DESTINATION IMAGE AND DESTINATION PERSONALITY

Sameer Hosany, Yuksel Ekinci and Muzaffer Uysal

When referring to this work, please cite the published version:

Hosany, S., Ekinci, Y. and Uysal, M. (2007) "Destination Image and Destination Personality" *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research,* **1 (1), 62-81**

Author contact: Sameer Hosany, School of Management, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, TW20 0EX, U.K., sameer.hosany@rhul.ac.uk

DESTINATION IMAGE AND DESTINATION PERSONALITY

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the relationship between brand image and brand personality. In the generic marketing literature, several theoretical frameworks exist to understand brand image and brand personality but still, much confusion surrounds the nature of the relationship between the two constructs. Drawing on the findings of two studies and using tourism destinations as a setting, this article contributes to this long-standing debate. Results indicate that destination image and destination personality are related concepts. Canonical correlation analyses reveal that the emotional component of destination image captures the majority of variance on destination personality dimensions.

Keywords: destination image; destination personality; destination branding; brand image; brand personality; tourism destination.

DESTINATION IMAGE AND DESTINATION PERSONALITY

Brand management scholars (e.g., Aaker, 1996; Kapferer, 1997) argue that brand image is an essential part of powerful brands. A strong brand can differentiate a product/service from its competitors (Lim and O'Cass, 2001). For the consumer, brands reduce search costs (Biswas, 1992), minimize perceived risks (Berthon, Hulbert, & Pitt, 1999), indicate high quality (Erdem, 1998), and satisfy consumers' functional and emotional needs (Bhat and Reddy, 1998). In the literature, a number of theoretical frameworks exist to understand brands, brand image, brand building and brand management (e.g., Keller, 1993; Aaker, 1996; Kapferer, 1997; de Chernatony, 2001). Despite the significant importance of brand image in all of these frameworks, much ambiguity exists as to its relationship with brand personality (Aaker and Fournier, 1995; Patterson, 1999). At the theoretical level, two issues can be identified, *viz* definitional problems and the interchangeable use of the terms brand image and brand personality (Patterson, 1999). In some studies, brand image is defined in terms of brand personality (see e.g., Hendon and Williams, 1985; Upshaw, 1995). In other studies, the terms brand image and brand personality are used interchangeably to gauge consumer perceptions of brands (e.g., Gardner and Levy, 1955; Martineau, 1958). Efforts to provide an unequivocal explanation of the brand image-brand personality relationship appear in the literature (e.g., Plummer, 1984; Karande, Zinkhan and Lum, 1997; Patterson, 1999) but progress in this area is slow due to a lack of empirical investigations. To the best of our knowledge, to date, no empirical studies exist that investigate the relationship between the two constructs.

Accordingly, this article examines the debatable relationship between brand image and brand personality in the context of tourism destinations. While prior

research documents the branding of goods and services, application of classical branding theories to places, in particular to tourism destinations, is a relatively new area of academic investigation (Gnoth, 1998; Cai, 2002). More recently, drawing upon concepts from classical branding theories, the relational exchange paradigm and the network paradigms, Hankinson (2004) proposes a "relational network brand" model for tourist destinations. This model conceptualizes the place brand as a core brand (personality, positioning and reality) with four categories of brand relationships (consumer relationships, primary service relationships, media relationships and brand infrastructure relationships).

In this article, we recognize that a tourist destination consists of a bundle of tangible and intangible, and can be potentially be seen as product or perceived as a brand. Referring to previous research on product/brand personality and adopting Aaker's (1997) terminology, we conceptualise destination personality as the set of personality traits associated with a destination. The contribution of this paper primarily lies in its empirical investigations of the brand image - brand personality relationship in the context of tourist destinations. The outline of the paper is as follows; the first part provides a conceptual background on brand (destination) image, brand (destination) personality and the relationship between the two constructs. Second, the research design and study findings are discussed; the final part draws conclusions, outlines managerial implications and highlights future research directions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Destination Image

Brand image is an important concept in consumer behavior (Dobni and Zinkhan, 1990). The most common and widely accepted definition of brand image is "the perceptions about a brand reflected as associations existing in the memory of the consumer" (Keller, 1993). The associations are created in three potential ways: direct experience with the product/service, from information sources or from inferences to pre-existing associations (Martinez and Pina, 2003). Brand image is a multidimensional construct (Martinez and de Chernatony, 2004) and consists of functional and symbolic brand benefits (Low and Lamb, 2000). Similar to the strong interests at studying brand image, for the past three decades, destination image has been a dominating area of tourism research. Studies on destination image trace back to the early 1970s with Hunt (1975) influential work examining the role of image in tourism development. In a review of the literature from 1973 to 2000, Pike (2000) identifies 142 destination image studies exploring a variety of areas such as the role and influence of destination image in consumer behavior, image formation, and destination image scale development. Interestingly, research on destination image goes beyond the academic community and is of equal relevance to destination marketers (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997). However, much attention to the study of destination image primarily lies in the latter influence on tourists' behaviors. For example, in a review of 23 frequently cited destination image studies, Chon (1990) finds that the most popular themes emerging from these studies are the role and influence of destination image on traveler's behavior and satisfaction. The image of a destination influences tourists' choice processes, the evaluation of that destination and future intentions (Bigné, Sanchez, & Sanchez, 2001).

Despite its academic importance and practical relevance for tourism marketing, researchers often neglect to provide a precise definition of destination

(Echtner and Ritchie, 1991). As Pearce (1988:162) comments "image is one of those terms that won't go away…a term with vague and shifting meanings". Nevertheless, the most commonly cited definition is "the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination" (Crompton (1979:18).

An increasing number of researchers direct their attention to identifying what constitutes destination image (e.g., Lawson and Band-Bovy, 1977; Dichter, 1985). Much empirical research support the premise that destination image consists primarily of two components: cognitive and affective (e.g. Crompton, 1979). Yet, with some exceptions, the majority of destination image studies focus on its cognitive component (e.g., Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Walmsley and Young, 1998; Chen and Uysal 2002) and overlook the affective component. Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) posits that the practice of focussing on only the cognitive component is not appropriate for studying destination image and can result in measurement issues since "the meaning of a place is not entirely determined by its physical properties" (Ward and Russell, 1981:123). Traditionally, researchers have a tendency to borrow Russell's (1980) scale to capture the affective component (see for e.g., Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997) and there is a strong preference for ad hoc measures to assess the cognitive attributes of destinations. Still, very few studies (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; MacKay and Fesenmaier, 2000; Uysal, Chen and Williams, 2000) employ both affective and cognitive components in evaluating destination image. Table 1 reviews some selected destination image studies in terms of dimensions studied and method adopted.

