



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

Postprint

This is the accepted version of a paper published in *Journal of Travel Research*. This paper has been peer-reviewed but does not include the final publisher proof-corrections or journal pagination.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Chekalina, T., Fuchs, M., Lexhagen, M. (2018)

Customer-based destination brand equity modelling: The role of destination resources, value-for money and value-in-use

*Journal of Travel Research*, 57(1): 31-51

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287516680774>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:miun:diva-29223>



**Customer-based destination brand equity modelling – The role of destination resources, value-for-money and value-in-use**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Travel Research</i>
Manuscript ID	JTR-15-08-09.R2
Manuscript Type:	Empirical Research Articles
Keywords:	destination branding, customer-based brand equity, value-in-use, destination resources, value-for-money, destination loyalty
Abstract:	<p>This study contributes to the development of knowledge on transferring the concept of customer-based brand equity to a tourism destination context. Keller's (2009) brand equity pyramid is utilized as the comparison framework to reveal similarities but also overlaps, differences and gaps on both the conceptual and measurement level of existing brand equity models for destinations. Particularly, the inner core of the model depicts the complex mechanisms of how destination resources transform into benefits for tourists overlooked by prior research. This study proposes a customer-based brand equity model for destinations, which consists of five dependent constructs, including awareness, loyalty, and three destination brand promise constructs constituting the inner core of the model, namely, destination resources, value-in-use and value-for-money. The model was repeatedly tested for the leading Swedish mountain destination Åre, by using a linear structural equation modelling approach. Findings confirm the path structure of the proposed model.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Customer-based destination brand equity modelling – The role of destination resources,**  
4  
5 **value-for-money and value-in-use**  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 **Abstract:** This study contributes to the development of knowledge on transferring the  
11 concept of customer-based brand equity to a tourism destination context. Keller's (2009)  
12 brand equity pyramid is utilized as the comparison framework to reveal similarities but also  
13 overlaps, differences and gaps on both the conceptual and measurement level of existing  
14 brand equity models for destinations. Particularly, the inner core of the model depicts the  
15 complex mechanisms of how destination resources transform into benefits for tourists  
16 overlooked by prior research. This study proposes a customer-based brand equity model for  
17 destinations, which consists of five dependent constructs, including awareness, loyalty, and  
18 three destination brand promise constructs constituting the inner core of the model, namely,  
19 destination resources, value-in-use and value-for-money. The model was repeatedly tested for  
20 the leading Swedish mountain destination Åre, by using a linear structural equation  
21 modelling approach. Findings confirm the path structure of the proposed model.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Key words:** destination branding, customer-based brand equity, destination resources, value-  
39 for-money, value-in-use, destination loyalty  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INTRODUCTION

Countries, regions, cities and even small locations and resorts make efforts to strengthen their destination brands, aiming at differentiating themselves from competitors to convey a unique value proposition and in the end, attract visitors and facilitate repeat visitation, readiness to pay a premium price and positive word-of-mouth (Blain, Levy, and Ritchie 2005; Pike 2005). Destination management organizations (DMOs) invest substantial budgets into the design of logos, development of slogans, publication of brochures, creation of web-sites, organization of events and the implementation of a variety of additional branding efforts. Thus, an issue which inevitably arises is whether these efforts help destinations reach their marketing goals? Do they really create successful and fundamentally memorable brands?

To answer these questions, tourism research usually employs customer-based approaches for the conceptualization and measurement of brand equity with emphasis on consumers' response to a brand name (Gartner 2009; Christodoulides and de Chernatony 2010; Davcik, da Silva and Hair 2015; Round and Roper 2015). As shown in below literature review, previous research widely adopted Aaker's (1991, 1996) and Keller's (1993) conceptualization of customer-based brand equity (CBBE). It derives from cognitive psychology and focuses on multi-dimensional memory structures, like awareness, image perception, quality and value assessments as well as loyalty. Destination brand equity studies have developed reliable, valid, parsimonious and theoretically sound measurement constructs which can be implemented with "pen and paper" instruments, thereby demonstrating managerial usefulness as diagnostic tools, capable of identifying areas for improvement and how the brand is perceived by customers. Although scholars emphasize that the complexity and multidimensionality of destinations compared to goods complicates the measurement of CBBE in a destination context (Boo, Busser, and Baloglu 2009, Pike 2009; Gartner 2009),

1  
2  
3 destination brand equity studies directly transfer conceptualization and measurement  
4  
5 approaches developed for product brands, especially consumer packaged goods  
6  
7 (Christodoulides and de Chernatony 2010). Indeed, tourism literature exhibits a lack of a  
8  
9 sound theoretical discussion regarding the dimensionality of model constructs, measurement  
10  
11 scales and the linkages between core model dimensions under the supposition of tourism as a  
12  
13 service industry. Nevertheless, the understanding of the mechanisms behind the formation of  
14  
15 attitudes which tourists develop towards destination brands has become a managerial task of  
16  
17 ultimate importance (Davis, Piven, and Breazeale 2014; Jung, Kim, and Kim 2014). Thus, in  
18  
19 the absence of a CBBE theory adapted to the peculiarities of destinations, tourism research  
20  
21 risks drawing the focus away from the essence of a destination brand and its value, thereby  
22  
23 losing its managerial relevancy.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Christodoulides and de Chernatony (2010) suggest that the selection of model  
29  
30 constructs should align with the brand category (product type), thus, incorporate service-  
31  
32 specific dimensions that drive customer-based brand value. We similarly believe that  
33  
34 destination branding research could largely benefit from the contemporary service-oriented  
35  
36 marketing perspective (Li and Petrick 2008). Tourism literature traditionally addresses the  
37  
38 heterogeneous and customer-centric nature of tourism. For example, Debbage and Daniels  
39  
40 (1998) argue that the “tourist industry as a mode of production is enormous, highly  
41  
42 commodified, and structured in ways that are fairly similar to other sectors of the economy”  
43  
44 (ibid., 18). They further emphasize, that tourism is “no single product but, rather, a wide  
45  
46 range of products and services that interact to provide an opportunity to fulfil a tourist  
47  
48 experience that comprise both tangible parts (e.g. hotel, restaurant, or air carrier) and  
49  
50 intangible parts (e.g. sunset, scenery, mood)” (ibid., 23). Furthermore, in order to address the  
51  
52 complexity of tourism as an economic sector, the tourism marketing literature introduced the  
53  
54 concept of tourism destination viewed as a market place where tourism demand and supply  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 finally meet (Murphy 1985; Goodall and Ashworth 1988; Buhalis 2000; Beritelli, Bieger, and  
4  
5 Laesser 2013). Thus, Murphy, Pritchard and Smith (2000) define a tourism destination as “an  
6  
7 amalgam of individual products and experience opportunities that combine to form a total  
8  
9 experience of the area visited” (ibid., 44).  
10

