



Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,
The Journal of Social Sciences Institute
Yıl/Year: 2018 – Sonbahar / Autumn
Sayı/Issue: İwact'18 Özel Sayısı - Sayfa / Page: 7-22
ISSN: 1302-6879 VAN/TURKEY

Makale Bilgisi / Article Info
Geliş/Received: 19.10.2018
Kabul/Accepted: 05.11.2018
Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

SEYAHAT EDİLECEK BİR YER OLARAK TÜRKİYE'NİN DESTİNASYON MARKA KİŞİLİĞİ

DESTINATION BRAND PERSONALITY OF TURKEY as A PLACE OF TRAVEL

PhD Student Ali Selçuk CAN

University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom.
Department of Marketing & Sales,
Ali.Can@myport.ac.uk

Prof. Dr. Faruk ALAEDDİNOĞLU

Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Turkey.
The Faculty of Literature, Department of Geography,
alaeddinoglu@yyu.edu.tr

Güları ALKAÇIR, MBA

Culture and Tourism Expert,
The General Directorate of Promotion,
The Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Turkey.
guları.alkacir@kulturturizm.gov.tr

Dr. Ewa FERENS

Department of Economy and Economic Policy,
Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland.
ewa_ferens@sggw.pl

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to explore tourists' perceptions of Turkey as a destination for travel. Also, the relation between culture and brand personality is also investigated. Tourists attribute brand personality

characteristics to tourist destinations. Accordingly, applying destination personality traits that reflect current and potential tourists' perception about destinations is increasing in importance in the context of destination marketing. In this study, destination personality of Turkey was measured using Aaker's brand personality scale. The questionnaire sample was chosen among international tourists, who visited Turkey in the period December 2015 to September 2016. In total, 346 participants completed the survey. The outcomes of the research confirm the previous literature that tourists' personality characteristics are associated with tourism destinations. The findings of the research indicate that the perceived destination personality of Turkey is two dimensional: sincerity and competence; as well as sophistication and ruggedness. Whilst destination personality traits do not differ according to gender, they do statistically differ in terms of age group and nationality. Theoretical and practical implications as well as future research perspectives are discussed at the end of the paper.

Keywords: Destination Branding, Brand Personality, Destination Marketing, Turkey

Öz

Bu çalışmanın amacı, turistlerin Türkiye'nin bir seyahat destinasyonu olarak algısını ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, kültür ve destinasyon kişiliği arasındaki ilişki de incelenmiştir. Bilindiği üzere, turistler marka kişilik özelliklerini turizm destinasyonlarına atfetmektedirler. Dolayısıyla destinasyon pazarlama alanında, mevcut ve potansiyel turistlerin destinasyonlar ile ilgili algılarını yansıtan destinasyon kişilik özelliklerine başvurulmasının önemi artmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'nin destinasyon kişiliği Aaker'in marka kişilik ölçeğine başvurularak ölçülmüştür. Anket örnekleme Türkiye'yi Aralık 2015 ve Eylül 2016 arasında ziyaret eden uluslararası turistler arasından seçilmiştir. Anketler toplamda 346 kişi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma bulguları, turistlerin kişilik özelliklerinin turizm destinasyonlarını çağrıştırdığı önceki dizini doğrulamaktadır. Bulgular ayrıca Türkiye'nin destinasyon kişiliğinin iki boyutlu olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır: içtenlik ve yeterlik ile sofistikelik ve sağlamlık. Destinasyon marka kişiliği cinsiyete göre farklılaşmamakta, ancak yaş grupları ve milliyete göre farklılaşmaktadır. Çalışmada ayrıca teorik ve pratik sonuçlar ile gelecekteki çalışmalar için önerilere de yer verilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Destinasyon Markalama, Marka Kişiliği, Destinasyon Pazarlaması, Türkiye

