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**Abstract**

Whether someone is likely to recommend a visit to a province or particular place to other is dependent on a few factors. Perception is argued to play a big role in deciding whether someone actually recommends a visit to others. This study takes Groningen as a case study in analyses what constructs such as attractiveness, image development and time contribute to the Image Sentiment Index or NPS-score. Attractiveness and time are deconstructed into three main concepts: leisure, work and living. Participants through Kantar Public’s panel all over the Netherlands aged 16 or older have been asked to fill in an online survey. Overall results done in various regression analyses demonstrate that leisure has the strongest effect on the NPS-score and the concept living also shows significant results. Work related activities do not appear to be correlated with an increased chance of recommending a visit.

*Keywords:* ISI, NPS-score, Groningen, perception of place, attractiveness of place, image development of place, time spent in place

**Table of Contents**

1. Introduction 4
2. Theory and Literature Framework 7

2.1 Image Sentiment Index (ISI) (or NPS-score) 7

2.2. Attractiveness and recommendation to others. 7

2.2.1 Leisure 8

2.2.2. Living 9

2.2.3 Working 9

2.3 Image development 10

2.3.1. Past experiences and expectations 11

2.4. Time and duration 12

 2.4.1. Lived 12

 2.4.2. Worked 13

 2.4.3. For recreational purposes (leisure) 14

1. Methods 15

3.1 Research Design and procedures 15

3.2. Sampling and Participants 16

3.3. Materials 16

3.4. Measures 16

 3.4.1. Dependent variable 16

 3.4.2. Independent variables 17

 3.4.3. Control variables 18

3.5. Analyses 18

1. Results 19

4.1. Descriptive results 19

4.2. Analyses 21

4.3 Control variables 24

1. Discussion and conclusion 24

5.1. Limitations 27

5.2. Suggestions for further research 27

1. Policy implementation 28
2. References 29
3. Appendices 36

**Perception and Visiting Intentions: A case study of the province of Groningen**

What makes someone want to visit a place is a complex question to answer straight away. Many factors play a role: sociological, psychological, environmental, economic and a variety of others. It cannot be solely pointing to one thing and assuming that is the driving factor as to why people decide to stop by a certain place. Identifying a construct that takes every factor detailed into account is not only difficult but perhaps also more or less impossible. A concept taking all most of these factors into account is the construct of perception.

 A perception that one has of a particular place is a key factor in deciding whether one is willing to at least think about visiting it (Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). Perception is also shaped by various factors, both implicitly and explicitly. It is a way of perceiving reality and experiencing it through the senses, allowing us to distinguish between figure, form, language, conduct, and action (Given, 2008). Opinions and judgments are influenced by individual perception (Given, 2008). Perception thus influences action (Hommel, Brown, & Nattkemper, 2016). The action can be implicit or explicit, meaning that either people think positively or badly of a concept (implicit) or people – particularly in this case – speak positively or negatively of a place. Perceptions, opinions, and thoughts about particular places can be through media, chats with friends or by many other ways of communicating (Ertan, Siciliano, & Yenigün, 2019; Jimenez, 2011). Without ever having visited a place, interaction with all these forms of communication can form perception biases and create an intrinsic motivation to go or not to go there (Ertan, Siciliano, & Yenigün, 2019; Moussaïd, Kämmer, Analytis, & Neth, 2013). Perception is therefore argued to be associated to social influence (Ertan, Siciliano, & Yenigün, 2019; Moussaïd, Kämmer, Analytis, & Neth, 2013) and tied to decision-making (Germar, Schlemmer, Krug, Voss, & Mojzisch, 2013).

 This study has a specific focus on Groningen. Prior research done by Kantar Public in collaboration with the Imago Monitor Groningen project in April 2022 found out that even though people think highly and very positively of this province, they are not so likely to recommend a visit to others (Kantar Public, 2022). A more in-depth analyses was required to identify barriers and driving factors as to why this might be the case. The focus of this study is then therefore, to what extent does perception influence the intention of others to visit Groningen. This research question is broken down into three main concepts to explain the phenomenon: (1) the attractiveness as a measurement of recommendation of a visit to others, (2) the expected and past image development, (3) the amount of time spend in the province in relation to work, living or for recreational purposes.

With regard to the focus of this paper, rather than speaking or thinking positively or negatively about a place, the action of importance here is whether people actively recommend a visit to Groningen to others. These people can be friends, family, acquaintances and/or colleagues. By identifying whether people are more likely to recommend a visit, it is possible to recognize a positive negative, or neutral perception. Previous travel experiences influence the cognitive component of destination images; travellers' motivations influence the affective component of destination images; and individuals' socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., young, well-educated travellers) influence the cognitive and affective assessment of image (Beerli and Martin, 2004, Gartner, 1994).

 The reason as to why Groningen has been chosen as a case study for this, is because it has been subject to quite a large number of cues and experiences that shape people’s perception of it. Groningen has been in the news quite a lot with negative connotations in relation to earthquakes and gas extraction (Miskovic, 2022; Start & Ekker, 2022), and radically demonstrating farmers (Dagblad van het Noorden, 2022; Winterman, 2019). It has also been associated negatively with words such as “secluded”, “far away”, “boring”, and “stiff” (Kantar Public, 2022; Alsem, Boisen, Koster, & Wever, 2020). These negative connotations could potentially influence the way that people perceive Groningen. The same goes for positive associations.

 Perceptions of Groningen can be influenced through personal experiences, media exposure or by experiences shared by others (Harappa, 2021; Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). Though not the focus of this study, it is important to realize how these perceptions are being formed, and that they do not occur by themselves. However, pinpointing what the actual turning point is for people to say “this is the thing that made me decide whether I think very positively or negatively of Groningen” is rather difficult. As mentioned before, perception is shaped by various factors (Given, 2008; Harappa, 2021). Therefore, identifying the most influential factor is more complex.