11  
12 While experiences exist in consumers’ minds, destinations and tourists co-create places  
13  
14 where the tourist experience may occur. Destinations co-create experiences of individual  
15  
16 tourists by offering the functional, emotional and symbolic value of the visitation (i.e., the  
17  
18 brand) (Gnoth 2007). In turn, tourists choose between available products and services,  
19  
20 directly participate in activities, interpret the elements of the physical environment devoted to  
21  
22 tourism consumption and allocate their own resources, including time, money, efforts and  
23  
24 skills (Mossberg 2007; Arnould, Price, and Tierney 1998; Fuchs 2004; Gnoth 2007;  
25  
26 Pettersson and Getz 2009). By utilizing a destination’s products, services and other tangible  
27  
28 and intangible resources (e.g., natural amenities, local culture, atmosphere of the place, etc.),  
29  
30 tourists experience the destination and evaluate whether their experience was valuable (i.e.,  
31  
32 value-in-use) (Vargo and Lusch 2004; Moeller 2010).  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 This study aims at contributing to the further development of the CBBE theory in a  
38  
39 tourism destination context by bridging the gap between destination brand equity evaluation  
40  
41 and the service nature of tourism consumption. After a review of the literature, a framework  
42  
43 based on Keller’s (2008) brand equity pyramid is utilized to compare findings from previous  
44  
45 destination brand equity studies. In subsequent sections, the conceptual model and  
46  
47 hypotheses are presented. More precisely, in order to adjust the CBBE model for tourism  
48  
49 destinations we take into account the value-co-creation approach recently developed by  
50  
51 service marketing scholars (Grönroos 2000, 2009; Vargo and Lusch 2004, 2008). We propose  
52  
53 that the core component of the CBBE model is about customers’ evaluation of the destination  
54  
55 promise to transform destination resources into value-in-use for the tourist. This approach is  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 consistent with Gnoth's (2007) conceptualization of destination brands viewed as a  
4  
5 representation of functional, emotional and symbolic values as well as the benefits tourists  
6  
7 are promised to receive as the result of service consumption. We, therefore, suggest to  
8  
9 integrate the concept of value-in-use of tourism destination visitation into the CBBE model.  
10  
11 Finally, the influence of destination brand awareness on the evaluation of the destination  
12  
13 promise is hypothesized, which, in turn affects actual behavior and behavioral intentions of  
14  
15 tourists towards the destination.  
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

For Peer Review

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Brand equity considers the differentiation effect which the customers' knowledge of the brand has on the customers' response to a product or service, the overall utility that customers place in a brand compared to its competitors (Keller 1993; Lassar, Mittal and Sharma 1995; De Chernatony and McDonald 2003). It is also a measure of marketing efforts' effectiveness (Keller 2008). Brand equity is defined as "assets and liabilities, including brand awareness, loyalty, perceived quality and brand associations linked to a brand's name and symbol that adds to (or subtracts from) the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or that firm's customers" (Aaker 1996, 7-8). From a service marketing perspective, brand equity is the outcome of developing brand relationships (Grönroos 2000). Accordingly, Keller (2009) extended the CBBE model to reflect this relationship building process between customers and the brand. His hierarchical 'CBBE pyramid' describes four stages of brand development, including brand identity (*brand salience*), brand meaning (*performance* of tangible products and *imagery* related to intangible aspects of the brand), brand response (*judgements* and *feelings*), and brand relationships (*resonance*) aiming at the establishment of customer loyalty (Keller 2008, 2009).

Destination brand equity research focuses on the development of destination brand performance models, thus, enabling the measurement of the marketing effectiveness of tourism destinations and the prediction of the destination's brand development in the future. While destination brand equity measurement has only recently attracted attention, it is typically studied from the customers' perspective. By applying Aaker's (1996) and Keller's (1993) CBBE concept, tourism scholars view the CBBE model for destinations as "the sum of factors contributing to a brand's value in the consumer's mind" (Konecnik and Gartner 2007, 401). Konecnik and Gartner (2007) were the first to apply the CBBE model in a destination context, arguing that the image construct should be isolated from other brand



1  
2  
3 dimensions, such as awareness, quality and loyalty. Additional authors examine the  
4  
5 relationships between CBBE model dimensions (Boo et al. 2009; Pike, Bianchi, Kerr, and  
6  
7 Patti 2010; Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Kladou and Kehagias 2014) or take out  
8  
9 destination loyalty of the CBBE model (Horng, Liu, Chou, and Tsai 2012; Im, Kim, Elliot,  
10  
11 and Han 2012; Bianchi, Pike and Ling 2014). Other studies focus on the relationships  
12  
13 between destination brand equity and social influence (Evangelista and Dioko 2011),  
14  
15 destination involvement (Kim, Han, Holland, and Byon 2009) or enduring travel involvement  
16  
17 (Ferns and Walls 2012). Finally, one group of authors suggests that destination brand equity  
18  
19 analysis should not be limited to the customers' perspective, but rather should integrate  
20  
21 stakeholders, including entrepreneurs and residents (Garcia, Gómez, and Molina 2012).  
22  
23

24  
25 Table 1 summarizes existing CBBE models for tourism destinations by relating model  
26  
27 dimensions to the respective brand building blocks of Keller's (2009) brand pyramid. It  
28  
29 reveals similarities but also differences, overlaps and gaps on both the conceptual and  
30  
31 measurement levels of CBBE model specifications. As will be discussed in detail next, the  
32  
33 framework assists in better understanding the complexity of relationships within CBBE  
34  
35 models previously adopted and validated in a tourism destination context.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 1 HERE\*\*\*  
42  
43  
44

