*sustainability*

MDPI

*Article*

# Perceptions of Home Concept Among British Homeowners in Primary and Secondary Homes: The Case of Ortaca

**Onur Akbulut [1], Yakin Ekin [2,*] and Tunahan Celik [3]**

[1] Department of Tourism Management, Fethiye Faculty of Business Administration, Mugla Sitki Kocman University, 48300 Mugla, Türkiye; onurakbulut@mu.edu.tr
[2] Department of Recreation Management, Faculty of Tourism, Akdeniz University, 07058 Antalya, Türkiye
[3] Institute of Social Sciences, Mugla Sitki Kocman University, 48000 Mugla, Türkiye; tunahan.celik.94@gmail.com
* Correspondence: ekin@akdeniz.edu.tr

**Abstract**

This study addresses second-home ownership not merely as a form of tourism accommodation or real estate investment, but as a home-building process intersecting with local life, belonging, daily practices, and sustainable destination governance. While the economic, environmental, and community impacts of second-homes have been extensively discussed in the literature, how individuals perceive their primary and secondary homes differently in terms of the bodily, material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional dimensions of home has been examined in a limited number of studies. This research analyzes paired data obtained through a two-stage online questionnaire from 223 British participants who own a secondary home in the Mugla–Ortaca region and a primary home in the United Kingdom. The 18-item Home Scale was used as the measurement tool. Confirmatory factor analysis, reliability–validity analyses, measurement invariance, and paired-samples *t*-tests were applied. The findings show that the bodily home difference was not statistically significant at the conventional 0.05 threshold, whereas primary-home scores were significantly higher in the material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional home dimensions. The small to small-medium effect sizes suggest that the results should be interpreted cautiously as an asymmetrical home-building process rather than as evidence of a hierarchical superiority of the primary home. The study proposes a planning approach that does not view second home owners as merely transient consumers in sustainable coastal–rural destinations, but rather considers social sustainability, service planning, seasonality management, and local community engagement channels together.

**Keywords:** second home; home concept; social sustainability



Academic Editor: Seweryn Zielinski

Received: 27 April 2026
Revised: 19 May 2026
Accepted: 22 May 2026
Published: 24 May 2026



## 1. Introduction

The phenomenon of second-homes, whether referred to by different local names such as holiday home, summer house, cottage, dacha, villa, or similar, is not merely a form of leisure accommodation. It is an interdisciplinary field situated between tourism, the housing market, rural and coastal planning, multi-local living, retirement mobility, amenity migration, and social relations established with the local community [1–4]. Therefore, defining second home ownership solely within the tourism and hospitality sector leads to both conceptual narrowing and renders invisible the housing, place, mobility, and community dimensions of second homes [3–7].

For a long time, second-home research has focused on the impacts of second homes on the local economy, housing prices, construction, environmental pressures, seasonality, and rural development [5–13]. In the post-COVID-19 period, this field has begun to be rethought, with second homes moving beyond being merely recreational escapes and becoming integrated with processes such as remote work, longer stays, the search for health and safety, multi-local residency, and even, in some contexts, primary homes [14–18]. This transformation makes it difficult to reduce the second homeowner's position in the destination to a fixed category of transient consumer from outside [19–21].

The starting point of this study is to empirically test how second homeowners differ between their primary and secondary homes, not only in terms of frequency of use, but also in terms of which dimensions of the "home" experience they have. In classical literature, home has been conceptualized as a multi-layered place beyond physical shelter, associated with security, privacy, material arrangement, family relationships, daily practices, memory, belonging, imagination, and identity production [22–27]. In mobility studies, it has been shown that home is not limited to a single fixed place, but can be reproduced through bodily, material, social, and imaginative practices between different places [28,29].

Despite this, two important gaps persist in the second-home literature. First, second-homeowners' perception of home is often indirectly addressed within discussions of local influence, demand, motivation, or the housing market; the perception of the same individual regarding their primary and secondary homes is not compared with a paired design [6,10,11]. Secondly, studies that quantitatively measure the multidimensional structure of the home are newly developing; while the Home Scale developed by Yi et al. (2025) provides an important basis for measuring the bodily, material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional dimensions of the home, its comparative use between two homes of the same individuals in the context of second home ownership is limited [30].

This research examines British individuals who own a secondary home in the Mugla-Ortaca area and a primary home in the United Kingdom. Studies on the British resident/tourist presence in and around Fethiye show that this group can develop relationship networks that cannot be reduced to a single identity among the categories of "tourist", "resident", "immigrant", "expat" and "second-homeowner" [31]. Studies on second home ownership in Türkiye also reveal that foreign ownership should be evaluated together with investment, lifestyle, retirement, climate, coastal life and tourism infrastructure [32–34].

The main objective of this study is to determine whether British second homeowners' perceptions of home differ between their primary and secondary homes across the bodily, material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional dimensions. To this end, the study seeks to answer three research questions: (RQ1) How do the same individuals evaluate their primary and secondary homes in terms of the five dimensions of home? (RQ2) In which dimensions are there statistically significant differences, and what are the effect sizes of these differences? (RQ3) How should these differences be cautiously interpreted in relation to sustainable coastal–rural destination planning, service provision, and possible channels of local community engagement?

The study's contribution is threefold. Theoretically, it combines the multidimensional approach in the home literature with discussions on second-home tourism and multi-local living [22,28–30]. Methodologically, it uses a paired design collecting data from the same individuals in two different residential contexts and strengthens the validity of the comparison by reporting measurement invariance [35–40]. In terms of application, the study discusses second homeowners as partially resident actors whose service needs and seasonal rhythms may be relevant to sustainable destination planning; however, community integration and social capital are treated as planning implications rather than variables directly tested in the empirical model [19–21].

### *1.1. Theoretical Background and Hypothesis Development*

#### 1.1.1. Second Homes: The Intersection of Tourism, Housing, Mobility, and Sustainable Planning

In international tourism statistics, a second home is considered a type of secondary residence visited by household members for purposes such as recreation, vacation, or leisure; however, the frequency of visits and duration of stay are limited in such a way that it does not become a primary home [1]. However, this definition does not imply that a second home is merely an object of visit; second homes are also multidimensional spatial entities associated with ownership, place attachment, use of local services, housing market, regional development, and environmental pressure [3–9].

