

YouTube usage by Spanish tourist destinations as a tool to communicate their identities and brands

Assumpció Huertas (Rovira i Virgili University)

María Isabel Míguez-González (University of Vigo)

Natàlia Lozano-Monterrubio (Rovira i Virgili University)

Biography:

Ph.D. Assumpció Huertas is a lecturer in Communication Studies and member of the research group Asteriscat at the Rovira i Virgili University (Tarragona, Spain). She teaches in the Degree in Communication and in the Master's Degree in Strategic Communication (URV). Her lines of research focus on the communication and branding of territories and tourist destinations and several areas of public relations. She is now the principal investigator of the project 'Influence of Communication 2.0 in tourism decision making and destination brand image. Useful applications for Spanish tourist destinations'.

Ph.D. María Isabel Míguez-González is a lecturer in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication at the University of Vigo (Spain). She coordinates the degree in Advertising and Public Relations and teaches courses in "Theory and practice of public relations" and "Communication Management". Her research focuses on public relations, communication management and tourism and she is currently involved in the national project "Use and influence of social media and 2.0 communications in tourism decision-making and destination brand image".

Ph.D. Natàlia Lozano is an associate professor at Universitat Rovira i Virgili (Tarragona) where she teaches Creativity in Advertising and Public Relations Techniques. Her PhD in Communication Studies focuses on how social media may help authorities to communicate their messages. She also holds an MA in International Public Relations (Cardiff University) and has participated in the EU funded project FoodRisC (FP7). Her research has specialised in online public relations, food communication and place branding.

Contact details for the corresponding author

María Isabel Míguez-González
Faculty of Social Sciences and Communication (University of Vigo)
Campus A Xunqueira s/n, 36005 Pontevedra; Spain.
Telf. 0034 986802032
mabelm@uvigo.es

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Spain's Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness [Grant id.: CSO2012-34824 “Uso e influencia de los social media y la comunicación 2.0 en la toma de decisiones turísticas y en la imagen de marca de los destinos”].

YouTube usage by Spanish tourist destinations as a tool to communicate their identities and brands

Abstract

Videos and video-sharing sites like YouTube offer new opportunities to DMOs to communicate the identity and brand of the destinations they represent. The aim of this article was to gain an insight into how Spanish DMOs use YouTube to communicate their promotional videos and commercials and to study whether these videos communicate brands through two main elements: attraction factors and emotional values. The research methodology combined a quantitative analysis of the communicative variables of the official YouTube accounts of the analysed territories with a content analysis of the last 25 videos uploaded to those channels. Results showed that the usage of YouTube by Spanish tourist destinations was widespread but with some limitations. The contents of videos were mainly informative and this helped to communicate attraction factors rather than emotional values. The article contributes good practices and recommendations to communicate territories' brands via YouTube.

Keywords: YouTube, destination marketing organizations, brand, attraction factors, emotional values

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3 Nowadays, destination brand is a key concept that has brought about substantial
4 changes to the management and communication of destinations. It involves the
5 association with territories of several attributes and emotional values and helps to
6 distinguish them (Morgan, Pritchard and Piggott, 2003; Blain, Levy & Ritchie, 2005;
7 Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2015). For this reason, destinations seek to communicate a
8 unique identity and personality (Govers & Go, 2009) as well as values that have a
9 profound impact on users' emotions and generate attraction to the region (Morgan,
10 Pritchard and Piggott, 2003). The concept of destination brand is totally linked to the
11 concepts of identity and image of tourist destinations.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Destination images created in the minds of potential tourists have a strong influence on
27 their choice of destination (Kim et al., 2014). According to Lee and Gretzel (2012),
28 tourists that have already created a clear image of a destination are more likely to visit
29 it. Such images are created from the experiential expectations of the potential tourists,
30 from both the online and offline media (Gartner, 1994; Pan & Li, 2011), and from
31 communications by the destinations (Govers, Go & Kumar, 2007).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 As a consequence, tourist destinations communicate their identity and brand through
42 their communicative actions in several media channels (Huertas, 2014) in order to
43 achieve the desired and agreed brand image among their publics. With this aim,
44 advertisers and public relations practitioners seek to stimulate mental images through
45 commercials and other communicative actions (Yoo & Kim, 2013). One of the most
46 accessible and used resources are promotional videos or spots which communicate
47 persuasive and appealing images through audiovisual sequences (Babin & Burns, 1997).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Tourist destination promotional videos and commercials are used by the communication
2 managers of Destination Management Organizations (DMOs) to generate knowledge
3 about the place and create positive images in the minds of tourists that encourage them
4 to visit the destinations (Huang et al., 2010). They are important tools for identity and
5 brand communication, and, consequently, important image creators. Therefore,
6 communication managers should focus their communicative strategies on the creation
7 of images (Kim et al., 2014).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 Despite the relevance of audiovisual tourism advertising (Pritchard, 2001; Feighey,
19 2003; Pan et al., 2011), and especially the potential influence of promotional videos that
20 has even been recognized by the tourist industry (Dinhopl & Gretzel, 2015), it is not
21 dealt with in the academic literature (Pritchard, 2001; Feighey, 2003; Pan et al., 2011).
22 There is more research about tourism photography than tourism video (Dinhopl &
23 Gretzel, 2015).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The huge influencing potential of videos is based on the perception process. As Hsieh &
34 Chen (2011) point out, visual information is directly connected to the internal process of
35 perception. Thus, videos and spots generate powerful emotional experiences which are
36 ideal for the communication of tourist destinations. Kim et al. (2014) prove in an
37 experiment that spots and videos generate a more positive attitude and greater intention
38 to visit a place than auditive advertising. Yet, they admit that DMOs have not taken full
39 advantage of advertising spots for the dissemination of tourist destinations.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Similarly, Tussyadiah & Fesenmaier (2009) showed that videos have a greater potential
52 than photographs to communicate experiences and emotions related to tourist
53 destinations. They state that videos influence tourists' experiences and aspirations by
54 the mental pleasure generated through imagination and fantasies about visiting the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 place. Moreover, videos may reproduce tourists' experiences or destination narratives
2 with visual continuity. They can explain stories, and consequently, may better represent
3 the reality than photographs. Videos may also show tourist activities that can be carried
4 out at a destination (Dinhopl & Gretzel, 2015), which are more difficult to reflect in
5 static photographs. Videos may communicate attributes such as nature, cultural heritage
6 or gastronomy but they should stress emotional aspects such as social relations,
7 enjoyment and adventure to generate greater connections with visitors (Hanefors &
8 Larsson, 1993).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 The emergence of the Internet, and concretely of websites such as YouTube, has created
21 a new channel for the dissemination of videos and spots. YouTube is a platform that
22 allows users and organizations to upload and share any kind of video. Therefore, it is a
23 key tool to disseminate promotional videos and spots that are easily accessible to social
24 media managers of tourist destinations. Moreover, YouTube clips can be shared on and
25 embedded in other social media channels (Facebook, Twitter, blogs, webs) by just
26 inserting the link.

