SAŽETAK: Jedan od glavnih elemenata tržišne marke koji razlikuje neku lokaciju od svojih konkurenata je identitet destinacije. Cilj ovog istraživanja je identificirati učinke identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo turista inamjere ponašanja na primjeru Pamukkala, jednog od vodećih centara kulturne baštine i turizma u Turskoj. Podaci za istraživanje dobiveni su osobnim anketiranjem prigodnog uzorka od 350 turista koji su odsjeli u hotelima na lokaciji Pamukkale-Hierapolis od travnja do lipnja 2018. godine, a na dobivenim podacima provedene su faktorska i regresijska analiza. Rezultati istraživanja ukazuju na to da percipirani identitet destinacije ima četiri dimenzije: vrsunaprofinjenost, prirodnu radost, iskrenost i krševitost, što je sve pozitivno utjecalo na lojalnost i namjere ponašanja posjetitelja. Ovo istraživanje potvrdilo je da pozitivna percepcija identiteta destinacije ima vrlo važnu ulogu u povećanju zadovoljstva destinacijom i u predviđanju budućeg ponašanja turista za destinaciju koju posjećuju.
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ABSTRACT: Destination personality is one of the major brand components that differentiates a location from its competitors. This research was intended to identify the effects of destination personality on tourist satisfaction and behavioral intentions using Pamukkale, one of Turkey’s leading cultural heritage and tourism centers. The research data were obtained by convenience sampling through a face-to-face questionnaire given to 350 domestic tourists who stayed in hotels located in Pamukkale-Hierapolis from April to June 2018. Factor and regression analyses were carried out for the data. The research findings indicate that perceived destination personality for Pamukkale-Hierapolis had four dimensions: competence-sophistication, natural-happy, sincerity and ruggedness, which had positive effects on destination loyalty and behavioral intentions among visitors. This research determined that a positive perception of destination personality had a very important role in increasing destination satisfaction and predicting future behaviors of tourists for the destination they visited.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector has a great potential to make a considerable economic and social contribution to the country where it develops if it is managed in a planned manner (Cornelissen, 2017). Countries and regions appear to understand the magnitude of such a contribution and include the tourism sector in their development plans (Tosun et al., 2003). To benefit more from the tourism sector, a challenging competition has begun among countries, regions and even cities (Hultman et al., 2015). People have become increasingly more able to travel as economic opportunities have become available, increasing free time, and developing communication facilities (Massidda and Etzo, 2012; Tfaily, 2018; Choi and Wu, 2018).

People tend to travel more as their leisure time and individual disposable income increase, and each year the number of tourists has risen (Burnaz and Ayyıldız, 2018). However, in addition to the increased number of travelers, the number of destinations that can be chosen by tourists have increased through technological developments in communications and transportation (Navío-Marco et al., 2018). Therefore, the natural and cultural attractiveness of destinations alone may not be enough to make travelers select it. Despite the challenging competition conditions in the tourism sector, it appears that destinations must distinguish themselves to attract more tourists or maintain their current position (Artuğer and Ercan, 2015). A tourism destination, comprised of many abstract and concrete components, can become more desirable and visited by tourists if it successfully completes the branding process (Salehzadeh et al., 2016).

One of the most important components in differentiation of goods and services is brand personality, which attempts to create uniqueness as required through attributing a number of personality traits to location, services and products (Aysen et al., 2012). This distinctiveness is an effective tool to direct

1. UVOD

Turizam ima veliki potencijal za stvaranje značajnog ekonomskog i društvenog doprinosa zemlji u kojoj se razvija pod uvjetom da se njime planirano upravlja (Cornelissen, 2017). Čini se da države i regije shvaćaju veličinu tog doprinosa pa uključuju turizam u razvojne planove (Tosun et al., 2003). Kako bi izvukle što veće koristi od turizma pojavilo se oštro natjecanje između država, regija, čak i gradova (Hultman et al., 2015). Putovanja su postala sve dostupnija s rastom ekonomskih mogućnosti, slobodnog vremena i razvojem mogućnosti komunikacija (Massidda i Etzo, 2012; Tfaily, 2018; Choi i Wu, 2018).

Zbog sve više slobodnog vremena i viška raspoloživog dohotka, postoji tendencija učestalijih i duljih putovanja pa se broj turista povećava iz godine u godinu (Burnaz i Ayyıldız, 2018). Ipak, uz povećani broj putnika, broj destinacija koje turisti mogu odabrati povećao se s tehnološkim dostignućima u komunikaciji i prijevozu (Navío-Marco et al., 2018). Stoga prirodne i kulturne atrakcije samih destinacija možda nisu dovoljne da bi potakle putnike na izbor upravo njih. Unatoč oštrim uvjetima natjecanja u turizmu, destinacije se trebaju razlikovati kako bi privukle više turista ili održale postojeću situaciju (Artuğer i Ercan, 2015). Turistička destinacija, koja se sastoji od mnogih apstraktних i konkretnih sastavnica, može postati poželjnija i posjećenija pod uvjetom uspješnog dvrsenja procesa brendiranja (Salehzadeh et al., 2016).

Jedna od najvažnijih komponenti diferencijacije robe i usluga je identitet tržišne marke kojom se nastoji stvoriti jedinstvenost kako nalaže atribucija određenih osobina lokaciji, uslugama i proizvodima (Aysen et al., 2012). Ta je osebujnost učinkovit alat za usmjeravanje ponašanja potrošača i davanje komparativne prednosti robnoj marki (Papadimitriou et al., 2015). Identitet tržišne marke u turizmu također se naziva i iden-
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consumer behaviors and provide brands with a competitive advantage (Papadimitriou et al., 2015). Brand personality is also called “destination personality” in the tourism sector (Hosany et al., 2006). Thus, tourism sites need to have a good destination personality for some purposes such as being preferred by the targeted markets, creating demand, and becoming a center of attraction arousing interest of potential tourist groups (Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Pan et al., 2017). Therefore, revealing the perceived personality characteristics and personality dimensions of destinations can have an effective role in predicting the tourist behavior (Wu et al., 2019).

The number of tourists visiting Pamukkale-Hierapolis has increased each year as it is an important tourism destination with thermal springs, travertine and ancient ruins. According to data of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Pamukkale-Hierapolis was visited by 974,000, 1,494,893 and 2,189,529 people in 2016, 2017, and 2018 respectively, making it one of Turkey’s most important tourist attractions (DOSIM, 2019). Pamukkale is especially visited by cultural tourists as well as domestic tourists almost every period of the year (Bertan, 2009). This research is intended to identify the destination’s perceived personality as well as examine the effect of the perceived destination personality on the destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Destination personality is one of the most powerful tools that differentiates destinations to consumers (Bridson and Evans, 2004; Pitt et al., 2007). Destination personality has a great importance for the sites to derive advantage within the tourism competition (Umur and Eren, 2016). Aaker (1997) is defining the destination personality as “association of sets of personality traits with brand”, then Hosany et al. (2006) defined brand personality as “association of a set of personality traits with brand”. Aaker (1997) defined the destination personality as “association of a set of personality traits with brand”, then Hosany et al. (2006) adapted this definition to destination and described destination personality as “a set of personality traits identified with a destination”.