### 45 **Destination brand salience**

46  
47 Brand salience defined as; "the strength of awareness of the destination for a given travel  
48  
49 situation" is the foundation of the CBBE model for destinations (Pike et al. 2010, 439). The  
50  
51 majority of CBBE destination studies adopt Aaker's (1996) concept of brand awareness,  
52  
53 defined as the strength of the brand's presence in the mind of the target audience (e.g., Boo et  
54  
55 al. 2009; Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Konecnik and Gartner 2007). It is emphasized that "a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 place must be known to the consumer in some context before it can even be considered as a  
4  
5 potential destination” (Gartner and Konecnik Ruzzier 2011, 473). This implies that potential  
6  
7 tourists are familiar with the destination and that an image of the destination exists in their  
8  
9 minds (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010). Therefore, brand  
10  
11 awareness - as the first step in brand equity creation - must be of a positive nature (Gartner  
12  
13 and Konecnik Ruzzier 2011). The majority of destination brand equity studies include  
14  
15 awareness defined as tourists’ ability to recall destination characteristics (e.g., Bianchi et al.  
16  
17 2014; Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Ferns and Walls 2012). Destination awareness exists  
18  
19 on different levels, including brand recognition, recall, familiarity, top-of-mind awareness,  
20  
21 recall of destination advertising, brand dominance, reputation and brand knowledge.  
22  
23 Furthermore, some authors address various information sources affecting destination image  
24  
25 (Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Beerli and Martin 2004), and distinguish between  
26  
27 informational destination familiarity (based on previously used information) and experiential  
28  
29 destination familiarity (reflecting previous destination experience) (Baloglu 2001).  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Overall, tourism research concludes that brand salience, defined as the strength of  
35  
36 destination awareness, is an important first step in destination brand equity creation.  
37  
38 However, there is no agreement on construct operationalization, as the only destination  
39  
40 awareness measure consistently employed in previous studies is the ability to recall  
41  
42 destination characteristics. The literature review reveals a need for further theoretical and  
43  
44 methodological developments of the brand salience model block. Thus, for the purpose of  
45  
46 operationalization and empirical validation of the awareness construct, this study emphasizes  
47  
48 aspects of destination characteristics, recall and the presence of information sources.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

#### 54 **Destination brand performance and imagery**

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Image and quality reflect specific characteristics of the destination and belong to the  
4 brand performance and imagery building block (Keller 2009). Destination brand equity  
5 studies usually consider attribute-based conceptualizations when measuring perceived  
6 destination image and quality (e.g., Horng et al. 2012; Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Pike et al.  
7 2010). These studies adopt Keller's (1993) conceptualization of brand image, defined as  
8 perceived destination brand reflected by a distinct set of associations, like knowledge, beliefs,  
9 feelings and impressions about a destination which consumers hold in memory and associate  
10 to the destination name. In turn, brand quality is defined as perceived overall superiority of a  
11 (service) product (Aaker 1991; Bianchi et al. 2014; Boo et al. 2009; Keller 1993). Tourism  
12 studies follow Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry's (1985, 1988) quality concept which  
13 compares customers' expectations and perceived performance, thereby reflecting an overall  
14 judgment towards the excellence of service delivery (Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Horng  
15 et al. 2012; Pike et al. 2010). Accordingly, destination brand quality is defined as "travelers'  
16 perception of a destination's ability to fulfil their expectation" (Ferns and Walls 2012, 29).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Previous studies typically address the specificity of tourism destinations by employing  
35 Echtner and Ritchie's (1991, 1993) framework further developed for destination image  
36 conceptualization by Gallarza, Saura and Garcia (2002). Dimensions include attribute-based  
37 and holistic images, functional and psychological characteristics as well as common and  
38 unique images of a destination. The approach presumes that destination brand image reflects  
39 those destination resources which make the destination attractive in the eyes of potential  
40 tourists (Horng et al. 2012). Similarly, destination brand quality refers to destination  
41 attributes perceived by tourists (Bianchi et al. 2014, 217). Konecnik and Gartner (2007)  
42 developed destination image and quality measurement scales by combining findings from in-  
43 depth interviews and previous research (Gallarza et al. 2002; Mazanec 1994; Baker and  
44 Crompton 2000; Ekinici and Riley 2001; Murphy et al. 2000). These scales have been adopted  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and modified in later destination brand equity studies (e.g., Pike et al. 2010; Horng et al.  
4  
5 2012; Bianchi et al. 2014). However, there are only a few attributes employed by several  
6  
7 studies simultaneously. Accommodation facilities is the most commonly utilized destination  
8  
9 attribute employed for destination image and quality  
10  
11 measurement. Fewer attributes comprise infrastructure, cleanliness, safety, history and  
12  
13 culture, shopping, urban areas, dining, nightlife and entertainment, events, atmosphere,  
14  
15 service personnel, communication and language. While nature and scenery is the most  
16  
17 commonly employed destination image attribute (Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Ferns and  
18  
19 Walls 2012; Im et al. 2012; Konecnik and Gartner 2007), less frequent attributes include  
20  
21 weather, activities, recreation opportunities, friendliness of locals, beaches, political stability,  
22  
23 being featured in movies and on TV, religion, sightseeing, technology, water sports and  
24  
25 family vacation opportunities.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 When it comes to effect measurement, a positive (inter-)relationship (Chen and  
31  
32 Myagmarsuren 2010; Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Ferns and Walls 2012) between attribute-  
33  
34 based image and quality has been identified. However, other empirical results remain  
35  
36 inconclusive. While, a positive effect of brand awareness on the perceived quality of  
37  
38 destination attributes is confirmed (Pike et al. 2010; Kladou and Kehagias 2014), the  
39  
40 relationship is non-significant in Chen and Myagmarsuren (2010). To conclude, although  
41  
42 literature has reached an agreement that destination-specific attributes should be applied  
43  
44 when operationalizing destination brand performance and imagery, findings illustrate that  
45  
46 attribute-based image and quality constructs greatly overlap on the measurement level.  
47  
48 Therefore, following Ferns and Walls (2012), we propose that ‘destination brand experience’,  
49  
50 manifested by attribute-based image and the quality of experienced destination attributes, can  
51  
52 well constitute a single construct.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Judgments and feelings

Most previous studies include consumers' judgements and emotional responses towards the destination brand. These representations, however, remain fragmented and mutually inclusive. For instance, by adopting measures of quality experience, brand quality is conceptualized through brand performance dimensions in terms of "the destination's ability to meet tourists' functional needs" (Boo et al. 2009, 221). Accordingly, destination performance is defined as "perceived utility that one derives from visiting a destination relative to the cost of doing so" (Evangelista and Dioko 2011, 318). Thus, brand performance scales include overall quality and performance superiority. Moreover, in Evangelista and Dioko (2011) "trust" represents the "judgements and feelings" block and includes measures, like trustworthiness, being caring and not taking advantage of consumers. Similarly, overall quality is a measure of destination brand equity in Garcia et al. (2012), while trust (reliability) and believability (credibility) appear as the brand meaning construct (Berry 2000). Finally, Im et al. (2012), Kladou and Kehagias (2014) and Bianchi et al. (2014) consider brand associations, but lack an agreement on how to conceptualize the construct. Overall quality and destination attitude is combined as brand associations by Im et al. (2012). By contrast, brand associations, defined as image perception, signal brand personality and trust (Kladou and Kehagias 2014). Similarly, brand "uniqueness" and "popularity" represent brand associations and perceived quality (Kim et al. 2009), while some authors use the notion of brand associations interchangeably with destination brand image (Bianchi et al. 2014).