 The findings of this report might not just be of relevance for the province of Groningen. It might not only be useful for provinces not only in The Netherlands, but also for any other place which could also use insights on whether the barriers and driving factors identified here might be useful. Barriers and driving factors can be translated into marketing strategies to draw in more tourists, habitants, and job seekers (Postma, Buda, & Gugerell, 2017; Jeng, Snyder, & Chen, 2017; Van & Hieu, 2020) .An influx of these people allows for a livelier place and might bring various benefits to Groningen. It could be of importance for economic reasons, as thinking and speaking highly of a place draws in tourists willing to spend time and money (Postma, Buda, & Gugerell, 2017; De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015). More people coming to Groningen and advocating for it, will lead to even more people thinking positively of it and increases visits (De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010).

 Nevertheless, there is a challenge in identifying factors that increase travel intentions and translating them into implementable executables. Therefore, besides examining the main research question, which is to what extent does perception influence visiting intentions, this paper also makes a first start in examining the following policy question: what can be done in order to translate the driving factors into more people recommending a visit to Groningen?

**2. Theory and Literature Framework**

**2.1 Image Sentiment Index (ISI) (or NPS-score).**

Figure 1 demonstrates the conceptual analyses of all hypotheses. During the exploratory analysis, the original study done by Kantar Public found out that the degree of recommendation was low. The use of the scale of using +10 up until -10 has specific reasoning. Studies done by the university of Groningen and Harvard (de Haan, Verhoef, & Wiesel, 2014; Janmaat & Van Herk, 2014; Reichheld, 2003) argue that by using this method, people were challenged to think differently about rating the province. On average, people tend to easily give passing scores, in the sense that they think of it as okay. However, by adding negative ratings, people are forced to think more critically about whether they would actually want to rate the province positively and to what extent they would do so.

 The ISI is broken down into three categories: (1) critics, (2) passively content, and (3) ambassadors (Janmaat & Van Herk, 2014). Critics are those who actively speak negatively about the province. The passively content people do not speak overwhelming positively nor negatively. The ambassadors actively speak positively about the province and are often called “walking marketeers”. These are the people necessary to draw in other people, as sharing positive experiences, thoughts and associations are found to be more effective in motivating people to consider visiting Groningen (PWC, 2018).

**2.2. Attractiveness and recommendation to others.**

Even though others might speak highly and positively of the province, the extent to which someone values and acts upon another one’s opinion differs from person to person (Moussaïd, Kämmer, Analytis, & Neth, 2013). Social influence plays a big role here. Different people value and place importance on different aspects of a province. This is means that they also find different factors attractive, dependent on what people might hear from others. Some might value the province as a place to live more than as a place to experience culture. Without ever having been to the province, one already has a perception of what it might look like or what they think they will experience there. These perceptions can be influenced through personal experiences, media exposure or by experiences shared by others (Harappa, 2021; Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). This translates into a perception that people might already have of the province about how attractive they think certain aspects are in relation to Groningen. Direct social ties tend to have more influence than indirect social ties in deciding on whether to visit Groningen or not (De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010). However, if a significant number of unfamiliar people share their opinions on review websites, such as Trustpilot or Tripadvisor, there is certain weight added in the final decision-making process (Krämer, Sauer, & Ellison, 2021; Wang, Lu, Ester, Wang, & Chen, 2016). Previous studies argue that attractiveness of a place might be is based on whether people think of it as a nice place to live, study, grow old, grow up, recreate, find a job, do business, or experience culture in (Kourtit, Nijkamp, & Wahlström, 2020; Buch, Hamann, Niebuhr, & Rossen, 2013). These factors encapsulate the concepts of work, leisure, and home (Lee, 2016).

**2.2.1. Leisure.** Going to a place for recreational purposes or to experience culture has a positive and inviting connotation to it (Katrini, 2018). Some argue that it might even be the most important factor convincing people to pay a visit (Bock, 2015). Positive or negative experiences that other shared – online, when searching for reviews, for example, or face-to-face – are driving factors in considering a visit (Khan, Chelliah, Haron, & Ahmed, 2017; Mehmetoglu, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2002). It is mostly through active advertising and advocating that people are willing to consider booking their (first) trip (de Haan, Verhoef, & Wiesel, 2014; Janmaat & Van Herk, 2014; Reichheld, 2003). Cultural and recreational activities are widely regarded as major factors in travel selections (Seyfi, Hall, & Rasoolimanesh, 2019).

**2.2.2. Work.** Positive work associations are generally associated with a better and more positive association of a place (Erfani, 2022). However, there is still some debate in whether this actively contributes to convincing other people to recommend a visit. Work life could be associated independently of private life (Gragnano, Simbula, & Miglioretti, 2020). Though someone might have positive work experiences, these do always not have to be necessarily related to recommending a visit. Rather, any work experience – positively or negatively – is more likely to increased work-related recommendations (Erfani, 2022; Gragnano, Simbula, & Miglioretti, 2020). This entails that if any recommendation is given, it is related to a specific work environment, rather than associating it broadly with the location of the environment. Nevertheless, occasionally, work experience can create a perception or expectation of what the atmosphere of the province in which it is located might be like (Erfani, 2022). Though, if this is the case, the effect is thought to be relatively small (Gragnano, Simbula, & Miglioretti, 2020). It could be argued that if any effect is to be found, this is due to slowly increasingly blurring lines between work and private life.

**2.2.3. Living.** However, Groningen has had controversial media attention in relation to earthquakes, gas extraction, demonstrations (Dagblad van het Noorden, 2022; Miskovic, 2022; Start & Ekker, 2022; Winterman, 2019). Whether someone would then like to travel to a place, is dependent on many factors. These factors are called travel motivators and are generally distributed into four main categories: (1) physical, (2) cultural, (3) interpersonal and (4) the status and prestige motivators (Cajiao, Leung, Larson, Tejedo, & Benayas, 2022). Nevertheless, besides these motivators there are also travel constraints (also called “leisure constraints”): social, political, physical, financial, time, health, family stage, lack of interest, fear and safety, lack of transportation, companionship, overcrowding, distance, and limited information about potential destination (Carneiro & Crompton, 2009; Chen, Chen, & Okumus, 2013). The final decision as to when someone decides to travel is dependent on a cost-benefit-analysis of the constraints and motivators, which are also more generally known as push- and pull factors (Khan, Chelliah, Haron, & Ahmed, 2017; Mehmetoglu, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2002).