Introduction

It is generally accepted that tourists' perceptions of a destination's personality influence travellers' behaviour. Creating a unique destination brand personality also gives countries a competitive advantage to differentiate their tourism products (Chi, Pan and Chiappa, 2018). Tourists ascribe personality characteristics to a destination

(Usakli and Baloglu, 2011; Murphy, Benckendorff and Moscardo, 2007) “*either to be used as an avenue for self-expression or to experience the anticipated instrumental/emotional benefits that differentiate one destination from another*” (Yuksel and Bilim, 2009: 76). Their emotional ties and loyalty with the destination can be enhanced by a distinctive destination personality (Ekinci, 2003). Hence, choosing appropriate personality traits that reflect current and potential tourists’ characteristics and understanding their perceptions about a destination, and applying these in destination branding are crucial for destination marketers.

Despite the concept of brand personality having come to the fore of destination marketing thinking in recent years (Yuksel and Bilim, 2009), little is known about how the demographic characteristics of tourists such as gender, age, and nationality, affect the perceived destination brand personality of a particular destination. Also, no study has yet been attempted to explore the destination personality of Turkey recently. Accordingly, this research is aimed at filling this gap. In this regard, the purpose of this paper is to investigate the perceived destination personality of Turkey as a place of travel. The primary objectives of the study are: (1) to test the applicability of Aaker’s (1997) brand personality traits to tourism destinations; (2) to identify the underlying dimensions of destination personality; (3) to examine whether personality factors differ according to gender, age, and nationality and (4) to make recommendations for tourism marketers regarding the utilisation of brand personality traits in their destination marketing campaigns.

Literature Review

Brand Personality

Due to the competitive nature of the international market and availability of substitutable tourism products, destination branding is nowadays considered as being a salient feature of marketing and the management of destinations (Mak, 2010). Branding a destination helps it to create a more tempting image through differentiation of its products from those of others (Pike, 2008; Usakli and Baloglu, 2011) and to “*avoid price erosion*” (Ivanov, Illum and Liang, 2010: 340). As a result of this, destination branding has become a recent emerging area of focus for destination marketing efforts (Forristal and Lehto, 2009). Brand personality finds its roots in the concept of destination branding. Brand personality can be viewed as a component of destination branding and refers to “the set of human characteristics associated with a brand” (Aaker, 1997: 347). “*Based on the premise that brands can have*

personalities in much the same way as humans, brand personality involves describing brands in terms of human characteristics" (Yuksel and Bilim, 2009: 77). If brands hold a personality that reflects consumers' self-identity, they will have a higher preference towards these brands (Kaplan et al., 2010). Moreover, consumers develop relationships with brands based on their symbolic value (Ekinçi and Hosany, 2006).

Since a well-established brand personality increases preference and patronage towards a destination, (Siguaw, Mattila and Austin, 1999), tourism destination managers should understand the development concept of destination branding (Blain, Levy and Ritchie, 2005). In addition, "*the stronger, the more favourable and the more unique a brand is perceived by the customer, the more customers feel that the brand satisfies their needs*" (Güse, 2011: 17). Hence, destination personality would appear to play a pivotal role in the creation of destination brands (Ekinçi and Hosany, 2006), by differentiating tourist destinations (Tan, 2008), and establishing effective positioning (Morgan and Pritchard, 2005). Furthermore, destination personality has a positive impact on perceived destination image, intention to recommend (Ekinçi and Hosany, 2006), and on intention to return (Usaklı and Baloglu, 2011). Fournier (1998) also contended that a well-established brand personality can strengthen consumers' emotional ties with a brand. Murphy, Benckendorff and Moscardo (2007) found that brand (destination) personality perceptions may differ according to travel motivations. Moreover, Sahin and Baloglu (2011) pointed out that brand personality perceptions statistically differ across different nationalities. Morgan and Pritchard (2005) also argue that critical to the establishment and promotion of a strong destination brand is the discovery of the brand's values, the conversion of those into a properly emotionally tempting personality as well as the targeted and efficient promotion of that message. Hence, understanding brand personality traits can be useful in developing destinations' marketing strategies.