Table 1
Selected References, Dimension(s) Studied and Method Adopted

References	Dimension(s) Studied	Method
Gartner (1989)	Cognitive	Structured: - 15 attributes - 5 point Likert scale
Reilly (1990)	Cognitive	Unstructured: - Open-ended questions
Echtner and Ritchie (1993)	Cognitive	Structured: - 34 attributes - 6 point Likert scale
Dann (1996)	Cognitive, affective and conative	Unstructured: -semi structured interviews, pictorial stimuli, and tourists' own projected images
Oppermann (1996)	Cognitive	Structured: - 15 attributes - 7 point Likert scale
Schroeder (1996)	Cognitive	Structured: - 20 attributes - 7 point Likert scale
Baloglu (1997)	Cognitive	Structured: - 27 attributes - 5 point Likert scale
Baloglu and Brinberg (1997)	Affective	Structured: - 4 attributes - 7 point semantic differential scale
Ong and Horbunlnekit (1997)	Cognitive	Structured: - 20 attributes using 7 point semantic differential scale - 17 attributes using 6 point Likert scale
Walmsley and Young (1998)	Affective	Structured: - 6 bipolar attributes - 7 point semantic differential scale
Baloglu and McCleary (1999)	Cognitive and affective	Structured: - 15 attributes using 5 point Likert scale - 4 bipolar attributes using 7 point semantic differential scale
Choi, Chan and Wu (1999)	Cognitive	Structured and unstructured: - 25 attributes using 7 point Likert scale - Open-ended questions
MacKay and Fesenmaier (2000)	Cognitive and affective	Structured: - 8 attributes - 7 point semantic differential scale
Uysal, Chen and Williams (2000)	Cognitive and affective	Structured: - 48 attributes using a 5 point Likert scale
Baloglu and Mangaloglu (2001)	Cognitive and affective	Structured: - 14 attributes using a 5 point Likert scale - 4 attributes using a 7 point semantic differential scale
Chen and Uysal (2002)	Cognitive	Structured: - 26 attributes using a 5 point Likert scale

Table 1 indicates that the majority of studies confine to assess the cognitive dimensions of destination image. Some notable exceptions exist that combine both cognitive and affective components. In terms of method, researchers have a strong preference for structured research designs. Five to seven point semantic differential and/or Likert-type scales are most common among researchers (for e.g., Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Ong and Horbunluekit, 1997; Chen and Uysal, 2002). As for the number of destination image attributes, it diverge largely: from 4 (see Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997) to 48 (see Uysal, Chen & Williams, 2000). On the other hand, in our review, Dann (1996) is the only study adopting an unstructured research design. The author offers an alternative qualitative method to the study of destination image and examines the linguistic content of tourists' mental images. Focusing on visitors' own projected images and responses to pictorial stimuli in both pre and on-trip situations, Dann (1996) develop a destination image analysis framework consisting of cognitive, affective and conative components. Dann's (1996) study further demonstrates the complexity at investigating the linkages between destination image and choice.

Destination Personality

Brand personality appeals to both academics (e.g. Aaker, 1997; Gardner and Levy, 1955) and practitioners (e.g. Plummer, 1984) as its importance becomes more apparent. Brand personality is described as the personality traits generally associated with humans that consumers perceive brand to possess (Batra, Lehmann, & Singh, 1993; Aaker, 1997). A distinctive brand personality can create a set of unique and favourable associations in consumer memory and thus enhance brand equity (Keller, 1993). Brand personality serves as an enduring basis for differentiation (Crask and Henry, 1990). As a result, brand personality is an important factor for the success of a

brand in terms of preference and choice (Batra et al., 1993). A well established brand personality can result in consumers having stronger emotional ties to the brand, greater trust and loyalty (Fournier, 1998).

Brand personality research suffers due to a lack of common theory and consensual taxonomy of personality traits to describe products and brands (Aaker and Fournier, 1995). On the basis of this premise, adopting a rigorous method, Aaker (1997) develops a reliable and valid instrument: the Brand Personality Scale (BPS). Aaker (1997) extends on the dimensions of human personality and supports a five dimensional brand personality structure: sincerity, excitement, competence, sophistication and ruggedness. Attributes such as down-to-earth, real, sincere and honest represent the sincerity dimension. Such traits as daring, exciting, imaginative and contemporary illustrate excitement. Attributes such as intelligent, reliable, secure and confident characterize competence. Attributes such as glamorous, upper class, good looking and charming personify sophistication. The ruggedness dimension feature traits such as tough, outdoorsy, masculine and western. Since Aaker's (1997) work, the literature reports several applications of the BPS in different settings and across cultures (e.g., Aaker, Benet-Martinez, & Garolera, 2001; Siguaw, Mattila, & Austin, 1999; Supphellen and Gronhaug, 2003).

Similar to brand personality research, the tourism literature increasingly acknowledges the importance of destination personality, in particular, at leveraging the perceived image of a place and in influencing tourist choice behavior (Crockett and Wood, 2002). At the conceptual level, many tourism academics embrace the face validity of the destination personality construct (e.g., Henderson, 2000; Morgan, Pritchard, & Piggott, 2002; Crockett and Wood, 2002). For example, through content

analysis of travel and tourism advertisements, Santos (2004) found that personality attributes such as "contemporary", "modern", "sophisticated", and "traditional" represents Portugal in the U.S. travel media. Henderson (2000) posits that the New Asia-Singapore brand is comprised of six personality characteristics: cosmopolitan, youthful, vibrant, modern, reliable and comfort. However, to date, limited empirical research exists that identify salient destination personality dimensions (Ekinci and Hosany, 2006).

Relationship between Brand Image and Brand Personality

Brand image and brand personality are key at creating brand equity (Martineau, 1958; Keller, 1993; Plummer, 1984). Although several models exist in the literature to explain the two concepts, much ambiguity surrounds the relationship between brand image and brand personality. Poor conceptualisations and a lack of empirical studies have hampered progress in understanding this relationship. At the conceptual level, two issues exist: definitional problems and interchangeable use of the terms brand image and brand personality. Patterson's (1999) review of the branding literature highlights the definitional inconsistencies; the author identifies 27 definitions of brand image and 12 brand personality definitions. In some instances, brand image is defined in terms of brand personality. Hendon and Williams (1985) and Upshaw (1995) definitions are typical of these inconsistencies.