The effects of second homes show a heterogeneous structure in the literature. In some destinations, second homes may create economic demand through construction, maintenance, retail, and local services; while in other contexts, they may risk increasing housing prices, reducing local accessibility, creating infrastructure burden, and intensifying environmental pressure [5–8,10–13]. Therefore, instead of generalizations such as whether second homes are "positive for regional development" or "negative for the local community," the structure of the housing market, the rhythm of use, the local governance capacity, ecological sensitivity, and the level of social interaction should be evaluated together [5–7,10,20].

The post-pandemic literature has shown that the functions of second homes can change. The trend of retreating to safe spaces, moving away from crowded forms of tourism, working remotely, and staying longer has revealed that second homes can transform from seasonal holiday destinations into local living infrastructure for some groups [14–18]. This transformation highlights intermediate categories that position second homeowners neither entirely as tourists nor entirely as residents, partial forms of residence, and the problem of invisible populations in destination governance [6,15,17].

#### 1.1.2. Residential Tourism, Second-Home Tourism, and Relationship with the Local Community

Residential tourism, lifestyle migration, amenity migration, long-term tourism, retirement mobility, and second-home ownership are closely related but not interchangeable concepts [11,29,31]. While residential tourism emphasizes long-term or repeated stays where the categories of tourist and resident are blurred, second-home tourism differs through ownership, frequency of use, seasonal rhythm, and use of local services [1,2,11]. Therefore, a second-home owner cannot be considered a temporary consumer from outside in every context; in some cases, they may socially participate in the local community, become involved in local networks, or contribute to community building [19–21].

Another important point is that the assumptions that second homes are used only by their owners or that second-home owners always remain outside the local community are overgeneralized. The usage regimes of second homes can develop in different forms, such as household members, visits to relatives and friends, short-term rentals, seasonal residences, and conversion to a primary home [6,11,12,18]. In addition, the relationship established with the local community, the duration of stay, language skills, use of local services, neighborhood relations, participation in community activities, and local rooting practices can vary [19–21,31].

Accordingly, this study uses the second-home literature as a contextual frame and does not empirically classify participants as tourists, residents, or migrants. British second homeowners are treated as a specific group whose home perceptions are compared across two residential contexts; implications for stakeholder participation and destination governance are therefore discussed cautiously and only in relation to the measured home-perception dimensions [19–21,31].

#### 1.1.3. The Multidimensional Structure of the Concept of Home

The home is not merely a physical building or dwelling; it is a multi-layered experience of place where the body rests, security is felt, material objects are arranged, family and intimacy relationships are established, memory is carried, self-narrative is produced, and daily practices are repeated [22–27,41–43]. Therefore, the distinction between "house" and "home" is important for understanding the difference between physical dwelling and a home laden with meaning, belonging, practice, and emotion [22–25].

In the context of mobility, the meaning of home becomes even more complex. Rather than being tied to a single fixed coordinate, home can be reconstructed through the practices of bodily comfort, material arrangement, social relationship, memory, and imagination produced by moving individuals in different places [28,29,44–46]. In second-home studies, the duality of "being at home" and "being away" often creates a more complex relationship than the primary/secondary home distinction; Because secondary residence can be a space for escape and renewal in some dimensions, and a more limited space in other dimensions in terms of family memory and daily continuity [26–29,47,48].

Yi et al. (2025) developed a five-dimensional scale to quantitatively measure the concept of home, consisting of bodily home, material home, vibrant home, imaginary home, and emotional home [30]. Bodily home refers to the function of security, comfort, and shelter; material home refers to ownership, economic meaning, hygiene, and lifestyle order; vibrant home refers to creativity, transformation, and aesthetic experience; imaginary home refers to freedom, ideal place, continuity, and self-projection; and emotional home refers to intimacy, love, origin, care, and nostalgia [22,26,28–30]. These five dimensions do not have to occur simultaneously and with equal intensity in the context of secondary residence; each dimension can be shaped by different usage rhythms, social networks, and biographical continuities [28–30,47,48].

#### 1.1.4. Research Model and Hypotheses

The less frequent or seasonal use of secondary homes does not automatically mean that they should produce lower scores on all dimensions of home perception. Some dimensions, such as bodily comfort and security, may be strongly established in the secondary home; conversely, dimensions such as material arrangement, daily vitality, family memory, and emotional rootedness may be more nourished by the continuity in the primary home [22,24,28–30,47,48]. Therefore, the hypotheses were formulated in a non-directional manner, with the expectation of differentiation between primary and secondary home contexts, rather than in a directional manner [30,36,37].

The bodily home refers to the comforting, safe, and sheltering qualities of home, including relaxation, refuge, and protection from external tensions [22,24,30]. In second-home contexts, these qualities may be strengthened by retreat, privacy, and post-pandemic safety meanings, whereas primary homes may also sustain bodily security through daily familiarity and continuous use [14–17,24,28,29]. Therefore, H1 is established without direction. H1: The perception of bodily home differs between primary and secondary home contexts.

The material home is associated with the material carriers of ownership, economic meaning, hygiene, equipment, daily order, and lifestyle [22,30,41]. Because primary homes usually involve longer-term accumulation, maintenance, and daily use, while secondary homes may operate through seasonal and periodic material arrangements, H2 is established without direction. H2: The perception of material home differs between primary and secondary home contexts.

The vibrant home refers to the production of home through creativity, transformation, aesthetic practice, and adaptation to needs [30,47,48]. Since the intensity of these practices

may vary according to duration of use and everyday routines, H3 is established without direction. H3: The perception of a vibrant home differs between primary and secondary home contexts.