It is generally accepted that there is a historical relation between culture and personality. McCracken (1986) posits that consumption rituals have an influence on consumer choices. Aaker and Maheswaran (1997) support the view that cultural orientation has an impact on attitudinal and behavioural characteristics of consumers as well as brand personality. Hofstede and McCrae (2004) postulate that there is a historical relationship between personality and culture. They further state that whilst recent researches adopted the trait perspective instead of psychoanalytic models on the personality side, new theoretical

perspectives have preferred identifications of common dimensions instead of incommensurable depictions of each unique ethos on the culture side. According to Hofstede (2011, p.3) “culture is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others. Uncertainty avoidance and individualism are perhaps the most relevant dimensions of Hofstede for the brand personality (Matzler et al., 2016). The first one “*deals with a society’s tolerance for ambiguity*” (Hofstede, 2011: p.10). The latter one is “*the degree to which people in a society are integrated into groups*” (Hofstede & McCrae, 2004: 63). Uncertainty accepting culture such as East and Central European countries, Latin countries, in German speaking countries are more tolerant of different opinions whilst uncertainty avoiding countries such as English speaking countries, Nordic and Chinese culture countries are more emotional.

Destination Brand Personality Measurement

Aaker (1997) developed a 42-item Brand Personality Scale (BPS) along with a theoretical brand personality framework consisting of five personality dimensions, namely, sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness that were derived from 15 personality facets of popular brands. In order to find that consumers could differentiate restaurants on the basis of personality characteristics, Aaker’s BPS was first used to explore the brand personality of three restaurant segments: quick service; casual dining; and upscale restaurants, in the field of tourism and hospitality by Siguaw et al. (1999). It was found that brand personality can be an effective strategy for differentiating one restaurant from another, but not the particular brand. Other tourism researchers have also applied Aaker’s BPS to examine destination brand personality. However, Usakli and Baloglu (2011) and Ekinici and Hosany (2006) have argued that Aaker’s (1997) BPS may not fully represent all personality traits associated with tourism destinations.

The results of Ekinici and Hosany’s (2006) study indicate that tourists ascribe personality characteristics to destinations, and that destination personality can be described in three dimensions: sincerity; excitement; and conviviality. The dimensions were found to be reliable and valid, with sincerity and excitement being the two main driving factors. Hosany et al. (2006) also found support that Aaker’s (1997) brand personality scale can be applied to places; however, they did not fully replicate the five dimensional model in their research. Instead, they found evidence that destination personality comprises three salient dimensions of sincerity, excitement and conviviality. Usakli and

Baloglu (2011) partially supported Aaker's (1997) original five dimensions of the brand personality framework in that they did not identify "ruggedness" in their study. Moreover, the sincerity and competence dimensions of Aaker's (1997) BPS did not emerge in Murphy et al.'s study (2006).

In contrast, Prayag (2007) used projective techniques (word association, brand fingerprint and brand personification) to explore visitors' perception of destination image and brand personality. Cappara, Barbaranelli, and Guido (2001) applied the Big Five personality traits of Extroversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability and Openness. More recently, using the survey method adapted from Aaker (1997), Kaplan et al. (2010) developed a new set of personality traits that marketers can use to assess the brand personalities of places. They identified six brand personality dimensions: excitement, malignancy, peacefulness, competence, conservatism and ruggedness. Three of these dimensions - excitement, competence and ruggedness - are congruent with the brand personality dimensions of Aaker (1997). Moreover, they uncovered a culture-specific dimension of brand personality, namely, conservatism and malignancy, which shows the negative aspects of personality.

Methodology

For this research, destination personality was measured using Aaker's (1997) brand personality scale, which has proven to be valid, reliable, and generalisable scale through its application in several tourism studies (Ekinci and Hosany, 2006; Forristal and Lehto, 2009; Hosany et al., 2006; Murphy et al., 2006, 2007; Siguaw et al., 1999; Usakli and Baloglu, 2011). Ratings for brand personality items were collected using a 5-point Likert type scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Questions regarding gender, age, and nationality of the participants were also included in the questionnaire.