Rather than at pointing at objects and other architectural components people find attractive in Groningen, various studies argue that in order to recommend a visit to others, own experiences and those of their social ties are more important in the final decision-making **(**Alamoush & Kertész, 2021). Experiences of attractiveness or the perception of the province are driving factors for people to decide to what extent they are even willing to reconsider travelling to a place.

H1: The more someone finds Groningen attractive for work, leisure and living, the more likely one would recommend the place to others.

**2.3 Image development.**

The perception one has about a particular place develops slowly (Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). It can be based on past experiences that already had made their contribution in shaping it. However, expectations can also play an important role. Sense of place is socially constructed as well as perceived (Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). The image of a place is constructed through a couple of variables, including demographics, level of income and unemployment rate (van Rheenen, 2015). If these are up to one’s own individual standards, they are more inclined to rate the image development positively and therefore recommend a visit to others (Harappa, 2021; Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017; De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010). Image development goes way beyond considering whether Groningen is an attractive place for leisure, work or living.

When speaking to others about experiences – both positively and negatively – expectations can be set about what Groningen must be like. Generally, people hold trust and value in the opinions and experiences of others (Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017; De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010). The controversy or the development of the image of Groningen has been subject to quite some media attention: earthquakes and gas extraction (Miskovic, 2022; Start & Ekker, 2022), and radically demonstrating farmers (Dagblad van het Noorden, 2022; Winterman, 2019).Various studies argue that this might have led to prominent negative connotations and associations (Kantar Public, 2022; Alsem, Boisen, Koster, & Wever, 2020).

 **2.3.1. Past experiences and expectations.**

Prior knowledge about the probabilistic structure of the world greatly aids perception and decision-making (Harappa, 2021; de Lange, Heilbron, & Kok, 2018; Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017). This effect is enhanced when social ties shared their experiences in relation to a specific topic. Using the example of the handling of the damage cause by the earthquakes and gas extraction, quite some non-locals have gathered negative perceptions about the province. (Kantar Public, 2022). This causes a decline in active recommendations for a visit or even considering a visit themselves.

The most prominent expectations lie within the domain of the view that Groningen has for its future. With the current house market prices, the province is a financially beneficial place to move to. Furthermore, the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen continuously scores well on various international university rankings. In turn, this shapes the expectation that Groningen will draw in more students, and that will lead to a livelier place (Hidalgo, Salesses, & Schechtner, 2015). Though, for some this is a more positive development, for other this might be leaning towards a more negative development. Generally, the number of people considering the arrival of more students as a positive occurrence weigh out to those labelling it as negative (Hidalgo, Salesses, & Schechtner, 2015). Some respondents from the Kantar Public study (2022) rate the international and cosy.

Arguably, in shaping the image, media play an important role (Leung, Law, van Hoof, & Buhalis, 2013). Most of the (new) information gathered happens through online platforms (Kapoor et al., 2017). These shape expectations. A report published by the municipality of Groningen (2012) found out that since 1996 Groningen has been considered generally safer.

H2: The more people expect the image of Groningen to positively develop, the more inclined they are to recommend a visit to others.

**2.4 Time and duration.**

 Time, and more specifically duration, of the concepts work, living and leisure are good indicators in determining whether someone finds the place attractive or not, and thus is willing to recommend it to others or not (De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010). It is generally assumed that if someone had spent more time in a specific place, they do because they like to. Otherwise, they would have left already, and therefore, not recommend a visit to others. However, sometimes, time spent there is not a choice but an obligation (Florida, 2008). For example, someone might have decided to move to Groningen as that is the only province for affordable housing. Another reason could be that someone had to move there for their job.

 **2.4.1. Lived.**

Whether the amount of time someone had lived in Groningen contributes to a boost in recommending a visit to others, might be a bit controversial. Following the reasoning of being able to choose freely where one would like to live, if all resources allow for it, it is more likely to assume they associate Groningen with more positive aspects (Ferentz, 2007). In turn, they would thus be more likely to recommend a visit to others. However, say that for example the financial means are insufficient in deciding freely where someone would like to live, then it is less likely to assume that they actively consider a recommendation (Florida, 2008, Ferentz, 2007).

2018 to 2019 shows a fast increase of new inhabitants of the municipality of Groningen. In 2018, 202.810 people lived there, whereas this increased to 231.299 inhabitants in 2019 (Alle Cijfers, 2022). This is an increase of 14% in a year. What made people move to the province during this time is that in The Netherlands, quite some people from the Randstad wanted to move out from the busy life and find something that a bit more calm (CBS, 2021; Nijestee, 2018). This also assumes that generally people do move to Groningen because they want to, not because they need to. Consequently, this could mean that if people decide to stay longer in Groningen, they are content with the place, and therefore likely to recommend a visit at minimum to others.

H3a: The longer someone had lived in Groningen, the more likely they are to recommend a visit the province to others.

**2.4.2. Worked.**

 Better employment associations are often linked to a better and more positive association with a location (Erfani, 2022). However, whether working at a particular job in Groningen for a longer time, actively contributes to encouraging others to encourage a visit is still debatable, is still quite debatable. There are only a few studies that imply that there is an effect between the duration of working in a particular place, and active recommendation to visit. Work experience might shape one's view or anticipation of the environment of the province in which it is located (Erfani, 2022). However, if this is the case, the effect is believed to be minor (Gragnano, Simbula, & Miglioretti, 2020). Again, it may be argued that if any influence is observed, it is due to the gradually blurred borders between work and personal life.