The imaginary home refers to the mental construction of home as an ideal, desirable, and self-projective place with biographical continuity [22,28,30]. Secondary homes may carry images of desired lifestyle, climate, escape, and freedom, whereas primary homes may carry stronger meanings of family history, continuity, and established identity [28,29,31,44,45]. Therefore, H4 is established without direction. H4: The perception of the imaginary home differs between primary and secondary home contexts.

The emotional home is the relational dimension of home established through love, intimacy, care, origin, nostalgia, and memory [22,26,27,30]. Because emotional meanings may be produced both through episodic second-home experiences and through long-term social and familial continuity in the primary home, H5 is established without direction. H5: The perception of emotional home differs between primary and secondary home contexts.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### *2.1. Research Area, Scope and Sample*

The study was conducted on British individuals who own secondary residences in and around the Ortaca district of Mugla province, particularly in Sarıgerme, Dalyan, and the Dalyan–Ortaca line. This area was chosen as a research context where coastal–rural tourism, second-home use, international mobility, and local service demand intersect. In the context of Türkiye, second-home ownership, the motivations of foreign homeowners, the search for lifestyle in coastal destinations, and post-pandemic usage changes are discussed [31–34].

The target group of the research consisted of British individuals who own secondary residences in Türkiye and primary residences in the United Kingdom. All participants declared themselves British nationals; the sample did not include participants of Turkish origin, born in Türkiye, with dual citizenship, or with Turkish family ties. Participants with residence permits in Türkiye only have this document in terms of long-term stay rights; this does not change the fact that their primary residence is in the United Kingdom.

Since an official and current sample framework was not available, the snowball sampling technique was used. Snowball sampling is an established method that allows new participants to be reached in hard-to-reach groups, groups without registered frameworks or accessible through social networks, through referrals from existing participants [49,50]. In this study, the first participants were reached through neighboring networks in Türkiye and local connections in the region. Then, the names and email addresses of new participants were obtained through referrals from existing participants. Because snowball sampling depends on existing social networks, the sample may overrepresent socially connected, longer-established, older, and more active second homeowners in the Ortaca region. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as analytically informative for this specific group rather than statistically generalizable to all British second-home owners in Türkiye.

### *2.2. Research Design and Data Collection Process*

The study used a two-phase, paired, and within-person comparison survey design. In Phase 1, participants assessed their perceptions of home in their secondary residence while residing in their secondary residence in Türkiye. In Phase 2, the same participants assessed their perceptions of home in their primary residence in the United Kingdom using the same scale items after returning to their primary residence. This design allows for comparison of the perceptions of the same individual in two residential contexts by reducing the effect of fixed characteristics that vary from person to person [35].

The data collection process was conducted between April 2025 and December 2025. An online survey was used in both phases. In the Phase 1 survey instructions, participants were informed that the study was two-phased, with the first phase measuring perceptions of secondary residence in Türkiye and the second phase measuring perceptions of primary residence after returning to their home country. In Phase 2, participants were asked to respond considering their primary residence, i.e., their home country. Participants were informed that the surveys lasted approximately five minutes, that responses would be kept anonymous, and that they were expected to answer all questions. Although the same scale was used in both phases, participants were instructed to evaluate the relevant residence separately in each phase, and the paired design was intended to reduce between-person heterogeneity rather than to merge the two residential contexts. Of the 242 participants who began the study, 19 were excluded because completely matched responses across the two phases were not available. Since the necessary paired data were missing for these cases, systematic attrition comparisons could not be conducted; this possibility is therefore acknowledged as a limitation.

### *2.3. Measurement Tool and Data Analysis*

To measure perception of home, the Home Scale developed by Yi et al. (2025) was used [30]. The scale consists of 18 items and five sub-dimensions: bodily home (3 items), material home (3 items), vibrant home (3 items), imaginary home (4 items), and emotional home (5 items). The scale was administered in its original English form, without any item changes, in accordance with the participants' native language. Responses were obtained using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Highly disagree to 7 = Highly agree. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 27 and AMOS 22. Frequency and percentage values were reported first for demographic variables. The internal consistency of the scale was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient [51]. The suitability of the measurement model was tested separately for primary and secondary home responses using confirmatory factor analysis [52,53]. Model fit was evaluated by interpreting multiple fit indicators such as $\chi^2/df$, CFI, GFI, NFI, RMSEA, and SRMR together instead of a single index [53,54].

Mean explained variance (AVE) and composite reliability (CR) values were calculated for convergent validity and composite reliability; thresholds of 0.50 for AVE and 0.70 for CR were used as reference [55–58]. Since the responses of the same participants were compared in two different contexts, measurement invariance analyses were performed to test whether the measurement represented the same construct in the two contexts [36]. Configural, metric, and partial scalar invariance models were tested, respectively; the $\Delta CFI \leq 0.010$ criterion was particularly considered in the decision-making process [37–40,59]. To assess the possibility of common method bias resulting from self-report measurement, Harman's single-factor test was also conducted using the 36 substantive scale items from the two residential contexts. The unrotated one-factor solution explained 20.21% of the total variance, below the commonly used 50% threshold; KMO was 0.845 and Bartlett's test was significant, $\chi^2(630) = 4929.70$, $p < 0.001$. These results suggest that common method bias is unlikely to be a serious concern. Paired-samples *t*-tests were applied to test the hypotheses. Since the hypotheses were established as non-directional, all tests were evaluated two-tailed, and the significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. Effect size was reported using Cohen's d, which is the standard deviation of the paired difference scores [60,61].

The study was approved by the Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University Ethics Committee with protocol code 250100. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, its two-stage structure, the anonymity of responses, and the principle of voluntariness. In Phase 1, participants provided their names and email addresses so that they could be

contacted for Phase 2; during the analysis phase, the data were not used in an identifying manner except for matching purposes.

## 3. Results

### *3.1. Demographics*

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the 223 participants included in the analyses. The sample was predominantly female (63.7%) and concentrated in older age groups: 52.0% were aged 55–64, and 35.9% were aged 65 or above. In addition, 71.7% were retired. This demographic structure is important for interpretation because older and retired second homeowners may attach stronger meanings to comfort, security, length of residence, and seasonal routines than younger or more mobile groups. The income profile was not homogeneous; although all participants were homeowners, 60.5% reported annual income below GBP 35,000. Therefore, the results should not be generalized to all British second-home owners or interpreted as representing a uniformly high-income group.

**Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of participants.

| Variable | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Female | 142 | 63.7 |
| | Male | 81 | 36.3 |
| Age group (years) | 18–24 | 0 | 0 |
| | 25–34 | 0 | 0 |
| | 35–44 | 9 | 4.0 |
| | 45–54 | 18 | 8.1 |
| | 55–64 | 116 | 52.0 |
| | 65–above | 80 | 35.9 |
| Education | Secondary education | 88 | 39.5 |
| | Bachelor's degree | 108 | 48.4 |
| | Master's degree | 20 | 9.0 |
| | Doctorate | 7 | 3.1 |
| Occupation | Retired | 160 | 71.7 |
| | Employed | 63 | 28.3 |
| Nationality | British | 223 | 100.0 |
| Annual income | Less than £35,000 | 135 | 60.5 |
| | £35,000–£45,000 | 9 | 4.0 |
| | £46,000–£55,000 | 26 | 11.7 |
| | £56,000–£65,000 | 36 | 16.1 |
| | £76,000–£85,000 | 8 | 3.6 |
| | £85,000 and above | 9 | 4.0 |

Participants' primary home ownership and usage patterns are presented in Table 2. Primary-home ownership is mostly long-term; 55.6% of participants have owned their primary home for more than 10 years. 56.1% of participants reported spending 10–12 months of the year in their primary home. This distribution indicates that the primary home is not merely a legal or administrative address for the sample, but a strong context associated with the main living arrangement throughout the year.

Usage patterns for secondary residences are given in Table 3. 72.2% of participants have owned their secondary residence in Türkiye for more than 10 years. 51.6% reported visiting their secondary residence 3–4 times a year, and 39.9% reported staying for more than 12 weeks a year. 52.0% of participants have a Turkish Republic residence permit; however, this document should be interpreted in conjunction with the information that the primary residence is in the United Kingdom. This usage pattern suggests that the secondary

residence should be considered as a form of partial residence, more intensive than short-term tourist accommodation but different from full residency, for the sample [6,15,17].

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics for primary-home ownership, annual occupancy, related expenditures, and second-home missingness.

| Questions | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q1: How long have you owned your primary home? | 0–2 years | 9 | 4.0 |
| | 3–4 years | 36 | 16.1 |
| | 5–6 years | 45 | 20.2 |
| | 7–8 years | 9 | 4.0 |
| | Over 10 years | 124 | 55.6 |
| Q2: On average, how many months do you spend at your primary home in a year? | 1–3 months | 35 | 15.7 |
| | 4–6 months | 54 | 24.2 |
| | 7–9 months | 9 | 4.0 |
| | 10–12 months | 125 | 56.1 |
| Q3: What is your average annual spending on your primary home and related expenditures in pounds? | £4000–£6000 | 87 | 39.0 |
| | £6001–£8000 | 73 | 32.7 |
| | £8001–£10,000 | 36 | 16.1 |
| | Over £10,001 | 27 | 12.1 |
| Q4: Did you miss your second home while staying in your primary home? | Never | 9 | 4.0 |
| | Seldom | 45 | 20.2 |
| | Sometimes | 81 | 36.3 |
| | Often | 71 | 31.8 |
| | Almost always | 17 | 7.6 |

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics for secondary-home ownership, use patterns, expenditures, and residence permit status.

| Questions | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q1: How long have you owned your second home in Türkiye? | 1–3 years | 27 | 12.1 |
| | 4–6 years | 0 | 0.0 |
| | 7–9 years | 35 | 15.7 |
| | Over ten years | 161 | 72.2 |
| Q2: What is the average number of times you visit your second home in a year? | 1–2 times | 72 | 32.3 |
| | 3–4 times | 115 | 51.6 |
| | 5–6 times | 18 | 8.1 |
| | Over 7 times | 18 | 8.1 |
| Q3: On average, how many weeks do you spend at your second home in a year? | 1–4 weeks | 45 | 20.2 |
| | 5–8 weeks | 45 | 20.2 |
| | 9–12 weeks | 44 | 19.7 |
| | Over 12 weeks | 89 | 39.9 |
| Q4: What is your average annual spending on your second home and related expenditures in pounds? | £1000–£2000 | 55 | 24.7 |
| | £2001–£3000 | 30 | 13.5 |
| | £3001–£4000 | 71 | 31.8 |
| | £4001–£5000 | 35 | 15.7 |
| | £5001–£8000 | 13 | 5.8 |
| | Over £8000 | 19 | 8.5 |
| Q5: Do you have a Republic of Türkiye Residence Permit Document? | Yes I have | 116 | 52.0 |
| | No, I don't have | 89 | 39.9 |
| | I don't have, but I intend to apply in future | 18 | 8.1 |

**Table 3.** *Cont.*

| Questions | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Q6: Did you miss your home in your country (primary) while staying in your second home? | Never | 18 | 8.1 |
| | Seldom | 81 | 36.3 |
| | Sometimes | 107 | 48.0 |
| | Often | 8 | 3.6 |
| | Almost always | 9 | 4.0 |

### *3.2. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis*

Confirmatory factor analyses show that the five-dimensional structure of the Home Scale is generally appropriate in primary and secondary housing contexts. As shown in Table 4, standardized factor loadings range from 0.688 to 0.896 in primary housing and from 0.679 to 0.955 in secondary housing. Most loadings being 0.70 and above indicate that items strongly represent the relevant latent dimensions, while borderline items were considered in the discussion for context sensitivity [52,53,57].