Moreover, destination brand value is defined as Zeithaml and Bitner's (2000) price-based concept of value in terms of customers' perceived balance between a product's price and utility (Boo et al. 2009; Evangelista and Dioko 2011; Bianchi et al. 2014). Measurements include value-for-money, reasonable price and being a bargain. Likewise, prior research confirms that perceived quality influences value-for-money (Boo et al. 2009). However, this

1  
2  
3 relationship is confirmed for only one out of two samples. Moreover, it is shown that  
4 destination awareness has a positive effect on brand assets (Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Pike  
5 et al. 2010), although this hypothesis was originally rejected (Boo et al. 2009). Furthermore,  
6 brand presentation influences the perception of brand meaning (Garcia et al. 2012). Likewise,  
7 brand associations turn out to influence perceived quality of destination attributes (Kladou  
8 and Kehagias 2014). However, this reverse relationship is tested as a post-hoc hypothesis,  
9 thus, is insufficiently justified from a theoretical viewpoint. Few studies examine the  
10 relationship between brand equity and tourist satisfaction. More precisely, it is confirmed that  
11 the perceived quality of destination attributes influences satisfaction, while the relationship  
12 between attribute-based image and satisfaction is found to be non-significant (Chen and  
13 Myagmarsuren 2010). Finally, inconsistent path relationships, satisfactory yet not perfect  
14 goodness-of-fit indices and a correlation between image and quality is reported by Boo et al.  
15 (2009). The authors suggest that tourists' previous experience might overshadow brand  
16 image.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 To conclude, the examination of model dimensions representing the judgements and  
35 feelings block reveals that tourism literature emphasizes the judgements component,  
36 specified as overall quality and credibility of the destination brand. However, benefits of  
37 using the brand are only partly represented, e.g. by image dimensions and destination  
38 satisfaction. With the sole exception of Garcia et al. (2012), literature ignores emotional  
39 response dimensions (e.g. fun and excitement), whereby Keller (2008) identifies them as  
40 significant for the judgements and feelings block. Finally, literature suggests that in a (e.g.  
41 tourism) service context, satisfaction should be "conceptualized as an attitude-like judgement  
42 after a purchase or an interaction with a services provider" (De Chernatony, Harris, and  
43 Christodoulides 2004, 22). Following these suggestions, this study integrates destination-  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 specific emotional brand value dimensions as part of the brand equity measurement in a  
4  
5 destination context.  
6  
7  
8

### 9 10 **Destination brand resonance**

11  
12 Loyalty and attachment are the dimensions of brand resonance at the top of the brand  
13  
14 equity pyramid (Keller 2009). Loyalty constitutes the core of the destination's brand equity  
15  
16 model representing the level of attachment a potential tourist has to a destination brand  
17  
18 (Horng et al. 2012; Kladou and Kehagias 2014). Destination loyalty implies that potential  
19  
20 tourists have a greater confidence in the destination brand compared to its competitors, which  
21  
22 translates into a willingness to pay a premium price (Bianchi et al. 2014). Thus, *behavioral*  
23  
24 brand loyalty refers to tourists' repeat visits to a destination and positive word of mouth  
25  
26 referrals (Konecnik and Gartner 2007), while *attitudinal* brand loyalty is manifested by  
27  
28 tourists' intention to revisit and recommend the destination to others as well as by the 'brand  
29  
30 commitment' in terms of individual preference and disposition towards a destination brand  
31  
32 (Gartner and Konecnik Ruzzier 2011).  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 While most studies specify attitudinal destination brand loyalty as an isolated construct,  
38  
39 literature lacks consensus on measurement items and scales. The most commonly, although  
40  
41 inconsistently, utilized measures of attitudinal destination brand loyalty comprise preference  
42  
43 (destination as preferred vacation choice) and willingness to recommend (e.g., Boo et al.  
44  
45 2009; Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Garcia et al. 2012). Fewer studies additionally consider the  
46  
47 intention to revisit (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Ferns and Walls 2012; Im et al. 2012). Less  
48  
49 common measures include overall loyalty (Boo et al. 2009; Garcia et al. 2012), enjoying the  
50  
51 destination (Boo et al. 2009; Kladou and Kehagias 2014), readiness to pay a premium price  
52  
53 (Im et al. 2012), confidence (Horng et al. 2012) and meeting the expectations (Kladou and  
54  
55 Kehagias 2014). Identifying the drivers behind destination brand loyalty is a crucial task in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 destination brand equity research. Thus, unsurprisingly, most studies in a relationship testing  
4  
5 context are considering brand resonance.  
6

7  
8 Nevertheless, findings remain contradictory and inconclusive. For instance, the  
9  
10 relationship between destination awareness and loyalty is confirmed by Pike et al. (2010),  
11  
12 while other authors reject this hypothesis (Im et al. 2012). Furthermore, a positive influence  
13  
14 of destination awareness on revisit intention can be demonstrated (Ferns and Walls 2012;  
15  
16 Horng et al. 2012), while another study, again, rejects this hypothesis (Im et al. 2012).  
17  
18 Similarly, the influence of attribute-based image on loyalty can be confirmed (Im et al. 2012),  
19  
20 while other scholars reject the hypothesis on this relationship (Chen and Myagmarsuren  
21  
22 2010). Likewise, while some studies approve the influence of perceived quality of destination  
23  
24 attributes on loyalty (Pike et al. 2010; Kladou and Kehagias 2014), this hypothesis is rejected  
25  
26 by others (Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Bianchi et al. 2014). Finally, attribute-based image  
27  
28 and quality positively influence travel intentions (Horng et al. 2010; Ferns and Walls 2012).  
29  
30 However, this relationship turns out to be non-significant in Im et al. (2012). Findings are  
31  
32 more consistent for destination judgements and feelings influencing destination brand  
33  
34 resonance: literature agrees that brand associations (Im et al. 2012; Kladou and Kehagias  
35  
36 2014), perceived quality (Boo et al. 2009), social and self-image (Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al.  
37  
38 2010), value-for-money (Boo et al. 2009; Bianchi et al. 2014) and satisfaction (Chen and  
39  
40 Myagmarsuren 2010) are antecedents of destination brand loyalty.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 In conclusion, the issue of valid measurement of the brand resonance construct is not  
47  
48 yet fully resolved. As it is difficult to distinguish between *attitudinal* and *behavioral* brand  
49  
50 loyalty, brand resonance overlaps with destination judgements and feelings on the level of  
51  
52 both, constructs and single measures. For instance, “benefits” in Konecnik and Gartner  
53  
54 (2007) and Pike et al. (2010), as well as “enjoyment” in Boo et al. (2009), Horng et al. (2012)  
55  
56 and Kladou and Kehagias (2014) semantically belong to the judgements and feelings brand  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 building block. Hence, this study focuses on destination preference, willingness to  
4  
5 recommend and intention to return as the most commonly utilized dimensions of attitudinal  
6  
7 destination brand loyalty. At the same time, we emphasize the need for continuing the  
8  
9 theoretical discussion on the phenomenon of destination brand loyalty and its  
10  
11 operationalization.  
12