> [Brand image] also known as 'brand personality' or 'brand character', it involves nothing more than describing a product as if it were a human being. (Hendon and Williams, 1985:66)

[Brand image is] generally synonymous with either the brand's strategic personality or its reputation as a whole. (Upshaw, 1995:14)

The second issue relates to the interchangeable use of the terms brand image and brand personality in the literature (e.g., Smothers, 1993; Doyle, 1989). An illustration is the following extract from Graeff (1997:49).

Marketers have become increasingly aware of the strategic importance of a brand's image. Just as people can be described in terms of their *personality* as perceived by other people, brands can be described in terms of their *image* as perceived by consumers.

Clearly, the above extract shows that the author makes no apparent effort to delineate between brand image and brand personality. Patterson (1999) further concluded that most studies fail to distinguish between the terms brand image, brand personality and user image. Still, some scholars attempt to provide some theoretical explanations to the brand image-brand personality relationship (e.g., Plummer, 1984; Karande et al., 1997; Patterson, 1999). For these authors, brand image is a more encapsulating term and has a number of inherent characteristics or dimensions, including, among others, brand personality, user image, product attributes and consumer benefits. For example, in Heylen, Dawson and Sampson's (1995) brand model, brand personality and brand identity are two components of image. However, Heylen et al., (1995) conceptualisation contrasts with Kapferer (1997) identity prism, in which personality and self-image are components of brand identity along with physical, relationship, reflection, and culture dimensions.

Another school of thought (Biel, 1993: 71) views brand image as "a cluster of attributes and associations that consumers connect to a brand". In this elaboration, evoked associations can be either hard (tangible/functional) or soft (emotional attributes). Brand personality is seen as the soft emotional side of brand image (Biel, 1993). Likewise, Fournier (1998) argues that when brand are successful at satisfying consumer needs, consumers develop strong emotions towards them. In summary, the lack of solid theory development results in confusion and impedes managerial practices. The relationship between brand image and brand personality necessitates substantive empirical testing and confirmation.

METHOD

The measures for destination image, destination personality, an attitude towards the destination, overall image and intention to recommend behavior were adapted from previous research. The questionnaire also comprises socio-demographics characteristics and aspects of travel behavior.

Destination Image

Destination image has both cognitive and affective components (Crompton, 1979; Dann 1996). Some previous studies investigate either the affective (e.g., Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997) or cognitive dimensions (e.g., Schroeder, 1996), but this study seeks to incorporate both dimensions in its assessment of destination image. Affective image is measured using 4 bipolar items adopted from Russell (1980). The four bipolar affective items are: distressing/relaxing; gloomy/exciting; sleepy/arousing; and unpleasant/pleasant. The cognitive image measure is adapted from Ong and Horbunluekit (1997) study and consists of 17 bipolar adjectives:

dirty/clean; easily accessible/isolated; friendly/cold; harmonious/hostile; innocent/sinful; interesting/boring; lively/stagnant; natural/artificial; overcrowded/sparse; pretty/ugly; quiet/noisy; sophisticated/simple; old/new; underdeveloped/overdeveloped; upmarket/poor; safe/unsafe; and very touristy/not at all touristy. Ratings for the 21-item destination image scale are captured on a 7-point semantic differential scale.

Destination Personality

Destination personality was measured using Aaker's (1997) five dimensional brand personality scale (BPS). The BPS is the most comprehensive instrument for measuring brand/product personality and numerous studies (e.g. Siguaw et al., 1999) adopt this scale to capture consumers' perception of brand personality. At a preliminary stage, we tested the original brand personality scale for content validity. Twenty native British subjects (50% male and 50% female) were asked to state whether each of the 42 personality traits are relevant to their description of tourism destinations. The criterion set out to establish content validity was that traits are chosen by at least 70 percent of the pre-test respondents. As a result of this process, 27 personality traits, across 5 dimensions, were retained for the final questionnaire and are as follows: Sincerity (down to earth, family oriented, sincere, wholesome, original, cheerful and friendly); Excitement (daring, exciting, spirited, imaginative, up to date, independent); Competenc*e* (reliable, secure, intelligent, successful, confident, secure); Sophistication (upper class, glamorous, good looking); and Ruggednes*s* (outdoorsy, masculine, western, tough, rugged). Ratings for the 27-items destination personality scale are captured using a 5 point Likert-type scale with anchors 1= "not descriptive at all" and 5= "extremely descriptive", consistent with Aaker's (1997)

study and recent research on brand personality (e.g., Diamantopoulos, Smith, & Grime, 2005).

Dependent Variables

The study also includes multiple dependent measures to assess the criterion validity of the scales. All items are measured using a 7-point single item Likert-type scale. Overall destination image evaluation is captured using the statement "What is your impression of the overall image of the destination?" with anchors extremely poor [-3] and extremely good [+3]. An attitude toward the destination is measured using the statement "How would you describe your overall feeling about the destination?" with anchors disliked very much [-3] and liked very much [+3]. Finally, the measure for intention to recommend is ad0apted from Cronin and Taylor (1992) using the statement "How likely is it that you would recommend this destination to your friends/family/colleagues?" with extremely unlikely [-3] and extremely likely [+3].

Data Collection and Sample

Data were collected in the United Kingdom (UK) in three different cities via a personally administered questionnaire. To participate in the survey, respondents were approached randomly on the high streets, around shopping complexes and at train stations to participate. In general, respondents were responsive and willing to participate, and refusal rates were predominantly low (around 15%). Using the retrieval hypothesis (Solomon, Bamossy, & Askegaard, 1999), respondents were instructed to recall their experiences about the most recent tourist destination visited outside the UK before answering a series of questions. A total of 148 usable

questionnaires were collected from British nationals. Table 2 summarizes the profile

of the respondents.

Table 2
Study 1: Sample Characteristics

Response Category	Frequency (n = 148)	Percentage of total
Gender		
Male	71	48
Female	77	52
Age		
16-24	27	18.2
25-34	35	23.6
35-44	40	27.0
45-54	34	23.0
55-64	12	8.2
Annual personal income (£)		
Less than 10 000	18	12.0
10 000-14 999	37	25.0
15 000-19 999	43	29.0
20 000-24 999	21	14.0
25 000-29 999	13	9.0
30 000-35 000	10	7.0
More than 35 000	6	4.0
Number of previous visits		
No previous visit	83	56.0
1-2 times	31	21.0
3-4 times	7	5.0
More than 4 times	27	18.0
Purpose of visit		
Leisure/Holidays	108	73.0
Visiting friends & relatives	27	18.0
Education	7	5.0
Others	6	4.0
Travel Companion		
Alone	17	11.6
Family	37	25.2
Partner	52	35.4
Friends	38	25.9
Others	4	3.0

The sample is almost equally split between males (48%) and females (52%).