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 YouTube is the third most visited social media site in the world with 2,000 million
39 visits per day. It accounts for 10% of global Internet traffic (Alexa Index 2014).
40 According to the *V Annual Study of Social Networks* published in April 2014 by IAB
41 Spain, YouTube is the third most visited website in Spain but the second on which users
42 spend most of their time with an average of 3.62 hours per week. Despite this, the study
43 also reveals that there is a poor relationship between YouTube and brand
44 communication. Users follow brands mainly on Facebook (up to 93%), followed by
45 Twitter (up to 20%) and YouTube (up to 9%). These figures may seem surprising and
46 should give some food for thought about the ability of social media managers to
47 communicate brands.

1 Before the emergence of YouTube, the channels for the dissemination of tourist videos
2 and spots were limited to television, cinema and tourism fairs. Today, with YouTube, its
3
4 audience reach is instantaneous, global and exponential. It is instantaneous because
5
6 once a video is uploaded to YouTube, it can be immediately viewed by any other user at
7
8 any time; global because it can be accessed from any part of the world with Internet
9
10 connection, and exponential because with the appearance of social networks and
11
12 participative users, videos can be largely disseminated, commented on and go viral.
13
14 According to Mansson (2011), several videos can be found with different perspectives
15
16 of the same place that have been created by diverse authors – DMOs, residents or
17
18 tourists. User participation enacted in videos, likes, shares and comments, creates,
19
20 enriches and promotes tourist destination images.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Moreover, the appearance of affordable high definition cameras, especially integrated in
28
29 mobile phones, laptops and tablets, and easy-to-understand edition programmes have
30
31 helped to proliferate the creation and dissemination of tourist videos in social media.
32
33 Today, there are several studies (Tussyadiah & Fesenmaier, 2009; Dinhopl & Gretzel,
34
35 2015) that analyse the videos created and shared by tourists due to their power as
36
37 influencers (Mansson, 2011) in tourist experiences. These clips transmit the narratives
38
39 of tourists, reproduce their experiences and allow other users to travel in their minds.
40
41 Mansson (2011) states that tourists create media products that circulate through social
42
43 media, which are consumed by other users who at the same time influence other media
44
45 products (Galí & Donaire, 2015). Therefore, users are mediators and are constantly
46
47 generating images concerning destinations.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Jennings and Weiler (2006) consider that not only tourists, but also governments, local
55
56 communities and DMOs are the mediators of tourist experiences. Videos show tourist
57
58 destinations and they are the real mediators of tourist experiences because social media
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 are at the service of both tourists with personal videos and DMOs with their institutional
2 videos. Moreover, tourist destinations may take advantage of users' participation to
3 generate virality and disseminate their videos. Somehow, users with their likes, shares
4 and comments may help with the dissemination of tourist destination videos and also
5 become mediators of the process. Therefore, it is important to study if destinations are
6 using videos and social media to their full to communicate their identity and brand, and
7 they generate their desired image among their publics.
8
9

10 The objective of the current article is twofold. In the first place, it analyses how tourist
11 destinations are using YouTube to share and communicate their promotional videos and
12 spots. And, in the second place, it studies whether promotion videos and spots
13 communicate their brands through two main elements: attraction factors and emotional
14 values. Several authors admit the importance of these two elements in the shaping of
15 destination brands (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Echtner and Ritchie, 2003; Hosany,
16 Ekinci and Uysal, 2006; Huertas, 2014), but other studies (Bigné, Sánchez-García and
17 Sanz-Blas, 2009; Michaelidou et al., 2013) uphold that tourist attractions and tangible
18 elements are better communicated through social media than emotional values. In short,
19 these two goals seek to ascertain whether Spanish Tourist Destinations take advantage
20 of all the communicative potential currently offered on video-sharing sites such as
21 YouTube to communicate the identity and brand of their territories.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

METHODOLOGY

The current study is structured in two parts and uses two research methods. The first aims to find out the usage of YouTube by the communication managers of Spanish tourist destinations. It is a quantitative method that analyses several key communicative items related with interactivity and visibility. The second research method is a content analysis and it aims to ascertain whether tourist destination brands communicate their attraction factors or functional aspects and their emotional values through their uploaded videos. The above is explained in detail in the following paragraphs.

Sample destinations

As a part of a project related to the use and influence of social media and communication 2.0 in the tourist decision making and the brand image of destinations, supported by Spain's Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, this study works with the sample approved for that project and used in some previous studies (Míguez-González & Huertas, 2015; Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2015; Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2016).