 One line of reasoning that could be followed, if any effect is to be found, at work one could come into contact with local people and increase their network. By increasing their network, they expand their weak ties network, and gain information from their experiences and place value on that (Raymond, Kyttä, & Stedman, 2017; Wang, Lu, Ester, Wang, & Chen, 2016; De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino, & Napolitano, 2015; Elliot, Papadopoulos, & Kim, 2010). It could then be argued, that the longer someone works at a company in Groningen, the more likely they have spoken to different people with experience of the province, thus the more likely they are to recommend a visit to others.

H3b: The longer someone had worked in Groningen, the more likely they are to recommend a visit the province to others.

**2.4.3. For recreational purposes (leisure).**

Whenever visiting a place for recreational purposes, it is likely to assume that people generally have more positive associations with the place (Katrini, 2018; de Haan, Verhoef, & Wiesel, 2014; Janmaat & Van Herk, 2014; Reichheld, 2003). Visiting a place more frequently over time even indicates positive times being spent there, hence the frequent returns. Whereas previously argued that cultural and recreational activities might be the most essential component in enticing people to come (Bock, 2015), the effect of time and frequency is overlooked in current studies. Positive or bad experiences shared by others - whether online, when searching for reviews, or in person - are driving considerations in choosing a visit (Khan, Chelliah, Haron, & Ahmed, 2017; Mehmetoglu, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2002). Seeing or hearing about any experience often, is likely to become a push or pull factor over time.

Cultural and recreational experiences are generally rated as important in travel making decisions (Seyfi, Hall, & Rasoolimanesh, 2019). Arguably, the more frequent one has (heard) positive cultural or recreational experiences, the more likely one is to recommend a visit to others. Generally, a visit to the Groninger Museum is highly recommended and the main train station has won multiple prizes for the most beautiful train station of The Netherlands. There is already a slight increase detected in tourists (Sweco, 2022).

H3c: The more often someone had visited Groningen for recreational purposes, the more likely they are to recommend a visit the province to others.

Attractiveness

Image development

Time spent

ISI / NPS-score

***Figure 1:*** Conceptual model of hypotheses.

**3. Methods**

**3.1. Research Design and Procedures.**

This research paper analysed data collected from questionnaires distributed and designed by Kantar Public, giving the study a quantitative and cross-sectional nature. Kantar Public is a company providing research services for any topic within the public sector. For this specific study, they designed a questionnaire focused on how the general public of The Netherlands views the province of Groningen, for both locals and non-locals and their different views of the province. It included questions that highlighted moving, travel and working intentions, the general view of how one believes the province has evolved among many other constructs that measured biases.

Prior to designing any questionnaires, the project leader of Kantar Public has at least one meeting discussing with the client what exactly they want to measure and if they have any specific questions, they would like to ask respondents. After that, the survey had to go through several feedback rounds until the client was satisfied with all the questions that were asked. Surveys were finalised and scripted by using NField. Then, when the questionnaire was ready to be distributed amongst Dutch participants, it was sent to the participants by using a tool in NField.

This paper is also part of a longitudinal study done by Imagomonitor Groningen, a study in which the imago of Groningen is tracked for a period of ten years (waves) to identify changing or stable factors. All analyses done and data used are part of the second wave.

**3.2. Sampling and Participants**

For this study, Kantar Public reached out to her panel. This panel was screened for the right participants for this survey. These include citizens all over The Netherlands aged sixteen or older, excluding those who, at the time of the screening, lived in Groningen. By doing so, it was possible to create a representative perspective of the general view Dutch citizens have of Groningen. All participants were selected by random sampling. No weight was added to the variables as all were seemingly normally distributed and no specific group of participants needed intentional oversampling to make the data more representative. Fieldwork for the data collection of non-locals took place from 20th of April up until 27th of April.

**3.3. Materials**

Data collected through surveys distributed by Kantar Public is done by CaWI-interviews. This is a computer-assisted web interview, whereby respondents follow a script provided in a website. Respondents can fill in the survey anytime and anywhere on any device.

**3.4. Measures**

**3.4.1. Dependent variable.** Whether someone would recommend a place to any other person had been suggested to be a significant indicator of the orientation of one’s perception towards it. The question measuring this asked how likely someone would recommend a visit to Groningen to friends, family members, acquaintances and/or colleagues. Participants were asked to rate this based on a -10 up until +10 scale score. The -10 represents not likely to recommend at all and +10 very likely to recommend. In SPSS this is coded into an into a 0-10 points Likert scale (0 = -10 and 10 = +10).

**3.4.2. Independent variables.**

***Attractiveness going to Groningen.*** The survey also asked to what extent non-locals personally thought of the attractiveness of Groningen within the following subjects: (1) as a place to live, (2) as a place to grow up, (3) a place to study, (4) a place to grow old, (5) a place to find a job, (6) a place to do business, (7) a place for recreation, and (8) a place to experience culture. All elements were based on a 1-11 points Likert-scale (1 = very much unattractive, 11 = very much attractive). This question was asked to non-locals only.

***Image development.*** To assess whether the expected image development had an effect on the likelihood of recommendation, participants were asked to rate whether they expected the image of Groningen to develop more positively or negatively over both the upcoming year and the upcoming four years. This was asked based on a 1-5 points Likert scale (1 = a lot more negatively, 5 = a lot more positively).

Additionally, though the effect was expected to be similar, it was analysed whether the image development of the past year and past four years has had an influence on the recommendation. This was also asked based on a 1-5 points Likert scale (1 = a lot more negatively, 5 = a lot more positively).

***Worked, lived or visited.*** Lastly, it was expected that if someone already had worked, lived or visited Groningen before, one would be more likely to give a positive recommendation to others. Whether someone had lived in Groningen, had worked there, or had visited was only asked to non-locals. The question for how long someone had lived in Groningen (1 = shorter than a year, 5 = longer than 25 years) had been asked as a single-coded question with five answer options. How often someone had visited Groningen for work purposes (1 = daily, 4 = a few times a year) and how often someone had visited Groningen for recreational purposes (1 = less than once a year, 4 = multiple times a month) had been asked as a single-coded question with four answer options. For a full overview of the answer options for each question, please consult Appendix A.