In terms of age group, 18 percent of the respondents were between 16 and 24 years of

age, 24 percent in the 25-34 age group, 27 percent in the 35-44 group, and 31 percent

were 45 or above. Sixty-six per cent of the sample earned an annual personal income of less than £20,000. For their most recent vacation, 58 percent travelled to a European destination with Spain (20%) and France (14%) as the two most popular destinations, and Belgium as the least popular European destination with 1.4 percent. The United States accounts for 6.1 percent of respondents' destination choice for holiday. Asian destinations (e.g., China, India and Malaysia) accounted for 7.5 percent and African countries (e.g., Mauritius, South Africa and Kenya) for only 4.8 percent. A large proportion of respondents (56%) were first-time visitors and the remaining 44 percent had previous visits ranging from one to more than four trips to the same destination. For the majority of respondents (73%), the main purpose of visit was for leisure.

RESULTS

Measure Refinements

The psychometric properties of the destination image and destination personality scales were assessed for construct validity, criterion validity, convergent validity, unidimensionality and reliability analyses (Churchill, 1979; Gerbing and Anderson, 1988; Anderson and Gerbing, 1998).

Exploratory Factor Analysis: Destination Image

The construct validity of the destination image scale was examined against convergent and discriminant validity, both of which were tested using exploratory factor analysis. Preliminary analyses using Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO = 0.79) and Barlett's test (significant at the 0.00 level) supported the appropriateness of factor analyses to the data (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Principal component

extraction with Varimax rotation was applied to the 21-items destination image scale. The criterion for the significance of factor loadings was set at 0.45 following the suggestion of Hair et al., (1998) for sample size of 150. Items exhibiting low factor loadings (<0.40), high cross loadings (>0.40) or low communalities (<0.30) were eliminated until a clean and rigid factor structure emerge. Initial findings suggest that the destination image scale consist of five dimensions. A three factor solution was retained for two reasons: first, the three factors explained most of the variance in the analyses; and second, the last two factors displayed insufficient reliability (alpha coefficient values were <.60). Table 3 presents the findings of factor analysis for the destination image scale.

Table 3
Destination Image Scale: Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation (n = 148)

Scale			Factor Loadings[a]			
	Mean[b]	SD	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Communality
Affective						
Unpleasant/Pleasant	5.57	1.47	83	-	-	69
Distressing/Relaxing	5.37	1.63	70	-	-	56
Pretty/Ugly	5.51	1.51	66	-	-	65
Gloomy/Exciting	5.32	1.53	65	-	-	68
Physical Atmosphere						
Quiet/Noisy	3.92	1.83	-	80	-	70
Innocent/Sinful	4.38	1.58	-	76	-	59
Sleepy/Arousing	3.47	1.53	-	74	-	62
Overcrowded/Sparse	3.53	1.70	-	59	-	63
Accessibility						
Lively/Stagnant	5.46	1.70	-	-	73	66
Friendly/Cold	5.74	1.55	-	-	71	63
Easily accessible/Isolated	4.82	1.92	-	-	66	53
Interesting/Boring	5.66	1.56	-	-	66	55
Eigenvalue			3.54	2.63	1.31	
Explained variance by factors (%)			22.20	20.30	19.80	
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient			0.77	0.74	0.70	

[a] Numbers are magnitudes of the factor multiplied by 100. Total variance extracted by the three factors is 62.30%. Item loading less than 0.45 omitted. [b] Items measured on a 7-point semantic differential scale.

In Table 3, the three extracted factors explained 62 percent of the total variance. All factors have relatively high reliability coefficients ranging from 0.70 to 0.77 and factor loadings are predominantly high ($\geq$.59). Such findings establish the construct validity of the destination image scale (Churchill, 1979). In destination image studies, the labelling of factors, as derived from factor analysis, is seen as being "a notoriously subjective activity" (Walmsley and Young, 1998). As a result, the first dimension was labelled "affective" and explained 22 percent of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.54) with a reliability coefficient of 0.77. The affective dimension groups four items: unpleasant/pleasant, distressing/relaxing, pretty/ugly and gloomy/exciting. The second dimension was labelled as "physical atmosphere" and accounts for 20 percent of the variance (eigenvalue = 2.63) with a reliability coefficient of 0.74. The physical atmosphere dimensions comprise of four bipolar items: quiet/noisy, innocent/sinful, sleepy/arousing and overcrowded/sparse. The last dimension was named "accessibility" and explain of 20 percent variation in the data (eigenvalue = 1.31) with reliability coefficient of 0.70. The accessibility dimension consists of the following four bipolar items: easily accessible/isolated, lively/stagnant, friendly/cold, and interesting/boring.

The criterion validity of the destination image scale was assessed using two ordinary least square (OLS) regressions analyses. The three destination image dimensions were considered as independent variables and overall destination image evaluation and intention to recommend as the dependent variables. The regression models were checked for multicollinearity effect using variance inflation factor (VIF). VIF values were below the maximum threshold level of 10 (Hair et al., 1998) and indicate no evidence of multicollinearity. Overall, from the regression models, destination image was statistically significant in estimating global evaluation of

destination image ($R^2 = 0.40$, $F_{(3,144)} = 30.33$, $p<0.00$) and intention to recommend ($R^2 = 0.46$, $F_{(3,144)} = 41.54$, $p<0.00$).

Exploratory Factor Analysis: Destination Personality

Similarly, the 27-items destination personality scale was subjected to exploratory factor analysis. The KMO value was at 0.85 and Bartlett's test was significant at the 0.00 level. Both results demonstrate the appropriateness of factor analyses to the data. Applying the same empirical criteria to that of the destination image scale, a final 3-factor model emerged from the analysis. Table 4 presents the results of exploratory factor analysis for the destination personality scale. Items with factor loadings lower than 0.45 are omitted.