It is composed of 38 Spanish tourist destinations. 37 belonging to 5 Autonomous Communities (Andalusia, the Canary Islands, Catalonia, Community of Madrid, and Galicia) which correspond to the Nielsen areas – these are geographical zones that have been established by the market research company Nielsen as similarly homogeneous in market terms and are representative of the Spanish territory as a whole. From each autonomous community a selection was made –when possible- of 8 types of destination that are representative of the several typologies of Spanish tourist destinations. These are as proposed in the *Handbook of Local Tourism Management Models* published by

1 the Spanish Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade (FEMP & TourSpain, 2008). The
2 typologies are the following: Autonomous Community, Relevant Coastal Destination,
3
4 Heritage City, Large Municipality, Coastal Destination, Inland Destination, Medium-
5
6 sized City and High Mountain Destination. Finally, in addition to all those destinations
7
8 the brand of Spain as a country destination has also been included (see table 1).
9
10

11 **Quantitative analysis**

12
13
14
15
16
17 For the proper communication of a destination and its brand through social media,
18
19 content is not the only asset for managing and evaluating, as interactivity and visibility
20
21 earned among users are also important aspects (Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2015). On the
22
23 one hand, interactivity is said to have positive effects on tourist satisfaction,
24
25 engagement, brand image and decision-making (Buhalis & Law, 2008; Walther & Jang,
26
27 2012). On the other hand, in the online media, visibility becomes a key issue as, if you
28
29 are not visible online, you do not exist.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 On YouTube channels, interactivity and visibility are measured by such items as:
38
39 number of videos uploaded, video views, views per video, likes, dislikes, comments,
40
41 subscribers and channel views. In our study these items have been measured using
42
43 Fanpage Karma¹, a free online analytical measuring tool popular with social media
44
45 managers to evaluate communication. The analysis was carried out in May 2014.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ¹ www.fanpagekarma.com
61
62
63
64
65

Content analysis

Under the project “Use and influence of social media and communication 2.0 in the tourist decision making and the brand image of destinations”, mentioned above, an specific methodology for content analysis of social networks in the field of tourism has been developed and explained in several studies about different social media (Míguez-González & Huertas, 2015; Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2015; Huertas & Mariné-Roig, 2016).

This is the methodology, which has also has been adopted in this study for Youtube, involves the analysis of attraction factors, based on some studies that build specific coding sheet templates (Aaker, 1997; De Moya and Jain, 2013; Huertas, 2014), and the analysis of emotional brand values, adapting the “Brand personality Scale” (Aaker, 1997) for the analysis of tourism destinations, with the result of the following categories:

A) *Attraction factors*: Nature (Nature and natural landscape, Rural landscape, Mountain, Ecotourism); Tangible Heritage (Sites, History, Religion, Works of Art, Museums); Cityscape (Architecture, Urban planning/landscape); Intangible Heritage (Intangible heritage/popular culture/traditions, Anthem/Flag/National Symbols); Gastronomy (Food/Cuisine, Wine Tourism); Leisure (Urban and cultural leisure/shows, Night life, Shopping); Sun and Beach (Sea/Beach, Sun, Climate/Weather); Business/trade; Sports (Hiking, Winter Sports, Water Sports, Adventure Sports, Elite Sports, Other Sports); Technology (Social Media/ICT, Technology, Innovation); Services (Hotel/Accommodation, Transport, Other services); Things to Do; Tourist Information/Agenda; Institutional and Non-tourist information.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

B) Emotional brand values: We used an adaptation of the “Brand Personality Scale” by Aaker (1997), which has been extended with other attributes and values adapted to tourism destinations):Sincerity: Down-to-earth (Family-oriented, Down-to-earth, Sustainable); Honest (Calm, Real, Traditional, Honest); Wholesome (Original, Wholesome; Quality of Life); Cheerful (Happiness, Sentimental, Friendly).Excitement: Daring (Trendy, Daring, Exciting, Exotic, Fashionable); Spirited (Cool, Spirited, Dynamic, Vital, Fresh, Young, Sensorial); Imaginative (Unique/different/diverse, imaginative, creative); Up-to-date (up-to-date, independent, contemporary, modern); Cosmopolitan (Cosmopolitan, Tolerant, Hospitable).Competence: Reliable (Reliable, Hard-working, Secure/safe, rigorous/responsible/ Pragmatic,), Intelligent (intelligent, technical, corporate, innovative); Successful (Successful, Leader, Ambitious, Powerful).Sophistication: Luxurious (Glamorous, Luxurious); Charming (charming/seductive, smooth, romantic, magical).Ruggedness: Outdoorsy (Outdoorsy, Get-away, Recreational); Tough (Tough, Rugged, non-conformist).

Based on this sample, for the purposes of this part of the study we have taken into account the destinations that have a YouTube channel linked to their official websites at the time of the analysis. This study analysed the last 25 videos published on the official YouTube accounts posted before the end of June 2014. The content analysis was carried out manually by five researchers working on the project according to the preestablished coding sheet template.