### 13 14 15 16 **Hierarchy of CBBE dimensions in a destination context** 17

18  
19 Table 2 summarizes the findings from previous destination studies which go beyond the  
20  
21 sole task of measuring CBBE model dimensions but also examine path-relationships between  
22  
23 brand equity dimensions. The table highlights tested relationships between the four blocks of  
24  
25 Keller's (2008, 2009) brand equity pyramid. The synthesis of prior studies' results enables  
26  
27 the identification of gaps on the level of both the measurement and the structural composition  
28  
29 of existing destination CBBE models.  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 2 HERE\*\*\*  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Interestingly, findings support the framework's hierarchical structure following Keller's  
40  
41 (2009) brand equity pyramid. Particularly, relationships between directly adjacent model  
42  
43 blocks are consistently confirmed empirically. Notably when the blocks located in the center  
44  
45 of the model are omitted, findings from hypothesis testing are contradictory and disconfirmed  
46  
47 (e.g. relationships between destination brand awareness and overall destination brand  
48  
49 judgement dimensions, destination brand awareness and destination loyalty, as well as the  
50  
51 impact of both attribute-based image and quality on loyalty).  
52

53  
54 As discussed, the conceptualization of model building blocks by existing studies  
55  
56 remains fragmented. Only a few hypotheses are tested and confirmed by two or more studies.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 More precisely, the relationships between destination awareness and destination brand  
4 resonance dimensions (i.e., loyalty and (re)visit intentions), attribute-based quality and  
5 destination loyalty, as well as the relationships between destination awareness and attribute-  
6 based quality have been tested by two studies, while the positive influence of consistency of  
7 tourists' self-image with destination brand on destination brand loyalty is the only  
8 relationship tested and confirmed by three studies (Bianchi et al. 2014; Boo et al. 2009; Pike  
9 et al. 2009).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Finally, previously tested hypotheses summarized in Table 2 reveal that most of  
19 previous studies tested the relationships between brand equity dimensions and destination  
20 brand loyalty (Hunter and Schmidt 1990). However, literature lacks consistency especially  
21 regarding the conceptual interpretation of attribute-based brand image, overall brand image  
22 and quality constructs resulting in conceptual overlaps and measurement gaps of brand equity  
23 constructs. As a result, the primary focus of this paper is to clarify the structural relationships  
24 within the inner core of the model.  
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

## RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

To resolve the aforementioned conceptualization and operationalization issues of destination brand equity modelling, we propose the application of the value co-creation framework (Vargo and Lusch 2004). Accordingly, attribute-based image and quality dimensions are related to the customers' perception of promised, experienced and retained performance of destination resources, which, in turn, contribute to the customers' value-in-use (Grönroos 2009). Previous studies (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al. 2010) point at the difficulties of model conceptualization and measurement primarily explained by the complexity and multidimensionality of tourism destinations compared to goods and services. The complexity of destination experiences is the primary reason why measurement scales developed for consumer products and services cannot be directly applied in a tourism destination context (Pike 2009; Gartner 2009). Indeed, a tourism destination, viewed as an amalgam of various service products and experience opportunities, is an ideal illustration of the value network concept, which accentuates the co-production and exchange of service offerings and value co-creation from a customers' perspective (Murphy et al. 2000; Vargo 2009; Lusch, Vargo and Tanniru 2010). Thus, as destinations represent inherent value creation processes triggered, co-produced, experienced and evaluated by customers, the application of the value network in a destination context is justified to identify interactions which impact customers' brand experience (Grönroos 2006; Baron and Harris 2010).

Gnoth (2007) conceptualizes destination brands as the representation of the functional, emotional and symbolic values of a destination, as well as the benefits which tourists are promised to receive as the result of their service consumption (ibid, 348). This is consistent with the service marketing view on value co-creation, which distinguishes between value-in-use and value-in-exchange (Vargo and Lusch 2004; Grönroos 2009). While value-in-

1  
2  
3 exchange is embedded in the exchanged product, value-in-use is created when goods or  
4  
5 services are used (Vargo and Lusch 2004). Thus, value for a customer is created as a result of  
6  
7 the interaction between a firm and a customer by the total experience of all experiential  
8  
9 elements, including the firm's resources, such as physical objects (e.g., goods), information,  
10  
11 interactions with employees, systems, infrastructures as well as other customers (Grönroos  
12  
13 2008). In many instances, these elements cannot be directly controlled by a firm (Vargo and  
14  
15 Lusch 2004). Rather, core values, like the cultural, social and natural dimensions of  
16  
17 destination resources, are utilized as inputs for service provision aimed at satisfying tourists'  
18  
19 needs. Accordingly, a destination is viewed as a promise to transform customers' resources,  
20  
21 while the inherent value concept is communicated through the brand which, in turn, is  
22  
23 collectively perceived by homogeneous tourist segments (Ek, Larsen, Hornskov, and  
24  
25 Mansfeldt 2008).  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 More theoretically, the destination promise, as the inner part of the customer-based  
31  
32 destination brand equity (CBD BE) model, includes customers' evaluations of tangible,  
33  
34 intangible and human resources offered by the destination, the value-in-use as tourists'  
35  
36 benefits from destination visitation, and, finally, the price-based value as the destination's  
37  
38 value-in-exchange. Thus, destination resources as destination-specific dimensions of complex  
39  
40 tourism experiences (Palmer 2010) include destination products and services, intangible  
41  
42 characteristics of the destination and social interactions. Most importantly, resource  
43  
44 availability is unique for every destination (Zabkar, Brencic, and Dmitrovic 2010). Similarly,  
45  
46 the combination of desired and experienced resources is unique for every tourist in a  
47  
48 particular visitation context (Moeller 2010). Against this theoretical background we propose  
49  
50 that destination resources, customers' benefits and value-for-money together comprise the  
51  
52 perceived destination brand promise reflected by the inner core of the destination brand  
53  
54 equity model pyramid (Figure 1).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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




Figure 1. Tourism destination brand equity pyramid

Peer Review

## CONCEPTUAL MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

Within the CBDDBE model framework, attribute-based image and quality represent tangible, intangible and social resources of the tourism destination. While studies integrating attribute-based image and quality simultaneously report high correlations between the constructs, conceptualization and measurement of these constructs greatly overlap (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Ferns and Walls 2012). We resolve this issue by combining attribute-based image and quality into one single dimension as proposed by Ferns and Walls (2012). Thus, customers' perception of promised, experienced and retained performance on the level of destination resources contributes to the formation of tourists' benefits from destination visitation (Larsen 2007). As the perception of destination resources represents the performance and imagery building block of the CBDDBE model, the model hierarchy stipulates the relationship between destination awareness and customer's perception of destination resources. Following Pike et al. (2010), Chen and Myagmarsuren (2010) and Kladou and Kehagias (2014), an integrative hypothesis has been formulated (Figure 2):