**3.4.3. Control variables.**

***Age****.* Age had been expected to play a role in recommendation. An exploratory analysis in SurveyReporter and SPSS showed that generally Groningen had not been associated as young. The Dutch bureau of statistics (CBS) (2021) reported that overall, older (aged over 30) rather than younger people tend to visit Groningen more often. This led to the expectation that older people tend to like Groningen better than younger people. Groningen was generally more associated with happiness, a high quality of living and cosy within this age group (Kantar Public, 2022).

***Level of education completed.*** As the Rijksuniversiteit of Groningen had been in top university rankings every now and then, this had been expected to be of influence. Overall, it had been estimated that the higher the level of education would be, the more likely they would recommend the place to others (1 = none, 7 = university of applied sciences/university master or PhD, 8 = don’t know, do not want to say). For a full overview of all levels of education, please consult Appendix B.

Both *age* and *level of education* were analysed by performing a simple linear regression.

**3.5 Analyses**

This study measures how perceptions of a particular place - which in this case was Groningen - influence travel, moving and working intentions, the following variables have been examined. All respondents who refused to answer, filled in no answer, or did not know their answer were treated as missing values and excluded from the analyses. To conduct the statistical analyses done in this research paper, IBM SPSS version 25 was used. Throughout the dataset, wherever necessary was filtered for non-locals to meet the objective of the main research question, which was to analyse to what extent perception of non-locals influenced the recommendation of a visit to Groningen.

A stepwise regression analysis was performed to assess the effect of each variable on the degree of recommendation for a visit. In this stepwise regression analysis, the variables of Groningen as an attractive place to live, to study, to grow up, to grow old, to find a job, to do business, for recreation and to experience culture were added. The stepwise regression filters out what variables were significant and sorted those based on their effect on the dependent variable. All other analyses were performed by using a simple linear regression.

**4. Results**

**4.1. Descriptive results**

Table 1 includes all descriptive values of the variables examined in all statistical analyses. After filtering for respondents who completed the survey and for non-locals only, a total of 1059 respondents were included in the final sample size. The NPS-score (how likely to recommend a visit to others) has been recalculated into its original scale. SPSS calculated a mean score of 7.28 (M = 7.28, SD = 2,00, min = 0, max = 10), and calculating this back to the original -10 / +10 scale, this would mean that on average people rate a 3.6. Variables measuring the attractiveness of Groningen differ in their mean scores. Groningen as an attractive place to find a job was giving the lowest average score of all attributes measuring the attractiveness (M = 6.07, SD = 2.55, min = 0, max = 10). Follow up are Groningen as an attractive place to live (M = 5.98, SD = 2.31, min = 0, max =10) and to do business (M = 6.16, SD = 2.25, min = 0, max = 10). The average scores of Groningen as an attractive place to grow up (M = 6.57, SD = 2.38, min = 0, max = 10) and grow old in lay relatively close to each other (M = 6.59, SD = 2.44, min = 0, max = 10). The highest average scores were given to Groningen as an attractive place to study (M = 7.94, SD = 2.17, min = 0, max = 10, to recreate (M = 7.42, SD = 2.01 min = 0, max = 10), and to experience culture (M = 7.45, SD = 1.95, min = 0, max = 10).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  *Descriptive statistics*  |
|   |   | N  | Min  | Max  | Mean  | S.D.  |  |
| Likeliness of recommending a visit to Groningen  |   | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 7.28   | 2.00  |  |
|  Groningen as an attractive place to…  |  live  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 6.07   | 2.55  |  |
|   | grow up  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 6.57   | 2.38  |  |
|   | study  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 7.94   | 2.17  |  |
|   | grow old  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 6.59  | 2.44  |  |
|   | find a job  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 5.98  | 2.31  |  |
|   | do business  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 6.16  | 2.25  |  |
|   | recreate  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 7.42  | 2.01  |  |
|   | experience culture  | 1059  | 0  | 10  | 7.45  | 1.95  |  |

***Table 1****.* Overview of the descriptive values of the variables used to analyze the hypotheses

Image development for the upcoming year (M = 3,16, SD = .56, min = 1, max = 5) and 4 years (M = 3.21, SD = .59, min = 1, max = 5), show the same variance in their standard deviation. Whereas the image development over the past year (M = 3,03, SD = .56, min = 1, max = 5) and over the past 4 years (M = 3.04, SD = .64, min = 1, max = 5) quite differ in their variance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   |  *Descriptive statistics*  |
|   |   | N  | Min  | Max  | Mean  | S.D.  |
| Image development...  | for the upcoming year  | 1059  | 1  | 5  | 3.16  | .561  |
|   | for the upcoming 4 years  | 1059  | 1  | 5  | 3.21  | .590  |
|   | the past year  | 1059  | 1  | 5  | 3.03  | .564  |
|   | the past 4 years  | 1059  | 1  | 5  | 3.04  | .642  |
| Lived in Groningen for how long  |   | 1059  | 1  | 5  | 3.43  | .309  |
| Visited Groningen for work how often  |   | 1059  | 1  | 4  | 2.64  | .341  |
| Visited Groningen for recreational purposes how often   |   | 1059  | 1  | 4  | 2.93  | .286  |

***Table 2****.* Overview of the descriptive values of the variables used to analyze the hypotheses

How long someone has lived in Groningen translates, if they have ever lived there, translates back to 5 to 10 years on average (M = 3.43, SD = 1.16, min = 1, max = 5). Whether someone has visited Groningen for job purposes, had they ever been there displays an average score of somewhere between weekly and monthly (M = 2.64, SD = 1.28, min = 1, max = 4). Lastly, if someone has ever visited Groningen for recreational purposes, then usually this has been done 3 to 12 times a year (M = 2.93, SD = 1.07, min = 1, max = 4). The control variables show the following descriptive results: the average age appears to be 42 (M = 42, SD = 19, min = 16, max = 90) and the average highest completed level of education somewhere between *MBO 2, 3, 4, of MBO oude structuur* and *HAVO en VWO bovenbouw / HBO-/WO-propedeuse* (M = 4.47, SD = 1.82, min = 1, max = 8).