RESULTS

Results of quantitative analysis

1 This part of the study analysed 32 out of 38 YouTube accounts, as not all the selected
2 destinations provided a linked to the official website². The longest-standing social
3 media account was the channel for Spain as a national destination which was created in
4 2005. This DMO was a pioneer in setting up an account as it did so the very same year
5 that YouTube was launched. Despite this, creating a YouTube account was not popular
6 between the years 2007 and 2012, when 84.37% of all the selected destinations opened
7 one. It can be concluded that the creation of these channels has progressively become
8 the norm.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 Community sizes differ from one account to another. The largest one belongs to the
21 national destination, Spain, with 6,725 subscribers. However, this was not the norm as
22 almost half the YouTube channels (46.15%) had less than a 100 subscribers. Therefore,
23 the average number stood at 673 subscribers per account.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 For the YouTube channels in the sample, each video was seen an average of 21,448
32 times. The most visited accounts of the sample were those for the capital of Spain,
33 EsMadrid Television (3.1 million channel views for 495 videos), followed by the
34 national destination, Spain (2.7 million channel views for 364 videos). Behind them was
35 the city of Seville (1.3 million channel views). Note that its content is more efficient
36 than the other bigger destinations as it has received over a million views for just 75
37 videos. This implies that the DMO of Seville successfully manages its YouTube
38 account and achieves a great impact on its publics by capturing their interest in the
39 videos and enhancing participation. This should be the main objective of all tourism
40 destinations that try to engage their publics through social media. Proper
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 ² Nonetheless, the software could not fully observe eight accounts because they had privacy settings that
58 did not allow harnessing some of the information necessary for the study. These accounts were the
59 following: Ayuntamiento de Vera, LPapromocion (Las Palmas), Turismo de Galicia, Turismo Madrid
60 (autonomous community), Turismo Rías Baixas, Turismo de Vigo, Visit Barcelona and Visit Salou.
61
62
63
64
65

1 communication of the identity and brand is achieved by publishing interesting contents
2 that arouse the public's interest and enhance their dissemination and visibility.
3

4
5 On average, user reactions to YouTube channels were generally positive, with 1,182
6 likes compared to 90 dislikes. Nevertheless, user feedback was difficult to gauge as an
7 average of only 228 comments were made per channel. In general terms, YouTube
8 channels enable visualizing content but are not a useful platform for learning users'
9 opinions, doubts and comments.
10

11
12 Overall, it can be concluded that the DMOs most concerned with engaging with their
13 users were the national destination, Spain; Catalonia, Andalusia and the Canary Islands
14 as autonomous communities; Costa del Sol as a relevant coastal destination; Córdoba as
15 a heritage city, Madrid and Seville as large cities and Girona as a medium-sized city
16 (see table 2).
17

18
19 However, it was observed that most inland destinations appeared among the least
20 subscribed accounts. The scarce content uploaded by DMOs was directly correlated
21 with the size of the audience (see table 3).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Results of content analysis**

32
33 Firstly, it should be noted that 8 out of 38 of the sample destinations (23.68%) did not
34 have any established YouTube channel linked to their official websites or any video
35 uploaded on it. Therefore, the sample was limited to the remaining 30 destinations.
36
37

38
39 When analysing data according to the typology of the destination, it was observed that
40 the national destination (Spain), all the autonomous communities (as specific
41 destinations), and all the relevant coastal destinations were provided with a YouTube
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 account. Of the destinations without a YouTube channel, there were two high mountain
2 destinations, two heritage cities, two large municipalities, one coastal destination, one
3 inland destination and one medium-sized city. In terms of autonomous communities, it
4 was observed that all eight destinations selected for Andalusia use YouTube, whereas
5 only three out of eight did so for the Canary Islands.
6
7
8
9

10 In the content analysis the sample compiled 542 videos of the possible 725, because not
11 all destinations had published 25 videos by the analysis period. This number increased
12 to 26 or 27 videos on some destinations which had more than a video posted on the last
13 selected date (see table 4).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Moreover, five of the destinations (16.67%) had not uploaded more than five videos and
23 in three of these cases the YouTube accounts had been set up for more than two years.
24 Therefore, their usage is deemed residual.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 3.1. Content typologies of the videos 32

33 Over half of the videos (51.29%) had exclusively informative content and in 30.44% of
34 the cases, according to the researchers' criteria, they were characterized for suggesting
35 places to visit or activities to pursue in the destinations. This informative function does
36 not make the most of the suggestive and emotional potential of videos (Tussyadiah &
37 Fesenmaier, 2009). Over 10% of the videos, information and suggestions were
38 combined. Videos with other types of contents such as acknowledgements or comments
39 about activities or facts represented almost 10% of the total. No significant differences
40 were found between two destinations or autonomous communities in the use of these
41 contents.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 3.2. Attraction factors 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In all the videos analysed at least one of the attraction factors mentioned in the methodology was identified. The factors related to leisure and tangible heritage appeared most frequently (in more than 29% of the videos) whereas aspects related with business, trade and technology did not reach 5% of the videos (see table 5).

When videos were analysed according to destination typology (see table 5), the following results were obtained:

When videos were analysed according to destination typology and autonomous communities (see table 5), it was observed that, as it was expected, leisure was fundamentally associated with large municipalities and it was hardly significant in coastal destinations (specific or relevant coastal destinations). Tangible heritage was exploited basically – as could be expected- in heritage cities and inland destinations; at a national level, it also was a recurrent attraction factor.

Cityscape was the most exploited attraction factor in the videos of the brand Spain, as a national destination, with a significant difference in percentage terms with different types of cities in which a stronger influence of this factor was expected. It is noteworthy that 33% of videos of high mountain destinations and 32% of videos of inland destinations (not cities) presented this element, whereas in large municipalities it is only present in 26% of them.

In the case of nature, results were highly consistent. At national level, autonomous communities, inland destinations and high mountain destinations used this factor, which is obviously less present in cities. It should be pointed out that in coastal destinations there were no references to nature because they were more focused on sun and beach aspects, which were included in a different category.

