

WHAT MAKES A NEIGHBORHOOD COOL?

Establishing a Neighborhood Coolness Scale



Authors: Nele Clasen (150453) & Jillian Clymer (121433)

Master Thesis MSc in Economics & Business Administration Brand & Communications Management Supervisor: Florian Kock Contract Number: 29934 Character Count: 167706 (92 Pages) Date of Submission: May 14, 2023

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables	4	
List of Abbreviations		
Abstract	6	
Acknowledgements	7	
1. Introduction	8	
1.1 Research Question	9	
1.2 Structure of Thesis	10	
2. Literature Review	12	
2.1 Coolness	12	
2.2 Tourism	15	
2.2.1 Destination Image	16	
2.2.2 Destination Self-Congruity	17	
2.2.3 Destination Personality	18	
2.3 Coolness and Tourism	19	
2.3.1 Destination Coolness	20	
2.4 Residents	21	
2.4.1 Residents and Tourism	21	
2.4.1.1 Residents' Quality of Life	22	
2.4.1.2 Destination Image and Residents	23	
2.4.2 Residents and Their Neighborhoods	24	
2.4.2.2 Destination Image from a Resident Perspective	26	
2.6 Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses	27	
2.6.1 Conceptual Framework	28	
2.6.1.1 Destination Coolness Scale	28	
2.6.1.2 Neighborhood Coolness Scale	30	
2.6.2 Hypotheses	31	
2.6.2.1 General Behaviors and Attitudes	32	
2.6.2.1 Neighborhood-Self Connection	34	
2.6.2.3 Residents' Support of Tourism	35	
3. Methodology	37	

3.1 Philosophy of Science	
3.2 Research Strategy	
3.3 Research Design	
3.4 Qualitative Pre-Study Methods	41
3.4.1 Sampling	41
3.4.2 Data Collection	
3.4.3 Data Analysis and Results of Qualitative Pre-Study	
3.4.3.2 'Lively' Dimension	
3.4.3.3 'Diverse' Dimension	
3.4.3.4 'Aesthetic' Dimension	
3.4.3.5 'Green' Dimension	
3.4.3.6 'Safe' Dimension	
3.5 Quantitative Study Methods	47
3.5.1 Item Pool	47
3.5.2 Data Collection	49
3.5.3 Sampling	
3.5.4 Methods of Data Analysis	51
4. Results of Quantitative Study	53
4.1 Demographics	53
4.2 Measurement Model	55
4.2.1 Indicator Reliability	
4.2.2 Internal Consistency Reliability	60
4.2.3 Convergent Validity	61
4.2.4 Discriminant Validity	61
4.3 Structural Model	
4.4 Findings	
4.4.1 Neighborhood Coolness Scale	
4.4.2 Hypothesis Testing	
4.4.2.1 General Behaviors and Attitudes	67
4.4.2.2 Neighborhood-Self Connection	
4.4.2.3 Residents' Support of Tourism	
4.5 Post-hoc Analyses	70

4.5.1 US vs DK	70
4.5.2 Dimensions on Outcome Variables	72
4.5.2.1 Dimensions on Willingness to Pay	73
4.5.2.2 Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection	74
5. Discussion of the Results	77
5.1 Neighborhood Coolness Scale	77
5.2 Outcome Variables	79
5. 3 Post-hoc Discussion	81
6. Theoretical and Managerial Implications	83
6.1 Theoretical Implications	83
6.2 Managerial Implications	84
7. Limitations and Future Research	87
8. Conclusion	90
9. References	93
Appendix A. Interview Guide for Qualitative Pre-Study	. 102
Appendix B. Questionnaire for Quantitative Study (adapted from Kock, 2021)	. 103
Appendix C. US vs. DK Study: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	.107
Appendix D. US vs. DK Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters	.107
Appendix E. US vs. DK Study: US Sample - Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	. 108
Appendix F. US vs. DK Study: DK Sample - Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	. 109
Appendix G. Adjusted R squared	.110
Appendix H. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	, .111
Appendix I. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters	.112
Appendix J. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	.112
Appendix K. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Adjusted R squared	.113
Appendix L. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Factor Loadings, Composit Reliability and Average Variance Extracted	te .114
Appendix M. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters	.115
Appendix N. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio	o .115

Appendix O. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Adjusted R squared......116

List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Structure of the Thesis (Own Elaboration)10
Figure 2: Visualization of Gap in Research Areas (Own Elaboration)
Figure 3: Destination Coolness Scale and Behavioral and Attitudinal Outcomes (Kock, 2021)30
Figure 4: Conceptual Model of the Neighborhood Coolness Scale (Adapted from Kock, 2021)31
Figure 5: Overview of our Hypotheses
Figure 6: Theoretical Model
Figure 7: Structural Equation Modelling after Elimination of Invalid and Unreliable Items64
Figure 8: Structural Equation Modelling of US only and DK only Samples
Figure 9: Structural Model of Study about Dimensions on Willingness to Pay74
Figure 10: Structural Model of Study about Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection76
Figure 11: Final Neighborhood Coolness Scale and Behavioral and Attitudinal Outcomes (Own
Elaboration)91

Table 1: Items and their Sources (Own Elaboration)	
Table 2: Demographics of the Participants	
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Total Sample (N=441)	57
Table 4: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE)	60
Table 5: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters	62
Table 6: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)	63
Table 7: Adjusted R ² Values	65
Table 8: Overview of the Results of Hypotheses Testing	67

List of Abbreviations

AVE	Average Variance Extracted
CR	Composite Reliability
CSI	Citizen Satisfaction Index
DK	Denmark
HTMT	Heterotrait-Monotrait
ITS	Intention to Stay
PLS	Partial Least Square
MTurk	Mechanical Turk
PLS-SEM	Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling
SEM	Structural Equation Modeling
US	United States
WOM	Word of Mouth
WTP	Willingness to Pay
QOL	Quality of Life

Abstract

The purpose of this master's thesis is to understand how residents perceive the coolness of the neighborhood they live in and how neighborhood coolness impacts their attitudes and behaviors. To get a better understanding of neighborhood coolness from the resident perspective, the authors conducted qualitative pre-study interviews with residents from Copenhagen. Using these findings, the authors developed a quantitative questionnaire, which was completed by 441 residents from Denmark and the United States. The data was then analyzed with Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling. The authors find that residents perceive cool neighborhoods to be local, lively, diverse, aesthetic, green and safe. The authors developed a reliable and valid neighborhood coolness scale. Neighborhood coolness positively influences behavioral and attitudinal outcome variables such as like, satisfaction, quality of life, word of mouth, intention to stay, willingness to pay more, local business support, community engagement, neighborhood-self connection and residents' support of tourism. Post-hoc analyses have been conducted on country differences and the direct impact of dimensions on outcome variables. This study makes theoretical contributions to the research areas of coolness, residents, and tourism. The results of the paper offer valuable insights for decision-makers on how residents perceive cool neighborhoods to live in and recommendations which can be used to create cool neighborhoods.

Keywords: Neighborhood Coolness, Residents, Coolness, Neighborhood Coolness Scale, Scale Development, Resident Behavior, Quality of Life, Neighborhood-Self Connection, Resident Satisfaction

Acknowledgements

We would like to give special thanks to our thesis supervisor Professor Florian Kock, Associate Professor of Marketing, Tourism and Hospitality Management at the Copenhagen Business School, for his great support during all the phases of our Master's thesis. Furthermore, we would like to thank our coolness research group of the 'Students involved in Research' Initiative at the Copenhagen Business School for the discussions that we had during the last months. We are thankful for the funding by Copenhagen Business School through the 'Students involved in Research' Initiative to be able to extend our quantitative study with a paid sample through Amazon MTurk. Thank you to the participants of our interviews for being open with telling us about their perception of cool neighborhoods as well as to the participants of the survey. Lastly, we would like to thank our friends and family for giving us emotional support during those challenging months of writing the thesis.

1. Introduction

A neighborhood "remains the most basic environmental unit in which our social lives occur, and it necessarily affects the quality of life of residents" (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008, p. 620).

Coolness is often used by the average person and media outlets to describe the places where we live and that we visit. For instance, since 2018 the global media and hospitality brand, TimeOut, has released a list of the "world's coolest neighborhoods" every year. TimeOut remarks that "cool' is probably the most subjective quality going" (TimeOut, n.d.). This was the case, until Kock (2021) developed a destination coolness scale, which establishes an understanding of what the coolness of a city means, from a tourist perspective. Kock (2021) proposes examining destination coolness from other perspectives, which will be undertaken in the current study. Through an examination of existing literature within the fields of coolness, tourism, and resident-related topics, the authors identify a research gap of the concept of coolness through the lens of a resident, which we seek to contribute to.

Amidst the hustle and bustle of daily life, the profound significance of an individuals' surroundings on their well-being and mental health is frequently disregarded (Cutrona et al., 2006). A neighborhood's quality plays a significant role, as the lack of accessible resources such as hospitals, reliable public transportation, and retail stores has been associated with heightened stress levels and even depression (Cutrona et al., 2006). Studies have shown that residents exhibit greater satisfaction in, for instance, low-density areas (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008; Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022) characterized by high levels of social cohesion (Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022) and abundant access to parks and green spaces (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008; Zenker et al., 2013; Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022). For residents, the ability to choose a cool, attractive neighborhood may not, however, be a possibility. In the US, given rising cost of living and urbanization, people are often moving to neighborhoods on the outskirts of cities tokened as "up-and-coming", that usually indicate a trade-off of living in a neighborhood with, for example, higher crime rates and lower-rated schools, for affordable housing nearby to a city (de Jong, 2019). Perhaps it is also the case that these new neighborhoods have not been able to successfully attract local businesses and public transportation options may also not yet be available. These new areas are typically characterized by real estate developments; in the US, it was estimated that 420,000 new rental apartments were built in 2022, accounting for the highest amount of construction in decades, however, while this growth likely seeks to address the troubles of urbanization, it has also prompted a nickname of "America, the bland" (Kodé, 2023). Considering the profound significance of an individual's surroundings on their wellbeing and mental health, as well as the challenges faced by residents moving to up-and-coming neighborhoods, it may appear daunting for policymakers, and real estate developers, for instance, to address these issues. But what if the same concept we use to explain the next fashion trend, or the newest rapper on the scene, namely coolness, could be part of the answer? Could the notion of "coolness" potentially hold the key to transforming neighborhoods and enhancing residents' well-being?

This present thesis seeks to understand what constitutes coolness of a neighborhood from a residents' point of view and how it affects their attitudes and behaviors. Through a qualitative pre-study and subsequent quantitative questionnaire, we find that cool neighborhoods are local, lively, diverse, aesthetic, green and safe. Neighborhood coolness can also make a positive impact on many attitudes and behaviors of residents. For instance, policymakers can increase their residents' well-being through coolness rather than through expensive infrastructure projects. Moreover, city marketeers can increase residents' support of tourism by marketing neighborhoods as lively and youthful. Real estate developments can increase residents' willingness to pay by reframing their 'bland' neighborhoods as cool, by encouraging a sense of community through social events. Local businesses can even contribute to the coolness of a neighborhood and also seek the benefits of residents' support of local businesses. We argue that residents can use their cool neighborhood as a tool to convey a desirable image of themselves to others. We identify this study as having multi-disciplinary implications and find it relevant for many different stakeholders.

1.1 Research Question

We consider the topic of neighborhood coolness as vital to researchers and decision-makers and therefore seek to investigate this concept. Drawing inspiration from Kock's (2021) novel study on destination coolness, we will adopt a similar approach to identify the key components that contribute

to neighborhood coolness from the perspective of residents. By doing so, we aim to create and validate a neighborhood coolness scale that can be used to measure neighborhood coolness and as a tool to create neighborhood coolness. We also seek to quantify the impact that neighborhood coolness has on various, relevant resident attitudes and behaviors, for example neighborhood-self connection, willingness to pay, resident satisfaction and quality of life. The following research question will guide the study:

What constitutes neighborhood coolness from a residents' perspective and how does it affect their behaviors and attitudes?

We began our study in the home to two of the coolest neighborhoods in the world, according to TimeOut (n.d.), Copenhagen, Denmark, to investigate how residents describe their cool and uncool neighborhoods. The results of this qualitative pre-study will be thematically analyzed and developed into a preliminary neighborhood coolness scale. We then tested this scale and quantified the impact that neighborhood coolness has on resident's attitudes and behavior through a quantitative, online questionnaire. A mixed methods approach allows this study to be not only exploratory in nature, but conclusive in providing researchers and practitioners with applicable, empirical findings.

1.2 Structure of Thesis



Figure 1. Structure of the Thesis (Own Elaboration)

The thesis is comprised of eight sections in order to address the research question. After the introduction, we will conduct an extensive review of literature within the fields of coolness, tourism, coolness in tourism and residents. Next, we will present the guiding conceptual framework of the

study, namely Kock's (2021) destination coolness scale and the hypotheses that we have developed to understand the impact of neighborhood coolness. In section three, the methodological choices made in the study will be discussed, namely, the philosophy of science and our chosen research strategy. We will describe the methods used for our qualitative study and analyze the results of this study which contributed to the development of our quantitative study. After we discuss the methods of the quantitative study, we will present the results of the quantitative study. Thereafter, we will interpret and discuss these results. The authors will outline the theoretical and managerial contributions of the study. We will then present the limitations of the study and suggest future research topics of relevance from the current work. Lastly, the authors will make concluding remarks on the research project.

2. Literature Review

This thesis seeks to investigate residents' perceptions of the coolness of their neighborhood and how this affects their attitudes and behaviors within their neighborhood. In identifying the necessity of this research, the authors conducted a review of existing literature within the domains of coolness and residents. We also saw a connection to tourism research, given the focus on local residents in this domain and as it provides insights into the perceptions individuals develop about places and their resulting behavior. Through a review of literature in these fields, the authors have identified a gap in literature. We see a connection between research on coolness and tourism, and on tourism and residents, however there is no connection between coolness and residents. In the following section, the authors will highlight some relevant research in this field, that led to the discovery of this gap and therefore presents the relevance of the current study.

Firstly, the authors will discuss existing literature on coolness, namely, research which seeks to understand how coolness perceptions of personalities, brands, and products are conceptualized. Then the authors will elaborate on relevant research within the field of tourism, namely destination image, destination self-congruency, and destination personality. Coolness has become a popular topic within tourism research in the last few years, and the authors will therefore present the existing literature in this niche field. We will then focus specifically on residents, firstly examining literature on this group within the field of tourism. Lastly, we will present research on how residents develop perceptions of their neighborhood and how their surroundings affect their attitudes and behaviors, such as citizen satisfaction.

2.1 Coolness

The challenge of coolness research is well reflected in Kock's (2021) statement, that says "[w]hile almost every layperson knows when things are cool or uncool (i.e., easy to judge), people struggle, including researchers, to clearly articulate what coolness is and what it derives from (i.e., hard to define)" (p. 1) and thereby emphasizing the need to conceptualize coolness. In order to understand the concept of coolness, we will discuss studies conducted in this research area in different contexts such as cool personalities and cool brands, as well as the dynamics and subjectivity of the concept of

coolness.

Dar-Nimrod et al. (2012) were some of the first researchers to conduct a quantitative study on coolness of personality traits. With the aim of operationalizing the concept of cool and investigating the overlap with social desirability, Dar-Nimrod et al. (2012) examined cool personalities from a psychological perspective. First, the researchers asked participants to describe coolness in their own words. The insights show that participants judge coolness based on perceptions of positivity and social desirability (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012). Then participants were asked to rate the attributes that were developed from the previous study and existing literature on a scale of 'much more cool' to 'much more socially desirable' (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012). In the final study, friends of the participants were asked to evaluate the participants on their coolness on previously identified categories about their personality (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012). The findings show that the coolness descriptors either capture cachet coolness referring to more socially desirable than cool attributes or contrarian coolness referring to more cool than socially desirable attributes (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012). This reflects two personality orientations of coolness, cachet coolness meaning "active, status-promoting, socially desirable characteristics" (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012, p. 175) and contrarian coolness referring to "coolness as more opaque, less active, and less engaged" (Dar-Nimrod et al., 2012, p. 180).

However, Warren and Campbell (2014) were more so interested in researching coolness from a product branding perspective. In an experimental study, they tested how perceived coolness and autonomy relate to each other in the context of hedonic products and found that autonomous brands or people that vary from the norm are perceived cool (Warren & Campbell, 2014). They define coolness as "a subjective and dynamic, socially constructed positive trait attributed to cultural objects (people, brands, products, trends, etc.) inferred to be appropriately autonomous" (Warren & Campbell, 2014, p. 544). Further, Warren and Campbell (2014) implicate that aiming for a cool image is more suitable for niche brands, because a mass brand is contradicting with an autonomous brand. An important conclusion of the study is that consumers choose cool brands if they want to stand out instead of fitting in (Warren & Campbell, 2014). This insight shows that people choose cool brands to reflect a certain image of themselves.

In an attempt to better understand the creation and management of cool brands, Warren et al. (2019) conceptualized brand coolness and developed a scale with ten characteristics that differentiate cool

from uncool brands. The scale characteristics are 'extraordinary', 'aesthetically appealing', 'energetic', 'original', 'authentic', 'rebellious', 'high status', 'subcultural', 'iconic', and 'popular' (Warren et al., 2019), which are derived from their qualitative pre-study and existing research. The more of these characteristics that apply to a brand, the cooler that brand appears to be (Warren et al., 2019). Warren et al. (2019) also examined how brand coolness relates to brand personality, self-brand connection, willingness to pay (WTP), brand attitude, brand love and word of mouth (WOM) and found that self-brand connection and brand love serve as mediators of brand coolness on WTP, WOM and brand attitudes.

While Warren et al. (2019) developed a general brand coolness scale, the scale with its specific dimensions is not applicable to all types of brands as the studies about coolness of alcoholic drinks (Nancarrow et al., 2001) or of technological products (Sundar et al., 2014) demonstrate. Nancarrow et al. (2001) found in their qualitative study about coolness of alcoholic drinks, that this category's coolness is built on 'ritual', 'exclusivity', 'authenticity', and 'understated marketing' and argue it is crucial to understand coolness perceptions across generations. In the context of technology, Sundar et al. (2014) studied how coolness of technological products can be conceptualized. In their study, they asked participants from the US, China, and Korea to rate the coolness of technological devices based on items of four dimensions, namely 'subculture', 'attractive', 'utility', and 'originality' (Sundar et al., 2014). Sundar et al. (2014) found that 'subculture', 'attractiveness', and 'originality' are the biggest players in constituting cool technological products, whereas 'utility' plays a subordinate role. Further, they demonstrated that these coolness dimensions can be useful to target respective customers.

Many researchers emphasize coolness as being of a dynamic and subjective nature. Gladwell (1997) examined the dynamics of coolness in the fashion industry and stressed the rapidly shifting perceptions of coolness of styles and brands. To follow up with the dynamic changes, 'cool hunters' get inspired by those people that are ahead of the average consumer and setting the trend of the next cool style (Gladwell, 1997). Further, these cultural intermediaries allow researchers to understand how coolness develops, because they exemplify coolness before it reaches the mass market (Bourdieu, 1984, as cited in Nancarrow et al., 2001). Building up on these dynamics, Warren et al. (2019) explain that brands can change from being uncool to niche cool to mass cool and vice versa. This means that brands are attributed to different groups of people (subcultures to mass markets)

along the different phases of the coolness cycle (Warren et al., 2019). However, many studies (Warren et al., 2019; Belk et al., 2015; Sundar et al., 2014) highlight that if cool brands start to target the mass market, brands risk becoming less differentiable from other brands, therefore becoming uncool.

Researchers have emphasized the subjectivity of coolness (Warren & Campbell, 2014). The study of Belk et al. (2015) exemplifies the cultural differences in perceptions of coolness as they analyzed qualitative data from citizens of the US and Finland and concluded "that the status that coolness conveys is not a universal currency that can be used anywhere" (Belk et al., 2015, p. 201). In both sample groups, themes such as "rap music, jazz, extreme sports, sunglasses, *The Matrix* (film), trendy clothes, expensive and trendy brands, tattoos, smoking, drugs, and alcohol" (Belk et al., 2015, p. 196) were considered cool. While informants from the US often equated coolness with rebelliousness in the interviews, Finnish informants described coolness perceived within Finland more so as the opposite of rebellious (Belk et al., 2015). Differences in coolness perceptions are not only observable in cultural contexts, but also generationally, as research about cool hotel brands by Chen et al. (2023) shows. The Baby Boomers' perceived coolness levels of certain hotel brands were lower than younger generations such as Gen Z, Millennials and Gen X (Chen et al., 2023). Both findings stress the subjectivity of coolness perceptions corresponding to the outlined limitations and future research suggestions by researchers, that stress varying coolness perceptions depending on culture (Belk et al., 2015), and generations (Chen et al., 2023).

The previous papers show that coolness can be viewed from different phenomena but also highlights how dynamic and subjective the concept of coolness is. This shows the necessity for further research in new contexts of coolness.

2.2 Tourism

In this section we present papers regarding destination image, self-congruity and destination personality to understand how tourists perceive a destination, which will serve as an inspiration for this thesis in understanding how people perceive places.

2.2.1 Destination Image

Since the aim of our study is to develop a neighborhood coolness scale, it is crucial to understand how destination [neighborhood] image is formed and how it impacts behaviors and attitudes. Many researchers contributed to the research area of destination image and its influence on travelers' behavior (Dolnicar & Grün, 2013), of which some will be presented in this section.

To understand how destination images are formed Baloglu and McCleary (1999) propose a model with two factors, namely personal and stimulus factors, which influence the destination image. Personal factors refer to psychological and social factors, whereas stimulus factors include previous experiences and physical elements (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). The destination image itself is evaluated on two levels – the perceptual/cognitive and affective level (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). More specifically, knowledge and beliefs from different sources of information about attributes of a destination are covered on the perceptual/cognitive level, and feelings relate to the affective level (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Baloglu and McCleary (1999) conducted a quantitative study by asking respondents to answer questions e.g., perceptual cognitive/perceptual evaluations, affective evaluations and sociopsychological travel motivations about Italy, Egypt, Greece and Turkey, where only answers of those participants that have not been to the country in question were analyzed to capture destination image without travel experience to that country. The variables were measured on different scales to capture the results accurately. The study findings show that perceptual/cognitive evaluations are impacted by type of information source, age and education level, whereas affective evaluations are impacted by perceptual/cognitive evaluations and sociopsychological tourism motivations (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999).

