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ABSTRACT
This study aims to identify residents’ attitudes regarding place image, place identity and residents welcoming tourists, and determine the effect of these attitudes on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism. Result of the analyses reveal that place identity has a significant effect on attitudes to positive impacts, on residents welcoming tourists and on place image. Also, it was concluded that residents welcoming tourists has a significant effect on attitudes to positive impacts, and place image has a significant effect on residents welcoming tourists.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Many studies have indicated that the tourism development contribute to increase in tax revenues and the development of infrastructure investments; on the other hand, it has been revealed that it provides foreign currency inflow; encourages growth on other sectors of industry (Lankford and Howard, 1994; Ko and Steward, 2002). At the same time, Hanafiah, Jamaluddin and Zulkifly (2013) stated that tourism creates diversified job opportunities and contributes to economic growth and plays crucial role in national economies. However, mass tourism and unplanned investments may sometimes have negative effects on nature, culture, and the
environment (Hanafiah et al., 2013). This causes residents to take negative attitudes towards tourism development.

Destinations that wish to economically benefit from tourism and achieve competitive advantage should attach importance to the sustainability of natural and cultural values, and garner residents’ support for tourism since they constitute one of the most important stakeholders in the tourism sector (Gursoy, Chi and Dyer, 2010). As such, it is extremely important that residents should be considered in tourism plans and policies which is made for the tourism development in destination. (Gursoy et al., 2010). Another important reason is positive or negative interactions that may develop between tourists and residents. Residents’ attitudes towards tourists, such as welcoming, hospitality, shape the destination’s image in tourists’ eyes (Yeşilyurt, 2019).

Tourism stakeholders do not constitute only tourists. There are other stakeholders such as employees, tourism enterprises, government, media, and residents. However, many studies carried out in this sector are studies based on tourists and touristic consumption. In recent years, the importance of residents in tourism has been felt and many researches (Akdu and Özemiş, 2018; Merrilees, et al., 2009; Alaeddinoğlu, 2007; Akova, 2006; Dal and Baysan, 2006; Uslu and Kiper, 2006; Tayfun and Kılıçlar, 2004; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Ko and Steward, 2002) have been conducted regarding this issue. At the local level, residents’ attitudes towards tourism development are key factors in achieving the destination’s competitive advantage (Lankford and Howard, 1994). However, Ko and Steward (2002) stated that the social effects of the tourism sector on residents should be investigated further. Moreover, many researchers have noted that residents should be involved in tourism development (Allen, Long, Perdue, and Kieselbach, 1988; Ko and Steward, 2002). As such, this research aims to identify residents’ attitudes at local level. Therefore, Edirne was chosen as research area. Edirne is Turkey’s gateway to Europe. This city is located on the border of Greece and Bulgaria of Turkey. The population of the research is residents living in Edirne and SEM was used in data analysis.

Tourism, a location-based phenomenon, cannot be considered independent of physical characteristics of places. All touristic actions develop in a phenomenon of place and time. According to literature review, residents’ place image attitudes
towards place where they live affect residents’ attitudes towards tourism (Stylidis, 2018). There are many national (Akdu and Özemiş, 2018; Alaeddinoğlu, 2007; Akova, 2006; Dal and Baysan, 2006; Uslu and Kiper, 2006; Tayfun and Kılıçlar, 2004;) and international studies (Merrilees, Miller and Herington, 2009; Beerli and Martin, 2004) investigating residents’ attitudes towards tourism. However, Stylidis et al. (2014) stated that residents’ perceptions of place image should be investigated as well as tourists. Additionally, some studies indicate that mass tourism harms interactions between residents and tourists; and these interactions are just economics (Aramberri, 2001). However, these studies do not consider the importance of emotional interaction between residents and tourists (Wearing & Wearing, 2001). As such, the main motivation of this study is to understand more deeply interactions between residents and tourists and to address this gap in literature. For this purpose, literature was scanned at first, and a conceptual model was offered to address this gap in literature. To sum up, the purpose of this model was to determine residents’ place image, place identity and welcoming attitudes, and the effect of these attitudes on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1) ATTITUDES TO POSITIVE IMPACTS

Although the tourism sector contributes to national economy of countries, research shows that this economic development has damaged the natural environment and socio-cultural structure (Liu and Var, 1986; Ko and Steward, 2002). On the other hand, Ap (1992) stated that residents’ attitudes towards tourism plays an extremely important role in the successful marketing of destination, and these attitudes should be considered in destination strategic planning (Ko and Steward, 2002). At the same time, Ap (1992) used the Social Exchange Theory (SET) to evaluate residents' negative or positive attitudes towards tourism. Social Exchange Theory is considered a concept related to social interactions or human relations. It is thought that these interactions or behaviors are derived from people's desires and wishes. This theory requires exchanging some tangible (such as goods, service, or money) and intangible (such as love, respect, and care) factors between people through social interactions (Brida, Disegna and Osti, 1999). Social Exchange Theory is a theory that blends sociology and economy. According to sociological approaches, people
interact socially to achieve some social rewards such as love and respect. According to Social Exchange Theory, these awards are provided after economic relations. Thus, people can reach the rewards they desire after these interactions (Kulualp, Sarı; 2019). Kivisto (2011) expressed that tourists and residents achieve tangible awards (money and information) and intangible rewards (approval, respect, harmony, love, joy and emotional closeness) through the economic interactions (Turner and Ash, 1975).