1 Institutional contents in the videos responded to the use that some destinations make of
2 their YouTube accounts, which should not be linked to determinant factors of the
3 destinations. Thus, some destinations, especially Catalan coastal sites, use their
4 YouTube accounts both to promote destinations from a tourism point of view and to
5 advertise them as a repository for institutional events. Agenda contents had similar
6 results to institutional contents.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 Intangible heritage was mainly exploited by heritage cities, inland destinations and
15 medium-sized municipalities. Gastronomy was used as an attraction factor by the Spain
16 brand and inland destinations. As was to be expected, sun and beach attraction factors
17 were highly relevant in coastal destinations, but were not so present in relevant coastal
18 destinations; they were especially exploited in autonomous communities and at national
19 level. Sports had a strong presence in relevant coastal destinations and in autonomous
20 communities. Non-tourist information was highly used at national level and in medium-
21 sized cities.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Finally, if agenda, institutional and non-tourist information categories are ignored and
36 contents are classified according to concrete elements of each category, the top five
37 contents present in those videos can be established (see table 6). Apart from that
38 contents, other categories that stood out were food/cuisine (17.96%); urban planning
39 (17.04%), and sea and beach (16.11%). Consequently, attraction factors like cuisine and
40 beach which were expected to be highly represented, were not very remarkable on
41 YouTube videos, whereas the results for architecture were surprising.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 3.3. Emotional brand values

54 In 23.7% of the videos analysed, none of the major values of the brand included in the
55 methodology could be identified. In this sense, the worst results were provided by
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 coastal destinations (44.4% of the videos did not reflect any brand value) and medium-
2 sized cities (40%). The YouTube account of Spain obtained very positive results (only
3 7% of the videos did not reflect any brand value), followed by high mountain
4 destinations (11.1%) and inland destinations (13.5%).
5
6
7
8
9

10 The two emotional brand values with a major presence in the videos analysed were
11 related with sincerity (45.74%) and excitement (45.74%). These results are consistent
12 with those obtained by Míguez-González and Huertas (2015) in the study on Facebook
13 and Twitter in a similar sample.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 In relation with the typology of destination, sincerity was the most remarkable brand
22 value in coastal destinations, large municipalities, heritage cities and inland
23 destinations. The outstanding brand value in the remaining destinations (national
24 destination, autonomous communities, medium-sized destinations and high mountain)
25 was excitement. Inland destinations reflected sincerity and ruggedness with more
26 prevalence. Excitement and sophistication were more present in high mountain
27 destinations and competence stood out in videos of the national brand (see table 7).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 It should be mentioned that from those categories that include emotional brand values,
40 the most used is honest (26.85%), followed by imaginative (23.52%). At the opposite
41 end, tough, luxurious, up-to-date and reliable were identified in less than 5% of the
42 videos of the sample. Table 9 includes the top five categories with a presence of 15% or
43 more. All of them belong to the most relevant emotional brand values.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 These results showed significant differences according to the type of destination. For
53 example, in the national destination the value spirited prevailed, whereas heritage cities
54 and coastal destinations were marked by honest. Inland destinations were identified as
55 being wholesome and high mountain destinations charming (see table 8). Therefore, the
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 same type of destination shared the same emotional brand values. Consequently, they
2 did not use emotional values that helped them to distinguish themselves from the rest,
3
4 that built their personality and that communicated their differences.
5
6

7 **Comparative results between quantitative and qualitative analysis**

8
9

10 The content analysis by destination does not provide relevant information on the
11 reasons for the success of any channels over others. Regarding the attraction factors,
12
13 videos of successful channels like Sevilla show similar contents to those of the other
14
15 destinations analyzed.
16
17
18
19

20 We could find a particularity in relation to the contents of agenda. No video of Sevilla,
21
22 Madrid or Spain, all of them with very good performance, includes such content.
23
24 According to this, we could point that the agenda contents are not in the interest of
25
26 users. However, there are several destinations in the sample whose videos are not
27
28 focused on agenda content and do not get good results.
29
30
31
32

33 In the analysis of the Brand values, more generic to all destinations, no significant
34
35 differences between destinations are appreciated, both in cases of channels with good
36
37 performance and others with very few subscribers or views.
38
39
40
41
42

43 **CONCLUSIONS**

44
45

46 Firstly, the usage of YouTube by Spanish tourist destinations is relatively widespread,
47
48 but it has some limitations. A quarter of the destinations analysed in this study did not
49
50 have an account linked to the official website or did not nourish it with content –this
51
52 was especially common in smaller inland destinations. The study confirms that
53
54 YouTube accounts were more common in vast destinations (national, autonomous
55
56 communities, relevant coastal destinations) and less relevant in small destinations like
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 municipalities, probably because performing an official promotional video generally has
2 a high cost.
3

4
5 Secondly, leaving aside some destinations like Sevilla, which is a model of social media
6 communication usage, destinations did not achieve many viewings or video reactions.
7
8 These results highlight that better management of videos is necessary to increase user
9 interest and participation. This is the only way to enhance comments and increase
10 visibility.
11
12

13
14 Thirdly, videos were mainly used to inform about the attractiveness of the destinations
15 and to arouse interest in visiting them. On a few occasions, DMOs expressed other
16 types of comments or acknowledgements through this channel. Therefore, the
17 informative nature relegates the persuasive aim into second place. Today, videos are
18 created according to what DMOs want to highlight about their territories, but these
19 contents do not seem to be enough to motivate users' interests, since the general results
20 of followers or views are low.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The relevance of YouTube as a tool to reflect the attraction factors of a destination is
37 clearly reflected in the results of the study. All videos showed some attraction factors,
38 but the presence of emotional brand values was scarce. These results are also supported
39 in previous studies (Bigné, Sánchez-García and Sanz-Blas, 2009; Michaelidou et al.,
40 2013; Huertas & Míguez, 2015).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 A wide variety of attraction factors was detected in the study videos. Elements related
50 with leisure and tangible heritage stood out whereas elements such as business, trade or
51 technology were hardly used. In relation to the emotional brand values transmitted,
52 there was a significant difference between those with major presence (sincerity and
53 excitement) and the other values considered in the study.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The attraction factors and emotional brand values reflected were determined rather by
2 the type of destination than geographical regions. Moreover, several destinations use the
3 same values in their communications. This implies that there is no differentiation in
4 communicative strategy and that DMOs do not use videos to communicate their
5 destinations' distinctive emotional values or differentiate their brands and identities
6 from the other destinations.
7