**4.2. Analyses**

Prior to performing all analyses, all variables were checked for assumptions and internal consistency. Though for the variables measuring the attractiveness of Groningen as a place to live, study, to do business recreate, to work, grow old, grow up, to study, or to experience culture, the assumption of normality has been violated according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk tests. However, all plots produced showed normal distributions of all above variables. For a full overview of assumption testing analyses, please consult Appendix C. However, prior to performing all statistical analyses, the estimation of a linear relationship of all variables was examined. All variables were separately analyzed and for a full overview, please consult Appendix C too, and separately, they each estimated a linear relationship with the dependent variable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Regression analyses for variables predicting feeling of level of democracy*  |
|   |  | Model 1  |   | Model 2  |   | Model 3  |
|   |  | B  | SE  |   | B  | SE  |   | B  | SE  |
| Constant  |  | 2.046\*\*\* | .201\*\*\* |   | 4.411  | .202  |   | 7.9061\*\*\*7.06325.8963\*\*\* | .452\*\*\*.237.130\*\*\*  |
| Attractive place to live\* |  | .212 | .- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Attractive place to grow up  |  | .018\*\*\* | .411\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attractive place to study\* |  | .125\*\*\* | .028\*\*\* |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Attractive place to grow old |  | .062 | - |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Attractive place to find a job |  | .032 | - |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Attractive place to do business |  | .032 | - |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Attractive place to recreate\* |  | .298\*\*\* | .038\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attractive place to experience\* culture |  | .099\*\*\* | .034\*\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Image development for the upcoming year |  |  |  | .024 | - |  |  |  |
|  | Image development for the upcoming 4\* years\* |  |  |  | .698\*\*\* | .105\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | Image development over the past year\* |  |  |  | .344\*\*\* | .146\*\*\* |  |  |  |
|  | Image development over the past 4 years\* |  |  |  | .412\*\*\* | .127\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| Lived in Groningen for how long1\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .268\*\*\* | .144\*\*\* |
| Worked in Groningen for how long2\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .171 | .237 |
| How often visited Groningen for recreational purposes3\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .951\*\*\* | .080\*\*\* |
| R2  |  | .432\*\*\* |   | .116\*\*\*  |   | .1991\*\*\* .0772\*\*\* .1173\*\*\* |
| F  |  | 200.717\*\*\*   |   | 46.1068\*\*\* |   | 3.473\*\*\* .518\*\*\* 140.554\*\*\* |

***Table 2:*** Overview of the results of the regression analyses. Note, \* significant predictors in the stepwise regression analyses, \*\* separate simple linear regression analyses, \*\*\* p < .05

Table 2 provides a summary of all regression analyses that had been performed. The main analyses consisted of examining whether Groningen as an attractive place to study, live, grow up, grow old, have a job, to do business, to recreate, or to experience culture had any influence on recommending it to others. The relationship was found to be significant for the model included the variables that measured the attractiveness of Groningen as a place to experience culture (B = .298, t = 7.93, p <.000), a place to live (B = .212, t = 9.35, p < .000), a place to study (B = .125, t = 4.40, p < .000), and a place to recreate (B = .099, t = 2.90, p < .004). The relationship was found to be strong (R = .658) and significant, and explained 43,2% of the variance (R2 = .432, F(1, 1054) = 8.411, p < .004). This is partially in line with H1. This means that only those four variables significantly predict that the more someone finds Groningen an attractive place to experience culture, to study, to live and to recreate in, the more they would recommend the place to others.

To analyze what kind of image development influences the NPS-score, another stepwise regression analysis was performed. Image development for the upcoming 4 years demonstrated the strongest relationship (B = .698, t = 6.535, p < .000), followed by the image development over the past four years (B = .412, t = 3.248, p < .000) and the past year (B = .344 t = 2.355, p < .000). Only the variable that measure the effect of the image development over a year showed no significant results. This is partially in line with H2, which assumed that the past and future image development would have an effect on the degree of recommendation for a visit. This means that the expected image development for the upcoming four years has the most influence, followed by the image development over the past 4 years, and lastly, the development for the past year. The more positive the expected development is to be, the more likely people also are to recommend a visit.

Finally, to assess whether the duration and/or frequency of living, working or visiting in Groningen has an impact on the recommendation, separate linear regression analyses were executed on the variables *lived in Groningen for how long* (B = .268, t = 1.864, p < .066), *how often visiting Groningen for work* (B = .171, t = .720, p = n.s.), and *how often visited Groningen for the past 5 years for recreational purposes* (B = .951, t = 11.856, p < .000). Only the last variable is significant in predicting the linear relationship (R2 = .117, F(1, 1057) = 140.55, p < .000). It explains 11.7% of the variance and demonstrates a moderate relationship (R = .343). This is in line with H3c, meaning that the more frequently someone visits Groningen, the more likely they are to recommend the place. H3a and H3b are therefore rejected.

**4.3. Control variables**

*Descriptive statistics*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | N  | Min  | Max  | Mean  | S.D.  |
| Age | 1059  | 16  | 90  | 44.61  | 19.189  |
| Highest level of education completed | 1059  | 1  | 8  | 4.65  | 1.779 |

***Table 3****.* Overview of the descriptive values of the variables used to analyze the control variables.

Table 3 and 4 provide a summary of the descriptive statistics and the outcomes of the regression analyses.

***Age.*** Age does not appear to influence the degree of recommending a visit to others (R2 = .002, F(1, 1057) = 2.208, p = n.s.). This means that no matter the age, it does not have an effect on whether someone is more likely to recommend a visit to Groningen to others.