Table 4
Destination Personality Scale: Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation (*n* = 148)

Scales	Mean[b]	SD	Factor Loadings[a]			
			Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Communality
Sincerity						
Sincere	2.90	1.30	77	-	-	67
Intelligent	2.80	1.20	76	-	-	67
Reliable	3.00	1.24	75	-	-	62
Successful	3.40	1.20	62	-	-	50
Wholesome	2.95	1.15	62	-	-	48
Down-to-earth	3.00	1.30	60	-	-	38
Excitement						
Exciting	3.80	1.15	-	82	-	81
Daring	2.90	1.35	-	74	-	60
Spirited	3.50	1.20	-	61	-	56
Original	3.20	1.25	-	58	-	49
Conviviality						
Friendly	4.00	1.00	-	-	84	77
Family oriented	3.50	1.25	-	-	80	67
Charming	3.40	1.10	-	-	64	46
Eigenvalue			4.70	1.75	1.22	
Explained variance by factors (%)			25.75	17.55	15.82	
Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient			0.81	0.72	0.69	

[a] Numbers are magnitudes of the factor multiplied by 100. Total variance extracted by the three factors is 59.12%. Item loading less than 0.45 omitted; [b] Items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Table 4 shows that a three factor solution was adequate according to: (a) the acceptable eigenvalues; and (b) the satisfactory amount of total variance explained. The three factors had eigenvalues greater than 1 and accounted for 59 percent of the total variation in the data. All factors have relatively high reliability coefficients: sincerity ($\alpha = 0.81$), excitement ($\alpha = 0.72$), with the exception of conviviality ($\alpha = 0.69$) which was only marginally below the recommended 0.70 threshold level. The factor loadings are reasonably robust (all $\geq .58$) and establish the construct validity of the scale (Churchill, 1979). The first factor was labelled "sincerity" and explained the highest proportion of the variance (26%) with eigenvalue of 4.70. The sincerity dimension includes the items: sincere, intelligent, reliable, successful, wholesome and

down to earth. The second factor was labelled as "excitement" and explained 18 per cent of variance with eigenvalue of 1.75. The excitement dimension consists of the items: exciting, daring, spirited and original. The last factor "conviviality" accounts for 16 percent of the variance (eigenvalue=1.22) and comprises the items: friendly, family oriented and charming.

Two OLS regression analyses provide an assessment of the criterion validity of the destination personality scale. These analyses examined the relationship between destination personality and the independent variables an attitude toward the destination and intention to recommend. The dimensions sincerity, excitement and conviviality were considered as independent variables, and an attitude towards the destination and intention to recommend as the dependent variables. The regression models were inspected for multicollinearity effect and all VIF values were less than 10, indicating no evidence of multicollinearity (Hair et al., 1998). From the regression results, destination personality was statistically significant at predicting an attitude towards the destination (R^2 = 0.23, $F_{(3,144)}$ = 14.61, p=0.00) and intention to recommend (R^2 = 0.23, $F_{(3,144)}$ = 14.34, p=0.00). As a result, these findings provide evidence for the criterion validity of the destination personality scale (Churchill, 1979).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Study 2

A second study was carried out with the main purpose to establish the external validity of the findings. Data were collected from a second sample in the departure lounge of a major European airport. Participants were British tourists waiting for their return flights to the UK after visiting a popular European city. Respondents were

approached randomly to participate in the survey. The questionnaire comprised of the 12-item destination image and 13-item destination personality scales as derived from exploratory factor analysis in Study 1. A total of 120 questionnaires were collected and a final 102 retained for analysis. The second sample consists of 60% males and 40% females. In terms of age group, the profile was as follows: 16–24: 19%, 25–34: 43%, 35–44: 23%, above 44: 15%. The majority of respondents (91%) were on their first visit to this European city.

The factor structure of the destination image and destination personality scales items were estimated using LISREL 8.1 (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1996). PRELIS was used to generate the variance-covariance matrix as input. The overall fit of the measurement model was determined initially by examining the χ^2 statistics. A significant χ^2 value indicates an inadequate fit but one should be cautious in interpreting the results because χ^2 statistics are dependent on sample size (Marsh and Hocevar, 1985; Bollen, 1989). As a result, several other fit indexes are available that are independent of sample size (Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988; Hu and Bentler, 1998). Among these, the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) are relatively unaffected by sample size.

A three-dimensional confirmatory factor model was estimated on the 12-items destination image scale. Initial inspection of the model revealed that fit indices were below recommended standards (e.g. Hu and Bentler, 1999) and indicates a poor fit: $\chi^2_{(51)} = 123.45$, $p < 0.001$; GFI = 0.83, AGFI = 0.74, NFI = 0.83, CFI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.11). In order to get a better fit, the model was subjected to modification and the

items distressing/relaxing, gloomy/exciting, sleepy/arousing were deleted. The three items loaded simultaneously on more than one factor. A second confirmatory model was re-estimated using the remaining 9 items. The model exhibited a better fit: the chi square, $\chi^2{}_{(51)} = 26.94$, was not significant ($p>0.001$). The other fit indices substantially improved and met the recommended acceptable minimum threshold level: GFI = 0.94; AGFI = 0.90; NFI = 0.92; CFI = 0.98; RMSEA = 0.03. All factor loadings were ≥ 0.35 and significant ($p<.05$), satisfying the criteria for convergent validity. The reliability coefficients for the three sub-scales ranged from 0.70 to 0.75.

Similar to the destination image scale, a three dimensional confirmatory factor model was estimated on the 13-item destination personality scale. The chi square, χ^2 $\chi^2{}_{(41)} = 70.99$, was significant ($p< 0.001$) and indicates a poor fit to the hypothesised solution. The other fit indices were generally below acceptable thresholds: GFI = 0.89; AGFI = 0.82; NFI = 0.84; CFI = 0.91; RMSEA = 0.08). An inspection of the modification indices revealed that the items reliable and down to earth were factorially complex and if deleted, will result in a better model fit. The two items were deleted and a second confirmatory model was re-estimated on the remaining 11 items. The overall model fit improved: chi square: $\chi^2{}_{(41)} = 42.76$, $p>0.001$; GFI = 0.92; AGFI = 0.87; NFI = 0.90; CFI = 0.96. The value of RMSEA equals 0.05 and is below the recommended cut-off value of 0.08. All factor loadings were ≥ 0.35 and significant ($p<0.05$) and therefore establishes convergent validity of the scale. The reliabilities of the individual sub-scales, sincerity ($\alpha = 0.70$); excitement ($\alpha = 0.72$); and conviviality ($\alpha = 0.76$) exceeded the minimum recommended level of 0.70 (Churchill, 1979).