Data were collected from a total of 346 international tourists during their holidays in the Antalya, Canakkale, Mugla, and Van provinces of Turkey. Based on Ministry of Culture and Tourism data (www.kulturturizm.gov.tr), in 2016, 7,841,072 (30.93%) out of 25,352,213 international visitors entered into Turkey through border gates in these cities. Antalya and Mugla were chosen as these are the top two visited cities by international tourists especially for their summer holiday. Canakkale and Van province were chosen because of their geographical locations as it is easier for researchers to find not only tourists from European countries but also tourists from Middle East or Far East countries in these destinations. The respondents were

randomly approached at the hotels in which they were staying after gaining permission from the hotel managers, with those being 18 years or older being allowed to participate. The questionnaire was submitted to the respondents in English. The percentage of participants in the age group 18 - 25 was 27.7% (N = 96), the 26 - 35 age group comprised 28.3% (N = 98), the 36 - 45 age group represented 31.2% (N = 108), and the over 45s comprised 12.7% (N = 44). In terms of nationality, 25% (N = 87) of the participants were from Iran, 18.5% from Germany (N = 64), 18.2% from the United Kingdom (N = 63), 11.3% from Belgium (N = 39), 9% from Russia (N = 31), 8.1% from Iceland (N = 28), and 9.8% were from other countries (N = 34). The gender breakdown of those who completed the questionnaire was almost equal, this being 174 males (50.3%) and 172 females (49.7%). SPSS 24 was applied for analysis of the data, with factor analysis, independent t tests and one way ANOVA were conducted. A reliability analysis of the Cronbach Alpha was performed for destination personality traits, which registered as 0.882 and indicates a good level of reliability as this is well above the proposed acceptable level of 0.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).

Findings and Discussion

While the top five brand personality descriptors for Turkey provided by the respondents were 'down to earth' (M = 3.63), 'cheerful' (M = 3.61), and 'reliable' (M = 3.58), the lowest scored facets were outdoorsy (M = 3.23), tough (M = 3.23), and upper class (M = 3.25). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using principal component analysis was undertaken to determine the underlying dimensions of destination brand personality items (See Table 2). The Bartlett test of Sphericity was significant ($p = 0.000$) supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.913) also indicated the appropriateness of using EFA for the set of destination brand personality variables.

Principal components analysis revealed the presence of just two components, rather than Aaker's (1997) five, with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 38.39% and 8.00% of the variance, respectively. That is, these two factors represented 46.40% of the total variance and were labelled (based on the items loading on them) as: 1) *sincerity and competence*; and 2) *sophistication and ruggedness*. The results of the factor analysis for brand personality items are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of Factor Analysis for Brand Personality

Items	Personality Traits	Mean	SD	Factor Loading	Variance explained (%)	Cumulative variance explained (%)	Cronbach α
	<i>Sincerity and Competence</i>				38.399	38.399	0.846
	Down to earth	3.63	1.099	0.795			
	Honest	3.44	1.089	0.644			
	Wholesome	3.38	1.141	0.614			
	Cheerful	3.61	1.132	0.581			
	Spirited	3.51	1.019	0.492			
	Up to date	3.51	1.138	0.526			
	Reliable	3.58	1.167	0.623			
	Intelligent	3.53	1.128	0.613			
	Successful	3.49	1.093	0.550			
	<i>Sophistication and Ruggedness</i>				8.003	46.403	0.740
	Daring	3.45	1.084	0.572			
	Imaginative	3.43	1.089	0.521			
	Upper class	3.25	1.178	0.603			
	Charming	3.45	1.139	0.510			
	Outdoorsy	3.23	1.113	0.612			
	Tough	3.23	1.205	0.713			

An independent-sample t test was conducted to compare the mean scores of destination brand personality traits for males and females (See Table 2), with no significant difference being found. A one-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean scores of destination brand personality traits based on age group (See Table 3) and a significant difference among the mean scores on the 'reliability' facet for this aspect emerged at the 0.05 level. A post-hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for the age group 26 - 35 ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.055$) was significantly different of 46 and over ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.305$). This result in line with Siguaw, Mattila and Austin (1999)'s assertion that people's demographics influence personality of restaurants. In this research, people's age groups have an impact on their perception about personality of a particular destination.