Regarding the tourism sector, Social Exchange Theory evaluates the positive and negative interactions between residents and tourists. Suppose residents find their earnings more than their losses because of touristic interactions. In that case, they will most likely develop positive attitudes towards tourists and the tourism industry, and these attitudes will stimulate the tourism development in the place (Brida, Disegna and Osti, 1999). Residents should have positive attitudes towards tourism sector to ensure cultural, socio-economic, and political sustainability at the regional level. Additionally, Cottrell and Vaske (2006) suggested that the most important factor in determining destination life cycle is residents’ attitudes towards tourism sector. García, Vázquez and Macías (2015) discussed impacts of tourism on the community from two perspectives, positive and negative at the regional level. The positive and negative impacts of tourism can dramatically change the community. These changes include economic changes (living standards, infrastructure investments), social changes (social support networks, public services), environmental changes (intact environment, protected and natural resources), cultural changes (neighborhood relations, physical conditions and opportunities, social responsibility), political changes (faith in local organizations, influence of local organizations) and changes related to residents’ welfare (the lifestyle and life quality of community, community pleasure) (Suess, Baloglu and Busser, 2018).

Many studies suggested that further research should be done on how Emotional Solidarity Scale (ESS) affects other constructs (Woosnam, 2012; Woosnam, Dudensing and Walker, 2015; Woosnam, Shafer, Scott and Timothy, 2015). Many studies (Woosnam, 2011; Woosnam, 2012; Woosnam and Aleshinloye, 2013, Woosnam, 2015;) indicated that emotional solidarity construct is an important predictor and predicted variable (Lai, Pinto and Pintassilgo, 2021) in tourism.
literature. Additionally, Woosnam (2012) stated that the dimension of residents welcoming tourists of ESS is more effective in estimating residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourists compared to other dimensions of the scale. Also, Ribeiro et al. (2017) and Hasani et al. (2016) found that there is a significant relationship between the variable of residents welcoming tourists and the tourism development. Regarding Social Exchange Theory that is the core of emotional solidarity scale, residents’ attitudes towards tourists and tourism affects their support and participation attitudes towards tourism development and positive impacts of tourism. Many studies have proven this effect (Yeşilyurt, 2019; Gursoy et al., 2018; Nunkoo and Ramkisson, 2012; Lee, 2013; Wang and Pfister, 2008; Ko and Stewart, 2002). These explanations indicate that residents welcoming tourists has a positive impact on residents’ attitudes to positive impacts of tourism.

**H1:** Residents welcoming tourists has a positive effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism.

2.2) **PLACE IDENTITY**

Asiliskender (2004) stated that identity is a concept shaped according to individuals’ life experiences. Communities and individuals’ identity attitudes form through these experiences. These attitudes are experienced in a physical environment. As such, the place begins to get further significance for the individual and community. Moreover, at the core of this concept, there are physical attributes. According to this concept, there is “we-consciousness” in the community. Thus, individuals feel like a part of in the community (Asiliskender, 2004). The notion of place identity has been addressed in studies in the field of environmental psychology. Proshanksy (1978) argued that experiences concerning place are related to identity and define the notion of place identity as: t is shaped via preferences, expectations, feelings, values, and beliefs that is derived from their interactions with the physical world and other people. Additionally, it is a complex pattern that combines the identity of the place and the people. Place identity is a notion dealing with the collective nature of interactions between people in a particular place (Hopkins and Dixon, 2006).
According to Dixon and Durkheim (2004), collective consciousness that shapes through interactions between place and people composes the identity attitude. This attitude becomes strong in time. Because of this, people living in a particular place for a long time have a stronger identity attitude than those living for a short time. Place identity is, above all, a subjective concept. For this reason, identity attitude of each individual towards place is unique. Just as in the process of the formation of individual identities, urban identities develop throughout the process of being different from others and being identical to the others. Belonging to a particular place generate we-consciousness, and this feeling garner safety and comfort of being a member of a group for individuals living in the same place (Göregenli, 2013, 188; Göregenli, Karakuş and Umuroğlu, 2014). Gustafson (2001) explain this notion with a three-pole triangle model that consists of self, environment, and others. Also, effective dimensions can be determined in the formation of the place identity attitude in this model. These dimensions are self-efficacy, distinctiveness, self-esteem, and sense of continuity (Breakwell, 1986). Lastly, Wang and Chen (2015) associated these four dimensions with the qualities of the place. These dimensions are briefly summarized below (Yeşilyurt, 2019):