Relationship between Destination Image and Destination Personality

The relationship between brand image and brand personality lacks both theoretical and empirical support in the literature. This article seeks to address the nature of this relationship based on tourists' evaluation of destination image and destination personality. The relationship between the two constructs was tested using canonical correlation. Canonical correlation analysis is a multivariate statistical model that estimates the simultaneous relationships between two sets of multiple variables. The underlying logic involves the derivation of a linear combination of variables from each of the two sets of variables (the destination personality and destination image summated scales, each consisting of three sub-scales) called canonical variates. Such a procedure attempts to maximise the correlation between two linear combinations of variables (Hair et al., 1998). The maximum number of canonical variates (functions) that can be extracted from a set of variables equals the number of variables in the smallest set of variables, in our case three. The canonical correlation analyses were run using the MANOVA procedure in SPSS. The analyses for the destination image and destination personality sub-scales resulted in two meaningful canonical functions significant at the 0.05 or better probability level. Table 5 presents the results of canonical correlation analysis for Study 1 and Study 2.

Table 5
Overall Results of Canonical Correlation Analysis

Statistics	Variate Number					
	Study 1 (*n*=148)			Study 2 (*n*=102)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Canonical Correlation	0.47	0.28	0.09	0.56	0.22	0.19
Wilki's lambda significance	0.00	0.01	0.30	0.00	0.07	0.05
Percentage of variance explained						
Destination Image	0.43	0.35	0.22	0.50	0.22	0.28
Cumulative %	0.44	0.78	1.00	0.50	0.80	1.00
Destination Personality	0.48	0.35	0.17	0.53	0.24	0.23
Cumulative %	0.48	0.83	1.00	0.53	0.77	1.00
Redundancy						
Destination Image	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.16	0.01	0.01
Cumulative %	0.10	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.17	0.18
Destination Personality	0.11	0.03	0.00	0.17	0.01	0.08
Cumulative %	0.11	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.18	0.19

For the significant functions, the canonical correlations ranged from 0.02 to 0.99 as

can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6
Canonical Loadings for Destination Personality and Destination Image Sub-Scales

Scales	Variate Number					
	Study 1 (*n*=148)			Study 2 (*n*=102)		
	1	2	3	1	2	3
Destination Image						
Affective	-0.99	0.02	0.12	-0.99	-0.08	-0.16
Physical Atmosphere	-0.06	-0.99	-0.03	-0.39	-0.23	-0.89
Accessibility	-0.55	0.21	-0.80	-0.61	0.78	-0.15
Destination Personality						
Sincerity	-0.54	0.53	-0.65	-0.91	-0.38	-0.16
Excitement	-0.54	0.79	-0.30	-0.58	0.36	0.73
Conviviality	-0.92	-0.39	0.04	-0.65	0.67	-0.36

As a rule of thumb, only variables (summated scales) having canonical loading

greater than 0.40 are interpretable. For example, in the first significant variate for

Study 1, the sub-scale physical atmosphere (destination image) is not part of the canonical variable. The same argument holds true for the first significant variate of Study 2 in which the canonical loading for physical atmosphere is less than 0.40. However, for the second significant variates of both Study 1 and Study 2, the sub-scales affective and accessibility (destination image) and the sub-scale conviviality (destination personality), have canonical loading values less than 0.40. Nevertheless, if we go with the very first significant and meaningful variate, the only sub-scale that does not qualify is physical atmosphere (canonical loading of .06 in Study 1 and 0.39 in Study 2) and was therefore omitted from further interpretations.

The results of the analysis also indicate that the two significant variates for both studies explained a high percentage of total variance: Study 1: 78% and 83%; Study 2: 80% and 77% respectively. However, the destination personality variance recovered from the destination image scale was 13 percent for Study 1 and 18 percent for Study 2 (see Table 5). The two significant pairs reveal that, with the exception of physical atmosphere as part of destination image, the sub-scales affective and accessibility are, in general, directly related to sincerity, excitement and conviviality. Such an outcome establishes the duality of the relationship between the two constructs.

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The current article makes an important contribution to the understanding of brand image and brand personality in the context of tourism destinations. In the literature, several models exist to understand brand image and brand personality, but

empirical investigations on the relationship between the two constructs are scarce. The terms brand image and brand personality are used interchangeably (e.g., Gardner and Levy, 1955; Martineau, 1958). In other cases, brand image and brand personality are theoretically identified as either separate concepts (e.g., Gordon, 1996) or relating concepts (e.g., Hendon and Williams, 1985; Upshaw, 1995). Some authors attempt to delineate between the two constructs (see for e.g., Patterson, 1999) but discussions remain only at the conceptual level.

Using canonical correlation, this study provides some empirical support to this contentious debate. Results indicate that destination image and destination personality are two different but related concepts. At least two of the destination image sub-scales (affective and accessibility) were significantly related to the destination personality scales (sincerity, excitement and conviviality). In the first study, almost 13 percent of the variance in destination personality was recovered from the destination image scale and 18 percent in the second study. As a result, these findings support the proposition that brand image is an encompassing term with brand personality as one of its components (e.g., Plummer, 1984) and brand personality is more related to the affective (softer) side of brand image. However, despite the statistical significance of these results, further investigations are required, given the limitation of this study to tourist destinations. Future studies could adopt a similar approach but in a different context (for e.g., retailing) to further substantiate our results.

Our study also makes important theoretical contributions to both the generic marketing and tourism literatures. Academics must pay particular attention at distinguishing between brand image and brand personality, since, failure to do so, will hinder research progress and result in poor conceptual developments. The terms brand

personality and brand image must not be used interchangeably. Our research is seen to partially complement Patterson (1999) study in an attempt to delineate between the two constructs. In contrast to Patterson (1999) who adopted a conceptual approach, this study builds upon an empirical stance at identifying the relationship between brand image and brand personality.

The present findings provide support for the application of Aaker's (1997) brand personality scale to tourism places. Previous studies focus on the applicability and validity of the scale to consumer goods and across cultures, but very little research attempts to test the relevance of brand personality to tourist destinations. The study results, however, do not fully replicate Aaker's (1997) five dimensional structure. Instead, in our study, destination personality comprises of only three salient dimensions: sincerity, excitement and conviviality. The evidence of a three versus a five dimensional solution is in line with Caprara, Barbaranelli, & Guido (2001) argument that brand personalities can comprise a small number of dimensions.

