.585$ | 0.113 |
| **H4:** By gender, there is no significant difference in the recommendations of the tourists who come to Kuşadası. | $Z = -1.931$ | 0.053 ** |
| **H5:** By age, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of the tourists who come to Kuşadası against its general characteristics. | $KW = 1.597$ | 0.902 |
| **H6:** By age, there is no significant difference in the attitudes of the tourists who come to Kuşadası against its natural structure. | $KW = 4.351$ | 0.500 |
| **H7:** By age, there is no significant difference in the personal opinions of the tourists who come to Kuşadası. | $KW = 2.697$ | 0.747 |
| **H8:** By age, there is no significant difference in the recommendations of the tourists who come to Kuşadası. | $KW = 2.484$ | 0.779 |
| Significance level **0.10 | | |

According to the results of the hypothesis tests, statistically significant differences found between male and female tourists in their opinions of general characteristics of Kuşadası and their attitude to recommend to others. Gender and age have no significant effect on their attitudes regarding the other factors.

## Result

Data obtained from the surveys of foreign tourists who visited Kuşadası in the summer of 2016 prove that there is a positive significant relation between their loyalty and the destination image. The studies of Artuğer et al. (2013) and Frangos et al. (2015) validate these results. The factor that effect tourists' revisiting Kuşadası is analyzed by logistic regression method. It has been found that gender, nationality and personal opinions about Kuşadası are influential on tourists visiting Kuşadası again. Moreover, according to the results of the hypothesis tests, on their personal opinion of the general characteristics of Kuşadası and regarding their attitude of recommendation, there is a difference between male and female tourists who come to Kuşadası. The overall destination image and the attitudes of travelling to tourist destinations have been analyzed in many studies around the world. In the future planning of tourist attractions, the analysis regarding the destination image and loyalty will guide the decision-making and healing policies. As we can see in studies like Bigne, Sanchez, & Sanchez (2001), Chen & Tsai (2007), Artuğer et al. (2013), a positive city image will connect the touristic place and tourists. As a result of this connection, positive developments will take place such as revisiting and/or recommendation. In the direction of the results

obtained in the study, it is thought that the development of the general and natural image of Kuşadası will be beneficial in securing the number of foreign tourists who come to Kuşadası. Developments of general and natural image will create a loyal customer profile, and this will affect Kuşadası tourism positively.

## References

Alegre, J., & Juaneda, C. (2006). Destination Loyalty Consumers' Economic Behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(3), 684–706.

Alpar, C. R. (2013). *Çok Değişkenli İstatistiksel Yöntemler* (4th ed.). Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Artuğer, S., Çetinsöz, B. C., & Kılıç, İ. (2013). The Effect of Destination Image on Destination Loyalty: An Application In Alanya. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(13), 124–136.

Baloglu, S., & Mangaloglu, M. (2001). Tourism destination images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece, and Italy as perceived by US-based tour operators and travel agents. *Tourism Management*, *22*, 1–9.

Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. (1999). A Model of Destination Image Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *26*(4), 868–897.

Bigne, J. E., Sanchez, M. I., & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour:inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, *22*, 607–616.

Bridson, K., Evans, J., & Hickman, M. (2008). Assessing the relationship between loyalty program attributes, store satisfaction and store loyalty. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *22*, 364–374.

Burns, A. C., & Bush, R. F. (1995). *Marketing research*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Byon, K., & Zhang, J. (2009). Development of a scale measuring destination image. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *28*(4), 508–532.

Chen, C.-F., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, *28*, 1115–1122.

Chia, C., & Qu, H. (2007). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, *29*, 624–636.

Crompton, J. (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.

Dick, A., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer Loyalty: Toward an Integrated Conceptual Framework. *Journal of The Academy of Marketıng Science*, *22*(2), 99–113.

Frangos, C., Karapistolis, D., Stalidis, G., Constantinos, F., Sotiropoulos, I., & Manolopoulos, I. (2015). Tourist Loyalty is All About Prices, Culture and the Sun: A Multinomial Logistic Regression of Tourists Visiting Athens. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *127*, 32 – 38.

Karataş, M., & Babür, S. (2013). Gelişen Dünya'da Turizm Sektörünün Yeri. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, *15*(25), 15–24.

Lisa, T., Noor, M., & Azila, N. (2016). Factors influencing destination loyalty of tourists at

historic cities in Malaysia: A proposed model. *The Social Sciences*, *11*(11), 2698–2704.

Niininen, O., Szivas, E., & Riley, M. (2004). Destination Loyalty and Repeat Behaviour: An Application of Optimum Stimulation Measurement. *Internatıonal Journal of Tourism Research*, *6*, 439–447.

Özer, Ö., & Günaydın, Y. (2010). Otel İşletmelerinde Müşteri memnuniyeti ve Müşteri Sadakati ilişkisi, Dört Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama. *İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*(2), 127–154.

Parker, A., Morrison, A., & Ismail, J. (2003). azed and confused? An exploratory study of the image of Brazil as a travel destination. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *9*(3), 243–259.

Pike, S., Bianchi, C., Kerr, G., & Patti, C. (2010). Consumer-based brand equity for Australia as a long-haul tourism destination in an emerging market. *International Marketing Review*, *27*(4), 434–449.

Prayag, G., & Ryan, C. (2011). Antecedents of Tourists' Loyalty to Mauritius: The Role and Influence of Destination Image, Place Attachment, Personal Involvement, and Satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, *20*(10), 1–15.

URL-1. (n.d.). TUİK. Retrieved November 28, 2016, from http://www.tuik.gov.tr/basinOdasi/haberler/2016_16_20160210.pdf

URL-2. (n.d.). TUİK. Retrieved December 9, 2016, from http://www.tuik.gov.tr/basinOdasi/haberler/2016_16_20160210.pdf

URL-3. (n.d.). TUİK. Retrieved December 9, 2016, from https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/?kn=95&locale=tr

URL-4. (n.d.). YİGM. Retrieved December 9, 2016, from http://yigm.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,9853/istatistikler.html

URL-5. (n.d.). Aydın Kültür ve İl Turizm Müdürlüğü. Retrieved November 28, 2016, from http://www.aydinkulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,64728/aydin-tanitim-brosuru.html

URL-6. (n.d.). TDK Retrieved May 11, 2017, from http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_gts&kelime=SADAKAT

Wu, C.-W. (2016). Destination Loyalty Modeling of the Global Tourism. *Journal ofBusiness Research*, *69*, 2213–2219.

Yoo, S., & Chang, Y. (2005). An Exploratory Research on the Store Image Attributes Affecting Its Store Loyalty. *Seoul Journal of Business*, *11*(1), 19–41.

Yoona, Y., & Uysal, M. (2003). An Examination of The Effects of Motivation and Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Structural Model. *Tourism Management*, *26*, 45–56.

Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L., & Lu, L. (2014). Destination image and tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, *40*, 213–222.