(1) Distinctiveness is a perception related to attributes which differs a place from others. The distinctiveness of a place consists of social, economic, or unique environmental features that make it different from other places (Truong, Lenglet and Mothe, 2018). Distinctive features of a place or perceptions related to its uniqueness will lead people to love it further. (Bilgin, 1997; Ginting, Rahman and Nasution, 2018; Truong et al., 2018; Wang and Xu, 2015). Therefore, when people live in a distinctive place or have a distinctive experience, they will develop a strength identity attitude towards place. In that case, strong emotional bonds occur between people and the place (Truong et al., 2018, Yeşilyurt, 2019). (2) Continuity is a place identity attitude that consists of people’s perceptions of value, nostalgia, and familiarity towards places where they live (Ginting and Wahid, 2015). It reflects the connection amongst the present and the past in places where people live (Yeşilyurt, 2019). This attitude shapes through social relations (Karakuş, 2014). (3) Self-esteem is an identity attitude that consists of symbolic values such as the historical and cultural values of a place which make people happy and proud of where they live (Ginting et al., 2018). For example, Çanakkale War one of the most important wars in Turkish history.
Because of this, residents living in Çanakkale are proud of living there (Yeşilyurt, 2019). (4) Bandura (1995) describes self-efficacy as an attitude. In this attitude, the people believe that the place where they live make their life easier (Ginting, 2016). In other words, the self-efficacy concept is about people’s belief that the place where they live make achieving their aims easier (Bandura, 1995).

Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012), Huh and Vogt (2008), and Andereck and Vogt (2000) stated that place identity is an effective determinant to measure residents’ attitudes towards tourism industry. On the other hand, Jackson and Inbarakan (2006), and Mackay and Campbell (2004) conducted a study that measured residents’ attitudes concerning positive and negative impacts of tourism and residents’ behavioral intentions on the tourism sector. Obtained results from the study show that there is a correlation between such behaviors and attitudes and the notion of place identity. According to this concept, residents’ place identity attitudes affects residents’ attitudes towards tourism development (Wang and Chen, 2015). As such, this indicate that place identity has an effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism.

**H2:** Place identity has a positive effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism.

### 2.3) RESIDENTS WELCOMING TOURISTS (WELCOMING NATURE)

Woosman (2012) stated that many studies do not consider residents’ attitudes towards tourism development and tourists. However, residents’ feelings and thoughts concerning tourists are considered as an important issue that will affect the tourism development (Ribeiro, Pinto, Silva and Woosnam, 2017). As per Campo and Turbay (2015), studies measuring residents’ perceptions towards tourists are not based on the theory, and these studies cannot fully measure these perceptions. Consequently, residents welcoming tourists is a notion in favor of the tourism development and tourists (Ribeiro et al., 2017).

Welcoming nature is just one dimension of Emotional Solidarity Scale developed by Woosnam and Norman (2010). Other two dimensions of this scale are emotional closeness and sympathetic understanding. Woosnam (2012) stated that people who economically benefit from the tourism sector are more moderate and sincerer towards tourists. He also argued that residents, who are kind and friendly to tourists, are probably proud of their own community. As such, it is thought that residents
welcoming tourists is better in estimating residents’ support for tourism compared to emotional closeness and sympathetic understanding dimensions. Accordingly, the welcoming nature dimension of the scale is a stronger predictor compared to other dimensions (Woosnam, 2012; Hasani, Moghavvemi and Hamzah, 2016; Moghavvemi, Woosnam, Paramanathan, Musa and Hamzah, 2017).

Although studies on emotional solidarity have started to become widespread recently in tourism, its theoretical framework dates to the 20th century (Joo et al., 2018). The core of emotional solidarity scale (ESS) is based on Social Exchange Theory (SET) of Durkheim (1984). This framework assumes that all kind of social interactions come true at the center of the community. Rituals are one of the most important sources of social interactions. Members of a community interact with socially and verbally by engaging in sacred beliefs and rituals. Individuals in social interactions share their experiences and emotional attachment occurs in consequence of these interactions. Thereby, community’ belongingness attitude gets stronger (Alver, 2010). Durkheim's (2012) emotional solidarity theory was modified by Woosnam et al. (2009). Woosnam and Norman (2010) took this theory one step further by developing the emotional attachment scale which consists of 10 items. Dimensions of the scale are welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding. Emotional solidarity measures the friendship attitude that occurs between hosts and guests via social interactions. This concept has been explored, especially in countries and destinations with immigration policies such as New Zealand. (Capistrano and Weaver, 2018). Results of intercultural studies on emotional solidarity reveal that Brazilians have a higher degree of emotional attachment score compared to Japanese (Joo et al., 2018). Other studies on the subject stated that the dimensions of sympathetic understanding (Li and Wan, 2017) and emotional closeness of the scale (Ribeiro et al., 2017) were not very effective in predicting constructs. (Joo et al., 2018). These explanations emphasize the importance of the welcoming nature dimension of the scale (Woosnam, Aleshinloye, Winkle and Qian, 2014). Researches show that residents’ support for tourism (Hasani et al., 2016; Li and Wan, 2017), tourists’ perceptions towards security and safety of the place (Woosnam et al., 2014; Woosnam et al., 2015), and tourists’ destination loyalty attitudes affect emotional solidarity (Joo et al., 2018).
Economic gains and tourists’ respect for the social rules of the community affect residents’ attitudes towards tourists. Therefore, the welcoming nature dimension of the emotional solidarity scale has a deeper perspective compared to other dimensions in understanding the nature of interactions between tourists and residents. In the welcoming nature dimension of the scale, attitudes such as residents’ understandings of equality/justice, perspectives towards tourism’s economic contributions, and feelings proud of the place where they live are aimed to be measured (Joo et al., 2018). Hamzah (2016) stated that residents’ positive attitudes towards tourism is derived from not only economic reasons such as tourism creating employment opportunities and improving the life quality in destination but also sociological reasons such as tourism creating cultural changes. Shared beliefs and behavior patterns and positive interactions between tourists and residents create a sense of belonging, reinforce empathy, and create a warm welcome environment.