From a practical standpoint, our findings offer important implications for developing destination marketing strategies. The tourism industry is increasingly competitive with destination marketing organisations (DMO's) competing to attract tourists. Creating and managing an appropriate destination image (or brand image) and destination personality (or brand personality) have become vital for effective positioning and differentiation. Our study provides evidence that personality traits are ubiquitous in tourists' evaluations of tourist destinations. More specifically, destination marketers should concentrate on developing promotional campaigns emphasising the distinctive personality of their places. In terms of antecedents, a multitude of marketing variables such as user imagery and advertising can create

brand personality (Batra et al., 1993; Plummer, 1984). As such, the use of different promotional tools (e.g., public relations, media advertising) can play a vital role in creating and maintaining a destination's distinctive personality.

Furthermore, the study found that tourists' evaluation of destinations comprised of cognitive, affective and personality dimensions. Destination marketers, in order to create a favourable image, are required to devise branding strategies that encompasses the three dimensions. Destination promoters can focus on the commonality between destination image and destination personality in order to communicate unique destination features and influence tourist behaviour. As a result, the positioning of a destination can translate into its rational benefits (cognitive images), such as accessibility and liveliness of the place. At a deeper level, destinations should communicate their emotional benefits (affective images and personality characteristics) such as the friendliness of its people, pleasure, excitement and relaxation.

This article makes important theoretical contributions to our understanding of the brand image – brand personality relationship. Nevertheless, it entails some limitations and overcoming them can act as a catalyst for future research streams. First, this study uses a battery of multi-attributes in the form of semantic differential scales to gauge destination image. The list of attributes may be incomplete and does not incorporate all relevant characteristics of destination image (Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Gartner, 1989). Future studies could adopt both structured and unstructured (e.g. free elicitation and triad elicitation) methods to capture the complex assessment of destinations (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Dann, 1996).

In this study, destination personality was measured using Aaker's (1997) brand personality scale, which was originally developed to measure brand personality in consumer good settings. As a result, personality traits used in this study might not reflect the full gamut of personality traits associated with destinations. To provide a comprehensive picture of the destination personality construct, future research could use qualitative research in the forms of focus groups or projective techniques to elicit destination-specific personality characteristics. Finally, the sample size is small and specific to only one culture (British respondents). As a result, the findings cannot be generalised to the wider tourist population. Despite these limitations, it seems beyond doubt that the two studies described in this article make important theoretical and empirical contributions to our understanding of the contentious relationship between brand image and brand personality. Further investigations along the same lines will certainly contribute to the debate.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (1996).Building strong brands. New York: The Free Press.

Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. Journal of Marketing Research, 34, 347-356.

Aaker, J., & Fournier, S. (1995). A brand as a character, a partner and a person: Three perspectives on the question of brand personality. Advances in Consumer Research, 22, 391-395.

Aaker, J. L., Benet-Martinez, V. & Garolera, J. (2001). Consumption symbols as carriers of culture: A study of Japanese and Spanish brand bersonality constructs. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81(3), 492-508.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1998). Structural equation modelling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. Psychological Bulletin, 103 (3): 411-23.

Baloglu, S. (1997). The relationship between destination images and trip characteristics of international travellers. Journal of Vacation Marketing, 3 (3), 221-233.

Baloglu, S., & Brinberg, D. (1997). Affective images of tourism destination. Journal of Travel Research, 35 (4), 11-15.

Baloglu, S., & McClearly, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. Annals of Tourism Reseach, 26 (4), 868-897.

Baloglu, S., & Mangaloglu, M. (2001). Tourism destination images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece and Italy as perceived by US-based tour operators and travel agents. Tourism Management, 22, 1-9.

Batra, R., Lehmann, D. R., & Singh, D. (1993). The brand personality component of brand goodwill: Some antecedents and consequences. In D. A. Aaker & A. Biel (Eds.), Brand Equity and Advertising (pp. 83-96). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berthon, P., Hulbert, J. M., & Pitt, L. F. (1999). Brand management prognostications. Sloan Management Review, 40 (2), 53-65.

Biel, A. (1993). Converting Image into Equity. In D. A. Aaker & A. Biel (Eds.), Brand Equity and Advertising (pp. 67-82). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bigné, J. E., Sanchez, M. I. & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behavior: Inter-relationship. Tourism Management, 22, 607-616.

Bhat, S., & Reddy, S. (1998). Symbolic and functional positioning of brands. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 15 (1), 32-44.

Biswas, A. (1992). The moderating role of brand familiarity in reference price perceptions. Journal of Business Research, 25 (November), 251-262.

Bollen, K. A. (1989). Structural equations with latent variables. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Cai, L. A. (2002). Cooperative branding for rural destinations. Annals of Tourism Research, 29, 720-742.

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C. & Guido, G. (2001). Brand personality: How to make the metaphor fit? Journal of Economic Psychology, 22, 377-395.

Chen, J. & Uysal, M. (2002). Market positioning analysis: A hybrid approach. Annals of Tourism Research, 29 (4), 987-1003.

Choi, W. M., Chan, A. & Wu, J. (1999). A qualitative and quantitative assessment of Hong Kong's image as a tourist destination. Tourism Management, 20, 361-365.

Chon, K. (1990) The role of destination image in tourism: A review and discussion. The Tourist Review, 45 (2), 2-9.

Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. Journal of Marketing Research, 16 (February), 64-73.

Crask, M. R., & Henry, A. L. (1990). A positioning-based decision model for selecting advertising messages. Journal of Advertising Research, 30 (4), 32-38.

Crockett, S. R., & Wood, L. J. (2002). Brand Western Australia: Holidays of an entirely different nature. In N. Morgan, A. Pritchard & R. Pride (Eds.), Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition (pp. 124-147). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

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.

Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: A re-examination and extension. Journal of Marketing, 56, 55-68.

Dann, G. M. S. (1996). Tourists' images of a destination – An alternative analysis. Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 5 (1/2), 41-55.

de Chernatony, L. (2001). From brand vision to brand evaluation: Strategically building and sustaining brands. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Diamantopoulos, A., Smith, G., & Grime, I. (2005). The impact of brand extensions on brand personality: Experimental evidence. European Journal of Marketing, 39 (1/2), 129-149.

Dichter, E. (1985). What is an image? Journal of Consumer Research, 13 (March): 455-72.

Dobni, D., & Zinkhan, G. M. (1990). In search of brand image: A foundation analysis. Advances in Consumer Research, 17, 110-119.