In general, destination image can be viewed "as the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of a destination" (Crompton, 1979, p. 18). Crompton (1979) investigated how US participants' destination image of Mexico relates to their travel decision making. Apart from the participants' concerns like safety and sanitation during the decision-making process, the main finding of the study is, that destination images are specific to a person and destination (Crompton, 1979). As the destination experience plays a large role in destination image construction, it is crucial for destination managers to promote positive attributes about a destination to outweigh attributes from negative experiences (Crompton, 1979).

Another interesting theoretical contribution to destination image is offered by Kock et al. (2016) by introducing the destination content model with the aim to understand tourists' mental representations of destinations and their decision-making. The model covers the components destination image, destination imagery and destination affect, and outcome variables such as WTP, willingness to travel and WOM were tested (Kock et al., 2016). While destination image is considered to be "individual's overall evaluative representation of a destination" (Josiassen et al., 2015, p. 791), destination imagery is "an individual's or a group of individuals' diverse cognitive and affective associations relating to a destination" (Josiassen et al., 2015, p. 792). The main difference between the constructs is that destination image is evaluative whereas destination imagery is descriptive. The third component, namely destination affect refers to "an individual's overall affect attributed to a destination" (Kock et al., 2016, p. 33). Kock et al. (2016) first gathered insights about associations of two countries (Germany and Spain) in qualitative in-depth interviews. In a subsequent quantitative study, destination image, destination imagery, destination affect as well as the before mentioned outcome variables were tested. The results show that tourist behavior is impacted by destination image, which is driven by destination imagery (Kock et al., 2016). Aligning with Crompton's (1979) findings, Kock et al. (2016) stress that in case a tourist attributes a negative characteristic to a destination, managers need to "weaken the link (associated strength) between the attribute and the destination or increasing its favorability (association valence)" (p. 42). Interestingly, an unfavorable association attributed to Spain was 'touristy' (Kock et al., 2016) – which we assume to be an unfavorable attribute for residents of a neighborhood as well.

The presented studies propose different angles to understand destination image and to derive decision-making to attract tourists. This is relevant to this thesis because the formation of destination image helps to understand how people develop perceptions about destinations and how they impact peoples' behaviors and attitudes, which can be applied to the neighborhood context.

2.2.2 Destination Self-Congruity

Strongly connected with destination image is the concept of destination self-congruity, which refers to the match of destination's visitor image and tourist's self-concept (Sirgy & Su, 2000). The destination visitor image is influenced by controllable elements of destination, price, promotion and

location, while personal characteristics of tourists are uncontrollable (Sirgy & Su, 2000). Sirgy et al. (2000) explain that "[p]roduct symbolic cues refer to stereotypic images of users of a product or store (e.g., sexy, classy, fashionable, young). The same can be said in relation to a tourist's attitude toward a destination (and travel behavior)" (Sirgy & Su, 2000, p. 340). Sirgy & Su (2000) point out that utilitarian and functional attributes may impact tourists' evaluations of destinations.

2.2.3 Destination Personality

Considering the increasing competitiveness in the tourism sector and the need to understand destination branding, Ekinci and Hosany (2006) examined how destination personality is formed. Derived from Aaker's (1997) brand personality definition, Ekinci and Hosany (2006) define the personality of destinations as "the set of human characteristics associated with a destination" (p. 6). The original brand personality scale by Aaker (1997) consists of five dimensions, 'sincerity', 'excitement', 'competence', 'sophistication' and 'ruggedness'. Ekinci and Hosany (2006) apply two of these dimensions - 'sincerity' and 'excitement' - to their destination personality scale. In addition, 'conviviality' has been added as a third dimension to capture tourist-specific items (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006). With a British sample, they tested the influence of the dimensions on variables such as cognitive image, affective image and intention to recommend, and found that only the 'conviviality' dimension is statistically significant and that intention to recommend and destination image is influenced by destination personality (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006). Considering that "cultural variations are one of the main causes of the differences in individuals' attitudes and behaviors" (Pan et al., 2017, p. 345), Pan et al. (2017) developed and tested a destination personality scale in a different cultural context with a sample of participants from China. Their study resulted in five dimensions, namely excitement (Aaker, 1997; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006), competence (Aaker, 1997), and three new dimensions: 'femininity', 'sacredness', 'vibrancy' (Pan et al., 2017).

In short, the presented destination scales can provide us a perspective of how people conceptualize the personality of a place. The findings show that the personality of brands and destinations cannot be viewed the same, and there are cultural differences highlighting the necessity of adapting scales to different context.

2.3 Coolness and Tourism

As discussed earlier by the authors, the research area of coolness has begun to develop in the last decade, but that being said there are still many phenomena that have little to no existing research in the context of coolness. Kock (2021) indicates that the coolness of a destination cannot be examined through, for instance, existing brand coolness models, as "destinations are complex amalgams of different components such as residents, architecture or culture" (p. 3). This aligns with for instance, the findings of Ekinci and Hosany (2006), in which the brand personality scale needed to be altered in order to conceptualize destination personality. The researchers will now examine the research that has been conducted in this niche field of coolness and tourism.

To our best knowledge, Chen and Chou's (2019) study on the antecedents and consequences of perceived coolness in creative tourism experiences was the first study to focus on the concepts of coolness and tourism in conjunction. They tested the effect that 'uniqueness', 'identification', and 'attractiveness' of creative tourism experiences had on tourists' perceived coolness, as well as, whether this perceived coolness had an impact on tourists' satisfaction, place attachment and destination loyalty (Chen & Chou, 2019). Chen and Chou (2019) found that all the three antecedents studied positively impacted the tourists' perceived coolness of the experience. Tourists' satisfaction and place attachment are directly and positively impacted by perceived coolness; however, this is not the case for destination loyalty (Chen & Chou, 2019). Instead, the impact of tourists' perceived coolness on destination loyalty is mediated by tourist satisfaction and place attachment (Chen & Chou, 2019). These authors proposed that based on their study the concept of perceived coolness is core to any tourist experience (Chen & Chou, 2019), highlighting the need for an expansion of the concept in coolness research.

Building off prior findings from coolness research (Warren & Campbell, 2014; Dar Nimrod et al., 2019; Warren et al., 2019), Loureiro and Blanco (2023) analyzed coolness in another tourism context, that of museum experiences (designated as museum coolness). The authors tested ten dimensions of museum coolness and found all dimensions to contribute to the concept, but five dimensions to be the most important in the development of this coolness measure, namely 'aesthetic', 'authentic', 'energetic', 'high status', and 'useful' (Loureiro & Blanco, 2023). Loureiro and Blanco (2023) additionally examined the association of atmospheric cues, authentic pride, and passionate desire to

revisit with museum coolness. The authors found that atmospheric cues, specifically design, have a significant impact on museum coolness (Loureiro & Blanco, 2023). Authentic pride has proved to be a significant outcome of museum coolness, and passionate desire to revisit is a function of both authentic pride and museum coolness (Loureiro & Blanco, 2023).

2.3.1 Destination Coolness

Kock (2021) highlights that a validated instrument that can measure the characteristics of destination coolness and quantify its effects on tourist behavior is missing from the academic world, leading to his research paper, "What makes a city cool? Understanding destination coolness and its implications for tourism". This research sought to gain a rudimental understanding of how tourists characterize coolness and the effect of a cool destination on tourist behavior. Through qualitative and quantitative studies, this destination coolness scale has been both empirically developed and validated. It can reliably distinguish between cool and uncool cities from a tourist perspective (Kock, 2021). Kock (2021) concludes that tourists perceive cool cities as authentic, rebellious, original and vibrant. However, he finds that cities do not need to fulfil every one of these dimensions in order to be considered cool (Kock, 2021). Further contributing to the research area, Kock (2021) concludes that perceived coolness positively contributes to tourist decision-making related to that destination, for instance it was found to positively impact intention to visit and actual visit behavior, likeliness to recommend, and result in a higher willingness to pay. The results also indicate that tourists perceive cool cities as providing a higher social return. Based on Escalas and Bettman's (2005) city-self connection concept, Kock (2021) tests and confirms that tourists are considerably more likely to identify and connect with a cool city.

The findings also indicate that coolness is an unambiguous, positive trait of a city, indicating the importance of studying it from a tourist perspective (Kock, 2021), and we suggest also from a resident point of view. Chen and Chou (2019) suppose that coolness is more important to younger tourists, however based on the studies by Kock (2021), it is found that coolness is not less important to older tourists. Kock (2021) additionally found that gender does not impact the importance of coolness for tourists, further contradicting prior research by Jackson and Dempster (2009) that equates coolness

and masculinity. Kock's (2021) findings illustrate that there could also perhaps be a compensatory effect in that those with lower autonomy may have a stronger appeal to visit cool cities.

2.4 Residents

The focal element of the current study is to understand the perspectives of residents and their perceptions of the neighborhoods they inhabit. Therefore, the authors conducted a review of literature on residents and their neighborhoods.

2.4.1 Residents and Tourism

According to Nunkoo and So (2016), "residents' support for tourism is one of the most systematically documented areas in tourism" (p. 857). There is an extensive list of economic, social and psychological benefits and costs that have been associated with the development of tourism to local communities. For instance, Lin et al. (2017) pointed out that tourism can create economic benefits, such as greater employment opportunity, higher income and standards of living, however it can also contribute negatively to the community with a rise in price of goods, services, and property. Monterrubio (2016) identified some social costs of tourism, such as traffic congestion, litter, noise, crime, drug use, alcohol consumption, prostitution, migration, social stratification, overcrowding and reduced local outdoor recreation opportunities. However, regarding recreation opportunities, Lin et al. (2017) argued that tourism presents the opportunity for communities to "upgrade infrastructure, recreation facilities such as parks, theaters, and others, and to provide more cultural events such as movies, concerts, and sports games" (p. 438). Therefore, identifying whether residents will support tourism in their communities is not necessarily straightforward. Because resident support has been identified as crucial for tourism to thrive (Bimonte & Punzo, 2016), much research has been conducted on how residents come to support tourism and how tourism affects residents' lives.

In Ap's (1992) novel, explanatory research into residents' perceptions towards tourism impacts, he developed a theoretical paradigm that served as a base for the research that has followed in this domain. Ap (1992) applied the model of social exchange theory to understand the development of a

resident's disposition to tourism; setting the tone for many researchers that followed, including but not limited to: Ap and Crompton (1993), Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) and Bimonte and Punzo (2016). Ap's (1992) framework assumes that residents are willing to contribute to local tourism to improve the economic, social, and psychological well-being of the residents. The resident must find the exchange relationship to be rewarding, reciprocal and fair to develop positive perceptions toward tourism in their community (Ap, 1992). He also suggested that there must be a balance of power between the residents and the tourists/tourism for positive perceptions toward tourism to be made (Ap, 1992). Ap and Crompton (1993) proposed that a resident's disposition will likely change over time and can be unique to individuals of the same community. They presented a continuum of residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal, depending on the incoming tourists' numbers and behavior (Ap & Crompton, 1993).

2.4.1.1 Residents' Quality of Life

Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) argued that while implied in previous research (Ap, 1992) that tourism influences resident's quality of life (QOL), there were no direct studies of tourism's impact on residents QOL and the effect of this QOL on residents' support of tourism. Although such assumptions had been made to date, the majority of research on QOL had focused on tourists and neglected the local communities (Nawijn & Mitas, 2012). Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) additionally argued that this research sets itself apart as it considers how tourism affects the individuals in a community, while most prior attitude/impact studies have often asked individuals how tourism affects their communities. The research contributed to the area by developing a measurement tool, Tourism and Quality of Life measure, that not only measures how an individual feels that tourism impacts an attribute of their life/community, but whether this attribute is important to them in their subjective perception of their QOL (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011).

Nawijn and Mitas (2012) argued that while Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) include well-being related items in their study, these items "addressed the 'way of life' of the respondent rather than how the respondents felt or how satisfied they were with their lives" (Nawijn & Mitas, 2012, p. 532). However, Nawijn and Mitas (2012), were interested in studying the effect tourism has on the well-

being and life satisfaction of the host community; specifically looking at subjective wellbeing (SWB), "a reflection of how we generally feel and an indicator of whether certain needs are gratified (cf. Diener & Lucas, 2000; Maslow, 1943; Veenhoven, 2009)" (as cited in Nawijn & Mitas, 2012, p. 532). The study considered the components of SWB, namely the hedonic level (affective) and life satisfaction (cognitive). At the time of the research, there was little known about the influence of external factors, like living environment, on individuals SWB (Nawijn & Mitas, 2012), presenting a contribution to many research domains. Nawijn and Mitas (2012) find through their research on the island of Mallorca, that perceived tourism impacts affect the cognitive component of SWB. Conversely for tourists, tourism is strongly associated with the affective component of SWB (hedonic level) (Nawijn & Mitas, 2012).

Uysal et al. (2016) conducted a review of all existing literature and research into the domain of tourism and QOL, from both the perspective of the resident and tourist. Of the thirty-five works of literature focused on residents that the authors reviewed, including Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) and Nawijn and Mitas (2012), the majority of the studies found a significant association between tourism impacts and resident's QOL (Uysal et al., 2016). Research has found that residents generally recognize the positive economic impact of tourism but are more so concerned by the potentially negative social and environmental impact (Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990; Perdue, Long, & Kang, 1995, as cited in Uysal et al., 2016). The authors concluded from their review that not all residents perceive tourism's impact and the impact on their QOL the same, aligning with the discussed findings of Ap and Crompton (1993). Additionally, they concluded that the residents' attitude towards and its perceived effect on QOL vary based on the level of development of tourism in their community. Specifically, the degree of development is negatively correlated with their attitude (Uysal et al., 2016).

2.4.1.2 Destination Image and Residents

While residents/host communities are quite well-researched in tourism, there is lacking research on the effect of the interactions that residents and tourists have on destination image (Stylidis, 2022). Stylidis (2022) studied the impact that residents and tourism employees, and specifically their

interaction quality with tourists, have on tourists' destination image in tourist destinations. Interaction between residents and tourists was found to positively affect tourists' cognitive and affective image (in one destination), and conative image, including their WOM (Stylidis, 2022). While not directly correlated to the present study, this research contributes to theory by incorporating residents into the development of destination image. Given that residents impact the destination image of tourists, it is interesting to consider that residents likely impact the destination image of a neighborhood to other residents and of potential residents.

The current, expansive research on residents within the context of tourism presents how important these stakeholders are within this industry. For instance, residents' QOL, well-being, and satisfaction can allow the tourism industry to thrive. The research also provides the authors with an understanding of how residents perceive aspects of their communities and what aspects are important to them.

2.4.2 Residents and Their Neighborhoods

While the afore-reviewed literature focuses on residents through the lens of tourism, a review of literature solely focused on residents is necessary for the present study. Research into the topic of residents and their surroundings (neighborhood, community, etc.) stretch across disciplines; a large proportion of research is within the area of public health (Oakes et al., 2015) and environmental psychology (Zenker & Rütter, 2014). That being said, the authors have contained the review of literature to what was viewed as most relevant given the scope and research area of the present study – this includes citizen satisfaction, and the perceptions residents have about their community, thereby place image.

2.4.2.1 Citizen Satisfaction and Livability

Hur and Morrow-Jones (2008) considered the factors that influence residents' satisfaction with their neighborhood by testing the following factors' influence on neighborhood satisfaction: 'safety from crime', 'local government service', 'cleanliness', 'trees', 'pedestrian access to stores', 'traffic', 'racial composition', 'distance to work', 'distance to family and friends', 'access to recreational

opportunities', 'proximity to problem areas', 'general appearance', 'density of housing'. Behaviors affecting neighborhood satisfaction, namely interaction by communication, interaction through favors and interaction through social activity were also researched. Based on the data collected, Hur and Murrow-Jones (2008) separated the responses into those living in satisfactory neighborhoods (respondents in these neighborhoods, on average, are satisfied) and those living in unsatisfactory neighborhoods (respondents in these neighborhoods, on average, are not satisfied). There was found to be differences in the factors which make a neighborhood to be satisfactory or unsatisfactory (Hur & Murrow-Jones, 2008). The most important factor in neighborhoods, 'density of housing' is the second most significant factor (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008). Interaction by social activity was the most significant social interaction factor in satisfactory neighborhoods. For unsatisfactory neighborhoods, 'safety from crime', 'racial composition', 'proximity to problem areas' were the most significant influences on neighborhood satisfaction. And for these unsatisfactory neighborhoods, no social interaction factors are significant (Hur & Morrow-Jones, 2008).

Zenker et al. (2013) argued that at the time of their research, an expansive amount of research in the area had resulted in conflicting tools – if cities needed to be evaluated or compared, the results differed entirely based on the scale used. Therefore, Zenker et al. (2013) developed one comprehensive measurement tool to evaluate and compare cities on satisfaction of living, using existing scales, as well as qualitative interviews. Zenker et al. (2013) created the Citizen Satisfaction Index (CSI), an item pool of 21 variables of citizen satisfaction and additionally established a conceptual framework for citizen satisfaction based on four dimensions of place satisfaction: 'urbanity & diversity', 'nature & recreation', 'job opportunities', and 'cost efficiency'. 'Urbanity & diversity' had the strongest impact on citizen satisfaction and refers to whether a place is open to many different cultures and whether a place has a metropolitan character, for example having a wide range of cultural and leisure activities, while 'nature & recreation' refers to low pollution, parks and open spaces, and the tranquility of a place (Zenker et al., 2013). 'Job opportunities' and the 'cost-efficiency' did not have a direct, significant impact on citizen satisfaction, but were included by the authors due to their influence on citizens' perceptions of the other dimensions and other place-related topics (Zenker et al., 2013).

Zenker and Rütter (2014) then utilized this afore-mentioned CSI model by Zenker et al. (2013) to

understand some of the effects of citizen satisfaction on place attachment, citizens attitude towards a place, and positive citizenship behavior. Their findings were that citizen satisfaction is the strongest predictor of place attachment, even more so than place of birth and length of residence (Zenker & Rütter, 2014). Additionally, citizen satisfaction has a positive effect on place brand attitude, which is important as both place attachment and place brand attitude decrease citizen intention to leave a place and increase positive WOM about a place (Zenker & Rütter, 2014).

Mouratidis and Yiannakou (2022) studied livability through both neighborhood satisfaction (cognitive evaluations) and neighborhood happiness (affective evaluations), among residents in Thessaloniki, Greece and Oslo, Norway. This study has many similarities to the previous studies reviewed; however, a unique contribution of this study is that it allowed for comparison of neighborhood satisfaction of different cultures and city types. In contrast, Hur and Murrow-Jones (2008) focused on one county in the US and Zenker et al. (2014) focused on one country, Germany. Mouratidis and Yiannakou (2022) tested how physical characteristics of the neighborhood, namely 'distance to city center', 'neighborhood density', 'amenities', 'park areas and tree cover', and perceived neighborhood characteristics, namely 'safety', 'noise', 'social cohesion', and 'neighborhood attachment', affect neighborhood satisfaction and happiness. In both cities the 'proximity to city center', 'safety', and 'neighborhood attachment' were found to be common determinants of neighborhood satisfaction, and 'safety', low 'noise' levels, 'social cohesion', 'neighborhood attachment', and lower 'neighborhood density' were found to be common determinants of neighborhood happiness (Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022). This is interesting given that Hur & Murrow-Jones (2008) found density to be a determinant of neighborhood satisfaction. The research proved that some determinants of livability differed in these two cities, which the authors argue means that livability perceptions are contextual and may differ across cultures (Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022). This is of course a possible explanation, however, these differences could also be in part to the sample being two very different types of cities.

2.4.2.2 Destination Image from a Resident Perspective

While research on destination image is quite extensive in the area of tourism, it is lacking from the perspective of local residents (Stylidis et al, 2016). A resident is likely to have a more complex

perspective of their community than a tourist has, as this is the place where they live, socialize, and often also where they work (Stylidis et al, 2016). Stylidis et al. (2016) developed a measurement tool that captures this complex nature by combining destination-specific attributes (commonly used in tourist destination image models) and community-specific attributes that relate to community satisfaction. This measurement tool consists of four dimensions: 'physical appearance', 'community services', 'social environment', and 'entertainment opportunities' (Stylidis et al., 2016). The 'community services' dimension, consisting of effective local government, local services, transportation, and job opportunities, was the most important dimension for local residents in the development of their place image (Stylidis et al., 2016). Consistent with tourist place image, it was found that residents of the tourist place also value the importance of an aesthetically appealing environment, as well as one that is safe, friendly, and clean (Stylidis et al., 2016). However, 'community services' were more important than social environment attributes (safe, friendly, clean) to local residents (Stylidis et al., 2016). 'Entertainment opportunities' were the least important to local residents in the development of their place image (Stylidis et al., 2016). While the authors do note that these specific results are perhaps cultural and suiting this specific tourist place surveyed (Stylidis et al., 2016), this measurement tool provides an understanding and conceptual roadmap of how residents perceive their local communities.

2.6 Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

In Kock's (2021) destination coolness study, he proposed to examine how coolness perceptions may impact residents' attitudes and behaviors towards their own city for future research, which sparked an interest in the researchers. After conducting a thorough literature review, the authors identified a research gap that existed between residents and coolness (see Figure 2). While literature examining coolness in relation to tourism, and tourism in relation to residents exists; to the best of the authors' knowledge, research on residents has never been examined in terms of coolness. The authors found the necessity to not only examine how coolness perceptions can impact residents' attitudes and behaviors, but how residents conceptualize coolness of their own neighborhoods. We proposed that the destination coolness scale cannot explain residents' conceptualization of coolness given the intricacies of coolness and destination perceptions in different contextual settings as seen. Therefore, we will seek to develop a conceptual model, namely the neighborhood coolness scale, from the

perspective of residents and understand the resulting attitudes and behaviors through the testing of hypotheses.



Figure 2: Visualization of Gap in Research Areas (Own Elaboration).

2.6.1 Conceptual Framework

The motivation and execution of the thesis at hand is based on the study conducted by Kock (2021), "*What makes a city cool? Understanding destination coolness and its implications for tourism*", as briefly introduced in Section 2.3.1. We will go more into depth on the development of the destination coolness scale in the following section, as this scale has served as a model for our study. While the aim of Kock's (2021) study was to develop a destination coolness scale from the tourist perspective, we seek to develop a scale for neighborhood coolness from a resident perspective.