**Table 4.** Scale items, standardized factor loadings, and error variances.

| Factors/Items | Primary-Home Loading | Error | Secondary-Home Loading | Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bodily Home | | | | |
| B1. Home should be a comfortable or relaxing place. | 0.724 | 0.476 | 0.799 | 0.362 |
| B2. Home should be a security place or shelter. | 0.785 | 0.384 | 0.805 | 0.352 |
| B3. Home should be a refuge or sanctuary away from work or other unsettlements. | 0.845 | 0.286 | 0.955 | 0.088 |
| Material Home | | | | |
| M1. A home should have economic significance and an established means of ownership. | 0.818 | 0.331 | 0.853 | 0.272 |
| M2. Home should be a clean or hygienic place. | 0.747 | 0.442 | 0.783 | 0.387 |
| M3. Home should embody a kind of lifestyle. | 0.688 | 0.527 | 0.886 | 0.215 |
| Vibrant Home | | | | |
| V1. Home should not be a single, static space; rather, it should be a site for creativity. | 0.793 | 0.371 | 0.866 | 0.250 |
| V2. A home must be a dynamic space that effectively adapts to our needs and the environment, transforming to enhance our quality of life. | 0.743 | 0.448 | 0.825 | 0.319 |
| V3. Home should be a place for artistic/ aesthetic practice, wide experience or exotic display. | 0.888 | 0.211 | 0.887 | 0.213 |
| Imaginary Home | | | | |
| I1. In my imagination, the home should be an authentic or ideal place that embodies freedom and conveys a sense of self-determination. | 0.787 | 0.381 | 0.881 | 0.224 |
| I2. In my imagination, home should be located in a desirable/convenient location, which is key to home-making practices, commerce, education, or employment. | 0.734 | 0.461 | 0.748 | 0.440 |
| I3. In my imagination, home is used to promote a sense of continuity and tells mobile, progressive or diasporic stories of one's family. | 0.823 | 0.323 | 0.807 | 0.349 |
| I4. In my imagination, home can be stretched beyond a physical site or reduced to one's body— home as self is a deliberate projection of oneself. | 0.745 | 0.445 | 0.811 | 0.342 |

**Table 4.** *Cont.*

| Factors/Items | Primary-Home Loading | Error | Secondary-Home Loading | Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional Home | | | | |
| E1. Home should have intimate or familial relationships with others. | 0.884 | 0.219 | 0.856 | 0.267 |
| E2. Home should convey love. | 0.896 | 0.197 | 0.684 | 0.532 |
| E3. Home reflects one's rootedness or origin. | 0.795 | 0.368 | 0.838 | 0.298 |
| E4. Home should be a place of caregiving. | 0.845 | 0.286 | 0.679 | 0.539 |
| E5. Home should be a nostalgic place that reflects personal or collective memories of past lives, which inherited furniture, family photographs, events, etc., can evoke. | 0.834 | 0.304 | 0.793 | 0.371 |

Table 5 shows the AVE, CR, and Cronbach's alpha values. AVE values are above 0.50 and CR values are above 0.70 in all dimensions. Cronbach's alpha coefficients also generally show high internal consistency [51,55–57]. Primary dwelling model fit indices were reported as $\chi^2$ = 149.152, df = 125, CFI = 0.989, GFI = 0.931, NFI = 0.937, and RMSEA = 0.030; secondary dwelling model fit indices were reported as $\chi^2$ = 147.598, df = 125, CFI = 0.990, GFI = 0.935, NFI = 0.941, and RMSEA = 0.029. These values indicate that the measurement model shows acceptable/strong fit in both contexts [53,54].

**Table 5.** AVE, CR, and Cronbach's Alpha values for home perception.

| Construct | Primary Home AVE | Primary Home CR | Primary Home α | Secondary Home AVE | Secondary Home CR | Secondary Home α |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bodily Home | 0.618 | 0.829 | 0.824 | 0.733 | 0.891 | 0.889 |
| Material Home | 0.567 | 0.796 | 0.792 | 0.709 | 0.879 | 0.873 |
| Vibrant Home | 0.656 | 0.851 | 0.846 | 0.739 | 0.895 | 0.895 |
| Imaginary Home | 0.598 | 0.856 | 0.850 | 0.661 | 0.886 | 0.885 |
| Emotional Home | 0.725 | 0.929 | 0.929 | 0.599 | 0.881 | 0.876 |

Note: AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability; and α = Cronbach's alpha.

### *3.3. Measurement Invariance*

Measurement invariance was tested to ensure meaningful comparison of primary and secondary home scores. As shown in Table 6, the configural model demonstrated excellent fit, $\chi^2(549) = 631.10$, $p = 0.009$, CFI = 0.982, TLI = 0.980, RMSEA = 0.026 (90% CI [0.014, 0.035]), and SRMR = 0.043, indicating that the same five-factor structure was supported across the two contexts. The metric model also showed acceptable fit (CFI = 0.974, RMSEA = 0.031, SRMR = 0.0444), and ΔCFI = −0.008 remained within the recommended 0.010 threshold [38,39]. The full scalar model produced a borderline fit change; therefore, based on modification indices and substantive interpretation, the I2 intercept was released because this item refers to a desirable/convenient location and may be interpreted differently for primary and secondary homes. The resulting partial scalar model showed acceptable fit (CFI = 0.967, RMSEA = 0.034, SRMR = 0.0447; ΔCFI = −0.007; ΔRMSEA = 0.003). Partial scalar invariance can provide an acceptable basis for cautious mean comparisons when only a limited number of parameters are released, and sufficient invariant indicators remain in the relevant factor [37,40,59].

**Table 6.** Measurement invariance across primary- and secondary-home contexts.

| Model | $\chi^2$ (df) | CFI | RMSEA | SRMR | ΔCFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Configural | 631.10 (549) | 0.982 | 0.026 | 0.0430 | — |
| Metric | 678.38 (561) | 0.974 | 0.031 | 0.0444 | −0.008 |
| Partial scalar (I2 intercept free) | 724.02 (574) | 0.967 | 0.034 | 0.0447 | −0.007 |

Note: All models were estimated using maximum likelihood (ML; n = 223). ΔCFI values were computed relative to the less constrained model (metric vs. configural; partial scalar vs. metric). Invariance decisions were primarily based on ΔCFI ≤ 0.010 [38,39].