According to tourism literature, tourism stakeholders’ attitudes affect the tourism development in a destination (Hagger, Anderson, Kyriakaki and Darkings, 2007). Studies show that residents’ welcoming attitudes towards tourists are critical for cooperation between the tourism industry and residents (Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008). Therefore, residents’ positive emotions and feelings towards place where they live lead to reducing the negative attitudes towards tourism industry and increasing positive attitudes towards tourism industry (Mason and Cheyne, 2000). In other words, there is correlations between residents’ feelings and thoughts on the tourism industry and residents’ place identity attitudes. Also, this correlation enhances residents’ support for tourism development (Wang and Chen, 2015; Petzelka, Krannich and Brehm, 2006). These explanations indicate that place identity has a positive effect on residents welcoming tourists.

**H3:** Place identity has a positive effect on residents welcoming tourists.

### 2.4) PLACE IMAGE

Image is used in different disciplines in different meanings. In the psychology field, image is an idea that is visualized in the mind, whereas in behavioral sciences, it is a holistic concept consisting of impression, knowledge, belief, and values (Yeşilyurt, 2019). Its effect on consumer behavior in marketing is mostly investigated (Jenkins,
1991; Yeşilyurt, 2019). In environmental psychology literature, it is emphasized that residents’ place image perceptions affect urban planning. Accordingly, residents’ place image perceptions are important regarding efficiency, success, and sustainability of plans to be made for the place where they live (Stylidis, Sit and Biran, 2016). Besides, abundance of components (cognitive, affective, and operational) used to measure destination image shows its complexity and that there is no consensus about its measurement (Stylidis and Cherifi, 2018; Kutlu, 2019). According to stakeholder theory, attitudes of all stakeholders should be considered in tourism planning and development (Stylidis et al., 2016). It is thought that residents’ place image perceptions affect attitudes towards tourism plans and policies (Stylidis, 2018; Schroeder, 1996). Stylidis et al. (2014) stated that residents’ place image perceptions should be investigated as well as tourists’ place image perceptions, while planning for tourism. Additionally, Yeşilyurt (2019) stated that residents’ place image attitudes are extremely important for the tourism development and there are a limited number of studies examining the relationship between residents’ place image attitudes and residents’ attitudes towards tourists and tourism.

In the model developed by Ramkinsoon and Nunkoo (2011), to measure residents’ place image attitudes in Mauritius, there are four sub-dimensions. In the study, the residents’ place image perceptions are addressed as (1) social facilities, (2) transportation facilities, (3) public facilities and (4) shopping opportunities of the place. According to findings of the study, residents’ perceptions of shopping opportunities, transportation opportunities and social facilities shape their place image attitudes (Yeşilyurt, 2019). Additionally, Echtner and Ritchie (2003) stated that the destination image has four components (functional characteristics, psychological characteristics, holistic characteristics, attributes). They suggested that destination holistic / utilitarian attributes are created by functional and psychological features of destination. Whereas tangible attributes such as accommodation facilities and price levels could be observed and measured, intangible attributes such as such as general feelings, atmosphere, and security could not be observed and measured (Cooper and Hall, 2008; Kutlu, 2019). Monuments, distinctive landscapes and historical buildings in destination are evaluated as unique functional attributes regarding tourism. While residents’ hospitable attitudes are related to the general
psychological features of destination; historical attractions are related to unique functional features of destination. (Kutlu, 2019).

Place identity is an attitude that refers to special feelings among stakeholders such as tourists, residents, or investors (Ruzzier and De Chernatony, 2013). These feelings, which turn into an extraordinary experience for tourists, make destination distinctive for tourists and create a strong sense of place for residents. At the same time, place identity is an attitude that increases people's life quality. This attitude enhances the satisfaction both residents and tourists towards place. Happy, healthy, and peaceful people contribute to the social development of the place where they live (Sani and Mahasti, 2012). In destination branding processes, place image and place identity should be considered together (Braun, Eshuis, Klijn and Zenker, 2018; Garcia et al., 2012; Bornhorst, Ritchie and Sheehan, 2010; Weible, 2006). These explanations indicate that place identity has a positive effect on residents' place image attitudes.