2.6.1.1 Destination Coolness Scale

As mentioned before, Kock (2021) developed and validated a destination coolness scale consisting of four dimensions, namely 'authentic', 'rebellious', 'original' and 'vibrant' (see Figure 3). Kock (2021) first conducted in-depth interviews from the US and Germany in order to gather insights of the unexplored research area of destination coolness from which he merged the insights, along with pre-existing literature, into five themes, namely authentic, rebellious, subcultural/original, symbolic

and vibrant. Based on these dimensions and an item pool of 24 destination coolness items, Kock (2021) developed a questionnaire which was tested via MTurk on a sample of US respondents.

After making adjustments to the model for purposes of validity, the scale is comprised of four dimensions and two indicator variables. More specifically, 'authentic', 'doesn't seem artificial' or 'is true to its roots' are included in the 'authentic' dimension (Kock, 2021). The 'rebellious' dimension includes 'nonconformist', 'has evolutionary spirit' and 'edgy' (Kock, 2021). The dimension of 'original' is described with 'original', 'stands apart from the crowd' and 'iconic', whereas the dimensions of 'vibrant' includes items such as 'outgoing', 'vibrant' and 'lively' (Kock, 2021). Kock (2021) also included several outcome variables in this study which proved that cool cities increase tourists' intention to visit, their actual visits, their willingness to recommend the city, and willingness to pay more. In a subsequent nomological analysis (using the same methods as the first study), Kock (2021) tested the effect of destination coolness on further, relevant outcome variables such as social return and city-self connection. Destination coolness positively impacts tourists' city-self connection and their social return, indicating that traveling to cool cities may have a compensatory effect.

This recently developed destination coolness scale does not only contribute to theory in the research area, but also offers practical implications by providing a tool for city managers to understand how to build cool destinations. The applied research design and the four dimensions including their items will serve as a model in the development of the neighborhood coolness scale and will be adapted to the neighborhood context where appropriate.



Figure 3: Destination Coolness Scale and Behavioral and Attitudinal Outcomes (Kock, 2021).

2.6.1.2 Neighborhood Coolness Scale

Upon the pre-study insights and literature review, especially Kock's (2021) study, the authors developed a neighborhood coolness scale consisting of six dimensions, namely 'local', 'lively', 'diverse', 'aesthetic', 'green' and 'safe' (see Figure 4). The dimensions will be introduced in detail in Section 3.4.3 and tested in the quantitative study.

Figure 4: Conceptual Model of the Neighborhood Coolness Scale (Adapted from Kock, 2021).



2.6.2 Hypotheses

As the authors have presumed that neighborhood coolness has an effect on residents' behaviors and attitudes, 14 hypotheses were developed based on the pre-study insights and existing literature (see Figure 5). The hypothesis model consists of one higher-order construct (neighborhood coolness) and ten outcome variables, namely 'like', 'satisfaction', 'word of mouth (WOM)', 'intention to stay (ITS)', 'quality of life (QOL)', 'willingness to pay (WTP)', 'local business support', 'community engagement', 'neighborhood-self connection' and 'residents' support of tourism'. Next, we present the hypotheses which are organized based on the following categories: general behaviors and attitudes (H1-H8), neighborhood-self connection (H9-H11) and residents' support of tourism (H12-H14).

Figure 5: Overview of our Hypotheses.



2.6.2.1 General Behaviors and Attitudes

Kock (2021) shares that tourists like to visit cool cities, and often boring cities struggle to attract tourists. While it was the case that our pre-study informants liked their cool neighborhoods, the researchers also found that residents that said their neighborhood was not cool, still said they liked living here. Therefore, it is of interest to the researchers to understand neighborhood coolness's impact on the likelihood of a resident liking their neighborhood. We hypothesize that:

H1: Neighborhood coolness is positively associated with whether residents like their neighborhood.

Citizen satisfaction has important implications across disciplines, such as community planning, tourism, place marketing and even public health. Therefore, we believe that by studying this variable,

we can increase the contributions of our research. Aligned with the insights discussed in H1, we believe that a resident can likely be satisfied with an uncool neighborhood. Therefore, we would like to test whether neighborhood coolness has an impact on residents' satisfaction with their neighborhood:

H2: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' satisfaction with their neighborhood.

In Kock's (2021) destination coolness findings, coolness had a positive impact of tourists' willingness to recommend the city as a tourist destination. Zenker and Rütter (2014) found that citizen satisfaction increases positive WOM about a place. Based on these findings and H2, we predict that neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on WOM, and therefore we hypothesize:

H3: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' likelihood to recommend their neighborhood to others to live in.

In tourism research, intention to revisit is a less important variable given that tourists tend to prefer to visit new destinations or their likelihood to revisit may be influenced by uncontrollable variables, such as flight delays (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000). However, given that residents' connection to their neighborhood is longer term, it is important to consider their intention to stay. Zenker and Rütter (2014) found that citizen satisfaction decreases citizen intention to leave a place. Thereby, based on H2, the authors hypothesize that:

H4: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' intention to stay in their neighborhood.

We have hypothesized that neighborhood coolness will positively impact citizen satisfaction, but additionally QOL can provide us with even deeper insights as it shows "how an area is doing not only from an objective physical design perspective but also from a subjective human response perspective" (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011, p. 248). QOL has been increasingly researched in the field of tourism, and this study will contribute to QOL research by examining how it is influenced by neighborhood coolness, through the hypothesis:

H5: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perceived quality of life.

Kock (2021) found that destination coolness positively impacts tourists' willingness to pay a higher

price. When we spoke to residents during the pre-study, we found conflicting responses in relation to WTP. Some residents said coolness does positively impact their willingness to pay a higher price, while others attributed their willingness to pay a higher price to more functional attributes, such as proximity to city center or public transportation. Therefore, we seek to investigate this phenomenon in our study, by hypothesizing that:

H6: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' willingness to pay more.

During the pre-study interviews, informants mentioned individual or local shops instead of chains as part of their cool neighborhoods, which leads us to believe that residents of cool neighborhoods may be more likely to support local businesses in their neighborhood. As local businesses can be an important contribution to local economy, we hypothesize:

H7: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' support of local businesses in their neighborhood.

The insights of the pre-study show that the informants have low levels of community engagement in their neighborhoods. This may contradict the community aspects that are created through subcultures in other cities such as the electronic music scenes in Berlin or surf cultures in Sydney as found by Kock (2021). Therefore, we will test whether neighborhood coolness and community engagement have a positive relationship. Thus, we hypothesize:

H8: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' community engagement within their neighborhood.

2.6.2.1 Neighborhood-Self Connection

Building up on Escalas & Bettman's (2005) study, in which they measured self-brand connection with items about self-reflection, identification, self-realization and personal connection in relation with brands, we adapted the following three hypotheses to the neighborhood coolness context, similarly to Kock (2021):

Derived from the original item "This brand reflects who I am" (Escalas & Bettman, 2005, p. 382), which has also been proven to be significant in the destination coolness context (Kock, 2021), we

find it interesting to see if this phenomenon also applies to residents and their cool neighborhood. Thus, we hypothesize:

H9: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of their neighborhood as a reflection of themself.

Based on the results of Kock's (2021) research, that implies the increased likelihood of tourists to identify with cool cities, we hypothesize this effect to be true for residents and their cool neighborhoods as well. Therefore, we will test the following:

H10: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' likelihood to identify with their neighborhood.

Looking at the residents' perceived connection to their neighborhood, we expect to see a positive relationship similarly to destination coolness having a positive effect on tourists' personal connection to the city (Kock, 2021). Thus, we form the hypothesis:

H11: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perceived connection to their neighborhood.

2.6.2.3 Residents' Support of Tourism

Under the assumption that cool neighborhoods attract tourists and in turn local residents are part of the tourist experience, we are interested in examining residents' support of tourism with the following three hypotheses:

We suppose that neighborhood coolness positively influences residents' wellbeing which may increase their likeliness to support tourism, therefore, we hypothesize:

H12: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' support of incoming tourists.

While Uysal et al. (2016) find that tourism affects residents of destination communities in terms of their well-being, regardless of whether they are directly involved in tourism or not, it would be interesting to test if this phenomenon can be found in the neighborhood coolness context as well. So, we developed the following hypothesis:
H13: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life.

Since tourism can also mean improvements of the infrastructure for communities (Lin et al., 2017), we conclude that more opportunities for community life are created through tourism, thus we hypothesize:

H14: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of tourisms' impact on their community life.

3. Methodology

In the following section, the authors will review the methodological considerations that guided our research. We will begin with an examination of the philosophical assumptions underlying the study, followed by a discussion of the chosen research strategy and design. The authors will then introduce the methods and results of our qualitative pre-study, as this was the main input in the development of our quantitative study. Lastly, we will review the methods utilized in our quantitative study.

3.1 Philosophy of Science

The present study seeks to conduct and analyze research in the social sciences area, and therefore it is necessary to understand the philosophical underpinnings of the research (Moon & Blackman, 2014). This allows the researchers to ensure that the results effectively capture the reality that is intended to be captured (Bell et al., 2022). Firstly, ontology represents the nature of reality and specifically whether social phenomenon can be viewed objectively or subjectively based on the meaning that individuals assign to them (Bell et al., 2022). Bell et al. (2022) identify two types of ontological assumptions, objectivism and constructionism. This study employs the constructionist school of thought, in that we suppose neighborhoods are not objectively cool or uncool, but gain their coolness when individuals assign this meaning to them. In Kock's (2021) development of the destination coolness scale, he utilizes the same school of thought based on Warren and Campbell's (2014) definition of coolness, "a subjective and dynamic, socially constructed positive trait attributed to cultural objects (people, brands, products, trends, etc.) inferred to be appropriately autonomous" (p. 544).

While ontology leads to our understanding of reality, epistemology allows for an understanding of how knowledge of this reality can be acquired (Bell et al., 2022). Epistemological assumptions are inferred based upon the ontological assumptions used. An interpretivist epistemology approach, which is assumed in this analysis, allows social researchers to gain an understanding of the subjective meaning of social actions from different people (Bell et al., 2022), considering the belief that multiple realities exist. An interpretivist approach naturally suggests that a research strategy will be inductive and qualitative in order to gain an understanding of human activity and meaning making, however this in not deterministic (Bell at al., 2022). In contrast, a positivist approach is assumed with an

objectivist ontological perspective and is generally employed with deductive and quantitative methods as it seeks to measure phenomena (Bell et al., 2022).

The researchers take on these constructionist and interpretivist philosophical lenses when developing the research strategy for this project, that will be further discussed in the following sections. However, these 'lenses' are not viewed as deterministic. The research strategy and design developed for this study takes a similar structure to that used in Kock's (2021) development of the destination coolness scale.

3.2 Research Strategy

Following the examination of our philosophical underpinnings, the next step in the research process is the identification of the research strategy that will be used, namely whether the study employs qualitative or quantitative methods. A qualitative research study emphasizes words or images, rather than quantification, which is emphasized in a quantitative research study (Bell et al., 2022). A mixed methods study integrates both qualitative and quantitative research (Bell et al., 2022). This strategy of research does not come without opposition as some argue that since qualitative and quantitative research imply different philosophical approaches, the two strategies are incompatible (Bell et al., 2022). However, if these philosophical approaches are not viewed as deterministic, the fusing of these two strategies is both feasible and desirable (Bell et al., 2022). The strategy has become increasingly accepted in social sciences research (Molina-Azorin et al., 2017) and was utilized by Kock (2021) in the development of the destination coolness scale.

Given the aim of the thesis to both develop and test a neighborhood coolness scale, the authors needed to conduct research that was exploratory and conclusive (Singh, 2007), warranting a mixed methods research strategy. The study began with an inductive research approach by conducting an exploratory, qualitative pre-study to generate insights about how residents characterize cool neighborhoods. The researchers focused specifically on the words and phrases that residents used to describe coolness and uncoolness in the context of their neighborhoods, highlighting the suitability for qualitative methods. This is necessary due to the authors' assumptions that residents' conceptualizations of coolness of their neighborhoods would differ from tourists' conceptualizations, similarly to how the destination

image of residents differ to that of tourists (Stylidis et al, 2016). Therefore, it was critical to speak with residents before developing the scale, as if we relied only on existing literature, we believed crucial elements might be missed. Through this inductive research the researchers developed a neighborhood coolness scale and hypotheses on the attitudes and behaviors of residents which were then tested and confirmed through a deductive quantitative study.

By applying a mixed methods research approach, the authors benefit from triangulation (Gibson, 2017) in which the results of the qualitative pre-study (i.e., the neighborhood coolness scale) were evaluated and validated during the data analysis of the quantitative study. This ensures that the findings are not biased by a specific method, which is expected to increase the credibility and generalizability of our findings.

3.3 Research Design

The first step in developing a mixed methods research design is the identification of the sequence and priority of the research. As previously mentioned, the qualitative data collection came first as this allowed for our development of the neighborhood coolness scale. However, the quantitative data collection was viewed as the principal research method, as the major contribution of the study is the testing of the neighborhood coolness scale and confirmation of hypotheses on neighborhood coolness' effect of resident's behaviors and attitudes. This sequence and prioritization are common in the mixed methods research strategy (Bell et al., 2022), and represents an exploratory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011 as cited in Bell et al., 2022). The research design is also cross-sectional in nature, as the qualitative research was conducted first, the time between the data collections is not sufficient to constitute as different time periods. It can also be defined as cross-sectional as it seeks to detect patterns of association (Bell et al., 2022), namely the associations of the dimensions onto neighborhood coolness and neighborhood coolness onto the proposed outcome variables.

We believe that we could best accomplish the aim of our qualitative pre-study through semistructured interviews. Interviews were utilized instead of ethnographic methods, as this research seeks to establish common patterns or themes amongst participants (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001) about their perceptions of neighborhood coolness. Additionally, interviews were chosen over focus groups due to their ability to gain deeper insights (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001). The researchers chose to use a semi-structured interview format, as this will provide a structure for the interview, while also allowing the researchers to follow up on the responses of the informants (Bell et al., 2022). While this study represents primary data collection, the data was supplemented with secondary data, namely existing literature that has been previously discussed in Section 2. The authors will go into more depth on the sampling and data collection of these interviews in Section 3.4.

The aim of our quantitative study was to evaluate how well the neighborhood coolness scale developed from our pre-study was able to measure neighborhood coolness, as well as to measure the effect neighborhood coolness had on selected outcome variables. In order to accomplish this, the authors chose to utilize a self-completion questionnaire. A self-completion questionnaire presents certain challenges in comparison to quantitative structure interviews, for instance the researchers are unable to address any lack of understanding the respondents have and are unable to probe respondents further on any responses (Bell et al., 2022). Additionally, there is a greater risk associated with respondent fatigue, as respondents can easily drop out of the questionnaire without finishing it (Bell et al., 2022). However, by using self-completion questionnaires we avoid the problem of interviewer variability (Bell et al., 2022), enhancing validity. They are also quicker to administer (Bell et al., 2022) especially considering the researchers chose to administer the survey online, which was important given the scope of this thesis and allowed the researchers to gain a larger sample size. The authors will discuss more on the sampling and the data collection of the online self-completion questionnaire in Section 3.5.

The quality of our research design can be accessed by examining the reliability, replicability, and validity (Bell et al., 2022). Reliability refers to whether the results of a study are repeatable and is generally of concern in quantitative research (Bell et al., 2022). The internal reliability was assessed and ensured during our data analysis through structural equation modeling (SEM) measurement tools. Reliability also questions the stability in responses (Bell et al., 2022); we do believe that the conceptualization of coolness will likely change over time (Kock, 2021). Therefore, while this model should be stable at present time, there may be a need for adjustments in the future. Closely related to reliability is replicability, which requires a study to be able to be replicated by other researchers. We

believe the replicability of this study is high given that we will outline all procedures used. Our quantitative research in this study is built for replication as our aim is to develop and validate a neighborhood coolness scale which can be used to measure the coolness of neighborhoods by researchers and practitioners alike. Lastly, validity relates to the integrity of conclusions made from the data collected, and is assessed through the measurement validity, internal validity, and external validity (Bell et al., 2022). Measurement validity pertains to quantitative research (Bell et al., 2022) and was also assessed and ensured during our data analysis. Internal validity pertains to the validity of inferences made of causal relationships between two or more variables issues (Bell et al., 2022). External validity relates to whether the samples used are representative of the population meant to be studied. While the external validity of our pre-study can be considered low as it is limited to mostly young, DK informants, the larger samples size and use of Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) in our quantitative study ensure a higher level of external validity.

3.4 Qualitative Pre-Study Methods

In the following section, the authors will review the methods used to conduct the qualitative prestudy. We will also explain the thematic analysis that was conducted on the qualitative pre-study's findings in order to develop our quantitative study.

3.4.1 Sampling

Due to the scope of the thesis and the available resources, we utilized a convenience sample (Bell et al., 2022) for the pre-study and therefore interviewed 15 participants living in DK from our networks. The advantage of convenience samples is the easy access to participants, on the other hand, the authors are aware of the concern that convenience samples threaten the generalizability of the results (Bell et al., 2022). However, the aim of the pre-study is to understand residents' perceptions whereas the generalizability of the developed neighborhood coolness scale will be tested in the subsequent quantitative study with participants from DK and the US. We required that the participants needed to be living in one of the neighborhoods of Copenhagen, DK, for more than one year so that they would be able to articulate neighborhood coolness perceptions from a resident perspective rather than a tourist. The age of the informants ranged from 22 to 49 years. Two of the participants were male and

13 were female. The participants were assured that their responses were anonymous, and they were asked to sign a data consent form. All of the interviews took place in February 2023. On average, the duration of the interviews was 08:10 minutes.

3.4.2 Data Collection

The qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted as online video interviews via the online application, Microsoft Teams. The researchers' interview guide drew inspiration from the questions that Kock (2021) utilized in his pre-study for the destination coolness scale development. Namely, the main questions were posed to the participants: 'Do you consider your neighborhood to be cool to live in?' If yes, 'what makes this neighborhood cool to live in?' If not, 'what makes this neighborhood uncool to live in?' We additionally asked the informants about the neighborhood they lived in and follow up questions. The full interview guide can be found in Appendix A.

We chose to ask residents to only speak about neighborhoods that they had lived in as we wanted to ensure that their conceptualizations of coolness were from a resident perspective. Richards (2016) suggested that "[t]he modern urban dweller does not live in the city as a whole, but rather in a series of villages or enclaves that are frequented on a regular basis for work, leisure, shopping, etc. Other parts of the city are off the physical and mental map – just as unknown as exotic faraway tourism destinations" (p. 9). Therefore, we must consider that if someone speaks about the coolness of a neighborhood that they have not actually lived in, then their perspective may be more aligned with that of a tourist.

The interview guide was developed with the goal of keeping the interviews under 15 minutes to increase the participation rate. After each of the first four interviews, the researchers requested feedback from the participant on the interviews. This feedback was utilized to improve the researchers interviews for the remaining 11 interviews. The researchers asked all informants for permission to record the interviews. After each interview the researchers manually transcribed the interviews to assist in the ease of analyzing the data. The interviews were conducted in English, however given that all informants are not native speakers, the researchers did their best to assist the informants when language barriers existed.

3.4.3 Data Analysis and Results of Qualitative Pre-Study

The authors conducted a thematic analysis (Guest et al., 2014) to analyze the qualitative data from the interviews. Since the aim of the pre-study was to gather insights about how residents perceive cool neighborhoods for the development of the quantitative study, we applied an exploratory approach by listening carefully and rereading the transcripts to discover common themes across informants (Guest et al., 2014). First, we sorted the insights into two main categories: how participants describe neighborhood coolness and how participants describe neighborhood uncoolness. After that, the insights were color-coded based on themes such as nightlife, opportunities, urban/suburban/residential, local, culturality, green areas, security, architecture, communal areas, aesthetic, accessibility and colorfulness. Similar themes were merged and those themes that were too functional (i.e., accessibility) or too vague (i.e., colorfulness) were eliminated. Ultimately, we considered the following six dimensions, which we also compared to existing literature, especially Kock's (2021) dimensions used in the destination coolness scale:

3.4.3.1 'Local' Dimension

During the analysis of the pre-study we found several subtopics that we categorized into the dimension 'local'. While some items share similarities with Kock's (2021) dimensions 'authentic' and 'original', we also received new insights, that were previously not covered in the destination coolness scale. Informants talked about the original feel that their cool neighborhood has, and that the neighborhood stands out compared to other neighborhoods, which aligns with the items 'is original' and 'stands apart from the crowd' that fall into the 'original' dimension of Kock's (2021) scale. Also, informants described cool neighborhoods as particular which aligns with the items 'distinct identity' and 'stands apart from the crowd' that are covered in the destination coolness dimension 'original' (Kock, 2021) and therefore have been included. In contrast to Kock's (2021) study, several informants mentioned the concept of 'local' when they were asked to describe their cool neighborhood. For instance, when asked to describe what about the neighborhood makes it a cool place to live in, one informant replied that it feels local in the big city. Moreover, informants spoke of the fact that the residents belong together or have a community to do things with. Lastly, we captured insights that a cool neighborhood was central, very close to everything and had everything the informants needed close by, which we grouped under the item 'feels like living in a bubble'. We

interpreted that based on the answers cool neighborhoods offer all you need and there is no need to exit the bubble, i.e., their neighborhood. Finally, the 'local' dimension covers the items 'has a local feel', 'is original', 'has a distinct identity', 'has a sense of community', and 'feels like living in a bubble'.

3.4.3.2 'Lively' Dimension

A second theme that emerged from the pre-study is 'lively', informants mentioned good opportunities for leisure activities, namely nightlife, bars, or cafés in their cool neighborhoods. Informants stated that their cool neighborhoods do not get boring and are the opposite of sleepy. Aligned with this finding, informants described their neighborhood as uncool with words such as boring, sleepy, not super active and very limited in cafés or nightlife. Thus, we clearly see similarities with the dimension of 'vibrant' used by Kock (2021) that covers the items 'outgoing', 'vibrant' and 'lively' as well as similarities with Warren et al.'s (2019) dimension 'energetic' which includes items such as 'energetic', 'outgoing', 'lively', and 'vigorous'. The item 'hip' was also added, as it was a descriptor utilized by informants in the pre-study. Moreover, according to several informants, youthfulness and young people are typically associated with cool neighborhoods, rather than families and older generations. However, this finding contrasts with Kock's (2021) study, where no connection of cool cities and youthfulness was found. We included 'youthful' as an item to understand if this characteristic is apparent in neighborhood coolness perceptions. In order to cover all of the meanings that we collected in this theme in the pre-study, we decided to name the dimension 'lively' instead of 'vibrant'.