Table 2. Independent t Test Results

Traits	Gender	N	Mean	t value	df	p
Down to earth	Male	174	3.55	-1.434	344	0.153
	Female	172	3.72			

Honest	Male	174	3.41	-0.487	344	0.627
	Female	172	3.47			
Wholesome	Male	174	3.39	0.247	344	0.805
	Female	172	3.36			
Cheerful	Male	174	3.61	-0.058	344	0.954
	Female	172	3.62			
Daring	Male	174	3.44	-0.144	344	0.886
	Female	172	3.46			
Spirited	Male	174	3.45	-1.162	344	0.246
	Female	172	3.58			
Imaginative	Male	174	3.41	-0.339	344	0.735
	Female	172	3.45			
Up to date	Male	174	3.43	-1.469	344	0.143
	Female	172	3.60			
Reliable	Male	174	3.52	-0.975	344	0.330
	Female	172	3.65			
Intelligent	Male	174	3.54	0.210	344	0.833
	Female	171	3.51			
Successful	Male	174	3.46	-0.589	344	0.556
	Female	172	3.53			
Upper class	Male	174	3.24	-0.160	344	0.873
	Female	172	3.26			
Charming	Male	174	3.34	-1.794	344	0.074
	Female	172	3.56			
Outdoorsy	Male	174	3.20	-0.505	344	0.614
	Female	172	3.26			
Tough	Male	174	3.32	1.364	344	0.173
	Female	172	3.14			

Since Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was 0.026 for 'honest', 0.16 for 'cheerful', and 0.011 for 'intelligent', which are all less than 0.05, the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated. Hence, robust tests of equality of means were conducted, with no

significant difference in the mean scores for ‘honest’ (Welsh = 0.074, Brown-Forsythe = 0.104) or ‘cheerful’ (Welsh = 0.179, Brown-Forsythe = 0.217) for the different age groups emerging. However, there were statistically significant differences regarding ‘intelligent’ according age group, with $p = 0.001$ for both the Welsh and Brown-Forsythe test. A post-hoc comparison using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the age group 26-35 ($M=3.87$, $SD=1.022$) was significantly different from age group of 36-45 ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.216$). Also, based on one-way ANOVA test result, there is a statistically difference between age groups of 26-35 ($M=3.83$, $SD=1.055$) and 46 and above ($M=3.14$, $SD=1.305$) in terms of “reliable”.

Table 3. One way ANOVA test results based on age group

Traits	18-25 (N=96)	26-35 (N=98)	36-45 (N=108)	46≥ (N=44)	F (3, 342)	Sig.
Down to earth	3.63	3.72	3.49	3.77	1.068	0.363
Honest	3.46	3.64	3.30	3.27	2.135	0.074
Wholesome	3.34	3.50	3.40	3.22	1.203	0.309
Cheerful	3.65	3.79	3.48	3.48	1.490	0.179
Daring	3.53	3.43	3.45	3.32	0.407	0.748
Spirited	3.50	3.60	3.47	3.43	0.403	0.751
Imaginative	3.51	3.55	3.35	3.20	1.396	0.244
Up to date	3.50	3.61	3.52	3.32	0.682	0.564
Reliable	3.48	3.83	3.64	3.14	4.007	0.008*
Intelligent	3.56	3.87	3.25	3.37	5.665	0.001**
Successful	3.41	3.65	3.44	3.48	1.005	0.391
Upper class	3.16	3.39	3.22	3.23	0.672	0.570
Charming	3.52	3.72	3.20	3.27	4.171	0.006
Outdoorsy	3.23	3.23	3.23	3.23	0.001	1.000
Tough	3.24	3.32	3.26	2.93	1.090	0.354