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 In general, the data in the current study corroborate those obtained in a previous study
16 (Huertas & Míguez, 2015) with two different social media platforms (Facebook and
17 Twitter). This proves that the trends observed are caused by the communicative habits
18 of DMOs rather than specific features of YouTube as a tool to disseminate contents and
19 values. The research shows that DMOs mainly use this video-sharing platform to
20 transmit messages that they consider relevant, but not to emotionally persuade the users.
21 Consequently, they do not make the most of the persuasive potential of videos.
22

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 In conclusion, although social media offer new possibilities and communicative
34 opportunities to DMOs, allow major interaction with publics and have great persuasive
35 potential to communicate emotional values, many DMOs continue to use these videos
36 and platforms as non-interactive media. As a consequence, the potential of these
37 channels is wasted (Munar, 2012; Hays et al., 2013).
38

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Tourists and users have been quicker and found it easier to adapt to these new video-
47 sharing platforms than some DMOs. Sometimes, users' videos demonstrate a greater
48 ability to communicate experiential and emotional brand values than some official
49 DMO videos. And they generate greater interactivity, visibility and even go viral.
50 Perhaps it is time for promotional videos to change their format. They should be less
51 commercial and more experiential. They could be more similar to those uploaded by
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 users, and not just communicate the tourist attractions but also experiences and
2 emotional values.
3

4
5 Thus, from the point of view of the brand strategy, the results of the study entail
6 implications for tourist destination managers and consequences for the creation of
7 destination promotional videos, that should take more into account the communication
8 of emotional values and the experiences in the destinations.
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 16 *Limitations of the study and future research*

17
18
19 This study has based on the content analysis of the DMO's videos, basically on the
20 communication of attraction factors and emotional values. It has not been possible to
21 establish a direct relation between these elements and the level of success or failure of
22 the channels reflected in the first part of the study. Therefore, there must be other
23 elements not addressed that influence the success of a channel: technical matters,
24 rhythm, tone (mood or storytelling, for example, as elements used to generate virality)
25 or even issues related to marketing strategies of OMDs.
26

27
28
29 So in future research it would be interesting to analyse other important topics in these
30 promotional videos. As well, it would be necessary to analyse comparatively the user
31 generated videos, that may serve as examples of interesting material to the receptor, and
32 to assess the users' opinions about videos of OMDs.
33
34
35
36

37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 **REFERENCES**

48
49
50
51 Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*,
52 34(3), 347-356
53

54
55
56
57 Alexa Index. (2014). *The top 500 sites on the web*. Available at:
58 <http://www.alexa.com/topsites> [Accessed April 7, 2015].
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Babin, L.A. & Burns, A.C. (1997). Effects of print ad pictures and copy containing
2 instructions to imagine on mental imagery that mediates attitudes. *Journal of*
3 *Advertising*, 26(3): 33-44.
4
5

6
7
8 Baloglu, S. and McCleary, K.W. (1999), 'A Model of Destination Image Formation',
9
10 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26, pp. 868-897.
11

12
13 Bigné, E.J., M.I. Sánchez-García and Sanz-Blas, S. (2009), 'The Functional-
14 Psychological Continuum in the Cognitive Image of a Destination. A Confirmatory
15 Analysis', *Tourism Management*, 30:5, pp. 715-723.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 Blain, C.; Levy, S.E. & J.R.B. Ritchie (2005). Destination Branding: Insights and
23 Practices from Destination Management Organizations. *Journal of Travel Research*,
24 43(4): 328-38.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism
31 management: 20 years on and 10 years after the Internet—The state of eTourism
32 research. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 609–623. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.01.005
33
34
35
36

37
38 De Moya, M. & Jain, R. (2013). When tourists are your “friends”: Exploring the brand
39 personality of Mexico and Brazil on Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, 39, 23-29
40
41
42

43
44 Dinhopl, A. & Gretzel, U. (2015). Changing Practices/New Technologies: Photos and
45 Videos on Vacation. In: Tussyadiah, L. and Inversini, A. (Eds.), *Information and*
46 *Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015* (pp. 777-788). Vienna, Austria:
47 Springer.
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 Echtner, C.M. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (2003), 'The Meaning and Measurement of
56 Destination Image', *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14:1, pp. 37-48.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Feighey, W. (2003). Negative image? Developing the visual in tourism research.
2 *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(1): 76-85.
3

4
5 Galí, N. & Donaire, J.A. (2015). Tourists taking photographs: the long tail in tourists'
6 perceived image of Barcelona. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(9): 893-902.
7

8
9
10
11 Gartner, W.C. (1994). Image formation process. *Journal of Travel & Tourism*
12 *Marketing*, 2(2/3): 191-216.
13

14
15
16
17 Govers, R., Go. F.M. & Kumar, K. (2007). Promoting tourism destination image.
18 *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1): 15-23.
19

20
21
22
23 Govers, R., Go. F.M. & Kumar, K. (2009). Place Branding: Glocal, virtual and physical
24 identities, constructed, imagined and experienced. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
25

26
27
28
29 Hanefors, M. & Larsson, L. (1993). Video strategies used by tour operators. *Tourism*
30 *Management*, 27-33.
31

32
33
34
35 Hays, S.; Page, S.J. & Buhalis, D. (2013). Social media as a destination marketing tool:
36 its use by national tourism organisations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16(3): 211-239.
37

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 Huertas, A. (2014). La comunicación de los territorios, los destinos y sus marcas. Guía
2 práctica de aplicación desde las relaciones públicas. Barcelona: DIRCOM-UOC.
3