Contrary to the findings of Kock's (2021) study, in which 'rebellious' was used to describe cool cities that "deviate from the norm, decide not to play by the rules and are seen as revolutionary in one way or the other" (p. 3), our informants did not mention rebellious to describe cool neighborhoods. Perhaps, rebelliousness is a desired feature for visiting tourists rather than residents living there permanently, as rebelliousness may disturb residents' privacy and has other negative impacts for residents. Nevertheless, we decided to test the item 'rebellious' (Kock, 2021; Warren et al., 2019), to see if the pre-study participants missed this aspect or if it in general does not apply to cool neighborhoods. Therefore, the dimension of 'lively' consists of the items 'is lively', 'offers nightlife,

cafes, etc.', 'is dynamic', 'is hip', 'is youthful', 'is rebellious'.

3.4.3.3 'Diverse' Dimension

Informants seemed to describe the diversity or the lack thereof of their neighborhood through the people that live there or the architecture. We believe this distinguishes the 'diverse' dimension from the previously discussed 'lively' dimension, which more so captures the neighborhood itself and its energy. Informants used, for instance, 'eclectic' or 'multi-cultural' to describe the people living in their cool neighborhood. Based on the insights, cool neighborhoods are characterized by residents of different cultures. In line with this finding, uncool neighborhoods were described as primarily consisting of families or older people. Informants also spoke about the gentrification of their neighborhood. In terms of architecture, cool neighborhoods were described as having varied buildings, while buildings in uncool neighborhoods tend to look the same. As mentioned in the dimension of 'lively', we did not record statements regarding rebelliousness, yet we will test 'is nonconformist' as tested by Kock (2021) and Warren et al. (2019) in this dimension. We decided to include 'is nonconformist' in this dimension instead of the 'lively' dimension as it fits well because it is a descriptor attributed to people. Finally, the dimension 'diverse' consists of the items 'is eclectic', 'is multi-cultural', 'is gentrified', 'is nonconformist', people of different ages are living here' and 'has varied architecture'.

3.4.3.4 'Aesthetic' Dimension

Whereas informants in Kock's (2021) study did not use attributes about aesthetic appeal for cool cities, some pre-study informants used words such as attractive or pretty. Our findings are more aligned with the brand coolness research by Warren et al. (2019), because their scale consists of an 'aesthetically appealing' dimension including the items 'looks good', 'is aesthetically appealing', 'is attractive' and 'has a really nice appearance'. Perhaps, neighborhood aesthetics plays a more important role for residents due to their permanent place of residence, compared to tourists visiting for a short time. A descriptor that was not mentioned in the pre-study is 'clean', however, the mention of other aesthetic attributes prompted the authors' curiosity as to whether a neighborhood needs to be clean to be cool. Our assumption was that perhaps this did not come up in the survey due to the

general cleanliness level of Copenhagen, and therefore we wanted to test this with the whole sample, including US respondents. The 'aesthetic' dimension covers items such as 'is pretty', 'is clean' and 'is aesthetically appealing'.

3.4.3.5 'Green' Dimension

Informants often spoke about green areas in their cool neighborhood from two different perspectives, namely from the aesthetic and functional perspectives. Informants described the aesthetic aspect of having green areas in their neighborhood. In terms of functional value, informants like to socialize and do sports in the local parks, or one informant specifically stated that she likes to immerse herself in nature and states that this makes her neighborhood cool. Building up on Yan and Chun-you (2006) that studied the influencing factors of environmental behavior of residents, we found it interesting to test it in the context of neighborhood coolness and added the item 'residents of this neighborhood care about the environment'. Finally, the 'green' dimension includes the items 'has green areas', 'there are places to immerse yourself in nature' and 'residents of this neighborhood care about the environment'.

3.4.3.6 'Safe' Dimension

Interestingly, several informants mentioned the functional attribute of 'safe' when they described uncool things about their cool neighborhood. More specifically, they mentioned gang violence to be a problem in their neighborhood. However, this still did not decrease their overall feeling of coolness about their neighborhood. We think that possibly the informants from DK are biased when it comes to security, as Copenhagen is ranked as the city with the highest personal security level as reported in the Safe Cities Index 2021 by The Economist (2021). Therefore, we decided to include 'safe' as an item to test if a neighborhood can be unsafe, and yet still be cool. This dimension has not been covered in Kock's (2021) scale.

In short, the insights of the pre-study show, that similarities and differences in how cool neighborhoods/cities are described by residents compared to tourists (Kock, 2021) can be found.

Since all participants were recruited from one country, we decided to also include items such as 'rebellious', 'nonconformist' and 'clean', which were not mentioned by the Danish informants, however, could be relevant in neighborhood coolness perceptions in other countries. See item pool overview in Section 3.5.1.

3.5 Quantitative Study Methods

We will now present the methods utilized for the qualitative main study. First, we will introduce the item pool that has been generated from the qualitative study. We will then discuss the sampling and data collection methods utilized for the quantitative study and the methods utilized for the quantitative data analysis.

3.5.1 Item Pool

Based upon the thematic analysis conducted after the qualitative pre-study, the researchers developed an item pool of 30 neighborhood coolness items, which are grouped into the discussed six dimensions. While the authors have placed the items into corresponding dimensions based on the pre-study, it will be tested in the analysis whether these items are part of the best-suited dimension. Additionally, there are 14 items related to our hypotheses. An overview of the items used in the quantitative study is demonstrated in Table 1. This item pool was then utilized to build the quantitative survey, which will be further discussed in the following section.

Item	Source
Local	[aspects of Kock's 'authentic' and 'original' dimensions]
Has a local feel	Pre-Study Informants 4, 7
Is original	Kock (2021); Pre-Study Informant 3
Has a distinct identity	Kock (2021); Pre-Study Informants 3, 9, 12, 15
Has a sense of community	Pre-Study: Informants 7, 9
Feels like living in a bubble	Pre-Study Informants 1, 4, 7, 13, 14
Lively	[aspects of Kock's (2021) 'vibrant 'and 'rebellious' dimensions]
Is lively	Kock (2021); Pre-Study Informants 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14,
Offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	Pre-Study Informants 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15
Is dynamic	Kock (2021); Warren et al. (2019)
Is hip	Pre-Study Informants 2, 15
Is youthful	Pre-Study Informants 2, 11, 12, 14, 15
Is rebellious	Adapted from Kock (2021); Warren et al. (2019)
Diverse	[based on pre-study; considers aspects covered in Kock (2021)]
Is eclectic	Pre-Study Informants 1
Is multi-cultural	Pre-Study Informants 1, 2, 6
Is gentrified	Pre-Study Informants 3, 6
Is nonconformist	Kock (2021); Warren et al. (2019)
People of different ages are living here	Pre-Study Informants 6, 7
Has varied architecture	Pre-Study Informants 1, 9, 12, 13, 15
Aesthetically Appealing	[from Warren et al., 2019]
Is pretty	Pre-Study Informants 11, 13; adapted from Warren et al. (2019)
Is clean	Own Idea
Is aesthetically appealing	Warren et al. (2019); Pre-Study Informants 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12,
Green	
Has green areas	Pre-Study Informants 1, 7, 9, 15
There are places to immerse yourself in	Pre-Study Informant 10
Residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	Adapted from Yan & Chun-you (2006)

 Table 1: Items and their Sources (Own Elaboration).

Safe	
Is safe	Pre-Study Informants 1, 4, 6
Satisfaction/Quality of Life	
I like living in this neighborhood.	Adapted from Kock (2021)
I would recommend this neighborhood to others to live in.	Adapted from Kock (2016); Zenker & Rütter (2014)
I do not have an intention to leave my current neighborhood.	Adapted Zenker & Rütter (2014)
I am satisfied with my current neighborhood.	Adapted Zenker & Rütter (2014) and Mouratidis & Yiannakou (2022)
My quality of life is high in this neighborhood.	Adapted from Nawijn & Mitas (2011)
I am willing to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood.	Adapted from Kock (2016)
Neighborhood-Self Connection	
This neighborhood reflects who I am.	Adapted from Escalas & Bettman (2005) and Kock (2021)
I can identify with this neighborhood.	Adapted from Escalas & Bettman (2005) and Kock (2021)
I feel a personal connection to this neighborhood.	Adapted from Escalas & Bettman (2005) and Kock (2021)
Tourism/Community	
I support local businesses in this neighborhood.	Own Elaboration
I am engaged in my community within this neighborhood.	Own Elaboration
I am happy about tourists visiting my neighborhood.	Own Elaboration
Tourists to my neighborhood positively affect my quality of life.	Adapted from Uysal et al. (2016)
Tourism positively influences community life.	Adapted from Nawijn & Mitas (2011)

3.5.2 Data Collection

We administered the online survey with the survey software Qualtrics. The surveys were conducted in April 2023. The language of the questionnaire was English. The questionnaire started with an introduction and an attention check to increase data quality. After that followed two open-end questions, namely "Which city or town do you currently live in?" and "Which neighborhood do you currently live in?". The respondents then needed to indicate how cool they would describe their current neighborhood on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' (pre-coded as 1), 'disagree' (2), 'Somewhat Disagree' (3), 'Neither agree or disagree' (4), to 'Somewhat agree' (5), 'Agree' (6), 'Strongly Agree' (7). A Likert scale is used to measure how intensely the respondents feel about an issue (Bell et al., 2022). This method eases the process of data analysis for the researchers, as the responses using this scale are pre-coded (Bell et al., 2022). Furthermore, this fulfills the criteria of equidistance, thereby reducing bias (Hair et al., 2022). The respondents were then asked to measure 24 items and 14 outcome variables in relation to the neighborhood they live in on the same 7-point Likert scale. In the end, closed demographic questions about gender, age, education level and family status were asked. The demographic answers were also pre-coded to simplify the subsequent data analysis. See full questionnaire in Appendix B.

Before launching the survey, we ran a pilot test amongst 15 family members and friends to test the survey and provide feedback. Some respondents voiced confusion as to what was meant by 'neighborhood', especially for those not living in cities. We therefore added the following explanation: "If you do not live in a city, we define your neighborhood as the local community surrounding your home". Several participants failed the built-in attention check, however, we decided to keep it, because it increases the quality of the data.

3.5.3 Sampling

After running the pilot test, we shared the survey link with residents living in DK and in the US. The Danish participants were recruited from our accessible network using a non-probability convenience sample method (Bell et al., 2022). However, the US sample was accessed through the crowdsourcing platform Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), where participants are compensated for their survey participation. The advantage of using MTurk is that a large and diverse sample size can be obtained within little time and financial resources (Goodman & Paolacci, 2017). Due to the monetary incentive, participants have high attention rates and motivation to complete the surveys successfully, which indicates high data quality (Goodman & Paolacci, 2017). MTurk thus enabled us to reach a diverse sample representing different age groups, educational backgrounds and family statuses in addition to our rather homogenous sample from our network in DK. By examining residents' perceptions about neighborhood coolness from two different countries, we can therefore increase the generalizability of the study findings. In total, 670 participants participation due to the violation of the

manipulation checks. Ultimately, 441 questionnaires were successfully recorded from which 91 (20.9%) were from DK and 350 (79.4%) from the US. More detailed information about the demographics can be found in Table 2 in Section 4.1.

3.5.4 Methods of Data Analysis

The quantitative data has been analyzed with the structural equation modeling (SEM) technique to "explain multiple statistical relationships simultaneously through visualization and model validation" (Dash & Paul, 2021). More specifically, partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) was chosen due to its suitability for complex structural models and for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2022) of the under researched field of neighborhood coolness. Thus, PLS-SEM is more suitable for theory development than CB-SEM, which is used for testing or confirming established theories (Hair et al., 2022).

A partial least square model is composed of an outer model (measurement model) and an inner model (structural model). The measurement model indicates how the constructs and items are related with each other (Hair et al., 2022), for example, how the six dimensions and their corresponding 24 items are related with each other. The structural model indicates how latent variables are related (Hair et al., 2022), for example how the six dimensions relate to neighborhood coolness. In line with Kock's (2021) destination coolness scale development, the present study also utilizes a reflective measurement model scale (Hair et al., 2022), meaning that the construct of neighborhood coolness causes covariation of the dimensions. More specifically, the arrows point from the higher-order component 'neighborhood coolness' to the lower-order components, namely the six dimensions 'local', 'lively', 'diverse', 'aesthetic', 'green' and 'safe' as well as to other lower-order components, namely the outcome variables. Based on the reflective measurement model, the authors will assess the internal consistency, convergent validity, and discriminant validity for all multi-variate constructs. All concepts in our model are represented by more than one item to reduce measurement error (Hair et al., 2022), except for the dimension 'safe' and the outcome variables 'like', 'WOM', 'ITS', 'satisfaction', 'QOL', 'WTP', 'support' and 'engage' that are single-item constructs. Despite concerns of measurement error, we follow the approach of Kock et al. (2019), which established that conceptually simple concepts do not necessitate multivariate modeling, for matters of parsimony. The

theoretical model is illustrated in Figure 6.



Figure 6: Theoretical Model.

Ultimately, we used the software SmartPLS 4 (Version 4.0.9.2) to carry out the PLS-SEM analysis with the data that was extracted from Qualtrics. The items were labeled and information such as country and geographical classification were added by the researchers.

4. Results of Quantitative Study

In this section, the results of the total sample from DK and the US will be presented. Firstly, we will address the demographics of the study. Then we will evaluate the measurement and structural models, and the findings regarding the neighborhood coolness scale and the hypotheses. Additionally, we will conduct post-hoc analyses about the comparison of the US versus DK samples and about the direct impact of dimensions of coolness on outcome variables.

4.1 Demographics

Our total sample (N=441) is represented by 43.5% female, 56.2% male and 0.2% participants who identified as other. In terms of age, almost 80% of respondents were younger than 40 years old. Regarding the educational levels of the respondents, 22.9% finished a master's degree or higher, 49.2% a bachelor's degree, 21.5% vocational school/high school, 5.4% secondary school and 0.9% primary school. In terms of family status, 42.6% had children, whereas 57.6% did not have children. In addition to the demographic quantitative data from the survey, the authors classified the respondents into their country of residence, DK and the US, as well as into the type of geographical area based on their qualitative answers to the question regarding the neighborhood, they currently live in. Based on the population size, we classified the neighborhoods into 'rural' (population size <2.500) and 'urban' (population size >2.500) geographical areas (USDA, n.d.). If no concrete answer was given, the authors checked the IP-address to verify their location. Hence, 9% of the total sample live in neighborhoods in rural areas, 83% live in urban areas, whereas 8% could not be specified.

In summary, the demographics show that our sample is represented by diverse respondents in terms of gender, age, education level (with the exception of small proportions of education levels 'finished secondary school' and 'finished primary school'), family status, and type of neighborhood. In terms of the cultural context, it should be noted that the Danish sample only accounts for 21% of the sample, and the US for 79%. In the following, we will take a closer look at the country differences regarding the demographics of the samples.

4.1.1 Denmark

In the Danish sample, 56.0% of the respondents were female and 44% were male. The age structure in years was distributed as follows: 86.8% were 18-29 years old, 9.9% were 30-39, 2.2% were 40-49, and 1.1% were 50-59. In terms of education level, 40.7% specified that they finished a master's degree or higher, 53.8% finished a bachelor's degree, 4.4% finished vocational school/high school, and 1.1% finished primary school only. Regarding their family status 3.3% stated that they had children, whereas 96.7% did not have children. Only 1% of the Danish sample lived in rural neighborhoods, whereas 99% lived in urban areas.

4.1.2 United States

In the US sample, 40.3% were female, 59.4%% were male and 0.3% identified as other. Regarding age, 20.0% of the participants were 18-29 years old, 40.3% were 30-39, 19.1% were 40-49, 12.3% were 50-59 and 8.3% were 60 and older. In terms of education level, 18.3% specified that they finished a master's degree or higher, 48.0% finished a bachelor's degree, 26.0% finished vocational school/high school, 6.9% finished secondary school and 0.9% finished primary school. Looking at the family status, 52.9% stated that they had children, whereas 47.1% did not have children. The geographical area classification indicates that 11% of the US sample live in rural neighborhoods and 79% in urban neighborhoods, while the remaining 10% could not be specified. An overview of the demographics of the participants is illustrated in Table 2.

Sample	Denmark	United States	Total Sample
Sample Size	91	350	441
-	[21%]	[79%]	
Gender (%)			
Female	56.0	40.3	43.5
Male	44.0	59.4	56.2
Other	0.0	0.3	0.2
Age (%)			
18-29	86.8	20.0	33.8
30-39	9.9	40.3	34.0
40-49	2.2	19.1	15.6
50-59	1.1	12.3	10.0
59 or older	0.0	8.3	6.6
Education Level (%)			
Finished a master's degree or higher	40.7	18.3	22.9
Finished a bachelor's degree	53.8	48.0	49.2
Finished vocational school/high school	4.4	26.0	21.5
Finished secondary school	0.0	6.9	5.4
Finished primary school	1.1	0.9	0.9
Family Status - Do you have Children? (%)			
Yes	3.3	52.9	42.6
No	96.7	47.1	57.4
Geographicial Classification (%) (Added by the Authors)			
Rural [population size <2.500]	1.0	11.0	9.0
Urban [population size >2.500]	99.0	79.0	83.0
Not specified	0.0	10.0	8.0

 Table 2: Demographics of the Participants.

4.2 Measurement Model

In total, the raw data consisted of 45 indicator variables, 24 items used in the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness, one overall coolness item, 14 items representing behavioral and attitudinal outcomes of neighborhood coolness, and six items related to demographics. As mentioned before, the researchers coded two of these items related to demographics after the survey for analysis

purposes, namely 'country of residence' and 'geographic area', encompassing whether the respondent lived in an urban or rural environment. The descriptive statistics of the total sample can be found in Table 3. The 441 respondents generally found their neighborhood to be somewhat cool with a mean value of 5.039 (5='somewhat agree'). None of the items had a mean less than 3 (3='somewhat disagree'), indicating that in general the respondents felt neutral or positive about the items, in regard to their neighborhood. The standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis of the items can all be considered acceptable. These items all relate to the distribution of the data. Skewness and kurtosis values between -1 and +1 indicate a normal data distribution (Hair et al., 2022). While some skewness and kurtosis values for this sample fall outside of these guidelines, SmartPLS does not need a normal distribution and therefore this is acceptable for this analysis.

Item Description	Mean	StD.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Neighborhood Coolness	5.04	1.517	-0.907	0.104
has a local feel	5.48	1.233	-1.189	1.603
is original	4.97	1.515	-0.613	-0.380
has a distinct identity	5.22	1.504	-0.941	0.415
has a sense of community	5.20	1.420	-0.910	0.506
is lively	4.79	1.706	-0.682	-0.548
offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	4.20	2.022	-0.257	-1.296
is dynamic	4.49	1.816	-0.406	-0.951
is hip	4.10	1.895	-0.128	-1.174
is youthful	4.38	1.877	-0.341	-1.043
is rebellious	3.37	1.942	0.351	-1.217
is eclectic	4.26	1.702	-0.321	-0.850
is multi-cultural	4.85	1.719	-0.721	-0.415
is gentrified	4.28	1.761	-0.164	-0.886
is nonconformist	3.85	1.658	0.135	-0.847
has varied architecture	4.54	1.751	-0.444	-0.889
is pretty	5.34	1.442	-1.078	0.832
is clean	5.51	1.364	-1.343	1.827
is aesthetically appealing	5.33	1.480	-1.071	0.690
has green areas	5.77	1.126	-1.597	3.751
there are places to immerse yourself in nature	5.41	1.402	-1.297	1.570
residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	5.20	1.258	-1.100	1.399
is safe	5.78	1.228	-1.638	3.201
Endogenous Variables				
I like living in this neighborhood.	5.53	1.368	-1.268	1.396
I would recommend this neighborhood to others to live in.	5.37	1.504	-1.196	0.932
I do not have an intention to leave my current neighborhood.	4.85	1.865	-0.662	-0.703
I am satisfied with my current neighborhood.	5.50	1.469	-1.295	1.232
My quality of life is high in this neighborhood.	5.46	1.424	-1.202	1.296
I am willing to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood.	4.71	1.751	-0.584	-0.588
I support local businesses in this neighborhood.	5.45	1.300	-1.235	1.592
I am engaged in my community within this neighborhood.	4.53	1.743	-0.505	-0.800
This neighborhood reflects who I am.	4.67	1.642	-0.633	-0.457
I can identify with this neighborhood.	4.96	1.555	-0.840	0.055
I feel a personal connection to this neighborhood.	5.00	1.583	-0.926	0.096
I am happy about tourists visiting my neighborhood.	4.95	1.425	-0.450	-0.095
Tourists to my neighborhood positively affect my quality of life.	4.51	1.469	-0.349	-0.250
Tourism positively influences community life.	4.73	1.511	-0.410	-0.279

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Total Sample (N=441).

In order to be able to accurately analyze the collected data, the researchers began with an evaluation of the measurement model by assessing the reliability and validity of the indicator variables and latent variables (Hair et al. 2022), namely the items, dimensions, and outcomes of neighborhood coolness.