*H1. The stronger the destination awareness, the more positive customers' perception of a) tangible, b) intangible and c) social destination resources*

The value-in-use represents tourists' state of being as the result of visiting the destination. In general, customer value is created within a dynamic and hierarchical means-end process of utilizing product attributes to obtain desired experiences, thus, achieving the customer's consumption purposes (Woodruff 1997). As the most relevant perceived value dimensions Sheth, Newman and Gross (1991) identify emotional, social and epistemic value. Emotional value is the utility derived from feelings or affections generated by a product. Social value

1  
2  
3 represents the enhancement of a social self-concept. Epistemic value reflects the capacity of a  
4  
5 product “to arouse curiosity, provide novelty, or satisfy a desire for knowledge” (ibid, 162).  
6  
7 Emotional experience, social recognition, novelty and knowledge constitute the dimensions  
8  
9 of modifying a customers’ state of being, and, consequently, represent value-in-use for a  
10  
11 customer. Similarly, Holbrook’s (2006) customer value typology includes hedonic value as  
12  
13 an intrinsic self-oriented pleasurable experience of fun or the aesthetic enjoyment as well as  
14  
15 the extrinsic other-oriented social value of status-enhancement or the improvement of the  
16  
17 self-esteem in the result of consumption. The value-in-use of a destination can, thus, be  
18  
19 exemplified based on Crompton’s (1979) classification of tourists’ benefits from destination  
20  
21 visitation in terms of satisfying internal socio-psychological needs. These benefits include  
22  
23 push-motivation factors, such as escape from routine environments, exploration and  
24  
25 evaluation of self, relaxation, social recognition, social interaction, novelty seeking and  
26  
27 knowledge (Crompton 1979). Interestingly, Klenosky (2002) applies a means-end approach  
28  
29 to examine relationships between pull and push motivation factors of destination choice. Pull  
30  
31 factors (e.g. historical and cultural attractions, natural resources, activities, etc.) are  
32  
33 considered as means to achieve benefits (ends), which correspond to travel pull motivations  
34  
35 (e.g. fun and enjoyment, self-esteem, excitement, etc.). Similarly, Komppula (2005) applies  
36  
37 Woodruff’s (1997) customer value hierarchy to illustrate the link between the tourist product  
38  
39 and customers’ “desired consequence experiences” (ibid, 9). However, literature only partly  
40  
41 reflects the value-in-use as a desired experiential state-of-being achieved in the course of  
42  
43 tourism consumption and the fulfilment of needs. This, in particular concerns the social-value  
44  
45 construct represented by the ‘social image’ and ‘self-image’ dimensions as discussed in Boo  
46  
47 et al. (2009), Pike et al. (2010) and Evangelista and Dioko (2011).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 Thus, we consider value-in-use as the dimension of the “judgements and feelings” brand  
55  
56 building block and integrate destination-specific visitation benefits, such as emotional  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (hedonic), social and epistemic value (Sheth et al. 1991; Holbrook 2006). The relationship  
4  
5 between destination resources and value-in-use has been confirmed by Pike et al. (2010) as  
6  
7 the positive influence of the quality of destination attributes on tourists' self-esteem and  
8  
9 social recognition. However, on a broader scale, this relationship derives from the inherent  
10  
11 means-end logic of destination resources transformed into desired customer benefits (Chi and  
12  
13 Qu 2008; Yoon and Uysal 2005; Zabkar et al. 2010): This relationship is hypothesized as  
14  
15 follows:  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 *H2. The more positive the customers' perception of a) tangible, b) intangible, and c)*  
22  
23 *social destination resources, the more positive the customers' perception of value-in-use*  
24  
25

26  
27 Three previous studies isolated value-for-money as a separate brand equity dimension  
28  
29 (Boo et al. 2009; Evangelista and Dioko 2011; Bianchi et al. 2014). The construct belongs to  
30  
31 the judgements and feelings brand building block and is consistent with the functional  
32  
33 (economic) value, which Sheth et al. (1991) and Holbrook (2006) identify as part of  
34  
35 customers' perceived value. Moreover, from the service marketing perspective (Vargo and  
36  
37 Lusch 2004; Grönroos 2008), price-based value constitutes the value-in-exchange and  
38  
39 considers customers' own resources used as inputs in the service process. Customers'  
40  
41 resources, however, include not only money, but also time, efforts and skills (Fuchs 2004;  
42  
43 Chen and Tsai 2007; Moeller 2010). Although the relationship between customers'  
44  
45 perception of destination attributes and value-for-money has not yet been tested as part of the  
46  
47 CBDBE model, Chen and Tsai (2007) empirically confirm that attribute-based trip quality  
48  
49 has a strong and positive impact on perceived value in terms of money, time and effort.  
50  
51 Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




1  
2  
3 *H3. The more positive the customers' perception of a) tangible, b) intangible and c) social*  
4 *destination resources, the more positive the customers' perception of value-for-money*  
5  
6  
7  
8

9  
10 The study at hand follows Konecnik and Gartner (2007), Pike et al. (2010), Chen and  
11 Myagmarsuren (2010), Im et al. (2012) and Bianchi et al. (2014) when specifying destination  
12 loyalty as an attitudinal concept. Thus, the intention to revisit and recommend the destination  
13 as well as the destination preference are included in the model. Like Boo et al. (2009), Kim et  
14 al. (2009), Pike et al. (2010), Chen and Myagmarsuren (2010), Im et al. (2012), Kladou and  
15 Kehagias (2014) and Bianchi et al. (2014), the following hypotheses, which reflect the  
16 relationships between the “judgments and feelings” dimensions and destination loyalty, are  
17 formulated:  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 *H4. The more positive customers' perception of value-in-use, the stronger the loyalty to a*  
31 *destination*  
32  
33

34 *H5. The more positive customers' perception of value-for-money, the stronger the loyalty*  
35 *to a destination*  
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



**Figure 2.** The Conceptual Model and Hypotheses to be tested

AW – awareness; DRES – destination resources; TAN – tangible destination resources;  
 INT – intangible destination resources; SOC – social destination resources; VIU –value-in-  
 use; VFM – value-for-money; LOY - loyalty

## PILOT STUDY RESEARCH DESIGN

A pilot study was designed for international tourists with previous experience of the Swedish mountain destination Åre. Åre is the leading Swedish ski tourism destination which is actively expanding on international markets.