4
5 Huertas, A. & Mariné-Roig, E. (2015). Destination Brand Communication Through the
6 Social Media: What Contents Trigger Most Reactions of Users?. In: Tussyadiah, L. and
7 Inversini, A. (Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015*
8 (pp. 295-308). Vienna, Austria: Springer.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 Huertas, A., & Marine-Roig, E. (2016). Differential Destination Content
17 Communication Strategies Through Multiple Social Media. In *Information and*
18 *Communication Technologies in Tourism 2016* (pp. 239-252). Springer International
19 Publishing.
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 IAB Spain. 2014. *V Annual Study of Social Networks*. Available at:
27 <http://www.iabspain.net/redes-sociales/> [Accessed: 7 April 2015]
28
29

30
31
32
33 Jennings, G. & Weiler, B. (2006). Mediating Meaning: Perspectives on Brokering
34 Quality Tourism Experiences. In: *Quality Tourism Experiences*, G. Jennings and N.
35 Nickerson (eds.). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
36
37
38

39
40 Kim, S.-B., Kim, D.-Y. & Bolls, P. (2014). Tourist mental-imagery processing:
41 Attention and arousal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 45: 63-76.
42
43
44

45
46 Lee, W. & Gretzel, U. (2012). Designing persuasive destination websites: A mental
47 imagery processing perspective. *Tourism Management*, 33(5):1270-1280.
48
49
50

51
52 Mansson, M. (2011). Mediatized Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4): 1634-
53 1652.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Michaelidou, N., Siamagka, N.-T., Moraes, C. and Micevski, M. (2013), 'Do Marketers
2 Use Visual Representations of Destinations That Tourists Value? Comparing Visitors'
3 Image of a Destination with Marketer-Controlled Images Online, *Journal of Travel*
4 *Research*, 52:6, pp. 789-804.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Míguez-González, M. I., & Huertas, A. (2015). The power of photographs in the
11 communication and public relations of tourist destinations and their brands through
12 Facebook and Flickr. *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 197-
13 215.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Morgan, N. J., Pritchard, A., & Piggott, R. (2003). Destination branding and the role of
21 the stakeholders: The case of New Zealand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 285-
22 299.
23
24
25
26
27

28 Munar, A.M. (2012). Social Media Strategies and Destination Management.
29 *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12,(2): 101-120.
30
31
32
33

34 Pan, B. & Li. X. (2011). Long tail of destination image and online marketing. *Annals of*
35 *Tourism Research*, 38(1): 132-152.
36
37
38
39

40 Pan, S.; Tsai, H. & Lee, J. (2011). Framing New Zealand: Understanding tourism TV
41 commercials. *Tourism Management*, 32: 596-603.
42
43
44
45

46 Pritchard, A. (2001). Tourism and representation: a scale for measuring gendered
47 portrayals. *Leisure Studies*, 20(2): 79-94.
48
49
50
51

52 Tussyadiah, L.P. & Fesenmaier, D.R. (2009). Mediating Tourist Experiences: Access to
53 Places via Shared Videos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(1): 24-40.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Walther, J. B. & Jang, J. (2012). Communication processes in participatory websites.
2 Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 18(1), 2-15
3

4
5 Yoo, K.-H. & Kim, J.R. (2013). How US state tourism offices use online newsrooms
6 and social media in media relations. *Public Relations Review*, 39: 534-541.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TABLES

Table 1. List of sample destinations.

Country	Spain				
Autonomous Community	Andalusia	Canaries	Catalonia	Com. of Madrid	Galicia
Relevant Coastal Destination	Málaga and Costa del Sol	Maspalomas	Brava Coast	There is not any	Rías Baixas
Heritage City	Córdoba	La Laguna	Tarragona	Alcalá de Henares	Santiago de Compostela
Large Municipality	Sevilla	Las Palmas	Barcelona	Madrid	Vigo
Coastal Destination	Vera	Puerto del Carmen	Salou	There is not any	Sanxenxo
Inland Destination	Ronda	Telde	Lleida	Chinchón	Monforte de Lemos
Medium-sized City	Úbeda	Arona	Girona	Boadilla del Monte	Ourense
High Mountain Destination	Lanjarón	Buenavista del Norte	Llavorsí	Navacerrada	There is not any

Source: Compiled by authors.

Table 2. Top five destination YouTube accounts in terms of audience, number of videos, video views and interactivity

	Number of channel subscribers	Total number of channel videos	Most efficient content (videos/views)	Total number of likes	Total number of dislikes	Total number of comments
1	Spain (N= 6,725)	EsMadrid TV (N= 495)	Seville (N= 47,301)	Seville (N= 6,577)	Seville (N= 492)	Spain (N= 1,623)
2	Seville (N= 2,730)	Spain (N= 364)	Islas Canarias Official (N= 2,440)	Spain (N= 6,508)	Turismo Córdoba (N= 474)	Seville N= (1,173)
3	EsMadrid TV (N= 2,673)	Catalunya Experience (N= 162)	Catalunya Experience (N= 2,384)	EsMadrid TV (N= 4,733)	Catalunya Experience (N= 303)	EsMadrid TV (N= 1,015)
4	Catalunya Experience (N= 1,027)	Visita Costa del Sol (N= 147)	Vive Andalucía (N= 1,612)	Turismo Córdoba (N= 3,641)	Spain (N= 289)	Catalunya Experience (N= 715)
5	Islas Canarias Official (N= 935)	Vive Andalucía (N= 133)	Girona Turisme TV (N= 745)	Catalunya Experience (N= 3,392)	EsMadrid TV (N= 287)	Turismo Córdoba (N= 375)

Source: Authors.

Table 3. Bottom destination YouTube accounts in terms of audience and number of videos

	Audience: Less subscribers	Total number of videos
1	Concello de Monforte Lemos (N= 7)	Concello de Monforte Lemos (N= 1)
2	Ayuntamiento Navacerrada (N= 8)	Puerto del Carmen (N= 2)
3	Turismo Ourense Inorde (N= 10)	Ayuntamiento Chinchón (N= 2)
4	Maspalomas, Costa Canaria (N= 14)	Turismo Ourense Inorde (N= 6)
5	Ayuntamiento Chinchón (N= 14)	Ayuntamiento Navacerrada (N= 10)
6	Puerto del Carmen (N= 19)	Turismo de Úbeda (N= 13)
7	Turisme de Lleida (N= 19)	Turisme de Lleida (N= 15)

Source: Compiled by authors.