*Significant probability level <.05, **Welsh test result

One-way between-groups ANOVA was conducted to compare the mean scores of destination brand personality traits based on nationality. Except for ‘daring’, ‘intelligent’, ‘successful’ and ‘upper class’, for all other facets, Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was less than 0.05 and thus, the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated. Since the data were normality distributed Kruskal Wallis test as a non-parametric test was not applied. Instead, a robustness test of Welsh probability levels was executed, with the results being

presented in the Table 4. The results of the one way ANOVA reveal that there is a significant difference among the mean scores of all personality trait facets in terms of nationality at the 0.05 level

With regard to the Hofstede's cultural dimensions, uncertainty avoidance index is 59 for Iran, 65 for Germany, 94 for Belgium and 95 for Russia. Individualism index is 39 for Russia, 41 for Iran, 67 for Germany, and 75 for Belgium (<http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>). As it can be seen from the Table 4, "down to earth", "honest", "wholesome", "spirited", "imaginative", "reliable", "intelligent", and "upper-class" personality traits are received the highest score for international tourists from countries characterised by high uncertainty index and low individualism index. "Cheerful", "daring", "up-to-date", "successful", "charming", and "tough" are received the highest score for international tourists characterised by low uncertainty index. Only "outdoorsy" is received the highest for international tourists from countries characterised by high individualism index. Therefore, these findings reveal that uncertainty and individualism appear to have their own link to certain personality traits.

Table 4. One way ANOVA test results based on nationality

Traits	Iran (N=87)	Belgium (N=39)	Germany (N=64)	Russia (N=31)	Iceland (N=28)	Other (N=34)	(N=63)	F (6, 339)	Sig.
Down to earth	3.67	3.46	3.11	3.94	4.21	3.62	3.81	4.869	0.000**
Honest	3.57	3.33	3.11	3.61	3.93	3.32	3.40	2.480	0.008**
Wholesome	3.48	3.33	2.81	3.77	4.00	2.88	3.62	6.952	0.000**
Cheerful	3.90	3.44	3.20	3.68	4.18	3.12	3.73	5.200	0.000**
Daring	3.60	3.31	3.16	3.52	4.00	3.29	3.44	2.569	0.791*
Spirited	3.68	3.51	2.94	3.74	4.07	3.21	3.67	6.822	0.000**
Imaginative	3.39	3.41	2.95	3.94	4.29	3.12	3.54	7.731	0.000**
Up to date	3.80	3.51	3.08	3.65	4.25	2.94	3.48	6.562	0.000**
Reliable	3.68	3.46	3.16	3.71	4.29	3.03	3.89	5.785	0.000**
Intelligent	3.46	3.49	3.02	3.80	4.00	3.32	3.94	5.300	0.688*

Successful	3.68	3.41	2.88	3.65	4.07	3.26	3.71	6.513	0.118*
Upper class	3.03	3.54	2.78	3.55	3.96	2.65	3.71	8.763	0.717*
Charming	3.63	3.54	2.97	3.48	4.07	2.97	3.59	5.222	0.000**
Outdoorsy	3.18	3.54	2.81	3.16	3.46	2.85	3.67	4.816	.000**
Tough	3.32	3.26	2.83	3.19	3.21	3.03	3.62	2.601	.023**
*Significant probability level < 0.05, **Welsh test result									

Conclusion

The purposes of this study were to investigate tourist perceptions of destination personality regarding Turkey and to examine empirically its association with gender, age, and nationality. This study findings lead to a number of theoretical and practical implications.