Identitet destinacije jedan je od naj-snažnijih alata kojima potrošači razlikuju destinacije (Bridson i Evans, 2004; Pitt et al., 2007). Identitet destinacije ima veliku važnost u izvlačenju koristi za lokacije u turističkom natjecanju (Umur i Eren, 2016). Aaker (1997) je definirao identitet tržišne marke kao „asociranje sklopa osobina s tržišnom markom“, a Hosany et al. (2006) su adaptirali tu definiciju na destinaciju opisavši identitet destinacije kao „sklop osobina koje se poistovjećuju s destinacijom“. Kao i tržišne marke, potrošači mogu destinacije percipirati prema određenim osobinama, akom tržišne marke i identitet destinacije.
naming. As with brands, the destinations may be perceived by the consumers through certain personality traits. Spain has a friendly and family-oriented personality whereas Paris is perceived by the tourists as having a romantic personality (Morgan and Pritchard, 2002). Prayag (2007) reported an emotional bond between the tourist and the destination as a result of the association between the personality traits of tourists and the personality traits they attribute to the destination. Brand personality has a positive influence on the trust in brand and brand loyalty through this emotional bond between the consumer and the brand. For this reason, it is necessary to create a correct destination personality during the process of creating a destination brand (Lee and Kang, 2013). Aguilar et al. (2014) underlined that destinations that wish to be different and build a powerful destination brand should create a destination personality to direct consumer behaviors. Besides, this type of positioning could make it easier to market that destination by the destination managers (Rojaz-Mendez et al., 2013).

Most studies in the tourism literature attempted to identify the factors affecting a tourist's behavioral intentions to predict tourist behaviors (Gonzalez et al., 2007; Chen and Chen, 2010; Prayag et al., 2013; Hultman et al., 2017). Namjere ponašanja sklop su stalnih postupaka koji pokazuju hoće li neki turist doživjeti turistički proizvod u budućnosti. Namjere ponašanja za destinaciju uključuju ponovni posjet destinaciji i preporuke drugima (Yang et al., 2011). Poznato je da identitet destinacije uspješno usmjerava ponašanja potrošača i sklonosti posjećivanja (Ekinci et al., 2007). Stokburger-Sauer (2011) navodi kako turisti koji osjećaju suglasnost između identiteta destinacije i njihovog vlastitog identiteta rado posjećuju te lokacije. Istraživanje koje su proveli Kumar i Nayak (2018) otkrije da različiti identiteti destinacije imaju utjecaj na stavove turista. Papadimitrou et al. (2015) odredili su da percepcija turista o identitetu destinacije prema specifičnoj destinaciji utječe na njihovu namjeru za posjet. U turističkoj literaturi postoje studije koje identificiraju pozitivan učinak identiteta
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colleagues (2015) determined that tourist’s destination personality perception towards a specific destination affected their intention to visit. In the tourism literature, there are studies identifying a positive effect of destination personality on the behavioral intentions (Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Kilç and Sop, 2012; Xie and Lee, 2013; Baloglu et al., 2014; Türkmen et al., 2018). Based on the results of those studies, the hypothesis H1 is as follows:

\[ H_1: \text{The perceived destination personality has effects on the behavioral intentions.} \]

There is not available study examining the effect of destination personality on the destination satisfaction, however, the elements of destination image are known to be effective on the destination satisfaction (O’Leary and Deegan, 2005; Prayag, 2007). The previous studies identified a relationship between the destination personality and the destination image (Hosany et al., 2006; Ekinci et al., 2007). Xie and Lee (2013) concluded that destination image had an effect on the destination personality in their research. Ekinci and Hosany (2006) determined a positive influence of destination personality on the destination image. Hultman et al. (2015) investigated the effect of destination personality on destination satisfaction in their study on Taiwanese tourists visiting foreign countries. In this study, it was concluded that the destination personality is highly effective on tourist satisfaction. According to Hultman et al. (2016) the structural model formed among the variables of destination personality, tourist satisfaction and behavioral intentions, the positive effect of destination personality on tourist satisfaction emerge.

In addition, Türkmen et al. (2018) concluded that destination personality had a positive influence on visit satisfaction. Chi et al. (2018) reported that tourists that associated their personality with the personality traits of a destination had a higher level of destination satisfaction. The research in Sar-
Zadovoljstvo je opće vrednovanje koje izražava zadovoljstvo neke osobe nakon što je doživjela istukstvo nekih proizvoda ili usluga (Castaneda et al., 2007). Zadovoljstvo destinacijom rezultat je ocjene turista o njihovim doživljajima u destinaciji. Turisti ocjenjuju sve proizvode i usluge koje konzumiraju tijekom odmora, kao i svoju interakciju s turističkim dionicima u destinaciji pa će biti zadovoljni ako se ispune njihova očekivanja ili nezadovojni ako se ne ispune (Vetitnev et al., 2013). Zbog toga, nakon što turisti iskuse doživljaj u destinaciji, javljaju se brojna kognitivna i emotivna stanja (Al-Ansi i Han, 2019) i, posljedično tomu, oni pokazuju određena ponašanja u odnosu na destinacije. Stoga je važno ispitati zadovoljstvo turista u predviđanju i razumijevanju ponašanja turista nakon doživljava (Martin et al., 2019).

Nakon zadovoljstva doživljenog na odmoru, turisti pokazuju sklonost za ponovni posjet destinaciji i preporučuju ju drugima (prijateljima, obitelji, poznanicima, itd.) (Žabkar et al., 2010). Istraživanje koje je provedeno na različitim skupinama turista u različitim destinacijama pokazalo je da su turisti, koji su bili zadovoljni s iskustvom destinacije, željeli ponovno posjetiti ili preporučiti drugima tu destinaciju (Kozak i Rimmington, 2000; Yoon i Uysal, 2005; Wang i Hsu, 2010; Prayag i Ryan, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Song et al., 2013; Papadimitriou et al., 2015; Matzler et al., 2016).

Temeljeno na ovome, slijedi hipoteza $H_3$:

$H_3$: Zadovoljstvo destinacijom ima učinke na namjere ponašanja.

dinia found a positive effect of dimensions of destination personality on the destination satisfaction. The second hypothesis of this research is as follows:

$H_2$: The perceived destination personality has effects on the destination satisfaction.

Satisfaction is a general evaluation that expresses pleasure of a person after he or she has experienced any goods or services (Castaneda et al., 2007). Destination satisfaction is a result of evaluation by the tourist of their vacation experience in a destination. The tourists evaluate all the goods and services consumed by them during their vacation and their interaction with the tourism stakeholders in the destination, and they will be satisfied if their expectations are met, or they will be unsatisfied if their expectations are not met (Vetitnev et al., 2013). Therefore, after a tourist’s experience at the destination, a number of cognitive and emotional states emerge in relation to the destination (Al-Ansi and Han, 2019), and consequently the tourists display certain behaviors related to the destination. Hence, it is important to examine the satisfaction of tourists in predicting and understanding tourist behavior after the experience (Martin et al., 2019).