***Level of education completed.*** Though explaining very little of the variance (R2 = .005, F(1, 1057) = 4.949, p = .026), the highest level of completed education appears to have a weak effect (R = .068) on the degree of recommending a visit to others. This does indicate that the higher one’s completed level of education is, the more likely they are to recommend a visit to Groningen to others.

*Regression analyses for control variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |  | Model 1  |   | Model 2  |   |
|   |  | B  | SE  |   | B  | SE  |   |
| Constant  |  | 7.067\* | .156\* |   | 6.921\* | .172\* |   |
|  Age |  | .005 | .003 |   |   |   |   |
|  Highest level of education completed |  |  |  |  | .077\* | .035\* |  |
| R2  |  | .002 |   | .005\* |   |
| F  |  | 2.208   |   | 4.949\* |   |

***Table 4:*** Overview of the results of the regression analyses. Note, \*p < .05

 **5. Discussion and Conclusion**

First and foremost, the main research question of this paper was to what extent the attractiveness of a place in relation to work, living and recreational purposes influences the degree of recommendation and therefore one’s perception of a place. The main results demonstrate that recreational purposes have a large influence in comparison to living purposes. Anything work-related does not in any way seem to influence the likeliness to recommend. Though at first instance positive work experience, and the duration and frequency of work-related activities could be associated with a higher change to positively recommend places to others, some studies argue that there is no influence. Being caught up in work does not allow for a thorough analyses or explicit impactful experience in deciding whether a province such as Groningen is worth recommending. Arguably, many things can play a role in shaping a work-location perception. It could also be that rather than recommending the province, people are more inclined to recommend the company itself or not, as that is more closely related towards perception shaping within the perspective of business. This finding is roughly in line with the literature but rejects H3b. The literature stated that if any effect was to be found, this would’ve been very small (Gragnano, Simbula, & Miglioretti, 2020). Therefore, the chances of finding no effect were relatively high.

However, when visiting a place for recreational purposes, perception shaping appears to be more positively oriented, and suggests a higher likelihood of recommending it to others. This is in line with current literature, and thus partially supporting H1 and fully supporting H3c. It explains that whenever just visiting a place, whether it be for just a couple of days or for a longer time, one is more likely to gain full experience, and therefore, they feel more confident in voicing their experience (Khan, Chelliah, Haron, & Ahmed, 2017; Mehmetoglu, 2011; Kim & Lee, 2002) This is most likely the reason why the attractiveness of Groningen as a recreational place showed the highest degree of impact in the stepwise regression analysis. This also contributes to the explaining as to why the more often one visits Groningen, the more likely they would recommend it. Visiting a place more times for recreational purposes indicates a positive experience, and this increases the likelihood of recommendation (Katrini, 2018; de Haan, Verhoef, & Wiesel, 2014; Janmaat & Van Herk, 2014; Reichheld, 2003).

An interesting result is that living in Groningen for a long time has to be found non-significant in predicting the degree of recommendation. However, in the stepwise regression, it is found to be quite an attractive place to live, increasing its recommendation. It is quite under debate as to why this is the case. Some argue that due to high house prices in bigger cities, Groningen becomes more attractive, as in comparison house prices are lower and the demographics and environmental factors are found to be more attractive by people moving out of the Randstad (CBS, 2021; Nijestee, 2018; Carneiro & Crompton, 2009; Chen, Chen, & Okumus, 2013). On other hand, the amount of time someone has lived in a city or province could well be argued to be influential in recommendation. The longer someone lives in a particular place, the higher the chances are they like it, the more likely they are to recommend it. Though, this does not appear to be the case.

Regarding the image development, the stepwise regression analyses shows interesting resulting. The most contributing factor in deciding whether it is worth to recommend a visited appears be the development for the upcoming four years. At first glance, this makes sense, as it would explain the growth in inhabitants from 2018 to 2019, but the decline happening after that (Alle Cijfers, 2022). Around 2019 and 2020, the news about Groningen was all about earthquakes and gas extraction (Dagblad van het Noorden, 2022; Miskovic, 2022; Start & Ekker, 2022; Winterman, 2019). For this exact same reason, it was to be expected that the image development for the upcoming year would have been significant too. However, what is the reasoning behind this, is still quite unclear. Furthermore, the reasons as to why the development of the past year and past four years are contributing factors in influencing the NPS-scores lacks thorough explanations. It could be that past experiences play an important role recommending a visit.

**5.1. Limitations**

One limitation of this study is the specificity of this case study. Though broad concepts are known about the positive and negative experience in a place in relation to work, living or recreational experiences, finding case specific literature to apply was quite difficult. Besides the lack of case specific literature, another limitation is that the analyses of an actual image development would have been more indicative of whether people are more likely to recommend a visit to Groningen. However, as this is only the second year that the Imagomonitor Groningen is running, is hard to draw any solid and sound conclusions in relation to comparative results.

**5.2. Suggestions for further research**

One suggestion for further research would be to how to amplify these factors of studying, recreation, living and to experience culture into a more positive NPS-score, leading to higher recommendations and a more positive perception of Groningen. It could focus on whether more ambassadors weight out the critics. It would be interesting to see if then the voicing of opinions of ambassadors contribute to a positive perception building and higher degree of recommendation.

Another interesting aspect for further research would be finding more thorough explanations as to why the NPS-score turned out to be low, even though the overall image development for the upcoming years is relatively positive. This research paper mainly focused on finding factors that contribute to what extent the NPS-score can be explained but did not include any specific explanations and thorough analyses as to why this score is low.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to look at the development of the NPS-score over time and what the possible changes could be and why. As the Imagomonitor Groningen is a longitudinal study, and regarding the controversial but increasingly positive perception of the province, it would be interesting to study to what extent the factors of attractiveness are still relevant or what other factors might have contributed to the NPS-score.