4.2.1 Indicator Reliability

The researchers first began their analysis of the reliability and validity of the measurement model by evaluating the factor loadings of the indicator variables onto the constructs (Hair et al., 2020). The factor loading of the indicator variable in this analysis indicates the items' contribution to the dimension of coolness that they are measuring. The typical threshold for factor loading reliability is 0.708 or higher (Hair et al., 2022), however in social sciences studies, especially with newly developed models, factor loadings are often lower than 0.70 (Hulland, 1999). Hair et al. (2020) suggest that all indicator variables with factor loadings between 0.40 and 0.70 should be considered for removal. When the authors first ran the PLS measurement model, four indicator variables were below the 0.70 threshold, namely, 'feels like living in a bubble' (0.386), 'is gentrified' (0.665), 'is nonconformist' (0.698), and 'people of different ages are living here' (0.462). The authors critically reflected on the potential sources of measurement error within these variables and concluded that the low loadings of the indicators, 'feels like living in a bubble' and 'people of different ages are living here' are likely due to poorly worded questions in the survey (Hair et al., 2022). 'Feels like living in a bubble' was constructed based upon interview informants reflecting on having everything they needed within their neighborhood. However, we believe that this item might have both negative and positive connotations and therefore should have been worded differently to more accurately capture the meaning the researchers had intended. Therefore, the authors deleted this indicator variable. Secondly, the authors believe the item 'people of different ages are living here' was also not worded for proper understanding. We believe that it may have been unclear how many individuals from different age groups were required to be living in the area in order to answer the question. As a result, we have decided to remove this indicator variable as well. While the other indicator variables 'is gentrified' and 'is nonconformist', that are both part of the 'diverse' dimension, fall just below Hair et al.'s (2022) proposed threshold, the authors decided to maintain these two indicators. The removal of these two additional indicators would decrease the content validity of the dimension 'diverse', as these two items and the 'people of different ages are living here' item are part of this same dimension. Content validity refers to how well the content of the dimension is captured by the indicators (Hair et al., 2022). We additionally expected that the factor loadings of these two indicators would increase with the elimination of 'people of different ages are living here' item.

The authors re-ran the PLS measurement model after removing the two indicator variables and the resulting factor loadings are displayed in Table 4. The factor loadings of 'is gentrified' and 'is nonconformist' increased to 0.685 and 0.712 respectively. While 'is gentrified' (0.685) is slightly below the threshold of 0.70, the authors have decided not to exclude the indicator based on the arbitrary threshold alone, especially given its proximity to the threshold and also to preserve the content validity of the model.

Construct/Items	Factor Loadings (Higher Order Loading)	CR	AVE
Neighborhood Coolness (newly developed) [Neighborhood]			
Local	0.802	0.88	0.648
has a local feel	0.739		
is original	0.848		
has a distinct identity	0.847		
has a sense of community	0.782		
Lively	0.823	0.948	0.754
is lively	0.873		
offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	0.877		
is dynamic	0.921		
is hip	0.907		
is youthful	0.891		
is rebellious	0.728		
Diverse	0.82	0.863	0.558
is eclectic	0.841		
is multi-cultural	0.709		
is gentrified	0.685		
is nonconformist	0.712		
has varied architecture	0.779		
Aesthetic	0.745	0.918	0.789
is pretty	0.945		
is clean	0.774		
is aesthetically appealing	0.936		
Green	0.628	0.858	0.668
has green areas	0.792		
there are places to immerse yourself in nature	0.794		
residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	0.865		
Neighborhood-Self Connection [adapted from Escalas & Bettman (2003) & Kock (2021)]		0.952	0.87
This neighborhood reflects who I am.	0.942		
I can identify with this neighborhood.	0.943		
I feel a personal connection to this neighborhood.	0.913		
Resident Support of Tourism		0.938	0.834
I am happy about tourists visiting my neighborhood.	0.893		
Tourists to my neighborhood positively affect my quality of life.	0.929		
Tourism positively influences community life.	0.918		

Table 4: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

4.2.2 Internal Consistency Reliability

Internal consistency determines whether the indicator variables measuring a construct are correlated,

but not redundant. This reliability measure can be evaluated through Cronbach's alpha; however, this measure has limitations, such as its tendency to underestimate internal consistency reliability (Hair et al., 2022). Therefore, the authors have instead evaluated this measure through composite reliability, which has been deemed as more appropriate (Hair et al., 2022). Hair et al. (2022) suggest that compositive reliability values above 0.90 indicate that the items are measuring the same phenomenon and are therefore not a valid measure of the construct, while composite reliability values below 0.60 are suggested to be lacking internal consistency reliability. The composite reliability for each of the multi-item dimensions and outcome variables are reported in Table 4. Several of the multi-item dimensions and outcome variables have values above Hair et al.'s (2022) suggested threshold of 0.90, namely 'lively' (0.948), 'aesthetic' (0.918), 'neighborhood-self connection' (0.952), 'resident support of tourism' (0.938). Bagozzi and Yi (2012) argued that these standard guidelines for composite reliability necessitate some flexibility, and therefore, no adjustments to the measurement model were necessary at this point.

4.2.3 Convergent Validity

Convergent validity is measured through average variance extracted (AVE), which is the extent that a construct's variance can be explained by the items used to measure the construct (Hair et al., 2022). Typically, an AVE of 0.50 or higher is considered acceptable (Hair et al., 2022), as a value below this threshold would mean that a majority of variance in the construct cannot be explained through the chosen items. The AVE for each of the multi-item constructs are reported in Table 4. All of the AVE measured in this analysis exceed the threshold of 0.50 indicated by Hair et al. (2022) and therefore convergent validity of all constructs can be inferred.

4.2.4 Discriminant Validity

In order to ensure that the tested constructs are unique and capture different phenomenon, the authors measured the discriminant validity of the model, through the Fornell-Larcker criterion and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio (Hair et al., 2022). The Fornell-Larcker method (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) implies that a construct should share more variance with its indicators than with the other constructs (Hair et al., 2022). In order to confirm through the Fornell-Larcker method that constructs are distinct,

"the square root of each construct's AVE should be greater than its highest correlation with any other construct" (Hair et al., 2022, p. 77). The Fornell-Larcker criterion parameters have been reported in Table 5. Those correlations that exceed the square root of the constructs AVE have been indicated in red. This is the case for the constructs 'diverse' and 'lively' (0.808) as marked in red in Table 5. Upon examination of these two constructs, the authors determined that it was not surprising that there is some overlap between the constructs, however they remain conceptually distinct. The content validity of the construct 'neighborhood coolness' would be lowered if we did not have these two dimensions. and considering the overlap is minimal, no adjustment to the two constructs were made.

	Aesthetic	Diverse	Green	Neighborhood- Self Connection	Lively	Local	Residents' Support of Tourism
Aesthetic	0.889						
Diverse	0.394	0.747					
Green	0.646	0.308	0.818				
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.614	0.508	0.523	0.933			
Lively	0.375	0.808	0.238	0.471	0.868		
Local	0.543	0.558	0.496	0.631	0.527	0.805	
Residents' Support of Tourism	0.332	0.531	0.311	0.455	0.542	0.446	0.913

 Table 5: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters.

Hair et al. (2022) suggest that HTMT must also be evaluated to confirm the discriminant validity of the constructs given shortcomings of the Fornell-Larcker method. HTMT estimates the true correlation between the constructs, if they were perfectly reliable. The threshold for HTMT has been debated by several authors, however, generally HTMT values should be below 0.85 or 0.90 (Henseler et al., 2015). The HTMT values of the measurement model are recorded in Table 6; those values that are below the threshold of 0.85 are indicated in green. Consistent with the Fornell-Lacker model, the HTMT value for 'lively' and 'diverse' (0.93) exceeds the threshold as marked in red in Table 6. The authors still maintain the argument that this can be expected and does not necessitate a change to the model.

Table 6: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт
Diverse <-> Aesthetic	0.432	QOL <-> ITS	0.534	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Engage	0.596
Engage <-> Aesthetic	0.397	QOL <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.65	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Green	0.322
Engage <-> Diverse	0.521	QOL <-> LIKE	0.744	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> ITS	0.269
Green <-> Aesthetic	0.755	QOL <-> Lively	0.373	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.498
Green <-> Diverse	0.322	QOL <-> Local	0.503	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> LIKE	0.354
Green <-> Engage	0.372	Safe <-> Aesthetic	0.696	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Lively	0.597
ITS <-> Aesthetic	0.512	Safe <-> Diverse	0.129	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Local	0.503
ITS <-> Diverse	0.255	Safe <-> Engage	0.146	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> QOL	0.355
ITS <-> Engage	0.379	Safe <-> Green	0.551	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Safe	0.147
ITS <-> Green	0.431	Safe <-> ITS	0.346	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Satisfaction	0.363
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Aestheti	c 0.668	Safe <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.361	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Local Business Support	0.433
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Diverse	0.576	Safe <-> LIKE	0.511	WOM <-> Aesthetic	0.726
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Engage	0.647	Safe <-> Lively	0.104	WOM <-> Diverse	0.384
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Green	0.56	Safe <-> Local	0.326	WOM <-> Engage	0.372
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> ITS	0.598	Safe <-> QOL	0.56	WOM <-> Green	0.48
LIKE <-> Aesthetic	0.698	Satisfaction <-> Aesthetic	0.681	WOM <-> ITS	0.567
LIKE <-> Diverse	0.403	Satisfaction <-> Diverse	0.353	WOM <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.654
LIKE <-> Engage	0.393	Satisfaction <-> Engage	0.391	WOM <-> LIKE	0.818
LIKE <-> Green	0.547	Satisfaction <-> Green	0.505	WOM <-> Lively	0.419
LIKE <-> ITS	0.618	Satisfaction <-> ITS	0.663	WOM <-> Local	0.582
LIKE <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.702	Satisfaction <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.696	WOM <-> QOL	0.739
Lively <-> Aesthetic	0.388	Satisfaction <-> LIKE	0.834	WOM <-> Safe	0.539
Lively <-> Diverse	0.93	Satisfaction <-> Lively	0.369	WOM <-> Satisfaction	0.798
Lively <-> Engage	0.394	Satisfaction <-> Local	0.559	WOM <-> Local Business Support	0.332
Lively <-> Green	0.242	Satisfaction <-> QOL	0.751	WOM <-> Residents' Support of Tourism	0.37
Lively <-> ITS	0.229	Satisfaction <-> Safe	0.509	WTP <-> Aesthetic	0.385
Lively <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.499	Local Business Support <-> Aesthetic	0.336	WTP <-> Diverse	0.508
Lively <-> LIKE	0.411	Local Business Support <-> Diverse	0.375	WTP <-> Engage	0.303
Local <-> Aesthetic	0.617	Local Business Support <-> Engage	0.616	WTP <-> Green	0.265
Local <-> Diverse	0.652	Local Business Support <-> Green	0.379	WTP <-> ITS	0.145
Local <-> Engage	0.585	Local Business Support <-> ITS	0.362	WTP <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.417
Local <-> Green	0.593	Local Business Support <-> Neighborhood-Self	0.518	WTP <-> LIKE	0.33
Local <-> ITS	0.479	Local Business Support <-> LIKE	0.426	WTP <-> Lively	0.453
Local <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.725	Local Business Support <-> Lively	0.282	WTP <-> Local	0.44
Local <-> LIKE	0.629	Local Business Support <-> Local	0.521	WTP <-> QOL	0.39
Local <-> Lively	0.575	Local Business Support <-> QOL	0.364	WTP <-> Safe	0.287
QOL <-> Aesthetic	0.668	Local Business Support <-> Safe	0.231	WTP <-> Satisfaction	0.331
QOL <-> Diverse	0.384	Local Business Support <-> Satisfaction	0.365	WTP <-> Local Business Support	0.279
QOL <-> Engage	0.363	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Aesthetic	0.362	WTP <-> Residents' Support of Tourism	0.426
QOL <-> Green	0.525	Residents' Support of Tourism <-> Diverse	0.623	WTP <-> WOM	0.366

4.3 Structural Model

As discussed in the prior section, the results of the measurement model show the reliability and validity of our constructs. Therefore, we continue with the assessment of the path coefficients in terms of their significance and relevance in the structural model to learn if constructs can be explained through the model (Hair et al., 2022).

Looking at the collinearity statistics of the inner model, all variance inflation factors (VIF) values of the combination of the exogenous construct (neighborhood coolness) and the endogenous constructs (all outcome variables) are below the threshold of 3 meaning that "collinearity has no substantial effect on the structural model estimates" (Hair et al., 2022, p. 114). As no collinearity issues were found, we continued bootstrapping 5,000 samples to assess the path coefficients. We utilized the percentile bootstrap as confidence interval method and a significance level of 0.05. Then the outer

weights/loadings and p-values (outer model) and path coefficients and p-values (inner model) were measured.

As for the assessment of the significance and relevance of the path coefficients, the values of the p-values and path coefficients were examined (Hair et al., 2022). All the p-values in our model are 0.000, hence lower than the chosen significance level of 0.05, which means that all the considered relationships are significant at a 95% confidence level (Hair et al., 2022). Path coefficients usually range between -1 and +1, where positive values indicate positive relationships and negative values indicate negative relationships (Hair et al., 2022). The closer the value to +1 [or -1], the stronger [weaker] the relationship (Hair et al., 2022). In our model we find that all path coefficients in our model are positive values indicating positive relationships. The structural equation modelling is displayed in Figure 7.





Next, we used the coefficient of determination (R^2) measure to assess how strong the causal relationships in our path model are (Hair et al., 2022). The values of the adjusted R^2 can range from 0 to 1, where 0 has the lowest explanatory power and 1 has the higher levels of explanatory power (Hair et al., 2022). We can interpret the adjusted R^2 , in that for example a 42.9% change in the variable 'like' can be explained by neighborhood coolness if it would increase by one unit from 'somewhat agree' to 'agree'. In contrast, if neighborhood coolness would increase by one unit, 'local business support' would only increase by 19.9%. The adjusted R^2 values are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Adjusted R² Values.

	Adjusted R Square
Outcome Variable	
Like	0.429
WOM	0.414
ITS	0.198
Satisfaction	0.360
QOL	0.360
WTP	0.268
Support of Local Businesses	0.199
Engage	0.297
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.493
Residents' Support of Tourism	0.328

4.4 Findings

After presenting the measurement and structural model, this section aims at presenting the findings for the newly developed neighborhood coolness scale and testing of the behavioral and attitudinal outcome variables hypotheses as introduced in Section 2.6.2. In addition to the main analysis, we decided to run two post-hoc analyses. In the first post-hoc analysis we compare the neighborhood coolness conceptualizations of the DK versus US sample, and in the second analysis we look into the direct impact of dimensions on the outcome variables WTP and neighborhood-self connection.

4.4.1 Neighborhood Coolness Scale

The 'neighborhood coolness scale' has been evaluated as a reliable and valid measurement tool of neighborhood coolness through the evaluation of the measurement and structural model in PLS-SEM. Findings show that neighborhood coolness can be described through six dimensions, namely 'local', 'lively', 'diverse', 'aesthetic', 'green' and 'safe'. All the indicators of the six dimensions have positive, valid relationships with their respective dimensions. For the multi-variate dimensions of neighborhood coolness, all the items used to measure the dimension are correlated but not redundant and can explain the majority of variance in said dimension. Additionally, all the multi-variate dimensions are unique, despite some overlap between 'lively' and 'diverse'.

The structural equation modeling in Figure 7 reveals that 'local' (0.802), 'lively' (0.822) and 'diverse' (0.820) have the highest path coefficients, thus playing the largest role in constituting neighborhood coolness. The dimension 'aesthetic' has a slightly lower path coefficient value of 0.745. This result aligns with the pre-study insights, as aesthetics were only mentioned by a few informants. Also, it was the authors' interpretation that some cities or neighborhoods, for instance, are cool but not necessarily aesthetic. The path coefficient of 'green' (0.628) and 'safe' (0.406) are lower, meaning that 'green' and 'safe' only play a minor role in the constitution of coolness compared to the other dimensions. One explanation could be that 'green' and 'safe' are more functional compared to the other dimensions, which the respondents did not primarily associate with coolness of a neighborhood.

4.4.2 Hypothesis Testing

The structural equation modeling shows that the p-values for all path coefficients are 0.000 (p<0.05), indicating that all path coefficients are significant. Further, the path coefficients are positive, thereby indicating positive relationships between the construct of neighborhood coolness and the outcome variables. As we hypothesized positive relationships between neighborhood coolness and all outcome variables, we can now confirm all of the 14 hypotheses (see Table 8), which will now be elaborated on further.

 Table 8: Overview of the Results of Hypotheses Testing.

Hypotheses	Accepted /
113/potiteses	Rejected
General Behaviors and Attitudes	
Hypothesis 1: Neighborhood coolness is positively associated with whether residents like their neighborhood.	Accepted
Hypothesis 2: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' satisfaction with their neighborhood	Accepted
Hypothesis 3: Neighborhood coolness has a positively affect residents' likelihood to recommend their neighborhood to others to live in. A	Accepted
Hypothesis 4: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' intention to stay in their neighborhood.	Accepted
Hypothesis 5: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perceived quality of life.	Accepted
Hypothesis 6: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' willingness to pay more.	Accepted
Hypothesis 7: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' support of local businesses in their neighborhood.	Accepted
Hypothesis 8: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' community engagement within their neighborhood.	Accepted
Neighborhood-Self Connection	
Hypothesis 9: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of their neighborhood as a reflection of themself.	Accepted
Hypothesis 10: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' likelihood to identify with their neighborhood.	Accepted
Hypothesis 11: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perceived connection to their neighborhood.	Accepted
Residents' Support of Tourism	
Hypothesis 12: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' support of incoming tourists.	Accepted
Hypothesis 13: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life.	Accepted
Hypothesis 14: Neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' perception of tourisms' impact on their community life.	Accepted

4.4.2.1 General Behaviors and Attitudes

When examining the effects of neighborhood coolness on the outcome variables, the attitudinal variable 'like' has the second highest path coefficient with a value of 0.656 (p=.000), displaying that neighborhood coolness has one of the strongest impacts of a residents' likelihood to like their neighborhood, and thereby confirming **H1**.

Neighborhood coolness has a positive path coefficient value of 0.601 (p=.000) onto 'satisfaction' representing a significant positive relationship and confirming **H2**. Neighborhood coolness's effect on 'satisfaction' is lower than on 'like', which we can assume from previous research on citizen satisfaction (Hur & Murrow-Jones, 2008; Zenker et al., 2014; Mouratidis & Yiannakou, 2022), is likely due to the breadth of attributes considered in satisfaction, including many functional attributes.

Neighborhood coolness has the third strongest effect on WOM (0.644; p=.000), and therefore, we can confirm H3. We have hypothesized this strong effect could be perhaps due to the social desirability of living in a cool neighborhood, therefore prompting a higher likelihood to speak about this neighborhood with others. As previously discussed, in existing studies citizen satisfaction had a

positive impact on WOM. However, interestingly neighborhood coolness's direct effect on WOM is larger than neighborhood coolness's direct effect on citizen satisfaction.

Although the path coefficient value for intention to stay is the lowest compared to the other outcome variables, we report a positive effect of neighborhood on ITS (0.447, p=.000), which confirms H4. It could be argued that neighborhood coolness does not have as high an impact on ITS, because the decision to stay in a neighborhood can be impacted by other external factors such as work, income, family, etc.

Neighborhood coolness has a positive path coefficient of 0.601 (p=.000) on 'QOL', confirming H5. Interestingly, 'QOL' and 'satisfaction' are affected to the same degree by neighborhood coolness. It could be the case that a resident equates their perceived satisfaction of their neighborhood with their perceived 'QOL' in this neighborhood.

Next, we confirm **H6**, because a positive effect of neighborhood coolness on residents' willingness to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood (0.519, p=.000) is reported. Compared to other outcome variables, neighborhood coolness and WTP have a weaker relationship. The authors assume a moderate relationship between the construct of neighborhood coolness and outcome variable of WTP, may be due to financial resources or affected by external factors such as location, infrastructure, or accessibility.

Although the dimension of 'local' plays one of the largest roles in constituting neighborhood coolness, we found that 'local business support' (0.448; p=.000) has the second lowest path coefficient and thus is less impacted by neighborhood coolness compared to other dimensions. Despite the low path coefficient, we can confirm **H7**. The authors found it to be interesting that 'support of local business' was only moderately affected by neighborhood coolness, given the large role 'local' plays in constituting coolness.

Despite low levels of community engagement reported by informants during the pre-study, strong positive effects of neighborhood coolness on 'engage' (0.574 p=.000) were found. This contrasting

finding could be explained by the fact that we mainly interviewed young informants in the pre-study who may not seek community engagement outside of their circle of friends from their education. Another reason could be that the pre-study sample is not representative, as Danish people tend to have close friend circles and are not easy to socialize with (Overgaard, n.d.). However, the sample for the quantitative study consisted of participants of different ages and also participants from the United States. Therefore, we can confirm **H8**.

4.4.2.2 Neighborhood-Self Connection

The strongest impact of 'neighborhood coolness' is visible on 'neighborhood-self connection' (0.703; p=.000), so that **H9**, **H10** and **H11** can be confirmed. More precisely, it impacts neighborhood-self reflection, and in their identification and connection with their neighborhood. These findings are interesting as they show that neighborhood coolness has the highest impact on residents' attitudes about themselves rather than their attitudes towards the neighborhood. Due to the strong impact of neighborhood coolness on neighborhood-self connection we assume that if people are more likely to identify with cool neighborhoods, they will want to project this identity, which in turn may also impact WOM.

4.4.2.3 Residents' Support of Tourism

Lastly, neighborhood coolness positively impacts residents' support for tourism (0.574; p=.000), which leads us to confirming **H12**, **H13** and **H14**. More specifically, this means that residents are more likely to support incoming tourists, tourists to their neighborhood affect their quality of life positively, and tourism positively influences their community life.

In conclusion, all hypotheses could be confirmed. Neighborhood coolness has positive and significant impacts on all outcome variables, indicating the importance of this construct. It was found that neighborhood coolness positively affects 'like', 'WOM' and 'neighborhood-self connection' the most, whereas 'ITS' and 'support of local business' are impacted the least.

4.5 Post-hoc Analyses

After conducting the main analysis of our data, we decided to use the available data to conduct two post-hoc analyses of interest. First, we looked to understand if and how neighborhood coolness perceptions between residents living in the US and DK differ. Secondly, after understanding the impact of neighborhood coolness on the behavioral and attitudinal outcome variables, we sought to understand what dimensions actually drive the outcomes.