Previous studies focused primarily on top-of-mind aspects of awareness (e.g., Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al. 2010). However, Aaker (1996) points out that top-of-mind is difficult to measure when consumers already have direct product experience. This study, therefore, adopts metrics of brand knowledge and brand presence from Lehmann, Keller and Farley (2008) and formulates eight awareness items as statements to be rated on a five point Likert agreement scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

For tangible resources a total of 36 items ranging from 1=completely dissatisfied to 5=completely satisfied is deduced from the literature on ski destinations (Hudson and Shephard 1998; Weiermair and Fuchs 1999; Fuchs 2002; Faullant, Matzler, and Füller 2008; Komppula and Laukkanen 2009). Six intangible destination resource items and four social destination resource items are similarly deduced from previous studies (Yoon and Uysal 2005; Chen and Tsai 2007; Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Chi and Qu 2008; del Bosque and Martin 2008; Faullant et al. 2008; Zabkar et al. 2010) and are refined based on a content analysis of Åre-specific marketing communications and publications in media as well as customers' narratives in blogs (Creswell 2009). The item-rating ranges from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Conceptualization of tourists' value-in-use of destination visitation is limited to the emotional (hedonic) value of destination visitation, assuming that hedonic value is of primary importance for alpine ski tourism (Holbrook 2006). However, we acknowledge that the scope of value-in-use of destination visitation is broader and, may include social value as well as

1  
2  
3 other types of value dimensions (Sheth et al. 1991; Crompton 1979). The construct is  
4  
5 operationalized by four emotional value items for ski destinations (Klenoski, Gengler, and  
6  
7 Mulvey 1993). Value-for-money is operationalized by two items adopted from Boo et al.  
8  
9 (2009) formulated as statements and rated on a five point Likert agreement scale ranging  
10  
11 from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Finally, the study adopts the three most  
12  
13 common measures of destination brand loyalty found in previous destination brand equity  
14  
15 studies, comprising of willingness to recommend and to come back to the destination as well  
16  
17 as destination preference as the measure of destination attachment (Konecnik and Gartner  
18  
19 2007; Boo et al. 2009). Loyalty items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from  
20  
21 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.  
22  
23

24  
25 English, Swedish and Russian questionnaires were prepared by native speakers, thus,  
26  
27 addressing the main target markets of the Swedish ski destination Åre. A pre-test with 44  
28  
29 students allowed a split-half test to check for item-reliability (Hair, Black, Babin, and  
30  
31 Anderson 2010). Finally, a web-survey was implemented to reach international guests after  
32  
33 their visit to the destination. Target markets were examined using the number of overnight  
34  
35 stays reported by the stakeholders SkiStar Åre and Holiday Club Åre, which represents  
36  
37 approximately 96% of the international guest-base. Findings justified a proportional-stratified  
38  
39 sampling strategy: e-mails were randomly selected from CRM-databases of these  
40  
41 stakeholders for each sample strata. As the goal was an accuracy of 95% at a significance  
42  
43 level of 5%, target sample size was  $n=384$  (Creswell 2009).  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 In total, 5,668 web survey invitations were disseminated. Data was anonymously collected  
49  
50 between April and May 2010. Final number of completed questionnaires is  $N=387$  (response  
51  
52 rate = 9%). The share of missing values was highest for items measuring tourists' perception  
53  
54 of tangible attributes. This can be explained by the service heterogeneity characteristics,  
55  
56 implying that only core destination components are used by most respondents. Thus, items  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with more than 10% of missing-values were removed, resulting in an exclusion of 25 out of  
4  
5 36 tangible attribute-items. From a theoretical point of view, the removal of items illustrates a  
6  
7 great degree of heterogeneity between consumers in terms of the combination of utilized  
8  
9 resources as emphasized by Moeller (2010).  
10

11 As suggested by Hair et al. (2010), missing-value imputation for resource variables was  
12  
13 performed through means substitution. For the remaining variables, a list-wise deletion of  
14  
15 cases with missing-values was applied. As a result, the number of usable cases is 248. Z-  
16  
17 score-examination revealed outliers ( $z > 3.29$ ) being substituted with “the next highest score  
18  
19 plus one” (Field 2005, 116). This type of score substitution affected 17 out of 34 items. The  
20  
21 number of adjusted scores varied from 1 to 4 per item and, therefore, did not exceed 2% per  
22  
23 item.  
24  
25

26  
27 Exploratory Factor Analysis (VariMax) examined factor structure, communalities, KMO-  
28  
29 criteria and Cronbach’s Alpha separately for those model constructs which could potentially  
30  
31 have underlying dimensions, including tangible destination resources (two factors emerged,  
32  
33 labelled “Skiing” and “Service”), intangible destination resources (one factor), social  
34  
35 destination resources (one factor), destination awareness (one factor). Three destination  
36  
37 awareness items with factor loadings below 0.5 were dropped from the analysis, namely “Åre  
38  
39 has a good reputation”, “I have heard about Åre from friends and relatives”, and “I often find  
40  
41 information about Åre on the internet” (Hair et al. 2010).  
42  
43  
44

45 As discussed by Hair et al. (2010, 712), the removal of 20% of measurement items  
46  
47 represents an acceptable level of measurement model adjustment and, thus, allows further  
48  
49 model testing with remaining data. Therefore, in addition to model testing with data collected  
50  
51 during the pilot study, the study has been replicated to collect new data and re-test the model.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## PILOT STUDY RESULTS AND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

In a first methodological step, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed using the AMOS (v.21) software package to test the constitutive measurement constructs of the proposed CBDBE model. Unidimensionality of the specified measurement model was examined (Hair et al. 2010). All loadings (regression weights) were statistically different from zero and all t-values higher than 1.96. However, overall model-fit revealed that most fit-statistics were slightly below recommended thresholds (Brown 2006). Thus, the measurement model was slightly adjusted. Examination of standardized loadings ( $< 0.50$ ), standardized residuals ( $> 2.58$ ) and modification indices suggested the removal of three items (“Åre is a luxury winter resort”, “Åre is a famous site for international winter sports competitions” and “Åre is known as one of the world's top ski resorts”). Additionally, Discriminant Validity analysis suggested the need to increase the extracted variance for the “Skiing” factor, which was achieved by removing the items “Safety in the ski area” and “Transportation at the mountain area”. As a result, model-fit improved substantially (Table 3). Although Goodness of Fit Index (GFI = 0.878) is still slightly below the recommended threshold, all indexes satisfy cut-off requirements (Steenkamp and Baumgartner 2000). Moreover, the model shows satisfactory measurement results (Table 4).