After a satisfactory vacation experience, tourists show a tendency to re-visit the same destination and recommend it to others (friends, family, acquaintances, etc.) (Žabkar et al., 2010). The research conducted on different groups of tourists at different destinations showed that tourists who were satisfied with the destination experience desired to re-visit that destination or recommended it to others (Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Yoon and Uysal, 2005; Wang and Hsu, 2010; Prayag and Ryan, 2012; Chen and Phou, 2013; Song et al., 2013; Papadimitriou et al., 2015; Matzler et al., 2016). Based on this, the hypothesis $H_3$ is as follows:

$H_3$: Destination satisfaction has effects on the behavioral intentions.
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

No study was found in the literature available to determine the destination personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis archaeological site in Denizli Province of Turkey. The gap in the data to indicate how effective of destination personality on the satisfaction and behavioral intention of tourist visiting this destination was clear. Especially, the literature showing the general effects of destination personality on the destination satisfaction in Pamukkale-Hierapolis site was not available. Therefore, it is important to fill the gap in the literature about the destination personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis site and to find out the influence of destination personality on the destination satisfaction to guide destination management organizations (DMO). In this respect, the purpose of this study was to identify the perceived destination personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis archeological site and determine the effects of destination personality on the destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions. The research also aimed to determine the effects of destination personality on the behavioral intentions. This research may guide scholars towards deeper research to guide DMO’s how to use the destination personality as a marketing tool.

According to data of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (YIGM, 2019), the number of visits to facilities with operation licenses in Denizli indicates that approximately 477,000 tourists visited in 2016 and there were approximately 700,000 overnights. In 2017, the number of visitors went up to 587,000 and the total number of overnights increased to 845,000. Approximately 552,000 of 845,000 overnights in Denizli belonged to domestic tourists. Furthermore, 709,000 of total overnights in Denizli were recorded in Pamukkale including 428,000 overnight stays by domestic tourists. The average of overnights was 1.72 for tourists who stayed overnight in Pamukkale.

Thus, The Pamukkale-Hierapolis archeological site is an important domestic tourist destination of Turkey and the number of do-
odsjeli barem jednu noć u lokalnim hotelima za razliku od jednodnevnih posjetitelja. Podaci su prikupljeni prigodnim uzorkovanjem uz dozvole hotela koji su ih i distribuirali. U razdoblju istraživanja od 1. travnja do 30. lipnja 2018. godine ispunjeno je 373 upitnika. U naknadnom pregledu ustanovljena su 23 nepotpuna upitnika pa je tako konačno analizirano 350 turskih turista.

Upitnik se sastojao od četiri odjeljka. U prvom se koristila Skala identiteta destinacije koju su razvili Hosany et al. (2006), a uključuje 27 osobina. Usakli i Baloglu (2011) istaknuli su da bi destinacije mogle imati posebna obilježja kada su mjerili identitet destinacije Las Vegasa pa su dodali razne osobine gore navedenoj skali (Hosany et al., 2006). U ovom istraživanju uvršten je i pregled komentara o lokalitetu Pamukkale-Hierapolis na Tripadvisor-u i drugim platformama društvenih medija, što je dovelo do deset osobina povezanih s lokacijom (djevičanska, elegantna, mirna, autentična, čista, osvježavajuća, nonšalantna, radosna i dražesna). Deset osobina dobiveno je stručnim mišljenjem dvaju znanstvenika koji su radili na brendiranju destinacije i koji su potvrdili da bi se te osobine mogle pripisati toj destinaciji. Zatim je 20 turskih posjetitelja Pamukkale-i pozvalo na pridružiti lokaciji deset novih osobina, a prosječna vrijednost za svaku od njih bila je preko 3,60 na Likertovoj skali od 5 točaka. Zatim se skala identiteta destinacije s 37 osobina, koja je uključivala i nove elemente, testirala na 50 turista u pilot studiji nakon čega nije eliminiran niti jedan element. Ispitanike smo zamolili da shvate Pamukkale kao osobu i ocijene lokaciju na osnovi 37 osobina.

Šest elemenata za mjerenje zadovoljstva destinacijom postavljeno je na skalu Hulman et al. (2015), a za mjerenje namjera ponašanja korištena je skala s četiri tvrdnje u studiji prema İlbân et al. (2016). Hulman et al. (2015) koristili su tehniku prijevođa i povnovog prijevođa za svoju skalu zadovoljstva destinacijom, a kako je skala identiteta destinacije upotrijebljena puno puta u turskim mestic visitors increases each year. For this reason, the research universe was comprised of Turkish tourists visiting Pamukkale-Hierapolis. The research data was acquired from the tourists who stayed in the hotels operating in Pamukkale at least one night to separate them from same-day visitors. Convenience sampling was carried out with the hotels' permissions and aid in distributing the questionnaires. During the research period between 1 April and 30 June 2018 373 questionnaire forms were completed by the participants. The review of the questionnaire forms showed 23 incomplete forms, which resulted in a sample of 350 Turkish tourists for the analysis.

The questionnaire form had four sections. The first section used the Destination Personality Scale (DPS) developed by Hosany et al. (2006) and DPS includes 27 personality traits. Usakli and Baloglu (2011) underlined that destinations might have specific characteristics and measured the destination personality of Las Vegas by adding different personality traits to the Scale (Hosany et al., 2006). For this research, the comments in Tripadvisor and in other social media platforms of Pamukkale-Hierapolis on the destination were reviewed, and ten personality traits associated with the site were identified in the visitors’ comments on Pamukkale (virgin, elegant, peaceful, authentic, clean, refreshing, debonair, natural, joyful and cute). Expert opinion was obtained from two academicians working on destination branding as regards 10 new personality traits, and they confirmed that these personality traits could be attributed to the destination. Then, 20 Turkish tourists who visited Pamukkale were asked to associate 10 new personality traits with the site and the average of answers provided for each personality trait was more than 3.60 (5-point Likert scale). So, the destination personality scale with 37 personality traits together with newly included items was tested on 50 tourists as pilot study. None of the items was removed as a result of the pilot study. The respondents were instructed to consider Pamukkale as a person and assess the site on the basis of 37 personality traits.
There were six items to measure destination satisfaction and the scale used by Hultman et al. (2015) was utilized to measure destination satisfaction. The scale with four statements in the study of İlban et al. (2016) was used to measure the behavioral intentions. Hultman et al. (2015) used the translation-retranslation technique for the destination satisfaction scale in their study. As the destination personality scale is used many times by Turkish studies (Artuğer and Çetinsöz, 2014; Artuğer and Ercan, 2015; Sağlık and Türkeri, 2015; Türkmen and Köroğlu, 2017), it was found unnecessary to translate and retranslate the scale. The categories of response to scale items were assessed by the 5-point Likert rating (1: I strongly disagree; .... 5: I strongly agree).

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

According to descriptive statistics, age distribution of participants was as follows: 40.7% were 26-35 years old, 23.5% were 18-25, 17.8% were 36-45 and 18.1% were 46 years old and above. Of participants, 54.2% were men and 45.8% were women. Of the participants, 6.6% were primary school graduates, 43.8% were high school graduates, 21.2% had an associate degree diploma, 20.9% had a bachelor's degree, and 7.4% had a graduate diploma. As for monthly income of participants, 19% had an income of TRY 1,650 (€300) and below, 27% had an income between TRY 1,651 and TRY 3,000 (€300-575), 19% had an income between TRY 3,001 and 5,000 (€576-950), and 14% had an income of TRY 5,001 (€951) and above. The final section of the questionnaire included demographic questions to determine the profile of participants such as gender, age, education and income level, and the participants were asked whether they had visited Pamukkale-Hierapolis site before.

A statistical package program SPSS 20.0 was used to analyze the research data. The data were analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics, explanatory factor analysis (EFA) and simple linear regression analysis.

4.1. Eksplanatorna faktorska analiza (EFA)

Prior to executing the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) tests on the variables included in the study. The reliability of the scale was above (α) 0.85. The post hoc analysis showed that the data was supported by the test results.