4.5.1 US vs DK

As this study included respondents from both DK and the US, it was of interest to the researchers to understand if the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness and the resulting attitudes and behaviors of residents differed by countries. The PLS-SEM model was therefore run for each of the country samples independently and then compared. Firstly, the measurement models were tested for each country, to ensure that the models are reliable and valid in this context. As with the main model, we evaluated the CR, AVE, Fornell-Larcker, and HTMT of the measurement model and the results of these evaluations can be found in Appendices C, D, E and F. Consistent with the main study, some of the indicator variables and constructs were slightly outside of the thresholds of these tests. The results for the US sample were generally very aligned with the main sample, given these respondents make up the majority (79%) of the main sample. For the DK sample there were several factor loadings below 0.70, namely 'has a sense of community' (0.523), 'is rebellious' (0.664), 'is multi-cultural' (0.611), 'is gentrified' (0.693), 'is nonconformist' (0.665), and 'is clean' (0.566), however based upon Hair et al. (2013), a factor loading above 0.5 can be considered significant. It is the case in the DK sample that the AVE for 'diverse' (0.488) is slightly below the threshold of 0.5, however due to its proximity to the threshold it has not been viewed as problematic. It should also be noted that the DK sample accounts for only 21% of the total sample and some indications of slight measurement error in this sample may be caused by this. Overall, we deem the models as valid and reliable for each country.

Consistent with the main model, these two models were then bootstrapped with 5,000 samples each before the evaluation of the structural models was performed. The resulting structural models are presented in Figure 8; the factor loadings and path coefficients of the US sample are indicated in blue

and in red for the DK sample. First, in interpreting the validity of the factor loadings of the indicator variables onto the dimensions, we can see that most values are relatively similar for both the samples. We can assume that the DK sample has lower factor loadings for some indicator variables due to the lower sample size, and therefore the authors do not view this as a ground for any adjustment to the model.

Upon examining the path coefficients of the dimensions onto neighborhood coolness, we also see some variation in the two samples. The US sample is consistent with the overall sample, with 'local' (0.827), 'lively' (0.824) and 'diverse' (0.836) having the highest path coefficients values. However, for the DK sample, 'lively' (0.739), 'diverse' (0.752), and 'aesthetic' (0.751) contribute most to the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness. Perhaps 'aesthetic' is more important to the DK sample, given the cultural significance of design in DK. The dimensions of 'green' and 'safe' have quite lower path coefficients in the DK sample (0.474 and 0.193, respectively) than in the US sample (0.660 and 0.436, respectively). However, for the DK sample the path coefficient for 'safe' is not statistically significant at a 95% confidence level and therefore this variable has not been interpreted further. This again could likely be attributed to a lower DK sample size. The low path coefficient for 'green' is quite surprising, given how environmentally focused DK is (Wolf et al., 2022).

And lastly, looking into the outcome variables, we again see some path coefficients are quite similar, while some differ between samples. The most extreme example is that of 'resident support for tourism' where the US sample has a path coefficient of 0.645 and the DK sample has a path coefficient of 0.272. Neighborhood coolness, therefore, has quite a low influence on residents' support for tourism in DK. It would be interesting to see the base-level support of tourism in these two countries to be able to understand if perhaps Danes are less accepting of tourism in general, attributing to a lower influence in this study. The effect of neighborhood coolness on 'community engagement' is also slightly lower for the DK sample (0.412), than the US sample (0.663). The path coefficients for 'WTP' and 'local business support' are also lower in the DK sample (0.359 and 0.340, respectively) compared to the US sample (0.550 and 0.500, respectively). We have hypothesized that this could be due to the sampling, as the DK sample is generally younger than the US sample and could therefore have fewer financial and henceforth a lower willingness to pay more and lower support of local businesses, which typically come with premium prices. A limitation of the study is that demographics related to income were not collected due to the complexity of differing currencies and wages in the
two countries. Income levels could allow us to test our assumptions. The adjusted R^2 of each study has been reported in Appendix G.



Figure 8: Structural Equation Modelling of US only and DK only Samples.

While these are only preliminary findings and should be evaluated with larger sample sizes, we can expect that the neighborhood coolness scale can be utilized to evaluate neighborhoods in different countries. It is likely based on our results, that there will be some differences in the importance of dimensions and that the attitudes and behaviors that neighborhood coolness solicit. It should be noted, however, that these two countries both have Western cultures, and therefore it would be interesting to test this on two more culturally diverse groups.

4.5.2 Dimensions on Outcome Variables

In this analysis we regress the dimensions directly on the outcome variables in order to understand the role of the six dimensions on the outcome variables. Although we ran the model in SmartPLS for all outcome variables, we chose to present 'WTP', and 'neighborhood-self connection', as their values were the most interesting to analyze. First, from the authors' point of view WTP is crucial for decision-makers as it is the most tangible outcome and is likely important for understanding the return on their investments into neighborhood coolness. By looking at the direct impact of the dimensions on the WTP we are able to understand what specifically drives residents to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood. Secondly, as the main analysis shows, neighborhood coolness has the largest impact on 'neighborhood-self connection', therefore it is of great interest to understand which dimensions actually drive 'neighborhood-self connection'. The two-part analysis was conducted on the total sample with 441 respondents as displayed in Section 4.1 and was measured based on the criteria outlined in the measurement model and structural model sections.

4.5.2.1 Dimensions on Willingness to Pay

First, we looked at the dimensions' direct relationship with willingness to pay more. Based on the measurement model analysis all factor loadings are above the threshold of 0.7, except for 'is multicultural' (0.693), 'has green areas' (0.685) and 'there are places to immerse yourself in nature' (0.693). However, due to the proximity to the threshold, we can infer reliability, validity and strong relationships to the respective dimensions. The values of the measurement model can be found in Appendices H, I and J. Aligned with the analysis of the main study, the Fornell-Larcker criterion parameters and the HTMT ratio indicate that all dimensions are discriminant, except for 'lively' and 'diverse'.

Next, we bootstrapped the model with 5,000 samples. The structural model in Figure 9 indicates that all p-values are significant as they are below the significance level of 0.05, except for 'aesthetic' (p=.939), 'green' (p=.581) and 'local (p=.108). This indicates that there is no observable significant effect of 'aesthetic', 'local' nor 'green' on 'WTP'. The dimension 'diverse' (0.232; p=.003) has the largest path coefficient, therefore, it plays the biggest role in constituting 'WTP'. Followed by 'safe' (0.214; p=.001) which plays the second largest role in the constitution of 'WTP'. Perhaps, the explanation why 'safe' increases the residents' willingness to pay more is that 79% of the participants are living in the US, where safety concerns may be higher compared to other countries as the US is ranked at only 47 in the ranking of safest countries (U.S. News, 2022). The dimension 'lively' has

the lowest impact on constituting 'WTP' as it has a path coefficient value of 0.178 (p=.027). The adjusted R² value is presented in Appendix K.



Figure 9: Structural Model of Study about Dimensions on Willingness to Pay.

To summarize, the study shows that WTP is driven by 'diverse', 'lively' and 'safe'. Thus, in order to increase the residents' willingness to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood, decision-makers should focus on making neighborhoods 'safe' and 'diverse'. 'Lively' plays a secondary role in terms of the 'WTP' and no significant effects of 'local', 'aesthetic' and 'green' were observed.

4.5.2.2 Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection

Next, we analyzed the impact of the dimensions on neighborhood-self connection. Looking at the measurement model all factor loadings are valid and reliable because they are above the threshold of

0.7, except for the factor loading of 'gentrified' (0.666) in the 'diverse' dimension. As the factor loading is so close to the threshold, we can still infer validity. Aligned with the main study, an overlap of the dimensions 'lively' and 'diverse' was identified with the Fornell-Larcker criterion parameters and HTMT ratio. The full results of the measurement model are displayed in Appendices L, M and N.

As the measurement model demonstrates the reliability and validity of the model, we analyzed the structural model with a bootstrap sample of 5,000 (see Figure 10). First, the majority of dimensions are statistically significant as their p-values are below 0.05, except for 'lively' (p=.339) and 'safe' (p=.968). Therefore, 'lively' and 'safe' have no significant effect on 'neighborhood-self connection'. The dimensions 'local' (0.310; p=.000) and 'aesthetic' (0.283; p=.000) have the highest path coefficients which means that they are the main drivers of constituting 'neighborhood-self connection'. On the other hand, 'diverse' (0.136; p=.026) and 'green' (0.134; p=.023) play the smallest role in the constitution of 'neighborhood-self connection'. The adjusted R² is reported in Appendix O.



Figure 10: Structural Model of Study about Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection.

In conclusion, 'neighborhood-self connection' is mostly impacted by the 'local' and 'aesthetic' dimensions. Interestingly, 'local' is also one of the three most important drivers in constituting neighborhood coolness, however, 'aesthetic' plays only the fourth largest role in constituting neighborhood coolness as the results of the main study show. Although aesthetic has not been captured in Kock's (2021) scale and therefore not in his outcome, we see similarities with Warren et al.'s (2019) findings of perceiving cool brands as aesthetic and its impact on self-brand connection. The dimensions 'diverse', and 'green' play a less important role for residents when it comes to them connecting with their neighborhood. Perhaps, 'green' is less important in this context because it is a more functional attribute.

5. Discussion of the Results

Upon analyzing the results of the qualitative pre-study and subsequent quantitative study, we will now answer the following research question:

What constitutes neighborhood coolness from a residents' perspective and how does it affect their behaviors and attitudes?

5.1 Neighborhood Coolness Scale

Based upon our qualitative pre-study, we developed an item pool and dimensions that we concluded constitute neighborhood coolness from a resident perspective. Through a quantitative online questionnaire, these items were evaluated as a valid and reliable tool to conceptualize neighborhood coolness from the perspective of a resident. We can therefore say that cool neighborhoods are those that residents describe as local, diverse, lively, aesthetic, green, and safe. It has been found that local, diverse, and lively play the largest role in constituting neighborhood coolness. We therefore find that the dimensions that are the most symbolic, and related to the character of the neighborhood, play the largest role in constituting neighborhood coolness. This differs to other research done into neighborhoods and residents, in tourism, city planning and place marketing that focuses chiefly on the functional attributes of the community. We will now discuss the highlights of our findings.

Looking into the main difference in how residents perceive neighborhood coolness compared to tourists' perceptions we found it interesting that residents characterize cool neighborhoods as diverse in terms of people and architecture. Though playing the second largest role in constituting neighborhood coolness, the dimension of 'diverse' had not been covered in Kock's (2021) destination coolness scale. Interestingly, Kock (2021) found in his pre-study that cool cities are defined through subcultures. Whereas our findings suggest that neighborhood coolness from the residents' perspective is not tied to one subculture and residents may have a much richer understanding of other subcultures creating the image of the city. Perhaps when tourists visit a city, they see the prominent subcultural groups and associate them with the destination, whereas residents have a deeper understanding of different people constituting/representing a neighborhood. For example, tourists associate a football subculture with the coolness of Liverpool (Kock, 2021), however residents of Anfield, where the stadium is located, actually believe that this subculture has ruined their neighborhood (Conn, 2013).

While only a few informants described the coolness of their neighborhood as local, in the sense of feeling part of a small community or village in a big city, we thought this most distinguished the perceptions of residents and tourists. Interestingly, this dimension was one of the most important in constituting neighborhood coolness in our quantitative study. We hypothesize this is perhaps more of a feeling that is more difficult to put into words, hence why it was discussed only by a few. Perhaps, local was not covered in the destination coolness scale (Kock, 2021), because the feeling of local is more important for residents living somewhere long-term or it can only be assessed after a period of time living in a neighborhood compared to tourists visiting a place for a short time. The development of this dimension could actually be relevant in the tourist context, however, as some travelers like to 'do as the locals do', and as we see some overlap with the 'original/iconic' dimension of the destination coolness (Kock, 2021) and our 'local' dimension.

The dimension 'lively' in the neighborhood coolness scale captures similar meanings as the 'vibrant' dimension in the destination coolness scale (Kock, 2021). However, in contrast to Kock's (2021) findings, we could see a connection of cool neighborhoods and youthfulness, as several informants associated younger generations living in cool neighborhoods and used descriptors such as youthful. We recommend further investigating if mostly younger people associate youthfulness with cool neighborhoods, or if this is a general finding for all age groups. We had originally included another item related to age in the questionnaire, namely 'people of different ages are living here', however this item was removed due to it being poorly worded and therefore not clear. Had we been able to collect valid responses to this, we may be able to have a better understanding of whether this concept of youthfulness relates more to the energy or to the people in the neighborhood.

In Kock's (2021) destination coolness, he found that tourist did not describe cool cities as having an aesthetic appeal. However, in our qualitative pre-study study, informants spoke of cool neighborhoods as being 'attractive' and 'pretty', and 'aesthetic' and this was therefore included as a dimension in our neighborhood coolness scale. It was then found to be the fourth most important dimension of neighborhood coolness in our quantitative study. Reflecting upon this contrasting finding, the authors become curious as to how the respondents were defining the items 'pretty' and 'aesthetically appealing'. For instance, does a respondent consider an area with new, modern architecture, one with posh, older buildings, or even one with graffiti to be pretty? We figured their responses may differ by culture and by person. Therefore, we suggest more research should be done

to understand how residents actually conceptualize aesthetic in this context.

We additionally added two more dimensions into our scale that were not part of the destination coolness scale (Kock, 2021), namely 'green' and 'safe'. While other coolness scales usually do not include functional dimensions, we found that the dimensions 'green' and 'safe' play a role in constituting neighborhood coolness. This provides much more overlap with citizen satisfaction scales which typically include attributes similar to these dimensions. While these dimensions were found to constitute neighborhood coolness, they were less important than the other dimensions. 'Green' may play a smaller role in the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness because perhaps urban neighborhoods are typically lacking in green areas and 83% of our respondents live in urban areas. The feeling of safety in a neighborhood is less important in constituting neighborhood coolness, a finding that also corresponds with insights from the pre-study interviews, in which informants talked about gang violence in their cool neighborhood.

5.2 Outcome Variables

Through the existing literature and our qualitative pre-study, we additionally identified attitudes and behaviors that we supposed would be impacted by neighborhood coolness. This led to the identification of 14 hypotheses covering general attitudinal and behavioral variables, as well as variables related to neighborhood-self connection and residents' support of tourism. All hypotheses were confirmed establishing that neighborhood coolness has a positive and significant effect on a residents' likelihood to: like their neighborhood, be satisfied with their neighborhood, have a high perceived quality of life in their neighborhood, stay in their neighborhood, be willing to pay more, recommend their neighborhood to others to live in, engage in the community in their neighborhood, and support local businesses in their neighborhood. Cool neighborhoods also have a positive impact on residents' neighborhood as a reflection of themselves, their likelihood to identify with their neighborhood and their perceived connection to their neighborhood. Additionally, neighborhood coolness positively impacts residents' support of tourism in a cool neighborhood, which explains their support of incoming tourists, perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life, and perception of tourism's impact on their community life. While all these relationships are positive, we see the largest impact

on neighborhood-self connection, liking of their neighborhood and likelihood to recommend their neighborhood.

Our findings that satisfaction and quality of life are positively and meaningfully impacted by neighborhood coolness present an interesting and relatively novel empirical understanding of residents' well-being. The majority of research into citizen satisfaction studies have investigated the impact of mostly functional neighborhood characteristics, such as accessibility, density of housing, governmental service, job opportunities, etc. While, for instance, Zenker et al.'s (2013) 'urbanity and diversity' dimension in their CSI, did tap more into the personality of a city with items such as 'the energy and atmosphere of the city', 'many different cultures and subcultures', and 'openness and tolerance of the city', the rest of the items are rather functional. From our research, we can see that these functional elements are not the only way to increase a citizen's perceived satisfaction and quality of life. In 2003, Berlin mayor, Klaus Wowereit, famously tokened the city as "poor, but sexy" (Tagesspiegel, 2014). While Berlin was struggling at the time in terms of infrastructure and the economy, the city was attractive, and people were happy living there (Tagesspiegel, 2014). Based on our findings, we find empirical truth to this iconic phrase. A city or neighborhood can increase the well-being of their citizens by focusing on the character of the area, namely the coolness, rather than infrastructural problems or governmental issues.

Interestingly, neighborhood-self connection is most impacted by neighborhood coolness, which means that residents can use cool neighborhoods as a tool to enhance their image rather than just impacting their behavior within their neighborhood. This finding contributes to Kock's (2021) discovery of compensatory consumption in the tourism field. Compensatory consumption refers to tourists looking for self-actualizations on their trips, more specifically, Kock (2021) posits that tourists are drawn to cool cities in order to compensate for lower levels of personality attributes, such as low autonomy. We suggest the compensatory effect in the resident context is that residents perceive their cool neighborhood as a reflection of themselves and therefore, outwardly identify with it. While compensatory effects for tourists may only last for the duration of the trip or shortly thereafter, the connections between a cool neighborhood and a resident likely have longer lasting effects. For instance, when residents invite people over or talk about their neighborhood, they are perhaps able to feel as though they are conveying a cool image themselves. This could be why WOM is the third

most impacted outcome variable by neighborhood coolness. It would be interesting to investigate the impact of neighborhood-self connection on WOM, as it could function as a mediator. Further, moving to a cool neighborhood may be more about the self-definition, self-verification or self-enhancement (Kock, 2021) of the resident than for example their well-being. While not covered in this study, based on these findings we could predict that when people move to a neighborhood, they are conscious and influenced by what living there will say about them. This highlights the importance of further research in neighborhood-self connections and compensatory effects in the resident domain.

Another interesting finding to highlight is the positive impact of neighborhood coolness on residents' support of tourism, thereby making an important contribution to tourism research and managers. Similarly, to research on citizen wellbeing, the concept of residents' support had mostly been researched through the lens of more practical attributes, typically looking into the economic and social cost and benefits of tourism. Our findings that neighborhood coolness increases residents' support of tourism indicate that a neighborhood can increase residents' support by focusing on the personality and image of the respective neighborhood rather than focusing on for instance, decreasing the social costs of tourism. Given our comparison of the neighborhood coolness scale to the destination coolness scale, we can also see clear overlaps in tourists' perceptions of coolness and residents' perceptions of coolness. This provides important contributions as the coolness perceptions of both stakeholder groups can be targeted simultaneously.

As we discussed in the prior section, 'local' is an important driver of neighborhood coolness. We assume based on our pre-study that local businesses contribute to this 'local feel'. However, neighborhood coolness has a low impact on 'local business support' which could possibly be explained by the fact that it is more impacted by other factors (i.e., price, availability) than the residents' actual desire to support local businesses. But without residents supporting these local businesses, one could expect that these local businesses would struggle. It would be interesting to investigate the relationship between these variables further.

5.3 Post-hoc Discussion

After we had answered our main research question, we were interested to further investigate certain phenomenon in the data that we had collected. For instance, as we had collected data in both the US

and DK, and we were interested to see if we could find any cultural intricacies in the data between these groups. Next, we looked into the direct impact of the dimensions on willingness to pay and neighborhood-self connection.

Kock (2021) hypothesizes that what makes a city cool may differ across cultural contexts. While the US and DK are both considered Western cultures, we wanted to examine if there were differences in the conceptualizations of neighborhood coolness in these two countries. However, given the sample size of DK residents, these results should be interpreted under this limitation. The US sample is generally aligned with the results of the main study, however for the DK respondents' cool neighborhoods are local, diverse, lively, aesthetic, green, and are not necessarily safe, as there is no observable significant effect. For the Danes, lively, diverse, and aesthetic are most important in the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness. The effect on attitudes and behaviors differs between countries. For instance, the impact of neighborhood coolness on residents' support for tourism and community engagement is significantly lower in DK than in the US. Overall, we can report differences in the importance of different dimensions and the importance on neighborhood coolness effect on outcome variables, however the neighborhood coolness scale can still be used as a valid measurement tool. However, given these cultures are more so closely aligned, it would be important to further test this neighborhood coolness scale in other cultural contexts, such as among Asia or African residents.

In the second post-hoc analysis we aimed at understanding the role of the previously identified dimensions on two selected outcome variables, namely 'WTP' and 'neighborhood-self connection'. Interestingly, the results show that the dimensions 'diverse' and 'safe' are the largest drivers in constituting willingness to pay more, whereas 'lively' plays a minor role. In terms of neighborhood-self connection, the findings show that 'lively' and 'aesthetic' play the largest role in driving the outcome variable. The importance of 'aesthetic' on neighborhood-self connection presents an interesting finding as it infers that residents may prefer to reside in an aesthetic neighborhood to convey a more favorable image of themselves.

6. Theoretical and Managerial Implications

We have now established that the neighborhood coolness scale is a valid measurement tool for neighborhood coolness from a resident perspective and confirmed all of our hypotheses. In the following section we will discuss the important contributions of this study from a theoretical and managerial perspective.

6.1 Theoretical Implications

This thesis offers important theoretical contributions to the research areas of residents by conceptualizing and validating neighborhood coolness from a resident perspective through empirical data. Thereby the authors fill an identified gap in coolness and residents research to understand neighborhood coolness. The authors developed a multi-dimensional neighborhood coolness scale on the basis of empirical data from the pre-study and quantitative study, which is to the best knowledge of the authors the first attempt to conceptualize neighborhood coolness. The six dimensions of the neighborhood coolness scale, namely 'local', 'lively', 'diverse', 'aesthetic', 'green' and 'safe' enable testing and comparing coolness perceptions of different neighborhoods. Therefore, the neighborhood coolness scale will offer a framework for future research. The testing of the neighborhood coolness scale in two countries, Denmark and the United States, shows preliminary findings that the scale could be applied to different neighborhoods. However, as the scale has also only been tested in two Western countries (United States, N=350 and Denmark, N=91); the generalizability of the scale should be viewed under this limitation. The study follows Kock's (2021) future research proposal for investigating the impact that residential coolness perceptions have on behavioral outcomes. Therefore, we compared the neighborhood coolness scale to the destination coolness scale by Kock (2021) in order to highlight differences in the perception of neighborhood coolness from a resident perspective and of destination coolness from a tourist perspective. Thereby, the study modifies the destination coolness scale to a different context. It was found that residents characterize neighborhood coolness with different descriptors than tourists describe destination coolness.

As presented in the literature review, the research area of quality of life has become a rather significant research field within tourism research. This research can contribute as we found that

neighborhood coolness positively influences residents' quality of life as well as the residents' perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life. The findings contribute to understanding residents' well-being in the context of neighborhood coolness. The study also contributes to tourism as it shows that neighborhood coolness can increase residents' support of tourism. The findings of the post-hoc analyses about the direct impact of the dimensions on the outcome variables contribute to understanding what drives the outcome variables WTP and neighborhood-self connection. For example, the finding that neighborhood-self connection is driven by 'aesthetic' contributes to theory by highlighting the need to understand the relationship of aesthetic attributes and their impact on self-connections, even beyond the research area of residents.