**H4:** Place identity has a positive effect on place image.

Residents have a highly critical regarding the tourism development (Ayazlar, 2016). As such, destination management organizations should be in cooperation with residents, while being made tourism policies and plans. Therefore, residents’ perceptions about place where they live should be determined (Easterling, 2005; Nicholas, Thapa and Ko, 2009). Because of residents’ important role in tourism planning process, their perceptions have been critical (Stylidis et al., 2015). Additionally, conducted researches have indicated that residents' place image attitudes affect residents’ attitudes towards tourism development (Yeşilyurt 2019; Ayazlar, 2016; Stylidis et al., 2015; Stylidis et al., 2014; Ramkisson and Nunkoo, 2011). These indicate that residents' place image has a positive effect on residents welcoming tourists.

**H5:** Residents' place image has a positive effect on residents welcoming tourists.

Variables assumed to be interrelated and the proposed model is presented in Figure 1.
3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1) STUDY LOCATION

In this research, Edirne was chosen as the study area. Edirne is located on the highway connecting Turkey to Europe. Described as Turkey's gateway to Europe, this city is located on the border of Greece and Bulgaria. According to the 2019 statistics (Sonhaber, 2020), with 3,221,378 visitors, Edirne is in the third rank after Istanbul and Antalya in Turkey regarding the number of incoming tourists. The most important reason for this choice is that there is no previous study measuring residents’ attitudes towards tourism in Edirne as a city and destination. However, to effectively manage residents’ attitudes towards tourism in Edirne, the existing attitudes should be evaluated at first. Also, Edirne with standing out its historical and cultural attributes is a city where adapts to change by blending the past and the present.

3.2) SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION

The population of the study is residents in Edirne aged 18 and over. The population of Edirne in 2018 was 408,216 (Nufusu, 2021). Since the target population is large and homogeneous, and every unit in it has the same probability of being
included in the sample; the simple random sampling method was used. Data was collected using the face-to-face questionnaire method during April and June 2019. Assistance was taken from the students in data collection, and data were collected from each neighborhood. It was given brief information to students about the research. If participant was 18 years or older, participant was asked to answer the questionnaire. Participants’ response time was 10-15 minutes. It was aimed to enhance the participation rate via face-to-face interview, as the participation rate in electronic surveys can be low. (Czaja and Blair, 2005). Also, it was targeted to minimize misunderstandings and prejudices regarding the questionnaire via the participant-student interaction. A total of 802 data were collected due to time and fund limitations. The questionnaire consists of two main parts. While there are socio-demographic questions in the first part, attitude questions in the second part. A 5-point Likert scale was used to measure attitude questions. On the scale, 1 refers to “strongly disagree”, while 5 represents “strongly agree”.

3.3) QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

A total of four scale were used: place image, place identity, residents welcoming tourists and attitudes to positive impacts of tourism. Items related to the place image scale have been compiled from studies measuring residents’ destination image attitudes (Echtner and Ritchie, 2003; Chen and Tsai, 2007; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Schroeder, 1996). The scale, which has 14 items, consists of four dimensions: community services (4 items), physical appearance (4 items), social environment (3 items), entertainment services (3 items). The place identity scale has four dimensions: sense of continuity (3 items), distinctiveness (3 items), self-efficacy (3 items) and self-esteem (3 items). Items in the scale were compiled from previous studies on the subject (Wang and Xu, 2015; Wang, Yamada, Brothers, 2011; Stokburger, 2011; Ujang 2010; Breakwell, 1986). Items measuring residents’ attitudes to positive impacts of tourism were taken from studies of Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012), Choi and Sirakaya (2005), and Wang and Xu (2015). Items measuring residents welcoming tourists were compiled from Woosnam and Norman (2010), Gursoy, Chi and Dyer (2010); Wang and Pfister (2008), Choi and Sirakaya (2005), Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal (2002), and McGehee and Andereck (2004).

3.4) DATA ANALYSIS
Descriptive statistics were presented in the analysis of data. Data were analyzed in three stages. In the first stage, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to determine sub-dimensions of multi-dimensional place image and place identity scales. In the second stage, structural relations between place image, place identity, residents welcoming tourists and attitudes to positive impacts of tourism were tested using path analysis (Browne, 2001; Ockey and Choi 2015).

4. FINDINGS

4.1) SAMPLE PROFILE

In this part of the study, demographic characteristics of participants were evaluated. In Table 1, the participants’ gender, age, birth of place and length of stay in Edirne were evaluated. In the study, the distribution of female and male participants was almost equal. 63% of participants were born in Edirne. 50.6% of participants have been in Edirne for 20 and more years, and this group was the group with the longest period of stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Sample (n: 802)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 and below</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edirne</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay (year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and more</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample Profile.