Postotak sudionika koji su rekli da su već prije posjetili lokalitet Pamukkale-Hierapolis bio je 83%.

There were six items to measure destination satisfaction and the scale used by Hultman et al. (2015) was utilized to measure destination satisfaction. The scale with four statements in the study of İlban et al. (2016) was used to measure the behavioral intentions. Hultman et al. (2015) used the translation-retranslation technique for the destination satisfaction scale in their study. As the destination personality scale is used many times by Turkish studies (Artuğer and Çetinsöz, 2014; Artuğer and Ercan, 2015; Sağlık and Türkeri, 2015; Türkmen and Köroğlu, 2017), it was found unnecessary to translate and retranslate the scale. The categories of response to scale items were assessed by the 5-point Likert rating (1: I strongly disagree; .... 5: I strongly agree).

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

According to descriptive statistics, age distribution of participants was as follows: 40.7% were 26-35, 23.5% were 18-25, 17.8% were 36-45 and 18.1% were 46 years old and above. Of participants, 54.2% were men and 45.8% were women. Of the participants, 6.6% were primary school graduates, 43.8% were high school graduates, 21.2% had an associate degree diploma, 20.9% had a bachelor’s degree, and 7.4% had a graduate diploma. As for monthly income of participants, 19% had an income of TRY 1,650 (€300) and below, 27% had an income between TRY 1,651 and TRY 3,000 (€300-575), 19% had an income between TRY 3,001 and 5,000 (€576-950),
and 14% had an income of TRY5,001 (€951) and over. The ratio of participants reported that they had visited Pamukkale-Hierapolis site before was 83%.

4.1. Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Before performing the Explanatory Factor Analysis (EFA), a reliability test and normal distribution test were performed on the items contained in the scales used for the research. The reliability of scales was over (α) .85. To verify the normal distribution of the research data, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was performed (p<.05) and was considered significant and the normal distribution of data was confirmed. However, the data from Likert scales did not show normal distribution in general, and the kurtosis-skewness values were considered for assessing the data. Thereafter, the normal distribution of statements contained in the scales was assessed by the kurtosis-skewness values (Büyüköztürk, 2002). As these values were in the range of ±1.5, they were considered to have normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013: 53).

Table 1 below shows the results of explanatory factor analysis for the destination personality scale. The KMO value on the scale was 0.965, the approximate chi-square (χ²) value was 8084.750 according to Bartlett test, and the significance level was p<.001. The results indicate that scale was suitable for the explanatory factor analysis (EFA). The destination personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis was measured with 37 personality traits. However, the factor loadings of five items was lower than 0.50 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013) and four items were cross-loaded (Lu et al., 2016), therefore nine items in total were excluded from the factor analysis. The factor analysis resulted in four factors and the explained variance for four factors was 69.342%.

Factor 1 had the highest explanatory level (21.22%) for the scale. Six items of this factor with nine personality traits are in the competence dimension and three items are in
Tablica 1: Rezultati EFA za identitet destinacije Pamukkale-Hierapolis

| Elementi                  | EFA Faktorska opterećenja | Komunaliteti |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|
|                           | Vrsna profinjenost | Iskrenost | Prirodna radost | Krševitost |               |
| Uspješnost                | 0,770                     | 0,727       |                |            |               |
| Samouvjerenost            | 0,766                     | 0,747       |                |            |               |
| Inteligencija             | 0,761                     | 0,718       |                |            |               |
| Modernost                 | 0,649                     | 0,668       |                |            |               |
| Pouzdanost                | 0,648                     | 0,632       |                |            |               |
| Siguranost                | 0,648                     | 0,660       |                |            |               |
| Prvaklasnost              | 0,642                     | 0,635       |                |            |               |
| Maštovitost               | 0,603                     | 0,676       |                |            |               |
| Glamuroznost              | 0,556                     | 0,602       |                |            |               |
| Iskrenost                 | 0,801                     | 0,777       |                |            |               |
| Blagotvornost             | 0,783                     | 0,766       |                |            |               |
| Obiteljska usmjerenost    | 0,760                     | 0,706       |                |            |               |
| Jedinstvenost             | 0,752                     | 0,741       |                |            |               |
| Radost                    | 0,688                     | 0,724       |                |            |               |
| Ljubaznost                | 0,640                     | 0,656       |                |            |               |
| Racionalnost              | 0,632                     | 0,579       |                |            |               |
| Smionost                  | 0,562                     | 0,647       |                |            |               |
| Prirodnost                | 0,734                     | 0,759       |                |            |               |
| Radost                    | 0,725                     | 0,739       |                |            |               |
| Mimocca                   | 0,712                     | 0,690       |                |            |               |
| Elegancija                | 0,684                     | 0,711       |                |            |               |
| Draženost                 | 0,640                     | 0,648       |                |            |               |
| Svježina                  | 0,629                     | 0,661       |                |            |               |
| Nonšalantnost             | 0,581                     | 0,670       |                |            |               |
| Čistoća                   | 0,553                     | 0,568       |                |            |               |
| Muževnost                 |                           | 0,849       | 0,779          |            |               |
| Krševitost                |                           | 0,733       | 0,784          |            |               |
| Žilavost                  |                           | 0,704       | 0,746          |            |               |
| Srednja vrijednost        | 3,63                      | 3,51        | 3,61           | 3,38       |               |
| Cronbach $\alpha$        | 0,936                     | 0,929       | 0,935          | 0,830      |               |
| Svojstvena vrijednost     | 5,944                     | 5,574       | 5,150          | 2,748      |               |
| Objašnjena varijanca (%) | 21,227                    | 19,908      | 18,393         | 9,813      |               |
| Ukupna objašnjena varijanca (%) | 21,227 | 41,135 | 59,528 | 69,342 |               |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinova prikladnost uzorka | 0,965 | | | | |
| Bartlettov test sferičnosti | Approx. Hi-kvadrat: 8019,816 | df:378 | sig: p<.001 | | |

Napomena: Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis


Table 1: EFA Results for Destination Personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis

| Items              | EFA Factor Loadings |                  |                    | Communalities |
|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
|                    | Competence          | Sincerity        | Naturas – Happy    | Ruggedness    |
|                    | -sophistication     |                  |                    |               |
| Successful         | .770                |                  |                    | .727          |
| Confident          | .766                |                  |                    | .747          |
| Intelligent        | .761                |                  |                    | .718          |
| Up to date         | .649                |                  |                    | .668          |
| Reliable           | .648                |                  |                    | .632          |
| Secure             | .648                |                  |                    | .660          |
| Upper class        | .642                |                  |                    | .635          |
| Imaginative        | .603                |                  |                    | .676          |
| Glamorous          | .556                |                  |                    | .602          |
| Sincere            | .801                |                  |                    | .777          |
| Wholesome          | .783                |                  |                    | .766          |
| Family-oriented    | .760                |                  |                    | .706          |
| Unique             | .752                |                  |                    | .741          |
| Cheerful           | .688                |                  |                    | .724          |
| Friendly           | .640                |                  |                    | .656          |
| Down to earth      | .632                |                  |                    | .579          |
| Daring             | .562                |                  |                    | .647          |
| Natural            |                     | .734             |                    | .759          |
| Happy              |                     | .725             |                    | .739          |
| Peaceful           |                     | .712             |                    | .690          |
| Elegant            |                     | .684             |                    | .711          |
| Cute               |                     | .640             |                    | .648          |
| Refreshing         |                     | .629             |                    | .661          |
| Debonair           |                     | .581             |                    | .670          |
| Clean              |                     | .553             |                    | .568          |
| Masculine          |                     |                  | .849              | .779          |
| Rugged             |                     |                  | .733              | .784          |
| Tough              |                     |                  | .704              | .746          |
| Mean               | 3.63                | 3.51             | 3.61               | 3.38          |
| Cronbach’s α       | .936                | .929             | .935              | .830          |
| Eigenvalue         | 5.944               | 5.574            | 5.150             | 2.748         |
| Explained variance (%) | 21.227          | 19.908           | 18.393            | 9.813         |
| Total explained variance (%) | 21.227          | 41.135           | 59.528            | 69.342         |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy | .965          |                  |                    |               |
| Bartlett’s Sphericity Test | Approx. Chi-Square: 8019.816 | df:378           | sig: p<.001      |