6.2 Managerial Implications

This thesis provides a valuable tool and insights for managers across disciplines. Importantly, it provides decision makers with a reliable tool to develop, measure and even compare the coolness of neighborhoods. We see direct implications for managers in the fields of place marketing, city planning, real estate, and tourism, as both a strategic tool and a communication tool, which we will present below.

When we consider how the neighborhood coolness scale can be implemented by managers, we take the example of real estate developers and marketeers. For instance, when we consider the topic of housing projects in "unattractive" or "up-and-coming" neighborhoods of real estate development managers, can utilize the dimensions of neighborhood coolness in the planning of the development and the marketing thereafter. They could create a strategic position implementing the pillars of local, diverse, and lively – the most important contributors to neighborhood coolness. In order to build up the 'local' feel of a neighborhood they can focus on leasing out retail spaces to local businesses instead of chains and/or publicizing community spaces and community events to build a sense of community. To encourage a lively feel, words like 'dynamic', and 'hip' can be utilized in marketing communications. And perhaps to promote the 'diverse' feel, the planners can seek to vary the architecture of the developments. These are only some of the considerations that can be used by planners and marketers to revamp the character of a neighborhood. However, we do not only see the managerial importance for real estate developers and marketeers as the scale can also for instance be

utilized by city planners to create favorable, cool associations, which in turn increase the attractiveness of these areas for real estate investment and development into neighborhoods.

Citizen well-being is a critical measure for policymakers, as individuals with high perceived wellbeing are positive contributors to their communities. For instance, they suffer less incidence of disease, resulting in lower healthcare costs, are more likely to contribute to their community, and are more productive in the workforce (CDC, n.d.). However, increasing citizen well-being often results in complex or expensive projects for policymakers. Therefore, our study provides large implications for policymakers in that they can target their constituent's satisfaction and quality of life, through the character of their neighborhoods, rather than the infrastructure or education system, for instance.

Residents are viewed as one of the most important stakeholders in the tourism industry and their support is critical to its success (Bimonte & Punzo, 2016). We find that neighborhood coolness increases a resident's support of tourism, namely by increasing residents' support of incoming tourists, residents' perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life and residents' perception of tourisms' impact on their community life. Therefore, this thesis makes contributions to managers in tourism. Marketers can target residents' support of tourism by using communications which increase a resident's perception of neighborhood coolness. As we have now highlighted overlaps between the neighborhood coolness scale and destination coolness scale, marketers can even see how they can portray coolness to both groups of stakeholders in the same communications. Not only can neighborhood coolness act as an important catalyst in residents' support of tourism, but can also affects a resident's perception of their neighborhood, hence whether they like or are satisfied with their neighborhood. While we only tested a residents' likelihood to recommend their neighborhood to live in, we know that residents act as "destination ambassadors to nonresidents" (Stylidis et al., 2016, p. 660) and therefore it is not only important they support tourism, but that they convey an attractive picture to tourists.

The results of this study are of critical importance, because as with tourist destinations (Kock, 2021), we can now confirm that neighborhood coolness is not just an ambiguously positive trait but makes a quantifiably positive impact on a resident's life and many of their attitudes and behaviors. Our model is especially practical for practitioners as it allows for the quantification of the effects of neighborhood coolness. For instance, a manager can deduct from this study that if they successfully

increase neighborhood coolness perceptions from just "somewhat agree" to "agree", they can anticipate a 41.4% increase in the residents' willingness to recommend this neighborhood to others to live in. Additionally, beyond the model itself we have researched the direct impact that the dimensions have on selected outcome variables. Therefore, if a manager seeks to target a specific outcome, such as WTP, they should focus on the 'diverse' feel of a neighborhood.

Based upon our study on US and DK residents we can see preliminary results as to how coolness conceptualizations may differ across cultures. The neighborhood coolness scale can be used to evaluate what dimensions are most important to different cultures, as well as how this neighborhood coolness will affect their attitudes and behavior. This is important as the implications of this study are relevant beyond the context of the US and DK.

7. Limitations and Future Research

Despite the meaningful theoretical and managerial contributions, the present thesis is subject to limitations. In the following section, we will therefore highlight the shortcomings of the analysis due to our constraints in time and scope. This highlights the need for future research, of which interesting topics will be discussed.

During our pre-study interviews a few informants mentioned that they believe parts of the neighborhood were cool, while other parts of the neighborhood were less cool. Additionally, when we tested the questionnaire, we received feedback from the respondents that for those not living in a city it was unclear what they could define as their neighborhood. Therefore, in the questionnaire we added a disclaimer, noting our definition of their neighborhood, 'If you do not live in a city, we define your neighborhood as the local community surrounding your home'. However, there is still the possibility that respondents faced confusion regarding what their neighborhood was, potentially affecting their responses. This presents also a potential limitation in the application of their scale for managers, but we argue this can be resolved by defining the specific area being tested to ensure respondents consider the respective neighborhood. We also believe the coolness of a neighborhood could be affected based on where that resident lives within the neighborhood. For instance, if a respondent lives on the outskirts of a cool neighborhood, next to a rather uncool neighborhood, then perhaps their results will be biased in their measurement of the coolness of their neighborhood.

In general, the representativeness of the sample is limited due to the probability sampling of the Danish sample. The size of the DK (N=91) sample also does not reach the critical sample size threshold and is thus insufficient to generalize the findings of this sample alone. Therefore, the comparison of the US and DK samples can be viewed as a preliminary analysis and further research relating to cultural differences of the neighborhood coolness scale should be conducted. It should be noted that the generalizability of this study is also limited as both samples are from Western countries. Hence, we propose to test the developed neighborhood coolness scale in other countries to validate the research as perhaps, in other countries different dimensions play a role in constituting neighborhood coolness.

Due to the scope of the thesis, we focused mostly on developing and testing the neighborhood

coolness with the total sample, and in a post-hoc analysis we were able to compare the US and DK samples and test the direct impact of the dimensions on two selected outcome variables. In general, the sample of the quantitative study is diverse in terms of age, gender, education level and family status. However, as the questionnaire covers demographic data about age, gender, education level and family status, there are more options to analyze different angles of neighborhood coolness, that may provide interesting implications. Future research should therefore focus more on the drivers of neighborhood coolness based on the demographics.

In this study we focused on neighborhoods in urban areas, however, it would have been interesting to analyze if there are differences in the conceptualization of coolness based on whether residents live in rural or urban neighborhoods, we decided not to analyze this phenomenon in our study due to the small percentage of participants living in rural neighborhoods (9% of the total sample). Future research should analyze possible differences with samples that are more balanced in terms of geographical classification.

Further, the authors considered including income level in the questionnaires, but it was decided to omit as the currencies and income levels in the two countries are different and therefore not comparable. Nevertheless, we suggest including a demographic question regarding income levels in future studies where applicable to see if residents perceive neighborhood coolness in different ways depending on their income level. It would also be interesting to see if the racial background influences the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness.

During our research we also came across two other interesting topics that could be studied in the context of neighborhood coolness in future research, namely the lifecycle of neighborhoods and the compensatory effect in residents' choice of neighborhood. First, building up on the lifecycle of brands introduced by Warren et al. (2019) and insights from the qualitative pre-study, we propose to research how neighborhoods evolve over time, as for example due to the phenomenon of gentrification. Moreover, it would be interesting to research how the perception of neighborhood coolness changes with the age of the residents and the life stage they are in. For example, do residents under 30 years of age perceive neighborhood coolness different than residents over 60 years of age? Second, Kock's findings illustrate there could also perhaps be a compensatory effect in that those with lower autonomy may have a stronger appeal to visit cool cities, highlighting the need for research on

compensatory consumption in tourism that does not currently exist (Kock, 2021). This could also point to an interesting research line, in whether there is a compensatory effect in residents' choice of neighborhood.

8. Conclusion

Creating a certain image for a neighborhood is attractive for different stakeholders e.g., residents, policy makers, real estate, local businesses. For example, research stresses the impact of neighborhoods on residents' mental health and well-being (Cutrona et al., 2006), which is important for policymakers. Further, the necessity to transform neighborhoods becomes clear considering the effects of urbanization that leads to people moving to less desirable neighborhoods. Our neighborhood coolness scale provides a tool for these decision-makers to create more favorable neighborhoods, which positively impacts residents' attitudes and behaviors. The scale development is based on Kock's (2021) research about destination coolness, and we contribute to this research stream by considering the perspective of residents. Looking into existing studies, research has so far studied the areas of coolness, residents and tourism separately, and only considered tourism and coolness, and residents in conjunction. Thus, we identified a gap in research about how coolness and residents are connected, which led us to the research question:

What constitutes neighborhood coolness from a residents' perspective and how does it affect their behaviors and attitudes?

To answer the research question, we developed and tested a multi-dimensional neighborhood coolness scale to understand what constitutes a cool neighborhood from a resident perspective, whereby the destination coolness scale by Kock (2021) served as a framework. Our scale development is based on a qualitative pre-study with 15 residents from DK and existing literature. The neighborhood coolness scale has been tested and adapted in a subsequent quantitative study with 441 participants from DK and the US. Through PLS-SEM we have proved it to be valid and reliable with six dimensions, namely 'local', 'lively', 'diverse', 'aesthetic, 'green' and 'safe' constituting neighborhood coolness (see Figure 11).

All hypotheses regarding residents' general behaviors and attitudes, neighborhood-self connection and support of tourism could be confirmed, therefore we prove that neighborhood coolness has a positive effect on residents' likelihood to: like their neighborhood, be satisfied with their neighborhood, have a high perceived quality of life in their neighborhood, stay in their neighborhood, be willing to pay more, recommend their neighborhood to others to live in, engage in the community in their neighborhood, and support local businesses in their neighborhood. Furthermore, residents' neighborhood-self connection that is whether they view their neighborhood as a reflection of themselves, their likelihood to identify with their neighborhood and their perceived connection to their neighborhood, is positively impacted by neighborhood coolness. Additionally, neighborhood coolness positively impacts residents' support of tourism, more specifically their support of incoming tourists, perception of tourists' impact on their quality of life, and perception of tourism's impact on their community life. Although neighborhood coolness positively impacts all outcome variables, it was found that neighborhood-self connection, liking of their neighborhood and likelihood to recommend their neighborhood are most impacted by neighborhood coolness.





The comparison of the DK and US sample in the post-hoc analysis serves as a preliminary demonstration of cultural differences in the conceptualization of neighborhood coolness. However, due to the low sample size (N=91) of the DK sample, the findings may not be generalizable, therefore,

we point out the need to conduct more studies in different contexts. In the post-hoc analysis conducted on the direct effect of the dimensions on selected outcome variables, we found that decision-makers should focus on the dimensions 'diverse', 'lively' and safe' to increase the residents' willingness to pay. In order to increase neighborhood-self connection the focus should be put on the dimensions of 'local' and 'aesthetic'.

As elaborated in the prior section, this thesis is subject to limitations. Although that we added a disclaimer about neighborhood definition into the questionnaire, residents may not be able to define what a neighborhood is, especially if they live in rural or suburban areas. Due to the scope of the thesis, many interesting phenomena related to this research were not able to be investigated further. For example, we were not able to investigate differences in perceptions of neighborhood coolness based on demographics such as gender, age, education level, family status, country, geographical area, or additionally race, income level. Also, it would be interesting to investigate the effect of lifecycle as proposed by Warren et al. (2019) or the compensatory effect (Kock, 2021) in the context of neighborhoods. Therefore, this study serves as an inspiration for many interesting research streams.

9. References

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of Brand Personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34(3), 347-356. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224379703400304
- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2011). Exploring the Nature of Tourism and Quality of Life Perceptions among Residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248–260. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510362918
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' Perceptions on Tourism Impacts. Annals of Tourism Research (19), 665-690. https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060-3
- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 47–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759303200108
- Bagozzi, R.P., & Yi, Y. (2012). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(1), 8-34. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0278-x
- Baloglu, S. McCleary, K.W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. Annals of Tourism Research, 26(4), 868-897. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00030-4
- Belk, R. W., Tian, K. & Paavola, H. (2015). Consuming cool: Behind the unemotional mask. *Research in Consumer Behavior*, 12, 183-208. https://doi.org/10.1108/S0885-2111(2010)0000012010
- Bell, E., Harley, B., & Bryman, A. (2022). Business Research Methods (6th ed.). Oxford University Press Academic UK. https://bookshelf-activate.vitalsource.com/books/9780192640505

- Bimonte, S., & Punzo, L. (2016). Tourist development and host-guest interaction: An economic exchange theory. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 58, 128-139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.03.004.
- CDC (n.d.). Health-Related Quality of Life. Well-being Concepts. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/wellbeing.htm
- Chen, F., Quadri-Felitti, D., & Mattila, A.S. (2023). Generation Influences Perceived Coolness But Not Favorable Attitudes Toward Cool Hotel Brands. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 64(1), 95-103. https://doi.org/10.1177/19389655211031442
- Chen, C. F., & Chou, S. H. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of perceived coolness for Generation Y in the context of creative tourism - A case study of the Pier 2 Art Center in Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 72, 121-129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.11.016
- Conn, D. (2013, May 6). Anfield: the victims, the anger and Liverpool's shameful truth. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/football/david-conn-inside-sport-blog/2013/may/06/anfield-liverpool-david-conn
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). An Assessment of the Image of Mexico as a Vacation Destination and the Influence of Geographical Location Upon That Image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(4), 18-23. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875790170040
- Cutrona, C.E., Wallace, G., & Wesner, K. A. (2006). Neighborhood Characteristics and Depression: An Examination of Stress Processes. Curr Dir Psychol Sci. 2006 Aug;15(4):188-192. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00433.x. PMID: 18185846; PMCID: PMC2186297.
- Dar-Nimrod, I., Hansen, I., & Proulx, T. (2012). Coolness: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 33(3), 175-185. DOI: 10.1027/1614-0001/a000088

- Dash, G., & Paul, J. (2021). CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting. *Journal of Technological Forecasting & Social Change. 173*(3), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121092
- de Jong, B. (2019, October 22). Four Characteristics Of An Up-And-Coming Neighborhood (And Why You Should Buy Your Next Home There). Forbes Real Estate. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesrealestatecouncil/2019/10/22/four-characteristics-of-anup-and-coming-neighborhood-and-why-you-should-buy-your-next-home-there/
- Dolnicar, S., & Grün, B. (2013). Validly measuring destination image in survey studies. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287512457267
- Ekinci, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination Personality: An Application of Brand Personality to
 Tourism Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127-139.
 https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287506291603
- Escalas, J. E., & Bettman, J. R. (2005). Self-construal, reference groups, and brand meaning. *Journal* of Consumer Research, 32(3), 378–389. https://doi.org/10.1086/497549
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312
- Gladwell, M. (1997). The Coolhunt. Annals of Style. Retrieved from: https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1997/03/17/the-coolhunt
- Gibson, C. (2017). Elaboration, Generalization, Triangulation, and Interpretation: On Enhancing the Value of Mixed Method Research, Organizational Research Methods, 20(2): 193–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116639133

- Goodman, J. K., & Paolacci, G. (2017). Crowdsourcing Consumer Research. *Journal of Consumer Research 44*(1), 196-210. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucx047
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2001). Handbook of interview research. SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412973588
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2014). Introduction to Applied Thematic Analysis. Thousand Oaks: Sage. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483384436
- Hair, J.F. Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E. (2013). Multivariate Data Analysis. Pearson Education UK.
- Hair, J. Howard, M.C, & Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 101-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.11.069.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences, 43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8
- Hur, M., & Morrow-Jones, H. (2008). Factors That Influence Residents' Satisfaction With Neighborhoods. Environment and Behavior, 40 (5), 619-635.
- Hulland, J. (1999). USE OF PARTIAL LEAST SQUARES (PLS) IN STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT RESEARCH: A REVIEW OF FOUR RECENT STUDIES. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2), 195-204. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199902)20:2<195::AID-SMJ13>3.0.CO;2-7

- Jackson, C., & Dempster, S. (2009). 'I sat back on my computer ... with a bottle of whisky next to me': constructing 'cool' masculinity through 'effortless' achievement in secondary and higher education, *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18(4), 341-356. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589230903260019
- Josiassen, A., Woo, L., & Kock, F. (2016). The Imagery–Image Duality Model: An Integrative Review and Advocating for Improved Delimitation of Concepts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(6), 789-803. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515583358
- Kock, F. (2021). What makes a city cool? Understanding destination coolness and its implications for tourism. *Tourism Management*, 86(3), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104317
- Kock, F., Josiassen, A., & Assaf, A. G. (2016). Advancing destination image: The destination content model. *Annals of Tourism Research, 61*, 28–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.07.003
- Kock, F., Josiassen, A. & George, A. A. (2019). The Xenophobic Tourist. Annals of Tourism Research, 74, 155-166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2018.11.005
- Kodé, A. (2023, January 20) America, the Bland. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/20/realestate/housing-developments-cityarchitecture.html
- Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist Satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an Off-Season Holiday Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269. https://doi-org.escweb.lib.cbs.dk/10.1177/004728750003800308

- Lin, Z., Chen, Y., & Filieri, R. (2017). Resident-tourist value co-creation: The role of residents' perceived tourism impacts and life satisfaction. *Tourism Management, 61,* 436–442. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.013
- Loureiro, S. M. C., & Blanco, T. M. (2023) Museum coolness: creating the desire to revisit, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 48(1), 94-109. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2021.1885799
- Molina-Azorin, J., Bergh, D, Corley, K., & Ketchen, D. (2017). Mixed Methods in the Organizational Sciences: Taking Stock and Moving Forward. *Organizational Research Methods*, 20(2): 179– 92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116687
- Monterrubio, C. (2016). The impact of spring break behaviour: An integrated threat theory analysis of residents' prejudice, *Tourism Management*, *54*, 418-427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.004
- Moon, K., & Blackman, D. (2014). A Guide to Understanding Social Science Research for Natural Scientists. *Conservation Biology*, *23*, 1167-1177.
- Mouratidis, K., Yiannakou, A. (2022). What makes cities livable? Determinants of neighborhood satisfaction and neighborhood happiness in different contexts. *Land Use Policy, 112*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105855
- Nancarrow, C., Nancarrow, P., & Page, J. (2001). An analysis of the concept of cool and its marketing implications. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, *1*(4), 311-322. https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.77
- Nawijn, J., & Mitas, O. (2012). Resident Attitudes to Tourism and Their Effect on Subjective Well-Being: The Case of Palma de Mallorca. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(5), 531-541. https://doi-org.esc-web.lib.cbs.dk/10.1177/004728751142648

- Nunkoo, R., & So, K. K. F. (2016). Residents' Support for Tourism: Testing Alternative Structural Models. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(7). https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515592972
- Oakes, J. M., Andrade, K. E., Biyoow, I. M., & Cowan, L. T. (2015). Twenty Years of Neighborhood Effect Research: An Assessment. *Current Epidemiology Reports*, 2, 80–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40471-015-0035-7
- Overgaard, L. (n.d). Denmark is a good place to work, but socialising is a big problem. Djoef. https://www.djoef.dk/english/news/2020/working-in-denmark.aspx
- Pan, L., Zhang, M. Gursoy, D., & Lu, L. (2017) Development and validation of a destination personality scale for mainland Chinese travelers. *Tourism Management*, 59, 338-348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.005
- Richards, G. (2016). Tourists in their own city considering the growth of a phenomenon. *Tourism Today*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348509950_Tourists_in_their_own_city_considering_the_growth_of_a_phenomenon
- Singh, K. (2007). Quantitative Social Research Methods. SAGE, New Delhi. https://doi.org/10.4135/9789351507741
- Sirgy, J. M., & Su, C. (2000). Destination Image, Self-Congruity, and Travel Behavior: Toward an Integrative Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, *38*(4). 340-352.
- Stylidis, D., Sit, J., & Biran, A. (2016). An Exploratory Study of Residents' Perception of Place Image: The Case of Kavala. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(5), 659–674. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514563163

- Stylidis, D. (2022). Exploring Resident-Tourist Interaction and its Impact on Tourists' Destination Image. Journal of Travel Research, 61(1), 186-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520969861
- Sundar, S. S., Tamul, D. J., & Wu, M. (2014). Capturing "cool": Measures for assessing coolness of technological products. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 72(2), 169-180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2013.09.008
- Tagesspiegel (2014, September 9). Klaus Wowereit Berlin Poor but sexy is not enough. https://www.tagesspiegel.de/kultur/poor-but-sexy-is-not-enough-4828222.html
- The Economist Intelligence Unit (2021). Safest Cities Index 2021. The Economist. https://safecities.economist.com/
- TimeOut (n.d). The 51 coolest neighbourhoods in the world. https://www.timeout.com/travel/coolestneighbourhoods-in-the-world
- Uysal, M., Sirgy, M. J., Woo, E., & Kim, H. L. (2016). Quality of life (QOL) and well-being research in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 53(4), 244-261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.013
- USDA (n.d.). Rural Classifications. Economic Research Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture. https://www.ers.usda.gov/topics/rural-economy-population/ruralclassifications/#:~:text=The%20U.S.%20Census%20Bureau%20uses,with%20fewer%20tha n%202%2C500%20residents
- U.S. News (2022). These Are the Safest Countries Ranking. https://www.usnews.com/news/bestcountries/rankings/safe?sort=alpha-desc

- Warren, C., & Campbell, M. C. (2014). What Makes Things Cool? How Autonomy Influences Perceived Coolness. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 41(2), 543-563. https://doi.org/10.1086/676680
- Warren, C., Batra, R., Loureiro S. M.C., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2019). Brand Coolness. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(5), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919857698
- Wolf, M. J, Emerson, J. W., Esty, D. C., de Sherbinin, A., Wendling, Z. A., et al. (2022). 2022 Environmental Performance Index. New Haven, CT: Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy. https://epi.yale.edu/
- Yan, S., & Chun-you, Wu (2006). An Empirical Study on Influencing Factors of Residents' Environmental Behavior. International Conference on Management Science and Engineering (ICMSE), 2197-2202. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICMSE.2006.314156
- Zenker, S., Petersen, S., & Aholt, A. (2013). The Citizen Satisfaction Index (CSI): Evidence for a four basic factor model in a German sample, *Cities*, 31, 156-164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2012.02.006.
- Zenker, S., & Rütter, N. (2014). Is satisfaction the key? The role of citizen satisfaction, place attachment and place brand attitude on positive citizenship behavior. *Cities – International Journal of Urban Policy and Planning, 38,* 11-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2013.12.009

Appendix A. Interview Guide for Qualitative Pre-Study

Qualitative Questionnaire

[Preliminary Information]

Recording of Audio, Anonymous Interview, Data Use and Protection, Signature on Data Protection Document

Introduction

[Icebreaker questions]

- A. Where do you live in Copenhagen at the moment?
- B. Where in Copenhagen have you lived?