### *3.4. Hypothesis Testing*

Paired samples *t*-tests are presented in Table 7. The bodily home difference approached but did not reach the conventional 0.05 significance threshold, t(222) = 1.931, $p = 0.055$, d = 0.129; therefore, H1 was not supported. This result should not be interpreted as statistical equivalence between the two residences, but as an absence of reliable evidence for a difference in this sample. In contrast, primary-home scores were significantly higher than secondary-home scores in the material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional home dimensions. Effect sizes ranged from 0.324 to 0.396 and are interpreted as small to small-medium [60,61].

**Table 7.** Paired-samples *t* tests comparing primary vs. secondary home perceptions.

| Dimension | Primary Home (M) | Secondary Home (M) | t(222) | *p* | Cohen's d |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bodily home | 5.818 | 5.489 | 1.931 | 0.055 | 0.129 |
| Material home | 5.945 | 5.268 | 4.837 | <0.001 | 0.324 |
| Vibrant home | 4.985 | 4.166 | 5.328 | <0.001 | 0.357 |
| Imaginary home | 5.222 | 4.298 | 5.911 | <0.001 | 0.396 |
| Emotional home | 5.497 | 4.581 | 5.883 | <0.001 | 0.394 |

Note: M = mean. Two-tailed paired-samples *t* tests (df = 222). Cohen's d is based on the SD of paired difference scores (SPSS paired effect size output). Exact *p*-values are shown unless $p < 0.001$.

The findings do not establish that the two residences are equivalent in bodily home perception. Rather, they indicate that no statistically reliable difference was detected at the conventional threshold, although the direction of the mean difference and the borderline *p*-value should be interpreted cautiously. The higher primary-home scores in material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional home dimensions suggest that daily continuity, long-term material accumulation, family/neighborhood networks, and biographical memory may nourish these dimensions more strongly; however, the small to small–medium effect sizes require restrained interpretation [22,24,28–30].

## 4. Discussion

The findings should be interpreted as a dimension-specific and modest pattern rather than as evidence that one residence is categorically superior to the other. The bodily home result was non-significant at the conventional threshold, but the *p*-value was borderline; therefore, the result is best read as cautious evidence that comfort, security, and refuge may be similarly salient across the two contexts for this sample, not as proof of equivalence. This interpretation is plausible given the older profile and long second-home ownership of many participants, but future research with larger and more diverse samples should examine whether the pattern is replicated [14–18,22,25,28–30].

The higher score of the primary dwelling in the material home dimension does not mean that the secondary dwelling is an "incomplete home." The material home is related to ownership, hygiene, economic meaning, equipment, and the material arrangement of lifestyle [22,30,41]. The primary residence's use for a large part of the year may have

reinforced the perception of a material home through longer-term maintenance, accumulation of belongings, repairs, daily routines, and personal arrangements [22,28,29]. The secondary residence, on the other hand, operates with a different logic of continuity of material arrangement because it is used more seasonally and periodically [6,12].

The difference in the vibrant home dimension can be explained by the idea that the home is constantly reproduced through daily practices [30,47,48]. A vibrant home implies creative arrangement, transformation, aesthetic practices, and adaptation to needs [30]. The greater continuity of life in the primary residence increases the likelihood of the home being transformed, rearranged according to use, and enlivened by daily experiences. However, the fact that the secondary residence has medium-high rather than low vibrant home scores indicates that this residence is also owned through certain practices [47,48].

The higher scores of the primary residence in the imaginary and emotional home dimensions are related to biographical continuity and social networks. Home is conceptualized as a relational place constructed through memory, origin, family history, love, care, and nostalgia [22,26,27,30,41,44,45]. The fact that participants have owned their primary residences for a long time and spend most of the year there may explain the stronger institutionalization of familial and everyday memory in the primary residence. In contrast, the fact that the level of longing for the primary residence while staying in the secondary residence mostly remains in the low-to-medium range indicates that the secondary residence also produces a certain emotional attraction and lifestyle desire [28,29,31].

These findings should not be read as direct evidence that second homeowners are integrated into the local community or that they produce social capital, because these variables were not measured. What the results do show is more limited: some dimensions of home perception are strongly developed in the second-home context, which makes it reasonable to discuss possible links with length of stay, service use, and seasonal presence in destination planning [19–21,31].

The study's planning implications should therefore be kept specific and proportional to the data. Since second homes appear to carry bodily comfort and refuge meanings for many participants, destination management may consider healthcare access, digital infrastructure, maintenance services, accessibility, and seasonality management for seasonal residents [6,7,17,20]. Broader recommendations concerning community participation, volunteering, neighborhood interaction, or social-capital formation should be treated as hypotheses for future research rather than as direct empirical conclusions of the present study [19–21].

This study also offers a clearer framework for the relationship between second-home tourism and residential tourism. The findings show that participants can be understood as neither entirely tourists nor entirely residents; although secondary homes strongly carry certain home dimensions, primary homes maintain some emotional, material, and imaginary functions more intensely [11,28,29,31]. Therefore, second-home ownership should be considered not as a singular form of mobility, but as a multi-local lifestyle where different house sizes are distributed in different locations [15,17,28,29].

## 5. Conclusions

This research compared the perceptions of the home of British participants who own a secondary home in the Ortaca area and a primary home in the United Kingdom using a five-dimensional Home Scale framework. The findings showed that the bodily home difference was not statistically significant at the conventional 0.05 threshold, whereas primary-home scores were significantly higher in the material, vibrant, imaginary, and emotional dimensions. Because effect sizes were small to small-medium, the results should

be interpreted cautiously as a dimension-specific asymmetry in home-making rather than as evidence of a sharp hierarchy in which the primary home is the only "real" home [22,28–30].

Theoretically, the study combines the second-home literature with the multidimensional structure of home and tests the home perception of the same individual in the context of two homes using a paired design. Methodologically, the study provides a stronger quantitative comparison opportunity in second-home research by offering within-person comparisons supported by measurement invariance analyses [36–40,59]. In terms of application, the study suggests that destination planning should consider the seasonal service needs and home-making practices of second homeowners; however, claims about community integration, social capital, and participation should remain cautious because they were not directly measured [6,19–21].