Note: Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis
### Tablica 2: Rezultati EFA za zadovoljstvo destinacijom

| Zadovoljstvo destinacijom                                                                 | EFA opterećenja | Komunaliteti |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Pamukkale-Hierapolis bila je sjajna destinacija za posjetiti.                            | 0,805           | 0,648        |
| Posjetom Pamukkale-Hieropolisu ostvario/la sam svrhu svog odmora.                        | 0,866           | 0,749        |
| Uzevši sve u obzir (npr., vrijeme, napor/trud/poduhvat, novac), zadovoljan/a sam posjetom Pamukkale-Hieropolisu. | 0,735           | 0,540        |
| Moj posjet Pamukkale-Hieropolisu ispunio je moja očekivanja.                            | 0,851           | 0,725        |
| Sve u svemu moj posjet Pamukkale-Hieropolisu bio je pametan izbor.                       | 0,890           | 0,792        |
| Īam lijepe uspomene s posjeta Pamukkale-Hieropolisu.                                     | 0,854           | 0,728        |

| Srednja vrijednost                                                                       |                 | 3,35         |
| Cronbach α                                                                             |                 | 0,911        |
| Svojstvena vrijednost                                                                  |                 | 4,182        |
| Ukupna objašnjena varijanca (%)                                                         |                 | 69,705       |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinova prikladnost uzorka                                                |                 | 0,869        |
| Bartlettov test sfernosti                                                              |                 |             |
| Napomena: Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis                                |                 |             |

### Table 2: EFA Results for Destination Satisfaction

| Destination Satisfaction                                                                 | EFA Loadings | Communalities |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Pamukkale-Hieropolis was the great destination to visit.                                | .805         | .648          |
| During my visit to Pamukkale-Hieropolis, I accomplished the purpose of my vacation      | .866         | .749          |
| All things considered (e.g., time, effort, money), I am satisfied with my visit to Pamukkale-Hieropolis. | .735         | .540          |
| My visit to Pamukkale-Hieropolis met my expectations.                                  | .851         | .725          |
| On the whole, my choice to visit Pamukkale-Hieropolis has been a wise one.             | .890         | .792          |
| I have pleasant memories from my visit to Pamukkale-Hieropolis.                        | .854         | .728          |

| Mean                                                                                   | 3.35         |
| Cronbach’s α                                                                          | .911         |
| Eigenvalue                                                                            | 4.182        |
| Total explained variance (%)                                                          | 69.705       |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy                                                    | .869         |
| Bartletts’ Sphericity Test                                                            | Approx. Chi-Square: 1450.724 df: 15 sig: p<.001 |

**Note:** Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis
the sophistication dimension in the original scale, therefore this factor is called competence-sophistication. This dimension also had highest participation rate (x̄ = 3.63). As the statements in the second dimension are included in the sincerity dimension in the original scale, this dimension is called sincerity. It explained the scale by 19.908% and the

| Tablica 2 pokazuje rezultate testova KMO i Bartlettove sferičnosti za skalu zadovoljstva destinacijom. Vrijednost KMO 0,869 približna je vrijednosti hi-kvadrata (χ²) 1450,724 prema Bartlettovom testu, a razina signifikantnosti je p<.001. Rezultati otkrivaju da skala odgovara za eksploratornu faktorsku analizu (EFA) (Altunışık et al.,

| Tablica 3: Rezultati EFA za Skalu namjera ponašanja

| Namjere ponašanja                                      | EFA opterečenja | Komunaliteti |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Želim posjetiti Pamukkale ponovno u budućnosti.        | 0,900           | 0,811        |
| Mogu drugima govoriti pozitivno o Pamukkale.           | 0,930           | 0,866        |
| Preporučio bih drugima da posjete Pamukkale.           | 0,911           | 0,830        |
| Nagovaram bliske prijatelje i rođake da posjete Pamukkale. | 0,880           | 0,774        |
| Srednja vrijednost                                    | 3,46            |              |
| Cronbach α                                            | 0,926           |              |
| Svojstvena vrijednost                                  | 3,281           |              |
| Ukupna objašnjena varijanca (%)                       | 82,014          |              |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkinova prikladnost uzorka               | 0,842           |              |
| Bartlett test sfernosti                                | Približan hi-kvadrat: 1111,592 df: 6 sig: p<0,001 |

Napomena: Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis

| Table 3: EFA Results for Behavioral Intentions Scale

| Behavioral Intentions                                      | EFA Loadings | Communalities |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| I want to visit Pamukkale again in the future.             | .900         | .811          |
| I can tell positive things for Pamukkale to others.        | .930         | .866          |
| I would recommend to visit Pamukkale.                      | .911         | .830          |
| I encourage my close friends and relatives to visit Pamukkale. | .880         | .774          |
| Mean                                                       | 3.46         |               |
| Cronbach’s α                                              | .926         |               |
| Eigenvalue                                                 | 3.281        |               |
| Total explained variance (%)                               | 82.014       |               |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy                         | .842         |               |
| Bartlett’s Sphericity Test                                 | Approx. Chi-Square: 1111.592 df: 6 sig: p<.001 |

Note: Varimax Rotation, Principal Component analysis
participation in this dimension was 3.51. The third dimension includes the items “Natural, Happy, Peaceful, Elegant, Cute, Refreshing, Debonair, and Clean”. As the items “Natural and Happy” have the highest factor load, the participation in this dimension was 3.61, which explains the scale by 18.393%. Three items in the last dimension are included in the ruggedness dimension in the original scale, therefore, this dimension is called ruggedness. This explains the scale by 9.813% and had the lowest participation rate (x̄ = 3.38).

Table 2 shows the results of KMO and Bartlett’s Sphericity Test for the destination satisfaction scale. The KMO value was 0.869, the approximate chi-square (χ²) value was 1450.724 according to Bartlett test, and the significance level was p<.001. The results indicate that the scale was suitable for the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Altunışık et al., 2012). The destination satisfaction was measured by six statements. The factor analysis resulted in a one-dimension scale and total explained variance was 69.705%.

Table 3 shows the results of KMO and Bartlett’s Sphericity Test for the behavioral intentions scale. The KMO value was .842, the approximate chi-square (χ²) value was 1111.592 according to Bartlett test, and the significance level was p<.001. The results indicate that scale was suitable for the explanatory factor analysis (EFA). The behavioral intentions scale was measured by four statements. The factor analysis resulted in a one-dimension scale and total explained variance was 82.014%.