4.2) CONSTRUCTS’ DIMENSIONALITY

Construct validity of the place identity scale was tested via factor analysis. In determining the number of factors, the scree plot, factors’ contribution to the variance, and factor eigenvalues were considered. The place identity scale consisted of four sub-dimensions: sense of distinctiveness (3 items), sense of continuity (3
items), self-esteem (3 items) and self-efficacy (3 items), and it was measured with a total of 12 items. After conducting a series of exploratory factor analysis, items with low communalities (<50) were excluded from the analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2002). The suitability of the sample size of 802 people for factor analysis was evaluated using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO). The KMO value is required to be over .50, and the KMO value of the scale was calculated as .622. This value indicates that the data set is suitable for factor analysis (Kalaycı, 2010: 327-328). The correlation between items was evaluated by Bartlett test. Test results ($\chi^2 = 1102.989; df = 15; p = 0.000; p <0.05$) demonstrate a high correlation between variables. According to Table 2, factor analysis results, 2 factors with eigenvalues above 1 were determined. The determined factors’ contribution to the variance was determined as 59.987. The first factor (sense of distinctiveness) describes 31% of the variance, and the second factor (self-esteem) describes 28% of the variance (Table 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Identity</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edirne’s attractiveness is very different from other cities I know.</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>31.717</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>4.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lifestyle in Edirne is very unique.</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think Edirne is a city with very distinctive features.</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a story in the media criticized Edirne, I feel embarrassed.</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Edirne makes me feel very proud.</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>28.270</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>3.5665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone praises Edirne, it feels like a personal compliment to me.</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Image</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective public</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>4.265</td>
<td>36.724</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>4.0680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good job opportunities</td>
<td>.798</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective local government</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical appearance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting historic sites.</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>1.719</td>
<td>34.486</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>4.0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice architecture.</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant weather.</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive scenery.</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents Welcoming Tourists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the community benefits from having tourists in Edirne.</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.690</td>
<td>56.341</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>4.1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to have tourists come to Edirne.</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scree plot, factors’ contributions to the variance, and eigenvalues of the scale were again considered in factor analysis of place image. The place image scale consisted of four dimensions: community services (1), physical appearance (2), social environment (3) and entertainment services (4) with a total of 14 items. After a series of exploratory factor analysis, items with low communalities were excluded. Analysis results show that the KMO value for place image was found to be .889. Bartlett test results ($\chi^2 = 3029.267; \text{df} = 21; \ p = 0.000; \ p < 0.05$) demonstrated a high correlation between variables. Factor analysis results reveal that there were 2 factors with eigenvalues above 1. These factors and their factor loadings, eigenvalues, Cronbach’s Alpha, and mean values are presented in Table 2.

The scree plot, factors’ contributions to the variance, and eigenvalues of the scale were considered in factor analysis of residents welcoming tourists. Factor analysis results indicate that, the KMO value for residents welcoming tourists is .538. The Bartlett test results ($\chi^2 = 350.137; \text{df} = 3; \ p = 0.000; \ p < 0.05$) demonstrated that there is a correlation between variables. Factor analysis results show that there was one
factor with eigenvalue above 1. Factor analysis values of the scale are included in Table 2.

Factor analysis results related to attitudes to positive impact of tourism reveal that the KMO value for the scale was .708. The Bartlett test results ($\chi^2 = 1432.348; \text{df} = 15; \ p = 0.000; \ p < 0.05$) demonstrated a high correlation between variables. According to analysis results, there was one factor with eigenvalue above 1. Factor loadings of all items were over 0.5. and the Cronbach's Alpha value of all subdimensions was above the threshold value (0.6) (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). These explanations indicate validity and reliability of scales used in the research.

**4.3) STRUCTURAL MODEL**

After testing validity and reliability of the scales, the proposed model was tested with SEM. Results from path analysis are included in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Structural Model.](image-url)
Fit indices of the proposed model are presented in Table 3. According to the table, the proposed model has good fit values (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chosen Criterion</th>
<th>Good Fit</th>
<th>Acceptable Fit</th>
<th>Value of Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$ (CMIN)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/df (CMIN/df)</td>
<td>$\leq 3$</td>
<td>$\leq 4-5$</td>
<td>1.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.89-0.85</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.97$</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$\leq 0.05$</td>
<td>0.06-0.08</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.95$</td>
<td>0.94-0.90</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>$\leq 0.05$</td>
<td>0.06-0.08</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Fit indices of model.

Results from path analysis are included in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research hypotheses</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 Attitudes to Positive Impacts --- Residents Welcoming Tourists</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>16.480</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 Attitudes to Positive Impacts --- Place Identity</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>5.078</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 Residents Welcoming Tourists --- Place Identity</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>3.080</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 Place Image --- Place Identity</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>5.258</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 Residents Welcoming Tourists --- Place Image</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Structural Equations of the Model.

5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

Results from path analysis in Table 4 indicate that all hypotheses of the research are supported. Obtained results are consistent with previous studies on the subject. (Yeşilyurt, 2019; Gursoy et al., 2018; Nunkoo and Ramkisson; 2012; Lee, 2013; Wang and Pfister, 2008; Huh and Vogt, 2008; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Andereck and Vogt, 2000). Results and findings are presented below:

Hypothesis 1 suggesting that residents welcoming tourists has a positive effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism was supported. This result shows that residents who have positive attitudes towards tourists tend to develop positive attitudes towards impacts of tourism. This result is consistent with previous studies and research on this issue (Yeşilyurt, 2019; Gursoy et al., 2018; Su, Long, Wall and Jin, 2016; Lee, 2013; Woosnam, 2012; Nunkoo and Ramkisson, 2012; Wang and Pfister, 2008; Lepp, 2007; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Akis et al., 1996). Teye et al. (2002)
stated that in the community that are aware of the importance of tourism development, residents' negative attitudes have decreased. Additionally, residents who have positive attitudes towards tourism development have positive attitudes towards tourists at their own destinations (Ribeiro et al., 2017). Therefore, residents who consider that tourism contributes to the local economy of Edirne and are proud to live in Edirne have positive attitudes to tourism development and impacts of tourism. As such, residents’ positive attitudes towards tourism is more economic. Underlying the reasons of this attitude are like that: tourism provides tangible resources for public expenditures and creates job opportunities for residents and increases infrastructure investments in the region.