Table 4. Number of videos analysed (number of videos per destination)

Spain											27
Autonomous Communities	Andalusia	22	Canaries	26	Catalonia	27	Com. of Madrid	25	Galicia	25	125
Relevant Coastal Destination	Costa del Sol	27	Maspalomas	25	Costa Brava	16	-	-	Rías Baixas	25	93
Heritage City	Córdoba	18	La Laguna	-	Tarragona	18	Alcalá de Henares	-	Santiago de Compostela	25	61
Large Municipality	Sevilla	25	Las Palmas	26	Barcelona	-	Madrid	27	Vigo	-	78
Coastal Destination	Vera	5	Puerto del Carmen	2	Salou	7	-	-	Sanxenxo	15	27
Inland Destination	Ronda	19	Telde	-	Lleida	15	Chinchón	2	Monforte de Lemos	1	37
Medium-sized City	Úbeda	12	Arona	-	Girona	23	Boadilla del Monte	25	Ourense	5	65
High Mountain Destination	Lanjarón	16	Buenavista del Norte	-	Llavorsí	-	Navacerrada	11	-	-	27
Total videos per Autonomous Community		144		79		106		90		96	542

Source: Compiled by authors.

Table 5. Percentage presence of attraction factors according to the total videos of the sample to type of destination (out of 1 point)

	Presence over the total	National destination	Autonomous communities	Relevant coastal destination	Heritage city	Large municipality	Coastal destination	Inland destination	Medium-sized city	High mountain destination
Leisure	0.32	0.37	0.29	0.15	0.44	0.62	0.11	0.24	0.35	0.19
Tangible heritage	0.3	0.41	0.30	0.16	0.48	0.24	0.22	0.51	0.34	0.19
Cityscape	0.26	0.63	0.23	0.09	0.46	0.26	0.07	0.32	0.23	0.33
Nature	0.26	<i>0.48</i>	0.46	0.27	0.11	0.01	0.00	0.43	0.12	0.41
Institutional	0.24	0.15	0.22	0.32	0.20	0.00	0.56	0.35	0.35	0.11
Intangible heritage	0.2	0.11	0.18	0.15	<i>0.38</i>	0.14	0.11	0.38	0.31	0.00
Gastronomy	0.2	<i>0.52</i>	0.28	0.15	0.15	0.08	0.26	0.43	0.12	0.00
Sun and beach	0.18	0.26	0.38	0.24	0.05	0.03	<i>0.48</i>	0.03	0.00	0.00
Agenda or tourist information	0.15	0.00	0.21	0.18	0.00	<i>0.33</i>	0.07	0.14	0.05	0.00
Sports	0.14	0.11	0.23	<i>0.30</i>	0.07	0.05	0.15	0.00	0.03	0.11
Non-tourist information	0.1	<i>0.26</i>	0.04	0.10	0.00	0.03	0.11	0.14	0.25	0.19
Services	0.07	0.00	0.06	0.14	0.03	0.05	0.04	<i>0.22</i>	0.06	0.00
Technology	0.04	0.04	<i>0.09</i>	0.06	0.02	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.03	0.00
Business/trade	0.03	0.00	0.02	<i>0.10</i>	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00

Table 6. Top five contents

Contents	Attraction factor category	Percentage presence
1. Urban and cultural leisure	Leisure	25.37%
2. Nature and nature landscape	Nature	22.59%
3. Intangible heritage/ popular cultures/traditions	Intangible heritage	20.37%
4. History	Tangible heritage	19.81%
5. Architecture	Cityscape	19.81%

Source: Compiled by authors.

Table 7. Presence of brand values according to the total videos of the sample to type of destination (out of 1 point)

	Sincerity	Excitement	Sophistication	Competence	Ruggedness
National destination	0.30	0.56	0.07	0.37	0.07
Autonomous communities	0.46	0.52	0.10	0.24	0.08
Relevant coastal destination	0.45	0.40	0.12	0.06	0.12
Heritage city	0.48	0.25	0.08	0.11	0.02
Large municipality	0.62	0.54	0.26	0.18	0.09
Coastal destination	0.48	0	0	0	0
Inland destination	0.76	0.43	0.22	0.11	0.24
Medium-sized city	0.28	0.43	0.23	0	0
High mountain	0.15	0.59	0.44	0	0.04
Presence over the total	0.46	0.43	0.16	0.13	0.08

Source: Compiled by authors.

Table 8. Top five categories included in the emotional brand values according to destinations and autonomous communities.

Category	Honest	Imaginative	Wholesome	Spirited	Charming
Brand value that belongs to	Sincerity	Exciting	Sincerity	Exciting	Sophistication
Presence over the total	0.27	0.24	0.19	0.17	0.15
National destination	0.07	0.26	0.15	0.52	0.07
Autonomous communities	0.20	0.29	0.20	0.19	0.08
Relevant coastal destination	0.26	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.12
Heritage city	0.41	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.08
Large municipality	0.33	0.27	0.29	0.19	0.24
Coastal destination	0.56	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07
Inland destination	0.35	0.24	0.59	0.22	0.19
Medium-sized city	0.18	0.34	0.09	0.06	0.23
High mountain	0.11	0.30	0.11	0.22	0.41

Source: Compiled by authors.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Spain's Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness [Grant id.: CSO2012-34824 “Uso e influencia de los social media y la comunicación 2.0 en la toma de decisiones turísticas y en la imagen de marca de los destinos”].