4.2. Testing of Research Hypotheses

Multiple regression analysis was used to test the research hypotheses. Table 4 shows the results of regression analysis performed to measure the effects of destination personality dimensions on the behavioral intentions. The multiple regression model for the dependent variable (behavioral intentions) and estimate variables (destination personality dimensions) are statistically significant (F[4;346]=162,490 p<0.001). Destination personality dimensions explain 61% of the total variance in destination satisfaction.

| Dimension                | t-value | p-value | Significance |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|--------------|
| Competence               | 2.594   | <0.05   | p < 0.05     |
| Sincerity                | 4.708   | <0.001  | p < 0.001    |
| Natural-Happy            | 5.334   | <0.001  | p < 0.001    |
| Ruggedness               | 3.169   | <0.05   | p < 0.05     |

Prema rezultatima četiri identiteta destinacije imala su statistički pozitivne utjecaje na namjere ponašanja, čime je potvrđena hipoteza H1.

Table 5 prikazuje rezultate višestruke regresijske analize koja je provedena kako bi se izmjerili učinci dimenzija identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo i pokazuje da je višestruki regresijski model za zavisnu varijablu (zadovoljstvo i namjere ponašanja) nije značajni (F[4;346]=162,490 p<0.001). Dimenzije identiteta destinacije objašnjavaju 61% ukupne varijance namjere ponašanja. Vršna profinjenost, iskrenost, prirodna radost i krševitost dimenzije su identiteta destinacije koje su imale značajne i pozitivne utjecaje na namjere ponašanja (β = 0.153 tcompetence = 2.594 pcompetence <0.05; β = 0.254 tsincerity = 4.708 psincerity <0.001; β = 0.334 tnatural­happy = 5.334 pnatural­happy <0.001; β = 0.146 truggedness = 3.169 pruggedness <0.05). Prema rezultatima četiri identiteta destinacije imala su statistički pozitivne učinke na namjere ponašanja, čime je potvrđena hipoteza H2.
cijom) and procijenjene varijable (dimenzije osnovnosti destinacije) statistički značajan \( F_{\text{4,345}}=121,592 \ (p<0.001) \). Identitet destinacije objašnjava 58% varijance za lojalnost destinaciji. Dimenzije kompetencije vrsna profinjenost, iskrenosti, prirodna radost i krševitosti identiteta destinacije imale su značajne i pozitivne učinke na zadovoljstvo destinacijom \( (\beta=0.188, t_{\text{competence}}=3.096, p_{\text{competence}}<0.05; \beta=0.245, t_{\text{natural-happy}}=4.402, p_{\text{natural-happy}}<0.001; \beta=0.381, t_{\text{sincerity}}=4.386, p_{\text{sincerity}}<0.001) \). Dakako, dimenzija krševitosti nije imala značajan učinak na zadovoljstvo destinacijom \( (t_{\text{ruggedness}}=0.635, p_{\text{ruggedness}}=0.526) \). Kako su dimenzije identiteta destinacije (osim dimenzije krševitosti) imale statistički pozitivne učinke na zadovoljstvo destinacijom, hipoteza \( H_2 \) je (3/4 djelomično) potvrđena.

\[ \text{Table 4: Učinci identiteta destinacije na namjere ponašanja.} \]

| ID\( \rightarrow \)NP | Std. \( \beta \) | T     | P   | R     | \( R^2 \) | Prilagođeni \( R^2 \) | F            | P        |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-----|-------|---------|------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Postojanost           |               | -1.509| 0.132|       | 0.782   | 0.611                  | 135,656      | 0.000*** |
| Vrsna profinjenost   | 0.153         | 2.594 |     |       | 0.010*  |                        |              |          |
| Iskrenost             | 0.254         | 4.708 |     |       | 0.000***|                        |              |          |
| Prirodna radost      | 0.334         | 5.539 |     |       | 0.000***|                        |              |          |
| Krševitost            | 0.146         | 3.169 |     |       | 0.002*  |                        |              |          |

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001; srednje vrijednosti reziduala: 760,258 - 0,518 df: 4 – 345

Napomena: ID: identitet destinacije, NP: namjere ponašanja

\[ \text{Table 4: Effects of Destination Personality on the Behavioral Intentions} \]

| DP\( \rightarrow \)BI | Std. \( \beta \) | T     | P   | R     | \( R^2 \) | Adjusted \( R^2 \) | F            | P        |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------|-----|-------|---------|-----------------------|--------------|----------|
| Constant              |               | -1.509| 0.132|       | 0.782   | 0.611                  | 135,656      | 0.000*** |
| Competence-sophistication | .153         | 2.594 |     |       | .010*   |                        |              |          |
| Sincerity             | .254          | 4.708 |     |       | 0.000***|                        |              |          |
| Natural-Happy         | .334          | 5.539 |     |       | 0.000***|                        |              |          |
| Ruggedness            | .146          | 3.169 |     |       | 0.002*  |                        |              |          |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001; mean squares regression-residual: 760.258 - .518 df: 4 – 345

Note: DP: Destination Personality, BI: Behavioral Intentions

The destination personality dimensions explained approximately 61% of variance in the behavioral intentions. Competence-sophistication, sincerity, natural-happy and ruggedness dimensions of destination personality had significant and positive effects on the behavioral intentions \( \beta=0.153, t_{\text{competence}}=2.594, p_{\text{competence}}<0.05; \beta=0.254, t_{\text{sincerity}}=4.708, p_{\text{sincerity}}<0.001; \beta=0.334, t_{\text{natural-happy}}=5.539, p_{\text{natural-happy}}<0.001; \beta=0.146, t_{\text{ruggedness}}=3.169, p_{\text{ruggedness}}<0.05 \). As the results indicate that four destination personality dimensions had statistically positive effects on the behavioral intentions, \( H_2 \) was supported.

Table 5 provides the results of multiple regression analysis carried out to measure the effects of destination personality dimensions
The multiple regression model for the dependent variable (destination satisfaction) and estimate variables (destination personality dimensions) is statistically significant ($F \[4;345\] = 121.592, \(p < .001\)). The destination personality explained 58% of variance in destination loyalty. Competence-sophistication, sincerity, natural-happy and ruggedness dimensions of destination personality had significant and positive effects on the destination satisfaction ($\beta = 0.188, t_{\text{competence}} = 3.096, p_{\text{competence}} < .05$; $\beta = 0.245, t_{\text{natural-happy}} = 4.402, p_{\text{natural-happy}} < .001$; $\beta = 0.381, t_{\text{sincerity}} = 4.386, p_{\text{sincerity}} < .001$). However, the ruggedness dimension did not have a significant effect on the destination satisfaction ($t_{\text{ruggedness}} = 0.635, p_{\text{rugged}} = 0.526$). As the destination personality dimensions (except ruggedness dimension) had statistically positive effects on the destination satisfaction, \(H_2\) was (3/4 partially) supported.