Another result, Hypothesis 2 was supported. In other words, place identity has a positive effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism. It was determined that place identity, which has 4 sub-dimensions, positively affects attitudes to positive impacts of tourism. However, factor analysis results show that residents’ self-efficacy and continuity attitudes did not occur. Therefore, the effect of residents’ self-efficacy and continuity attitudes on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism has not been determined. These results are consistent with the study of Wang and Xu (2015). Regarding the continuity attitude, Edirne has not important role in residents' selfness and lifestyles. Residents' attitudes towards the significance of Edirne in their life do not form. The main reason of this is that city is primarily a medium-sized and not industrialized. However, it has historical-cultural wealth. These conditions make Edirne an ideal destination for tourism, but does not make it an ideal place for residents. This indicates that residents have not developed continuity attitudes towards Edirne. In other words, they do not consider that the place where they live make their life easier, and, has contribution to be able to achieve their aims / expectations.

According to factor analysis results, residents have distinctiveness and self-esteem attitudes. Also, SEM results show that these attitudes had a positive effect on attitudes to positive impacts of tourism. Regarding residents’ distinctiveness attitudes, they describe Edirne as an extraordinary and unique city. As for residents’ self-esteem attitudes, they are proud to live in Edirne, they internalize living in Edirne,
and their belongingness attitudes towards Edirne occur. These attitudes positively affect attitudes to positive impacts of tourism in Edirne.

Obtained results supported Hypothesis 3 suggesting that place identity positively affects residents welcoming tourists. In other words, residents consider that Edirne is a unique place, and they are proud to live in Edirne. These attitudes positively affect the interactions between residents – tourist in Edirne. Su et al. (2016) and Woosnam (2012) stated that residents have positive attitudes towards tourism in destination where they interact intensively with tourists. These results are consistent with the previous studies on the subject (Wang and Chen, 2015; Petzelka, Krannich and Brehm, 2006).

According to analysis results, Hypothesis 4 supported which suggests that place identity positively affects residents’ place image. Factor analysis results of place image show that residents’ attitudes in dimensions of community services and physical appearance formed, but residents’ attitudes in dimensions of social environment and entertainment services did not form. In other words, residents in Edirne do not have any attitude related to good restaurants, a good nightlife, a good place for shopping (the items of entertainment services) friendly locals, a safe place to live and a clean environment (the items of social environment). Residents consider that the local government and public services are effective regarding community services. Besides, they consider that there are unique historical monuments in Edirne regarding physical appearance, Edirne has a unique architecture and eye-catching views, and Edirne’s climate conditions are ideal. They have a perception that the place where they live is unique regarding distinctiveness attitudes. This perception shapes their attitudes towards physical appearance and community services. Regarding the self-esteem attitude, residents’ senses of belongingness to place where they live formed, they internalized the place where they live, and believed that their place has increased their self-esteem. In other words, living in Edirne makes them feel greatly proud. When some people say good things related to Edirne, they feel praised. When somebody says bad things related to Edirne, they feel criticized. On the other hand, this attitude shapes residents’ physical appearance and community services perceptions. These results are consistent with previous studies (Braun et al., 2018; Garcia et al., 2012; Bornhorst et al., 2010; Weible, 2006).
Another result is that Hypothesis 5 which suggests that residents' place image attitudes has a significant positive effect on residents welcoming tourists, is supported. Regarding the place image attitude, residents with attitudes related to community services and physical appearance develop positive attitudes towards tourism and tourists. In other words, historical-cultural attractions of Edirne, the presence of a unique architecture, its unique eye-catching sights and the effectiveness of public services in Edirne have a positive effect on residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourists. These attributes positively affect interactions between residents and tourists in Edirne. Residents are pleased with the presence of tourists in Edirne and adopt a hospitable attitude towards them. This attitude turns the tourists’ experience into an extraordinary one. These results are consistent with previous studies (Yeşilyurt 2019; Ayazlar, 2016; Stylidis et al., 2015; Stylidis et al., 2014; Ramkisson and Nunkoo, 2011).

6. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Regarding the place identity attitude, in tourism planning of Edirne, a positioning should be made based on its distinctive features. As such, some social areas where residents can spend time in should be built around the historical and cultural attractions such as Selimiye Mosque, Complex of Sultan Bayezid II Health Museum, and Lausanne Monument. Thus, these social places will give residents much more opportunities to socialise in the historical and cultural attractions. It should be ensured that residents more often visit these places to reinforce residents’ place identity attitudes. For example, environmental arrangements should be made such as lighting and ground-direction signs for historical places such as the Selimiye Mosque, Complex of Sultan Bayezid II Health Museum, and Lausanne Monument in Edirne. Also, entrepreneurs should be encouraged for the investing in these places. Thus, these places’ the frequency of being visited by residents will increase, and residents will be more social in these areas. In that case, residents’ place identity attitudes and especially their belongingness attitudes will strengthen. In summary, historical and cultural places and attractions in Edirne are important for tourists and residents. Both local governments and entrepreneurs need to make more efforts in this way. It should be ensured that these places become more open to public use and their surroundings are organized as social living areas.
Regarding place image, it was found that residents’ community services and physical appearance attitudes formed, but the residents’ social environment and entertainment services attitudes did not form. As such, it is necessary to improve the residents’ life quality and increase public and social opportunities in destination. Besides, it is required to develop social living areas, preserve the city architecture’s main character, increase the service quality of existing touristic enterprises. Thus, entrepreneurs are encouraged to invest in tourism sector. Additionally, services such as public transport, health and infrastructure should be strengthened. Attracting foreign investors to the city and encouraging local and foreign entrepreneurs for investments will positively affect job opportunities in the city. Moreover, making efforts to raise the residents’ awareness related attractions such as festivals, handicrafts, food and beverage products peculiar to the city will contribute to the residents’ place image attitudes. On the other hand, it is necessary to make arrangements such as parks, forests and walking paths where residents can spend recreational time. Sports, entertainment and shopping opportunities should be enhanced; the unique architectural structure of the place should be maintained. Additionally, the quality of public transport services, social services and opportunities should be improved. All these arrangements will reinforce the residents’ place image attitude and positively affect their tourism development support.

Other obtained results reveal that residents’ distinctiveness and self-esteem attitudes formed, but residents’ continuity and self-efficacy attitudes did not form. The most important reason for this is the lack of job and career opportunities in Edirne. As such, Edirne is an ideal destination for tourists regarding its archaeological sites and attractions, but it is not an ideal place for residents regarding job and career opportunities. Therefore, attracting local and foreign investors to the region and encouraging investments will create important employment opportunities in the city. Regarding distinctiveness and self-esteem attitudes, residents find Edirne unique, and they are proud to be living in Edirne. As such, to attract more tourists, destination management organizations should make effort to provide residents with meaningful and unique experiences by highlighting the destination distinctiveness.

In summary, in this study, residents’ place identity attitudes are measured regarding Social Exchange Theory. This framework requires the exchange of
resources (tangible, intangible, social and psychological benefits) through touristic interactions between residents and tourist. Regarding this framework, the balance of giving and receiving in touristic interactions between residents and tourists should be ensured. A win and win approach should be adopted in these interactions. Both sides (residents-tourists) should benefit from these interactions. The local government should ensure required conditions for this. Thus, residents welcoming tourists and attitudes to positive impact of tourism will be strengthen. As such, tourism planners and destination management organizations should particularly consider residents' benefit from tourism. Otherwise, if both sides do not benefit from touristic interactions, they will refrain from touristic interactions. This will cause residents to display negative attitudes towards tourism and tourists. Therefore, plans and strategies for tourism development should focus on not only the tangible benefits (goods, service or money) of tourists and residents but also intangible benefits (love, respect and care). On the other hand, tourism planners should fully observe residents’ expectations from tourism. As such, determining residents’ expectations (tangible, intangible, social and psychological gains) will also contribute to the effectiveness of these tourism plans and policies. In addition, tourism planners should consider residents’ economic conditions, cultural values and destination life cycle, while they are making destination plans and policies. On the other hand, to expand the residents’ awareness towards positive impact of tourism, it is recommended to organize informative training programs and projects for residents unable to understand the socio-economic impacts of tourism. Such a program is especially recommended for destinations that are still in the early stage of destination life cycle. This kind of an information program can increase the public’ awareness of tourism and prevent their prejudices towards tourists.

7. FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS

This research has some limitations. These limitations should be considered, while evaluating results. First, this study relies on EFAs + Path analysis. A suggestion for further research should be to compare these results with a full SEM analysis since that will allow validating the constructs (regarding convergent and discriminant validity). Additionally, data collection process in the research was limited to November and December 2019. As data were collected from Edirne, results were
generalized for Edirne. Future studies may also test the conceptual model of the study for different destinations. In this study, a conceptual model was developed using previously developed scales. These previously developed scales may have a limited perspective on understanding interactions between residents and tourists. Future studies can use qualitative research methods to gain a deeper understanding interaction between residents and tourists. Additionally, future studies can measure more closely residents’ attitudes and expectations towards tourism and tourists. As such, their tangible (economic) and intangible (socio-psychological) gains from tourism could be determined, and they could enrank these gains. Also, variables such as residents’ ethnicity, destination’ size and the status, the population density and the stage of destination life cycle will also contribute to the model to better predict the phenomenon. Future research could use these variables as moderators and predict the construct with a deeper perspective. Consequently, these variables will affect residents’ attitudes towards tourism sector and tourists in different ways. Thus, it is recommended that proposed model in this research is to be investigated in different destinations.
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