From the theoretical point of view, firstly, the outcomes of the research confirm the previous literature that tourists' personality characteristics are associated with tourism destinations. Specifically, Aaker's (1997) measurement framework has been shown as being applicable to tourism destinations. However, the research outcomes did not fully endorse the Aaker's (1997) brand personality framework in that only two of the five factors were found to be germane to the focal context. First factor included all the items from sincerity and competence in addition to the spirited and up-to-date items from the excitement dimension. Moreover, all the personal facets of sophistication and ruggedness with the addition of imaginative and daring from the excitement dimension emerged as combining to form a second factor. This finding is in line with the results of Hosany et al. (2006), Murphy et al. (2006) and Usakli and Baloglu (2011) in terms of not fully replicating the Aaker's (1997) dimensions in the case of Turkey.

Thirdly, the findings indicate that the destination brand personality of Turkey does not statistically differ according to gender. On the other hand, this research has confirmed the finding of Sahin and Baloglu (2011) that there are significant differences in this respect across nationalities. Furthermore, destination brand personality traits also statistically differs for 'reliability' and 'intelligent' in terms of age group. That is, people who were in the age group of 26-35 rated the destination as having 'reliability' comparatively higher than those who were over 46. Also, people in the age group 26-35 awarded significantly higher importance to 'intelligent' facet than those in that of 36-45.

Finally, the findings of the research reveal that Hofstede's cultural dimensions of individualism and uncertainty have their own link to specific personality traits. As suggested by Rojas-Mendez, Murphy and Papadopoulos (2011), countries should filter the brand personality through the cultural lens of the visitors. Hence, destination marketers should highlight different personality traits in their promotional campaigns by considering the culture of international tourists.

From the practical point of view, destination marketers in Turkey should emphasise its unique brand personality characteristics in the advertising campaigns. This campaign should be differentiated based on the target market and age group, with appropriate marketing tools. For instance, based on the findings mentioned above, brand personality traits of "intelligent" needs to be highlighted in the marketing campaign of Turkey, which target age groups of 26-35 and 36-45. More specifically promotional messages and materials should show aspects regarding the brand personality of "intelligent". In addition, Turkey should emphasize "reliability" on promotional materials if it is aimed to target age group of 26-35. Moreover, different personality traits should be emphasized in Turkey's advertising campaigns when targeting different countries. For instance, "down-to-earth" and "imaginative" may be apparent in advertising campaigns of Turkey in Russia while "cheerful" and "up-to-date" brand personality traits should be stressed in Iran.

This study has some limitations. For instance, the sample of questionnaire does not properly reflect the overall international tourists of Turkey in terms of nationality. Furthermore, this research is limited to perceptions of international tourists regarding Turkey's brand personality who visited only a number of cities in Turkey. Also, whether it was the first visit of tourists to Turkey or not was not evaluated during the analysis. Final limitation is relatively small number of international tourists. Further studies should overcome these limitations.

Work Cited

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34 (3), 347-356.
- Aaker, J.L. & Maheswaran, D. (1997). The Effect of Cultural Orientation on Persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 24 (3), 315-328.