Tablica 6 prikazuje rezultate regresijske analize za određivanje učinka zadovoljstva destinacijom na namjere ponašanja. Regresijski model za zavisne varijable (namjere ponašanja) procijenjenju varijablu (zadovoljstvo destinacijom) statistički je značajan ($F \[1;348\] = 565.814, \(p < .001\)$), a za zadovoljstvo destinacijom ustanovljen je značajan i pozitivan učinak na namjere ponašanja s marginom od 0,787 ($t_{\text{satisfaction}} = 23.787, p_{\text{satisfaction}} < .001$). Stoga ovi rezultati pokazuju da je hipoteza \(H_3\) potvrđena.

| OD \(\rightarrow\) ZD | Std. \(\beta\) | T | P   | R   | R² | Prilagođeni R² | F       | P       |
|----------------------|----------------|---|-----|-----|----|----------------|--------|---------|
| Postojanost          | -              | 0.934 | 0.351 | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Vrsna profinjenost   | 0.188          | 3.096 | 0.002* | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Iskrenost            | 0.245          | 4.402 | 0.000*** | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Prirodna radost      | 0.381          | 6.108 | 0.000*** | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Krševitost           | 0.030          | 0.635 | 0.526 | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p< 0.001; sredina kvadrata neprotumačena modelom: 53.306 - 0.438 df: 4 – 345

Napomena: ID: identitet destinacije, ZD: zadovoljstvo destinacijom

| DP \(\rightarrow\) DS | Std. \(\beta\) | T | P   | R   | R² | Adjusted R² | F       | P       |
|----------------------|----------------|---|-----|-----|----|-------------|--------|---------|
| Constant             | -              | 0.934 | 0.351 | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Competence-sophistication | 0.188          | 3.096 | 0.002* | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Sincerity            | 0.245          | 4.402 | 0.000*** | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Natural-Happy        | 0.381          | 6.108 | 0.000*** | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |
| Ruggedness           | 0.030          | 0.635 | 0.526 | 0.765 | 0.585 | 0.580 | 121.592 | 0.000*** |

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p< .001; mean squares regression-residual: 53.306 - 0.438 df: 4 – 345

Note: DP: Destination Personality. DS: Destination Satisfaction
Table 6: Effects of Destination Satisfaction on the Behavioral Intentions

| DS → BI | Std. β | T   | P     | R   | R²  | Adjusted R² | F       | P     |
|---------|--------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-------------|---------|-------|
| Constant| 3.816  | 0.000*** | 0.787 | 0.619 | 0.618 | 565.814 | 0.000*** |
| Destination Satisfaction | .787 | 23.787 | 0.000*** | .787 | .619 | .618 | 565.814 | .000*** |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001; mean squares regression-residual: 284.645 - 0.503 df: 1 – 348

Note: DS: Destination Satisfaction. BI: Behavioral Intentions

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Pamukkale-Hierapolis is a destination that is rich in natural, historical and cultural elements that generate a very high potential to attract tourists (Ertaş and Gürsoy, 2016). However, it is not enough to have a number of attractions to become a preferred destination by the tourists, but it should become a brand and be different from competitors (Guiry and Vequist IV, 2014). One of the most important tools for branding a destination is destination personality (Murphy et al., 2007; Kim and Lehto, 2013; Türkmen and Köroğlu, 2017). This study identified and explored the dimensions of destination's personality in Pamukkale-Hierapolis and examined their effects on destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions.

Table 6 shows the results of regression analysis carried out to determine the effects of destination satisfaction on the behavioral intentions. The regression model for the dependent variable (behavioral intentions) and estimate variable (destination satisfaction) is statistically significant (F[1,348]=565.814 p<.001). The destination satisfaction had significant and positive effect on the behavioral intentions by 0.787 (t=23.787 p<.001). The results show that H₃ was supported.
U istraživanju koje je proveo Aaker (1997) vrnost i profinjenost bile su dvije odvojene dimenzije, kao što je to bilo i u nekoliko kasnijih studija (Pitt et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Usakli i Baloglu, 2011; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Kılıç i Sop, 2012; De Moya i Jain, 2013; Chen i Phou, 2013; George i Anandkumar, 2014). Postoje i istraživanja u kojima se ove dvije dimenzije identiteta pojavljuju kao jedna (Murphy et al., 2007). Iskrenost i krševitost originalne su dimenzije Aakerove skale identiteta tržišne marke (1997), a one se pojavljuju i u mnogim studijama koje se bave identitetom destinacije (Murphy et al., 2007; Pitt et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). Skala identiteta tržišne marke prema Aaker-u originalno je imala pet dimenzija (istinitost, uzbudnjenje, vrnost, profinjenost i krševitost), a rezultirala je iz dvije, tri, četiri ili pet dimenzija koje su opisivane destinačija (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Lehto, 2009; De Moya i Jain, 2013; Apostolopoulou i Papadimitriou, 2014). To potvrđuje da turisti različito percipiraju svaku destinaciju te da je čak moguće doći i do različitih dimenzija u slučaju kad istu destinaciju percipiraju različite skupine.

Tvrdiće da destinacije mogu imati posebne osobine, Usakli i Baloglu (2011) te d’Astous i Boujbel (2007) izmjerili su osobine percepcije i zaključili da se identitet destinacije Pamukkale pojavljuje u četiri dimenzije. Tri se sastoje od tvrdnje koje su uvrštene u izvornu skalu, a jedna je uključena u naknadnu. Dvije od tih tvrđnji isključene su iz skale kao rezultat faktorske analize, a osam preostalih obilježja (prirodna, sretna, eleganta, mirna, osvježavajuća, nonšalanta, čista i ljupka) skupljena su unutar jedne dimenzije. Elementi s većim faktorskim opterećenjem razmatrali su se za imenovanje ove nove dimenzije (Ekinci i Hosany, 2006:133). Zasigurno se ne može reći da bi ove osobine vrijedile za sve destinacije. Međutim, ako se and Koroğlu. 2017). This research has identified the dimensions of destination personality of Pamukkale-Hierapolis and addressed the effects of these dimensions on the destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions.

**Theoretical Implications**

The research resulted in the following four dimensions of Pamukkale’s destination personality: competence-sophistication. sincerity, natural-happy and ruggedness. The “competence-sophistication” dimension explained the scale at the highest level (54%). In the research by Aaker (1997) the competence and sophistication were two separate dimensions as was the case in several other studies (Pitt et al., 2007; Forristal and Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Kim and Lehto, 2012; Kılıç and Sop, 2012; De Moya and Jain, 2013; Chen and Phou, 2013; George and Anandkumar, 2014). As in this research, there are also studies in which these two dimensions appeared as one (Murphy et al., 2007). The sincerity and ruggedness are the original dimensions in Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale. These two dimensions are addressed as destination personality dimensions in many studies (Murphy et al., 2007; Pitt et al., 2007; Forristal and Lehto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Kim and Lehto, 2012; Kılıç and Sop, 2012; De Moya and Jain, 2013; Chen and Phou, 2013; George and Anandkumar, 2014). As in this research, there are also studies in which these two dimensions appeared as one (Murphy et al., 2007). The sincerity and ruggedness are the original dimensions in Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale. These two dimensions are addressed as destination personality dimensions in many studies (Murphy et al., 2007; Pitt et al., 2007; Forristal and Lehto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Kim and Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen and Phou, 2013; Guiry and Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017). The brand personality scale developed by Aaker originally had five dimensions (sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness). This scale resulted in two, three, four or five dimensions when applied to destinations (Ekinci et al., 2007; Forristal i Leto, 2009; Opoku, 2009; Kim i Lehto, 2012; Ye, 2012; Chen i Phou, 2013; Guiry i Vequist IV, 2014; Artuğer i Çetinsöz, 2014; Türkmen i Koroğlu, 2017).
slicne strukture pojave u uzorku populacija s većom snagom za predstavljanje cjeline, moći će se govoriti o različitim dimenzijama identiteta destinacije.