Main Part

[Topic: Cool neighborhood and their descriptions]

1. Do you consider your neighborhood to be cool to live in?

Yes \rightarrow What makes this neighborhood cool to live in? Which adjectives would you use to describe it?

No \rightarrow What makes this neighborhood uncool to live in? Which adjectives would you use to describe it?

2. Do you like living in this neighborhood? Why?

Follow up question if answered with 'No', Would there be a cool neighborhood, that you could imagine to live in?

[Topic: Social life]

3. How would you describe your community engagement in this neighborhood?

[Topic: Rent prices]

4. Cool neighborhood: Are you willing to pay more to live in this neighborhood? Uncool neighborhood: Would you be willing to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood?

[Topic: Recommendation to others] – if question 1 is answered with a Yes

5. Would you recommend this neighborhood to others to live in? If so, why?

[Topic: Uncoolness]

6. Is there anything uncool in your neighborhood?

End

Thanking for the interview and explain further steps.

Appendix B. Questionnaire for Quantitative Study (adapted from Kock, 2021)

[Conducted with Qualtrics]

Which city or town do you currently live in? [Note: Open ended question]

•

Which neighborhood do you currently live in? [Note: Open ended question]

•

With this neighborhood in mind, please indicate below how you would describe it [Note: items are in randomized order; 7-point Likert scale*]:

• Is cool

With your neighborhood '_____' in mind, please indicate below how you would describe it [Note: items are in randomized order; 7-point Likert scale*]:

[Local Block]

- Has a local feel
- Is original
- Has a distinct identity
- Has a sense of community
- Feels like living in a bubble

[Lively Block]

- Is lively
- Offers nightlife, cafes, etc.
- Is dynamic
- Is hip
- Is youthful
- Is rebellious

[Diversity Block]

- Is eclectic
- Is multi-cultural
- Is gentrified
- Is nonconformist
- People of different ages are living here
- Has varied architecture

[Aesthetically Appealing Block]

- Is pretty
- Is clean
- Is aesthetically appealing

[Green Block]

- Has green areas
- Select strongly agree [Note: marker question]
- There are places to immerse yourself in nature
- Residents of this neighborhood care about the environment

[Safe Block]

• Is safe

With your neighborhood '____' in mind, please indicate below how you would describe your behavior: [Note: items are in randomized order; 7-point Likert scale]:

[Satisfaction/Quality of Life Block]

- I like living in this neighborhood.
- I would recommend this neighborhood to others to live in.
- I do not have an intention to leave my current neighborhood.
- I am satisfied with my current neighborhood.
- My quality of life is high in this neighborhood.
- I am willing to pay more to live in a cool neighborhood.

[Neighborhood-Self Connection Block]

- This neighborhood reflects who I am.
- I can identify with this neighborhood.
- I feel a personal connection to this neighborhood.

[Tourism/Community Block]

- I support local businesses in this neighborhood.
- I am engaged in my community within this neighborhood.
- I am happy about tourists visiting my neighborhood.
- Tourists to my neighborhood positively affect my quality of life.
- Tourism positively influences community life.

[Demographics]

What gender do you identify as?

- Woman
- Man
- Other

How old are you?

- 18-29
- 30-39
- 40-49

- 50-59
- 59 or older

What is your highest education?

- Finished a master's degree or higher
- Finished a bachelor's degree
- Finished vocational school/high school
- Finished secondary school
- Finished primary school

Do you have children?

- Yes
- No

*7-point Likert Scale: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neither agree or disagree, Somewhat agree, Agree, Strongly Agree

Appendix C. US vs. DK Study: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted

	US Sample			DK Sample		
Construct/Items	Factor Loadings (Higher order loading)	CR	AVE	Factor Loadings (Higher order loading)	CR	AVE
Neighborhood Coolness (newly developed) [Neighborhood]						
Local	0,827	<u>0,891</u>	<u>0,673</u>	0,739	<u>0,837</u>	<u>0,57</u>
has a local feel	0,740			0,753		
is original	0,847			0,876		
has a distinct identity	0,856			0,819		
has a sense of community	0,832			0,523		
Lively	0,824	<u>0,954</u>	0,775	0,839	<u>0,925</u>	<u>0,673</u>
is lively	0,888			0,799		
offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	0,878			0,882		
is dynamic	0,922			0,911		
is hip	0,918			0,840		
is youthful	0,906			0,804		
is rebellious	0,757			0,664		
Diverse	0,836	<u>0,869</u>	<u>0,573</u>	0,752	0,825	<u>0,488</u>
is eclectic	0,854			0,760		
is multi-cultural	0,725			0,611		
is gentrified	0,683			0,693		
is nonconformist	0,718			0,655		
has varied architecture	0,793			0,761		
Aesthetic	0,753	<u>0,927</u>	0,809	<u>0,751</u>	<u>0,88</u>	<u>0,72</u>
is pretty	0,943			0,961		
is clean	0,812			0,566		
is aesthetically appealing	0,938			0,956		
Green	0,660	0,857	0,668	<u>0,474</u>	0,865	<u>0,681</u>
has green areas	0,776			0,876		
there are places to immerse yourself in nature	0,797			0,861		
residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	0,876			0,781		
Neighborhood - Self Connection (adapted from Escalas & Bettman, 2003 & Kock, 2021)	0,739	0,950	0,863	0,668	0,956	0,879
This neighborhood reflects who I am.	0,937			0,949		
I can identify with this neighborhood.	0,932			0,965		
I feel a personal connection to this neighborhood.	0.918			0,897		
Resident Support of Tourism	0.645	0.946	0.854	0.272	0.884	0.717
I am happy about tourists visiting my neighborhood.	0,907	1.0		0,850		
Tourists to my neighborhood positively affect my quality of life.	0,934			0,872		
Tourism positively influences community life.	0,930			0,817		

Appendix D. US vs. DK Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters
US Sample

	Aesthetic	Diverse	Green	Neighborhood- Self Connection	Lively	Local	Resident Support for Tourism
Aesthetic	0.899						
Diverse	0.414	0.757					
Green	0.700	0.34	0.817				
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.637	0.558	0.546	0.929			
Lively	0.374	0.833	0.269	0.520	0.880		
Local	0.578	0.597	0.548	0.655	0.552	0.820	
Resident Support for Tourism	0.390	0.592	0.350	0.482	0.619	0.515	0.924
DK Sample							
	Aesthetic	Diverse	Green	Neighborhood- Self	Lively	Local	Resident Support for
				Connection			Tourism
Aesthetic	0.848						
Diverse	0.364	0.698					
Green	0.432	0.193	0.825				
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.624	0.391	0.465	0.937			
Lively	0.43	0.708	0.14	0.449	0.821		
Local	0.482	0.434	0.272	0.594	0.5	0.755	
Resident Support for Tourism	0.132	0.21	0.128	0.245	0.319	0.13	0.847

Appendix E.

US vs. DK Study: US Sample - Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт
Comm. Engagement <-> Aesthetic	0.49	Local Bus.Support <-> ITS	0.332	Safe <-> Diverse	0.128
Diverse <-> Aesthetic	0.45	Local Bus. Support <-> N-S Connection	0.5	Safe <-> Green	0.586
Diverse <-> Comm. Engagement	0.627	Local Bus. Support <-> Like	0.508	Safe <-> ITS	0.422
Green <-> Aesthetic	0.801	Local Bus. Support <-> Lively	0.329	Safe <-> N-S Connection	0.446
Green <-> Comm. Engagement	0.417	Local Bus. Support <-> Local	0.558	Safe <-> Like	0.546
Green <-> Diverse	0.341	QOL <-> Aesthetic	0.663	Safe <-> Lively	0.102
ITS <-> Aesthetic	0.55	QOL <-> Comm. Engagement	0.48	Safe <-> Local	0.371
ITS <-> Comm. Engagement	0.357	QOL <-> Diverse	0.396	Safe <-> Local Bus. Support	0.308
ITS <-> Diverse	0.27	QOL <-> Green	0.569	Safe <-> QOL	0.593
ITS <-> Green	0.453	QOL <-> ITS	0.558	Safe <-> Support Tourism	0.207
N-S Connection <-> Aesthetic	0.694	QOL <-> N-S Connection	0.683	Safe <-> Satisfaction	0.549
N-S Connection <-> Comm. Engagement	0.663	QOL <-> Like	0.732	WOM <-> Aesthetic	0.74
N-S Connection <-> Diverse	0.63	QOL <-> Lively	0.358	WOM <-> Comm. Engagement	0.545
N-S Connection <-> Green	0.57	QOL <-> Local	0.529	WOM <-> Diverse	0.414
N-S Connection <-> ITS	0.578	QOL <-> Local Bus. Support	0.408	WOM <-> Green	0.551
Like <-> Aesthetic	0.701	Support Tourism <-> Aesthetic	0.421	WOM <-> ITS	0.593
Like <-> Comm. Engagement	0.537	Support Tourism <-> Comm. Engagem	0.611	WOM <-> N-S Connection	0.729
Like <-> Diverse	0.434	Support Tourism <-> Diverse	0.683	WOM <-> Like	0.787
Like <-> Green	0.616	Support Tourism <-> Green	0.356	WOM <-> Lively	0.401
Like <-> ITS	0.656	Support Tourism <-> ITS	0.255	WOM <-> Local	0.616
Like <-> N- S Connection	0.767	Support Tourism <-> N-S Connection	0.525	WOM <-> Local Bus. Support	0.381
Lively <-> Aesthetic	0.384	Support Tourism <-> Like	0.402	WOM <-> QOL	0.72
Lively <-> Comm. Engagement	0.523	Support Tourism <-> Lively	0.669	WOM <-> Support Tourism	0.441
Lively <-> Diverse	0.949	Support Tourism <-> Local	0.575	WOM <-> Satisfaction	0.783
Lively <-> Green	0.262	Support Tourism <-> Local Bus. Suppor	0.435	WOM <-> Safe	0.577
Lively <-> ITS	0.211	Support Tourism <-> QOL	0.403	WTP <-> Aesthetic	0.374
Lively <-> N-S Connection	0.551	Satisfaction <-> Aesthetic	0.692	WTP <-> Comm. Engagement	0.454
Lively <-> Like	0.386	Satisfaction <-> Comm. Engagement	0.505	WTP <-> Diverse	0.562
Local <-> Aesthetic	0.649	Satisfaction <-> Diverse	0.361	WTP <-> Green	0.237
Local <-> Comm. Engagement	0.672	Satisfaction <-> Green	0.548	WTP <-> ITS	0.165
Local <-> Diverse	0.692	Satisfaction <-> ITS	0.695	WTP <-> N-S Connection	0.484
Local <-> Green	0.642	Satisfaction <-> N-S Connection	0.74	WTP <-> Like	0.349
Local <-> ITS	0.445	Satisfaction <-> Like	0.825	WTP <-> Lively	0.492
Local <-> N-S Connection	0.741	Satisfaction <-> Lively	0.35	WTP <-> Local	0.526
Local <-> Like	0.665	Satisfaction <-> Local	0.582	WTP <-> Local Bus. Support	0.319
Local <-> Lively	0.6	Satisfaction <-> Local Bus. Support	0.407	WTP <-> QOL	0.378
Local Bus. Support <-> Aesthetic	0.391	Satisfaction <-> QOL	0.735	WTP <-> Support Tourism	0.546
Local Bus. Support <-> Comm. Engager	0.642	Satisfaction <-> Support Tourism	0.396	WTP <-> Satisfaction	0.346
Local Bus. Support <-> Diverse	0.409	Safe <-> Aesthetic	0.718	WTP <-> Safe	0.268
Local Bus. Support <-> Green	0.43	Safe <-> Comm. Engagement	0.229	WTP <-> WOM	0.386

Appendix F. US vs. DK Study: DK Sample - Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт	Construct	нтмт
Comm. Engagement <-> Aesthetic	0.307	Local Bus.Support <-> ITS	0.399	Safe <-> Diverse	0.241
Diverse <-> Aesthetic	0.448	Local Bus. Support <-> N-S Connection	0.484	Safe <-> Green	0.456
Diverse <-> Comm. Engagement	0.256	Local Bus. Support <-> Like	0.341	Safe <-> ITS	0.119
Green <-> Aesthetic	0.594	Local Bus. Support <-> Lively	0.241	Safe <-> Identity	0.213
Green <-> Comm. Engagement	0.305	Local Bus. Support <-> Local	0.42	Safe <-> Like	0.29
Green <-> Diverse	0.327	QOL <-> Aesthetic	0.7	Safe <-> Lively	0.173
ITS <-> Aesthetic	0.405	QOL <-> Comm. Engagement	0.396	Safe <-> Local	0.133
ITS <-> Comm. Engagement	0.431	QOL <-> Diverse	0.372	Safe <-> Support	0.096
ITS <-> Diverse	0.219	QOL <-> Green	0.402	Safe <-> QOL	0.349
ITS <-> Green	0.351	QOL <-> ITS	0.543	Safe <-> Tourism	0.039
N-S Connection <-> Aesthetic	0.681	QOL <-> N-S Connection	0.746	Safe <-> Satisfaction	0.253
N-S Connection <-> Comm. Engagement	0.523	QOL <-> Like	0.781	WOM <-> Aesthetic	0.694
N-S Connection <-> Diverse	0.413	QOL <-> Lively	0.425	WOM <-> Engage	0.358
N-S Connection <-> Green	0.541	QOL <-> Local	0.432	WOM <-> Diverse	0.312
N-S Connection <-> ITS	0.631	QOL <-> Local Bus. Support	0.374	WOM <-> Green	0.266
Like <-> Aesthetic	0.695	Support Tourism <-> Aesthetic	0.148	WOM <-> ITS	0.63
Like <-> Comm. Engagement	0.393	Support Tourism <-> Comm. Engagemen	0.376	WOM <-> Identity	0.694
Like <-> Diverse	0.312	Support Tourism <-> Diverse	0.285	WOM <-> Like	0.944
Like <-> Green	0.331	Support Tourism <-> Green	0.153	WOM <-> Lively	0.482
Like <-> ITS	0.597	Support Tourism <-> ITS	0.263	WOM <-> Local	0.521
Like <-> N- S Connection	0.716	Support Tourism <-> N-S Connection	0.276	WOM <-> Support	0.399
Lively <-> Aesthetic	0.49	Support Tourism <-> Like	0.361	WOM <-> QOL	0.807
Lively <-> Comm. Engagement	0.276	Support Tourism <-> Lively	0.376	WOM <-> Tourism	0.326
Lively <-> Diverse	0.855	Support Tourism <-> Local	0.167	WOM <-> Satisfaction	0.874
Lively <-> Green	0.182	Support Tourism <-> Local Bus. Support	0.32	WOM <-> Safe	0.27
Lively <-> ITS	0.374	Support Tourism <-> QOL	0.327	WTP <-> Aesthetic	0.443
Lively <-> N-S Connection	0.465	Satisfaction <-> Aesthetic	0.628	WTP <-> Engage	0.256
Lively <-> Like	0.508	Satisfaction <-> Comm. Engagement	0.367	WTP <-> Diverse	0.29
Local <-> Aesthetic	0.488	Satisfaction <-> Diverse	0.347	WTP <-> Green	0.43
Local <-> Comm. Engagement	0.445	Satisfaction <-> Aesthetic	0.628	WTP <-> ITS	0.161
Local <-> Diverse	0.488	Satisfaction <-> Comm. Engagement	0.367	WTP <-> Identity	0.407
Local <-> Green	0.39	Satisfaction <-> Diverse	0.347	WTP <-> Like	0.171
Local <-> ITS	0.605	Satisfaction <-> Green	0.356	WTP <-> Lively	0.214
Local <-> N-S Connection	0.708	Satisfaction <-> ITS	0.63	WTP <-> Local	0.115
Local <-> Like	0.539	Satisfaction <-> Identity	0.728	WTP <-> Support	0.334
Local <-> Lively	0.512	Satisfaction <-> Like	0.87	WTP <-> QOL	0.395
Local Bus. Support <-> Aesthetic	0.212	Satisfaction <-> Lively	0.45	WTP <-> Tourism	0.106
Local Bus. Support <-> Comm. Engageme	0.473	Satisfaction <-> Local	0.492	WTP <-> Satisfaction	0.216
Local Bus. Support <-> Diverse	0.273	Satisfaction <-> Support	0.355	WTP <-> Safe	0.32
Local Bus. Support <-> Green	0.223	Satisfaction <-> QOL	0.817	WTP <-> WOM	0.175

Appendix G. Adjusted R squared

	Adjusted R Square			
	US Sample	DK Sample		
Outcome Variable				
Like	.440	.433		
WOM	.431	.397		
ITS	.197	.235		
Satisfaction	.362	.366		
QOL	.359	.387		
WTP	.301	.119		
Local Business Support	.247	.106		
Engage	.437	.161		
Neighborhood-Self Connection	.545	.468		
Residents' Support for Tourism	.414	.063		

Appendix H. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted

Construct/Items	Factor Loadings (Higher order loading)	CR	AVE
Willingness to Pay (WTP)			
Local	0.105	0.88	0.648
has a local feel	0.738		
is original	0.846		
has a distinct identity	0.840		
has a sense of community	0.792		
Lively	0.178	0.948	0.754
is lively	0.866		
offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	0.870		
is dynamic	0.914		
is hip	0.908		
is youthful	0.896		
is rebellious	0.745		
Diverse	0.232	0.863	0.558
is eclectic	0.835		
is multi-cultural	0.693		
is gentrified	0.713		
is nonconformist	0.720		
has varied architecture	0.765		
Aesthetic	-0.006	0.919	0.792
is pretty	0.929		
is clean	0.811		
is aesthetically appealing	0.925		
Green	0.214	0.824	0.615
has green areas	0.685		
there are places to immerse yourself in nature	0.693		
residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	m 0.947		

Appendix I. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters

	Aesthetic	Diverse	Green	Lively	Local	Safe	WTP
Aesthetic	0.890						
Diverse	0.377	0.747					
Green	0.668	0.357	0.784				
Lively	0.349	0.809	0.287	0.868			
Local	0.530	0.555	0.521	0.523	0.805		
Safe	0.638	0.083	0.502	0.051	0.294	1	
WTP	0.359	0.462	0.326	0.440	0.405	0.287	1

Appendix J. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

Construct	HTMT
Diverse <-> Aesthetic	0.432
Green <-> Aesthetic	0.755
Green <-> Diverse	0.322
Lively <-> Aesthetic	0.388
Lively <-> Diverse	0.93
Lively <-> Green	0.242
Local <-> Aesthetic	0.617
Local <-> Diverse	0.652
Local <-> Green	0.593
Local <-> Lively	0.575
Safe <-> Aesthetic	0.696
Safe <-> Diverse	0.129
Safe <-> Green	0.551
Safe <-> Lively	0.104
Safe <-> Local	0.326
WTP <-> Aesthetic	0.385
WTP <-> Diverse	0.508
WTP <-> Green	0.265
WTP <-> Lively	0.453
WTP <-> Local	0.44
WTP <-> Safe	0.287

Appendix K. Dimensions on Willingness to Pay Study: Adjusted R squared

	R Square Adjusted
Outcome Variable	
WTP	0.289

Appendix L.

Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability and Average Variance Extracted

Construct/Items	Factor Loadings (Higher order loading)	CR	AVE
Identity			
Local	0.310	0.88	0.648
has a local feel	0.760		
is original	0.830		
has a distinct identity	0.819		
has a sense of community	0.809		
Lively	0.062	0.948	0.754
is lively	0.875		
offers nightlife, cafes, etc.	0.877		
is dynamic	0.922		
is hip	0.906		
is youthful	0.891		
is rebellious	0.722		
Diverse	0.136	0.862	0.557
is eclectic	0.846		
is multi-cultural	0.713		
is gentrified	0.666		
is nonconformist	0.706		
has varied architecture	0.789		
Aesthetic	0.283	0.918	0.79
is pretty	0.942		
is clean	0.776		
is aesthetically appealing	0.937		
Green	0.134	0.853	0.661
has green areas	0.767		
there are places to immerse yourself in nature	0.783		
residents of this neighborhood care about the environment	0.883		

Appendix M. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Fornell-Larcker Criterion Parameters

	Aesthetic	Diverse	Green	Neighborhood-Self Connection	Lively	Local	Safe
Aesthetic	0.889						
Diverse	0.394	0.747					
Green	0.651	0.324	0.813				
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.613	0.511	0.534	0.933			
Lively	0.376	0.808	0.252	0.471	0.868		
Local	0.542	0.55	0.509	0.637	0.513	0.805	
Safe	0.619	0.085	0.501	0.348	0.059	0.3	1

Appendix N. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio

Construct	HTMT
Diverse <-> Aesthetic	0.432
Green <-> Aesthetic	0.755
Green <-> Diverse	0.322
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Aesthetic	0.668
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Diverse	0.576
Neighborhood-Self Connection <-> Green	0.56
Lively <-> Aesthetic	0.388
Lively <-> Diverse	0.93
Lively <-> Green	0.242
Lively <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.499
Local <-> Aesthetic	0.617
Local <-> Diverse	0.652
Local <-> Green	0.593
Local <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.725
Local <-> Lively	0.575
Safe <-> Aesthetic	0.696
Safe <-> Diverse	0.129
Safe <-> Green	0.551
Safe <-> Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.361
Safe <-> Lively	0.104
Safe <-> Local	0.326

Appendix O. Dimensions on Neighborhood-Self Connection Study: Adjusted R squared

	R Square Adjusted
Outcome Variable	
Neighborhood-Self Connection	0.534