The study has limitations. First, the sample consists only of British participants and from a single regional context; therefore, the findings should not be directly generalized to different nationalities, age groups, income levels, or different second-home destinations [50]. Second, the study is based on self-report data; emotional and imaginary home dimensions may be influenced by current mood, last visit experience, or seasonal context [35]. Third, the achievement of partial scalar invariance suggests that some items may carry different nuances of meaning in the context of two residences; therefore, subsequent studies should support quantitative findings with qualitative interviews [37,40,59].

Future research should model second-home use intensity, annual stay, frequency of visits, participation in local social networks, rental/lease patterns, and the likelihood of conversion to primary residence, along with the five dimensions of home perception [6,15,17,18]. In addition, comparative studies examining second-home owners of different nationalities, local people, and public/private sector stakeholders together can make a more comprehensive contribution to the Special Issue's agenda on social capital, stakeholder participation, destination governance, and sustainable rural–coastal tourism [19–21].

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, O.A.; methodology, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; software, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; validation, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; formal analysis, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; investigation, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; resources, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; data curation, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; writing—original draft preparation, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; writing—review and editing, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; visualization, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; supervision, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; project administration, O.A., Y.E. and T.C.; funding acquisition, O.A., Y.E. and T.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by Ethics Committee) of MUGLA SITKI KOCMAN UNIVERSITY (protocol code 250100 and 8 March 2025).

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

1. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs; World Tourism Organization. *International Recommendations for Tourism Statistics 2008*; United Nations: New York, NY, USA, 2010. [CrossRef]
2. Hall, C.M. Second home tourism: An international review. *Tour. Rev. Int.* **2014**, *18*, 115–135. [CrossRef]
3. Hall, C.M.; Müller, D.K. *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground*; Channel View Publications: Clevedon, UK, 2004. [CrossRef]

4. Müller, D.K.; Hall, C.M.; Keen, D. Second home tourism impact, planning and management. In *Tourism, Mobility and Second Homes: Between Elite Landscape and Common Ground*; Hall, C.M., Müller, D.K., Eds.; Channel View Publications: Clevedon, UK, 2004; pp. 15–32. [CrossRef]
5. Back, A. Endemic and diverse: Planning perspectives on second-home tourism's heterogeneous impact on Swedish housing markets. *Hous. Theory Soc.* **2022**, *39*, 317–340. [CrossRef]
6. Back, A.; Marjavaara, R.; Müller, D.K. The invisible hand of an invisible population: Dynamics and heterogeneity of second-home housing markets. *Int. J. Tour. Res.* **2022**, *24*, 536–549. [CrossRef]
7. Ericsson, B.; Øian, H.; Selvaag, S.K.; Lerfald, M.; Breiby, M.A. Planning of second-home tourism and sustainability in various locations: Same but different? *Nor. J. Geogr.* **2022**, *76*, 209–227. [CrossRef]
8. Hiltunen, M.J. Environmental impacts of rural second home tourism—Case Lake District in Finland. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2007**, *7*, 243–265. [CrossRef]
9. Müller, D.K. Second homes in the Nordic countries: Between common heritage and exclusive commodity. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2007**, *7*, 193–201. [CrossRef]
10. Lerfald, M. Unveiling the impact of second homes on rural development: A scoping review. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2024**, *24*, 222–243. [CrossRef]
11. Ferrari, S. Impacts of second home and visiting friends and relatives tourism on migration: A conceptual framework. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 4352. [CrossRef]
12. Boto-García, D.; Baños Pino, J.F. The economics of second-home tourism: Are there expenditure reallocation effects from accommodation savings? *Tour. Econ.* **2024**, *30*, 969–995. [CrossRef]
13. Back, A.; Hane-Weijman, E.; Hoogendoorn, G. Temporary residents and permanent jobs? Second-home tourism and job creation in the construction sector. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2024**, *24*, 244–267. [CrossRef]
14. Czarnecki, A.; Dacko, A.; Dacko, M. Changes in mobility patterns and the switching roles of second homes as a result of the first wave of COVID-19. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2023**, *31*, 149–167. [CrossRef]
15. Raun, J.; Järv, O.; Okkonen, P.; Rantanen, M.; Hyyryläinen, T.; Ryynänen, T.; Toivonen, T. New avenues for second home tourism research using big data: Prospects and challenges. *Curr. Issues Tour.* **2023**, *26*, 890–902. [CrossRef]
16. Zoğal, V.; Domènech, A.; Emekli, G. Stay at (which) home: Second homes during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *J. Tour. Futures* **2022**, *8*, 125–133. [CrossRef]
17. Hannonen, O.; Åkerlund, U.; Pitkänen, K. Recent developments in second home research: Has the COVID-19 pandemic spurred a re-thinking of second home mobilities? *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2024**, *24*, 173–198. [CrossRef]
18. Sulyok, J.; Nemes, G.; Orbán, É.; Tomay, K. "Is second the new first?"—The conversion of second homes into primary ones during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Eur. Countrys.* **2024**, *16*, 64–85. [CrossRef]
19. Jørgensen, M.T.; Sundbo, J.; Fuglsang, L. Co-creating communities of place in second home tourism. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2024**, *24*, 153–172. [CrossRef]
20. Wistveen, L.; Breiby, M.A.; Mei, X.Y. Destination and place: Social sustainability and social innovation in second-home tourism. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2024**, *24*, 412–430. [CrossRef]
21. Bærenholdt, J.O.; Hovgaard, G.; Lebel, J. Sharing places: The role of second-home tourism in Nordic coastal communities. *Scand. J. Hosp. Tour.* **2025**, *25*, 215–235. [CrossRef]
22. Blunt, A.; Dowling, R. *Home*; Routledge: London, UK, 2006. [CrossRef]
23. Dovey, K. Home and homelessness. In *Home Environments*; Altman, I., Werner, C.M., Eds.; Springer: Boston, MA, USA, 1985; pp. 33–64. [CrossRef]
24. Sixsmith, J. The meaning of home: An exploratory study of environmental experience. *J. Environ. Psychol.* **1986**, *6*, 281–298. [CrossRef]
25. Easthope, H. A place called home. *Hous. Theory Soc.* **2004**, *21*, 128–138. [CrossRef]
26. White, N.R.; White, P.B. Home and away: Tourists in a connected world. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2007**, *34*, 88–104. [CrossRef]
27. Pearce, P.L. The experience of visiting home and familiar places. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2012**, *39*, 1024–1047. [CrossRef]
28. Ellingsen, W.G.; Hidle, K. Performing home in mobility: Second homes in Norway. *Tour. Geogr.* **2013**, *15*, 250–267. [CrossRef]
29. Wu, Y.F.; Hannam, K.; Xu, H.G. Reconceptualising home in seasonal Chinese tourism mobilities. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2018**, *73*, 71–80. [CrossRef]
30. Yi, X.; Fu, X.; Lin, B.; Cai, X. Home: Developing and testing a scale. *Habitat Int.* **2025**, *159*, 103374. [CrossRef]
31. Bennett-Cook, R. Fethiye: Turkey's "Little Britain"—Residential tourists' identity and relationships. *J. Tour. Cult. Change* **2023**, *21*, 38–53. [CrossRef]
32. Sulak, B.; Türk, E. Rural dynamics of second home trends in the Eastern Black Sea Region. *J. Rural Stud.* **2022**, *89*, 35–44. [CrossRef]
33. Üngüren, E.; Kaçmaz, Y.Y. Identifying the factors affecting second-home purchase decisions of foreigners in Turkey: An exploratory mixed-method approach. *Tourism* **2021**, *69*, 163–179. [CrossRef]