Jedan od najvećih doprinosa ovoga istraživanja jest pokušaj predviđanja budućih ponašanja turista putem osobina destinacije. Dimenzije identiteta destinacije imale su pozitivne učinke na namjere ponašanja i zadovoljstvo destinacijom. Ove četiri dimenzije imale su uglavnom pozitivne učinke na namjere ponašanja i zadovoljstvo destinacijom. U prvom slučaju sve su četiri dimenzije imale pozitivan utjecaj, dok su u drugom pozitivno utjecale tri dimenzije s iznimkom dimenzije krševitosti.

Povećana percepcija identiteta destinacije vrlo je važna za ponovni posjet turista destinaciji i preporuke drugima da ju posjete (Stokburger-Sauer, 2011; Xie i Lee, 2013; Papadimitriou et al., 2015). I u ovom istraživanju zaključci se slažu s onima iz literature.

Postoje brojne studije u literaturi kojima se ispituje odnos između imidža identiteta destinacije te namjera ponašanja i lojalnosti (Ekinci et al., 2007; Papadimitriou et al., 2015; Chen i Phou, 2013; Pool et al., 2018). Međutim, mali je broj studija koje pokušavaju objasniti učinak identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo turista (Hultman et al., 2015; Hultman et al., 2016; Soiden et al., 2017; Türkmen et al., 2018).

U istraživanjima o utjecaju identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo destinacijom i dimenzije vrsne profinjenosti, iskrenosti i prirodne radosti, osim krševitosti, imaju pozitivne učinke na zadovoljstvo destinacijom. Hultman et al. (2015), Hultman et al. (2016) i Türkmen et al. (2018) uočili su pozitivan učinak identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo posjetom u svojim istraživanjima. I u ovom istraživanju može se smatrati da rezultati ukazuju na pozitivne učinke percepcije identiteta destinacije na zadovoljstvo.

Stoga, identitet destinacije (Ekinci i Hosany, 2006) kao značajna metafora za cluding different personality traits in their study. In this research, destination personality of Pamukkale appeared in four dimensions. Three dimensions consisted of statements included in the original scale, and one dimension had statements included in the scale afterward. Two of these statements were excluded from the scale as a result of factor analysis, and eight remaining traits (natural, happy, elegant, peaceful, refreshing, debonair, clean, and cute) were gathered under one dimension. The items with higher factor load were considered to name this new dimension (Ekinci and Hosany, 2006:133). Certainly, it cannot be said that these personality traits would apply to all destinations. However, if similar structures occur when it is repeated in sample populations with higher power to represent the universe. It will be possible to speak of different dimensions of destination personality.

One of the major contributions of this research to literature is to attempt to predict the future behaviors of tourists through destination personality. The destination personality dimensions had mostly positive effects on the behavioral intentions and destination satisfaction. The former were affected positively by four dimensions whereas the latter was affected positively by three dimensions with the exception of the ruggedness dimension.

Increased perception of destination personality is very important for tourists to re-visit the destination and recommend others to visit that destination (Stokburger-Sauer, 2011; Xie and Lee, 2013; Papadimitriou et al., 2015). The findings of this research are consistent with this conclusion.

There are many studies in the literature that examine the relationship between the image of the destination personality, and behavioral intentions and loyalty (Ekinci et al., 2007; Papadimitriou et al., 2015; Chen and Phou, 2013; Pool et al., 2018). However, few studies trying to explain the effect of destination personality on tourist satisfaction have been found (Hultman et al., 2015; Hultman et al., 2016; Soiden et al., 2017; Türkmen et al., 2018).
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zumijevanje stavova i ponašanja turista ima važnu ulogu u razumijevanju i objašnjavanju zadovoljstva turista. Istraživanje je konačno obradilo učinke zadovoljstva destinacijom na namjere ponašanja i zaključak je u skladu s literaturom (Faullant et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2017; Wu i Li, 2017), tj. da će turisti radije ponovno posjetiti destinaciju i preporučiti ju drugima ako je njihovo zadovoljstvo destinacijom veće.

**Praktične implikacije**

Iz perspektive prakse, čini se da je identitet destinacije relevantan alat marketinške komunikacije za brendiranje gradova i regija te za njihovo plasiranje na tržište. Zato je značaj identiteta destinacije evidentan kod izbora lokacija i stvaranja pozitivnog pomaka. Svaka lokacija može imati posebne osobine pa se i destinacije mogu pojedinačno pozicionirati svojim osobinama baziranima na specifičnim značajkama kako bi se distancirale i prikazale konkurentske jakima (Papadimitriou i dr., 2015). Zato bi menadžeri destinacija trebali istražiti identitet destinacije koju žele tržišno plasirati i identificirati dimenzije identiteta destinacije koje bi mogle imati pozitivne učinke na ponašanja turista.

S obzirom na ukupan pozitivan učinak identiteta destinacije na namjere ponašanja turista, poslovni subjekti u turizmu trebali bi razmotriti strukturu identiteta drevnog grada Pamukkale Hierapolis. Shodno tomu trebale bi se i odrediti marketinške strategije. Struktura identiteta Pamukkale trebala bi se razviti i odraziti na percepciju turista. Ovu strukturu, u kojoj dimenzija prirodna radost izlazi u prvi plan, trebaju uzeti u obzir institucije ili organizacije koje rade u području destinacijskog marketinga. Osobine okupljene pod ovom istaknutom dimenzijom poput samo-uvjerenosti, uspješnosti, inteligentnosti, pouzdanosti, prvoklasnosti, kreativnosti, sigurnosti, privlačnosti te dobrog izgleda trebaju se isticati u primjeni marketinških strategija.

Practical Implications

From a practical perspective, the destination personality appears to be an important marketing communication tool to make cities or regions a brand and to market them. So, the importance of destination personality is apparent in choosing sites and making a positive difference. Each location can have specific personality traits (Papadimitriou et al., 2015) and it can be possible to position destinations especially through destination personality created by destination-specific characteristics in order to make that site a different and competitively powerful (Papadimitriou et al., 2015). Therefore, the destination managers should investigate the destination personality they wish to market and to identify the dimensions of destination personality that would have positive effects on the tourists’ behaviors.

Regarding the overall positive effect of destination personality on the behavioral intentions of tourists, the personality structure
of Pamukkale Hierapolis Ancient City should be taken into consideration by businesses operating in the tourism sector. Marketing strategies should be determined accordingly as well. The personality structure of Pamukkale should be developed and it should be felt by the tourists. This personality structure, in which the "nature -happy" dimension comes to the fore, should be taken into consideration by institutions or organizations active in the field of destination marketing. Confident, successful, intelligent, reliable, top class, safe, creative, attractive and good looking personality traits that are gathered under this prominent dimension should be emphasized while applying marketing strategies.

Limitations and Future Research

This research had a number of limitations. Firstly, the data was collected between April and June 2018, and the sample included 350 visitors. The researchers were able to collect the data until the end of June, but the sample group should be extended during the high season (July and August) to achieve the results that can be generalized across future studies.

The second limitation was that the research was conducted only on the domestic tourists. Further studies should also include foreign tourists as they have different cultures, which may also render the perception of a destination differently. The perception of destination personality by Turkish tourists and foreign tourists can be identified for comparison purposes and different results can be obtained. These results may help the destination to be marketed accordingly to foreign tourists and domestic tourists.

The third limitation was that the research sample included current visitors since it is estimated that the experience of a destination by current visitors shapes their personal perception. Hence, the perception of destination personality should also be identified by the tourists who have never visited the destination. Supporting their perception and identifying the aspects that need to be changed will be effective in guidance for potential markets.
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