Doyle, P. (1989). Building successful brands: The strategic options. Journal of Marketing Management, 5 (1), 77-95.

Echtner, C., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1991). The meaning and measurement of destination image. The Journal of Tourism Studies, 2 (2), 2-12.

Echtner, C., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. Journal of Travel Research, 31 (4), 3–13.

Ekinci, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination Personality: An application of brand personality to tourism destinations. Journal of Travel Research, 45 (November), 127-139.

Erdem, T. (1998). An empirical analysis of umbrella branding. Journal of Marketing Research, 35 (August), 339-351.

Fournier, S. (1998) Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. Journal of Consumer Research, 24, 343-373.

Gardner, B. B. & Levy, S. J. (1955). The product and the brand. Harvard Business Review, 33 (March/April), 33–39.

Gartner, W. C. (1989). Tourism image: Attribute measurement of state tourism products using multidimensional scaling techniques. Journal of Travel Research, 28 (2), 15–19.

Gerbing, D. W. & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment." Journal of Marketing Research, 25 (May): 186-92.

Gnoth, J. (1998). Conference reports: Branding tourism places. Annals of tourism research, 25, 758-760.

Gordon, W. (1996). Assessing the brand through research. In D. Cowley (Eds., 2nd ed.) Understanding brands (pp. 33-56). London: Kogan Page.

Graeff, T. R. (1997). Consumption situations and the effects of brand image on consumers' brand evaluations. Psychology and Marketing, 14 (1), 49-70.

Hair, Jr. J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate data analysis. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Hankinson, G. (2004). Relational network brands: Towards a conceptual model of place brands. Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10 (2), 109-121.

Henderson, J. C. (2000). Selling places: the new Asia-Singapore brand. Journal of Tourism Studies, 11 (1), 36-44.

Hendon, D. W., & Williams, E. L. (1985). Winning the battle for your customers. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 2 (4), 65-75.

Heylen, J. P., Dawson, B. & Sampson, P. (1995). An implicit model of consumer behavior. Journal of Market Research Society, 37 (1), 51-67.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1998). Fit indices in covariance structure modelling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification. Psychological Methods, 3 (4), 424 - 453.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling,* 6, 1-55.

Hunt, J. D. (1975). Image as a factor in tourism development. Journal of Travel Research, 13 (3), 1-7.

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1996). LISREL 8 user's reference guide. Chicago: Scientific Software International.

Kapferer, J. N. (1997). Strategic brand management: Creating and sustaining brand equity long term. (2nd ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Karande, K. Zinkhan, G. M., & Lum, A. B. (1997). Brand personality and self-concept: A replication and extension. American Marketing Association Summer Conference, 65-171.

Keller, K. L. (1993) Conceptualising, measuring and managing customer-based brand equity. Journal of Marketing, 57, 1-22.

Lawson, F., & Band-Bovy, M. (1977). Tourism and recreational development. London: Architectural Press.

Lim, K., & O'Cass, A. (2001). Consumer brand classifications: An assessment of culture-of-origin versus country-of-origin. Journal of Product and Brand Management., 10 (2), 120-136.

Low, G. S., & Lamb, C. W. (2000). The measurement and dimensionality of brand associations. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 9 (6), 350-368.

Mackay, K. J., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2000). An exploration of cross-cultural destination image assessment. Journal of Travel Research, 38, 417-423.

Marsh, H. W., J. W. Balla, & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-Fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis: effects of sample size. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 391-411.

Marsh, H. W., & Hocevar, P. (1985). Application of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First and higher order factor models and their invariance across groups. Psychological Bulletin, 97 (3), 562-582.

Martineau, P. (1958). The personality of the retail store. Harvard Business Review, 36 (1), 47-55.

Martinez, E., & Pina, J. M. (2003). The negative impact of brand extensions on parent brand image. Journal of Product and Brand Management, 12 (7), 432-448

Martinez, E., & de Chernatony, L. (2004). The effect of brand extension strategies upon brand image. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 21 (1), 39-50

Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Piggott, R. (2002). New Zealand, 100% pure: The creation of a powerful niche destination brand. Journal of Brand Management, 9 (4/5), 335-354.

Ong, B. S., & Horbunluekit, S. (1997). The impact of a Thai cultural show on Thailand's destination image. American Business Review, 15 (2), 97-103.

Oppermann, M. (1996). Convention destination images: analysis of association meeting planners' perceptions. Tourism Management, 17 (3), 175-182

Patterson, M. (1999). Re-appraising the concept of brand image. Journal of Brand Management, 6 (6), 409-426.

Pearce, P. L. (1988). The ulysses factor: Evaluating visitors in tourist settings. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Pike, S. (2002). Destination image analysis – A review of 142 papers from 1973 to 2000. Tourism Management, 23 (5), 541-549.

Plummer, J. T. (1984). How personality makes a difference. Journal of Advertising Research, 24 (6), 27-31.

Reilly, M. D. (1990). Free elicitation of descriptive adjectives for tourism image assessment. Journal of Travel Research, 28 (4), 21-26.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39 (6), 1161-1178.

Santos, C. A. (2004). Framing Portugal representational dynamics. Annals of Tourism Research, 31 (1), 122-138.

Schroeder, T. (1996). The relationship of residents' image of their state as a tourist destination and their support for tourism. Journal of Travel Research, 34 (4), 71-73.

Siguaw, J. A., Mattila, A. & Austin, J. R. (1999). The brand personality scale - An application for restaurants. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 40 (3), 48-55.

Supphellen, M., & Gronhaug, K. (2003). Building foreign brand personalities in Russia: The moderating effect of consumer ethnocentrism. International Journal of Advertising, 22 (2), 203-226.

Solomon, M., Bamossy, G. & Askegaard, S. (1999), Consumer behavior: A european perspective. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Smothers, N. (1993). Can products and brands have charisma? In D. A. Aaker & A. Biel (Eds.), Brand equity and advertising (pp. 97-111). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Upshaw, L. (1995). Building brand identity: A strategy for success in a hostile market place. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Uysal, M., Chen, J., & Williams, D. (2000). Increasing state market share through a regional positioning. Tourism Management, 21 (1), 89-96.

Walmsley, D. Y., & Young, M. (1998). Evaluative images and tourism: The use of personal constructs to describe the structure of destination Images. Journal of Travel Research, 36, 65–69.

Ward, L. M., & Russell, A. (1981). The psychological representation of molar

    physical environments. Journal of Environmental Psychology: General, 110,

    121-152.