- Blain, C., Levy, S.E. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (2005). Destination Branding: Insights and Practices from Destination Management Organizations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (4), 328-338.
- Cappara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C. and Guido, G. (2001). Brand personality: How to make the metaphor fit?. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22 (3), 377-395.
- Chi, C.G.Q., Pan, L. and Chiappa, G.D. (2018). Examining destination personality: Its antecedents and outcomes, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 9, 149-159.
- Ekinci, Y. (2003). From destination image to destination branding: An emerging area of research. *e-Review of Tourism Research (eRTR)*, 1 (2), 21-24.
- Ekinci Y. and Hosany, S. (2006). Destination Personality: An Application of Brand Personality to Tourism Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45 (2), 127-139.
- Forristal, L.J. and Lehto, X.Y. (2009). Place branding with native species: Personality as a criterion. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 5 (3), 213-225.
- Fournier, S. (1998). Consumers and Their Brands: Developing Relationship Theory in Consumer Research. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (4), 343-373.
- Güse, von K.S. (2011). *Brand Personalities and Consumer-brand Relationships as Elements of Successful Brand Management*. University of Bamberg Press: Bamberg.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Hofstede, G. & McCrae, R.R. (2004). Personality and Culture Revisited: Linking Traits and Dimensions of Culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38 (1), 52-88. Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Hofstede, G. & McCrae, R.R. (2004). Personality and Culture Revisited: Linking Traits and Dimensions of Culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 38 (1), 52-88.
- Hosany, S., Ekinci, Y. and Uysal, M. (2006). Destination Image and Destination Personality: An Application of Branding Theories to Tourism Places. *Journal of Business Research*, 59 (5), 638-642.
- Ivanov, S.H., Illum, S.F. and Liang, Y. (2010). Application of destination brand molecule on destination image and brand perception: An exploratory study. *Original Scientific Paper*, 58 (4), 339-360.

- Kaplan, M.D., Yurt, O., Guneri, B. and Kurtulus, K. (2010). Branding places: applying brand personality concept to cities, *European Journal of Marketing*, 44 (9), 1286-1304.
- McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and Consumption: S Theoretical Account of the Structure and Movement of the Cultural Meaning of Consumer Goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (1), 71-84.
- Mak, A.K.Y. (2011). An identity-centered approach to place branding: Case of industry partners' evaluation of Iowa's destination image. *Journal of Brand Management*, 18 (6), 438 – 450.
- Matzler, K., Strobly, A., Stokburger-Sauer, N., Bobovnick, A., & Bauer, F. (2006). Brand personality and culture: The role of cultural differences on the impact of brand personality perceptions on tourists' visit intentions. *Tourism Management*, 52, 507-520.
- Morgan, N.J. and Pritchard, A. (2005). Promoting Niche Tourism Destination Brands: Case Studies of New Zealand and Wales. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 12(1), 17-33.
- Murphy, L., Benckendorff, P. and Moscardo, G. (2007). Destination Brand Personality: Visitor Perceptions of a Regional Tourism Destination. *Tourism Analysis*, 12 (5-6), 419-432.
- Murphy, L., Moscardo, G. and Benckendorff, P. (2006). Can regional destinations really have a brand personality?. In: Papageorgiou, G., Cutting Edge Research in Tourism: New directions, challenges and applications. *Cutting Edge Research in Tourism: New directions, challenges and applications*, Surrey, Guildford, United Kingdom, (p. 1-16). 6-9 June 2006.
- Nunnally, J. and Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pike, S. (2008). Consumer-Based Brand Equity for Destinations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 22 (1), 51-61.
- Prayag, G. (2007). Exploring the Relationship between Destination Image & Brand Personality of a Tourist Destination-An Application of Projective Techniques. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, Fall 2007, 111-130.
- Rojas-Mendez, Murphy, S.A., & Papadopoulos, N. (2011). The U.S. brand personality: A Sino perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (8), 1028-1034.
- Sahin, S. and Baloglu, S. (2011). Brand personality and destination image of Istanbul. *Anatolia-An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 22 (1), 69-88.

- Siguaw, J.A., Mattila, A. and Austin, J.R. (2009). The Brand-
Personality Scale: An Application for Restaurants. *Cornell
Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40 (3), 48-55.
- Tan, A.J.S. (2008) Destination Branding: Creating a Destination
Choice. *Perspectives in Asian Leisure and Tourism*, 1 (1),
Article 5.
- Usakli, A. and Baloglu, S. (2011) Brand personality of tourist
destinations: An application of self-congruity theory. *Tourism
Management*, 32 (1), 114-127.
- Yuksel, F. and Bilim, Y. (2009). Interactions between Visual Appeals,
Holiday Motivations, Destination Personality and the Self-
Image: Implications for Destination Advertising. *Journal of
Travel and Tourism Research*, Fall 2009, 75-104.