34. Baltacı, F.; Kurar, İ. COVID-19 determining the changing motivations of international second home tourists in coastal Turkey. *J. Geogr. Inst. Jovan Cvijić SASA* **2022**, *72*, 175–189. [CrossRef]
35. Podsakoff, P.M.; MacKenzie, S.B.; Lee, J.Y.; Podsakoff, N.P. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2003**, *88*, 879–903. [CrossRef]
36. Vandenberg, R.J.; Lance, C.E. A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organ. Res. Methods* **2000**, *3*, 4–70. [CrossRef]
37. Steenkamp, J.B.E.M.; Baumgartner, H. Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *J. Consum. Res.* **1998**, *25*, 78–90. [CrossRef]
38. Cheung, G.W.; Rensvold, R.B. Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Struct. Equ. Model.* **2002**, *9*, 233–255. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
39. Chen, F.F. Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Struct. Equ. Model.* **2007**, *14*, 464–504. [CrossRef]
40. Putnick, D.L.; Bornstein, M.H. Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Dev. Rev.* **2016**, *41*, 71–90. [CrossRef]
41. Miller, D. (Ed.) *Home Possessions: Material Culture Behind Closed Doors*; Berg: Oxford, UK, 2001. [CrossRef]
42. Yelsalı Parmaksız, P.M. *Ev: Tarihsel, Toplumsal ve Sembolik Bir Mekân Olarak Anlamı ve Dönüşümü*; Nika Yayınevi: Ankara, Türkiye, 2023.
43. Lordoğlu, C. Duygularla yüklü bir mekân olarak ev: Yaşayan evlerin programı "Daire". *MSGSÜ Sos. Bilim.* **2024**, *29*, 160–176. [CrossRef]
44. Ashtar, L.; Shani, A.; Uriely, N. Blending "home" and "away": Young Israeli migrants as VFR travelers. *Tour. Geogr.* **2017**, *19*, 658–672. [CrossRef]
45. Boccagni, P.; Baldassar, L. Emotions on the move: Mapping the emergent field of emotion and migration. *Emot. Space Soc.* **2015**, *16*, 73–80. [CrossRef]
46. Morley, D. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*; Routledge: London, UK, 2000. [CrossRef]
47. Frochot, I.; Kreziak, D.; Elliot, S. Home away from home: A longitudinal study of the holiday appropriation process. *Tour. Manag.* **2019**, *71*, 327–336. [CrossRef]
48. Zhu, Y.; Cheng, M.; Wang, J.; Ma, L.; Jiang, R. The construction of home feeling by Airbnb guests in the sharing economy: A semantics perspective. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **2019**, *75*, 308–321. [CrossRef]
49. Goodman, L.A. Snowball sampling. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **1961**, *32*, 148–170. [CrossRef]
50. Creswell, J.W.; Creswell, J.D. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed.; SAGE: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2018.
51. Cronbach, L.J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika* **1951**, *16*, 297–334. [CrossRef]
52. Brown, T.A. *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*, 2nd ed.; Guilford Press: New York, NY, USA, 2015.
53. Kline, R.B. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, 4th ed.; Guilford Press: New York, NY, USA, 2016.
54. Hu, L.T.; Bentler, P.M. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Struct. Equ. Model.* **1999**, *6*, 1–55. [CrossRef]
55. Bagozzi, R.P.; Yi, Y. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **1988**, *16*, 74–94. [CrossRef]
56. Fornell, C.; Larcker, D.F. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *J. Mark. Res.* **1981**, *18*, 39–50. [CrossRef]
57. Hair, J.F.; Black, W.C.; Babin, B.J.; Anderson, R.E. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed.; Cengage: Andover, UK, 2019.
58. Raykov, T. Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. *Appl. Psychol. Meas.* **1997**, *21*, 173–184. [CrossRef]
59. Byrne, B.M.; Shavelson, R.J.; Muthén, B. Testing for the equivalence of factor covariance and mean structures: The issue of partial measurement invariance. *Psychol. Bull.* **1989**, *105*, 456–466. [CrossRef]
60. Cohen, J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed.; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ, USA, 1988. [CrossRef]
61. Lakens, D. Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for *t*-tests and ANOVAs. *Front. Psychol.* **2013**, *4*, 863. [CrossRef]