1. **Policy implementation**

The main goal would be to encourage people to rate Groningen more positively and to have them actively recommend a visit to others. However, how to go about this, is quite the task. The municipality of The Hague uses active city marketing in which they make use of the pull factors of the city. This they emphasize and actively market upon. It is slowly showing minor effects. The results of this study show that the general public of The Netherlands thinks of Groningen as an attractive place to recreate and to study. It would be advice to actively market on these two aspects and find niches to draw in people. Exploratory analyses done by Kantar Public (2022) show that the Marinitoren is quite commonly known amongst non-locals. Therefore, it would be advised to start making use of active city marketing.
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**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Answer options for time worked, lived and frequency visited**

Q020 – V19: Duration lived in Groningen

How long have you lived in Groningen?

1. Shorter than a year
2. 1 -5 years
3. 5 – 10 years
4. 10 – 15 years
5. Longer than 25 years

Q022 – V21: How often for work

How often do you visit Groningen for work?

1. Daily
2. Weekly
3. Monthly
4. A few times a year

Q024 – V23: Frequency visited

How often have you visited Groningen the past five years for recreational purposes?

1. Less than once a year
2. 1 – 2 times a year
3. 3 – 12 times a year
4. Multiple times a month

**Appendix B: List of level of education completed**

|  |
| --- |
| *Highest completed education* |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Geen onderwijs\Basisonderwijs | 90 | 8,5 | 8,5 | 8,5 |
| LBO \ VBO \ VMBO (kader- en beroepsgerichte leerweg) \ MBO 1 | 70 | 6,6 | 6,6 | 15,1 |
| MAVO \ eerste 3 jaar HAVO en VWO \ VMBO (theoretische en gemengde leerweg) | 86 | 8,1 | 8,1 | 23,2 |
| MBO 2, 3, 4 of MBO oude structuur | 195 | 18,4 | 18,4 | 41,6 |
| HAVO en VWO bovenbouw \ HBO-\WO-propedeuse | 191 | 18,0 | 18,0 | 59,7 |
| HBO-\WO-bachelor of kandidaats | 293 | 27,7 | 27,7 | 87,3 |
| HBO-\WO-master of doctoraal | 126 | 11,9 | 11,9 | 99,2 |
| Weet niet \ wil niet zeggen | 8 | ,8 | ,8 | 100,0 |
| Total | 1059 | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

**Appendix C: Assumption testing**

*Tests of Normality* *and collinearity*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |  | Shapiro-Wilk  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Collinearity diagnostics |  |  |  |  |
|  | Statistic  | df  | Sig.  |  |  |  |  |  |  | VIF | Durbin-Watson |  |  |  |  |
| Groningen as an attractive place to… | Live | .883 | 14 | .063 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.547 | 1.889\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | grow up | .808 | 14 | .006\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.366 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Study | .879 | 14 | .056 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.757 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grow old | .931 | 14 | .317 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.474 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Find a job  | .937 | 14 | .381 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.056 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Do business | .936 | 14 | .373 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.269 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Recreate | .902 | 14 | .121 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.170 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Experience culture | .865 | 14 | .036\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.472 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Image development… | The past year | .800 | 14 | .005\*\* |  |  | f |  |  |  | 2.010 | 1.863\* |  |  |  |  |
|  | The past 4 years | .779 | 14 | .003\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.969 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The upcoming year | .801 | 14 | .005\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.357 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The upcoming 4 years | .771 | 14 | .002\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.148 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lived in Groningen for how long |  | .868 | 14 | .039\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 2.032 |  |  |  |  |
| How often visited Groningen for work |  | .778 | 14 | .003\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.725 |  |  |  |  |
| How often visited Groningen the past 5 years for recreational purposes |  | .843 | 14 | .018\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.870 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  | .968 | 14 | .014\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.845 |  |  |  |  |
| Highest completed level of education |  | .835 | 14 | .853 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.839 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recommendation to others |  | .951 | 14 | .574 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

This table contains values for significance of normality and collinearity diagnostics. These are assumptions that need to be met to perform a regression analysis. Note, \* these are Durbin-Watson value for the each separate (stepwise) regression model, \*\* even though these values are significant, Q-Q plots and histograms with a normality plot show normal distributions.

**Appendix D: Syntax**

**Tests for Normality**

EXAMINE VARIABLES=OPL\_VOLT LFT time\_living freq\_job NPS\_score freq\_visit foreign\_live

 foreign\_growup foreign\_study foreign\_growold foreign\_job foreign\_undertake foreign\_recreate

 foreign\_culture img\_past\_year img\_past\_4years img\_future\_year img\_future\_4years

 /PLOT BOXPLOT NPPLOT

 /COMPARE GROUPS

 /STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES

 /CINTERVAL 95

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /NOTOTAL.

**Stepwise regression analyses**

REGRESSION

 /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE ZPP

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=STEPWISE foreign\_live foreign\_growup foreign\_study foreign\_growold foreign\_job foreign\_undertake foreign\_recreate foreign\_culture

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN

 /SAVE RESID ZRESID DFBETA SDBETA.

REGRESSION

 /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE ZPP

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=STEPWISE img\_past\_year img\_past\_4years img\_future\_year img\_future\_4years

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN

 /SAVE RESID ZRESID DFBETA SDBETA.

**Regression analysis for time living in Groningen and recommendation**

REGRESSION

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=ENTER time\_living

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN

 /SAVE RESID ZRESID DFBETA SDBETA.

**Regression analysis for frequently in Groningen for job purposes and recommendation**

REGRESSION

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=ENTER freq\_job

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN

 /SAVE RESID ZRESID DFBETA SDBETA.

**Regression analysis for frequently in Groningen for recreational purposes and recommendation**

REGRESSION

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=ENTER freq\_visit

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN

 /SAVE RESID ZRESID DFBETA SDBETA.

**Regression analyses for control variables**

REGRESSION

 /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=ENTER LFT

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN.

REGRESSION

 /DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N

 /MISSING LISTWISE

 /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA COLLIN TOL CHANGE

 /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)

 /NOORIGIN

 /DEPENDENT NPS\_score

 /METHOD=ENTER OPL\_VOLT

 /RESIDUALS DURBIN.