\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 3 HERE\*\*\*

\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 4 HERE\*\*\*

More precisely, Composite Reliability (CR) supports the model as all CR-values rank above the threshold-value of 0.7 (Hair et al. 2010). All estimates are significant (t-values  $> 1.96$ ) and show high values (standardized loadings  $> 0.50$ ). Squared-Multiple-Correlation

1  
2  
3 (SMC) demonstrates respectable portions while Average Variance Extracted (AVE)  
4  
5 amounting at values of 0.5 (or higher) indicates convergent validity (Hair et al. 2010;  
6  
7 Nunkoo, Ramkissoon, and Gursoy 2013). Finally, results confirm Convergent Validity, as  
8  
9 indicators of the latent constructs share high proportions of common variance. Overall, CFA  
10  
11 results are satisfactory: Convergent Validity is confirmed, while Discriminant Validity is  
12  
13 attested for most model dimensions (Table 5).  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 5 HERE\*\*\*  
19  
20


21  
22  
23 As a next step, the measurement model is transformed into a structural model to test the  
24  
25 hypothesized relationships between validated CBDBE model-constructs (Reisinger and  
26  
27 Turner 1999). A linear structural equation model (SEM) using maximum likelihood (ML)  
28  
29 estimation is applied (Hair et al. 2010). The goodness-of-fit statistics for the path model,  
30  
31 however, do not fully satisfy recommended thresholds (GFI = 0.773; RMSEA = 0.084 [LL  
32  
33 0.078; UL 0.091]; SRMR = 0.21; Normed-Chi-Square ( $\chi^2/df$ ) = 2.76 (1002.94/363);  
34  
35 TLI = 0.83; CFI = 0.85; AGFI = 0.73). Furthermore, not all hypothesized paths are  
36  
37 statistically significant. Particularly, relationships between awareness and intangible  
38  
39 attributes, the influence of intangible attributes on both value-in-use and value-for-money  
40  
41 perception as well as the influence of social destination resources on value-for-money turned-  
42  
43 out to be non-significant.  
44  
45

46  
47 However, examination of modification indices revealed that the model fit is substantially  
48  
49 improved by allowing theoretically plausible correlations between the four destination  
50  
51 resource dimensions. Thus, in the revised model (figure 3) “Skiing” (SKI), “Service” (SER),  
52  
53 “Intangible destination resources” (INT) and “Social destination resources” (SOC) constitute  
54  
55 the sub-dimensions of the second-order construct DRES (“Destination resources”). As a  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

result of this model revision, the Goodness-of-Fit statistics reach a satisfactory level:

GFI = 0.83; RMSEA = 0.065 (LL 0.058; UL 0.072); Normed-Chi-

Square ( $\chi^2/df$ ) = 2.04 (750.65/368); SRMR = 0.077; TLI = 0.90; CFI = 0.91; AGFI = 0.80.



**Figure 3.** Standardized path estimates for the revised CBDDBE structural model

AW – awareness; DRES – destination resources; SKI – tangible resources/skiing; SER – tangible resources/service; INT – intangible destination resources; SOC – social destination resources; VIU – value-in-use/emotional value; VFM – value-for-money; LOY - loyalty

Loadings pertaining to the four sub-dimensions of the second-order construct DRES are all statistically significant and vary from 0.675 for “Intangible destination resources” to 0.812 for “Social destination resources”. The AVE Value for the DRES construct amounts at 0.59



1  
2  
3 (Hair et al. 2010). All proposed relationships between the model constructs are statistically  
4  
5 significant (Table 6).  
6  
7

8  
9 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 6 HERE\*\*\*  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 To conclude, the hypothesized hierarchical structure of the proposed CBDDBE model could  
15  
16 be empirically confirmed. Thus, the test approach can be considered as plausible, reliable and  
17  
18 valid (Hair et al. 2010). However, in order to re-test the model, the survey instrument is  
19  
20 improved prior to collection of new sample data. Particularly, customers' perception of  
21  
22 tangible, intangible and social destination resources are consistently operationalized on the  
23  
24 basis of similar measurement scales.  
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

## REPLICATION STUDY RESULTS


In order to re-test reliability and robustness of the proposed CBDBE model, new customer data was collected during July-August 2013. The survey instrument was slightly modified, thus, a satisfaction scale was employed to measure the intangible and social destination resources and value-for-money. In order to address the issue of missing values and to re-test the model without missing value replacement, the guest-base was extended to both domestic and international visitors of the Swedish ski destination Åre in the winter season 2012/2013. In total, 23,243 e-mails from the CRM-databases of four major accommodation providers, including Skistar Åre, Holiday Club Åre, Copperhill Mountain Lodge Åre and Tott Hotell Åre, were disseminated. A reminder was sent out two weeks after the first invitation. While 3,013 respondents started the survey, resulting in a 13% response rate, 1,984 individuals completed the survey. Respondents who answered all the 29 measurement items of the CBDBE model made up the sub-sample for repeat model testing (n=752). The first effort to validate measurement constructs by CFA, again, produced fit statistics slightly below recommended thresholds (Brown 2006). Examination of standardized residuals ( $> 2.58$ ) revealed the need to remove the social resource item "Friendliness and professionalism of employees". Additionally, results from Discriminant Validity analysis indicate the need to increase the extracted variance of the "Service" construct, which is achieved by removing the "Overall quality of accommodation" item with the lowest loading score. The performed adjustments resulted in a substantial improvement of the model fit (GFI = 0.896; RMSEA = 0.061 (LL 0.057; UL 0.065); SRMR = 0.062;  $\chi^2/df = 3.781$  (1119.302/296); TLI = 0.93; CFI = 0.94; AGFI = 0.87. The Normed-Chi-Square statistic slightly above the threshold value ( $\chi^2/df = 3.781$ ) may, however, be neglected due to the relatively large sample size (Hair et al. 2010).

1  
2  
3 Moreover, the measurement model shows satisfactory measurement results (Table 7).  
4  
5 First, the values for Composite Reliabilities (CR) approve the model and CR values rank well  
6  
7 above the recommended threshold amounting at 0.7. Estimated regression weights (factor  
8  
9 loadings) are relatively high and significant. Particularly, all t-values are above 1.96 varying  
10  
11 from 14.177 to 48.278; all standardized loadings are greater than 0.50 (varying between  
12  
13 0.541 and 0.961), whilst most of the standardized loadings exceed 0.7. Squared Multiple  
14  
15 Correlations (SMC) demonstrate respectable portions. Average Variance Extracted (AVE)  
16  
17 ranks well above the recommended threshold value amounting at 0.5. Convergent Validity of  
18  
19 the construct measurement is confirmed as indicators of latent construct are sharing a  
20  
21 relatively high proportion of common variance (Hair et al. 2010). Additionally, the  
22  
23 standardized loadings for the DRES second-order construct are all statistically significant and  
24  
25 vary from 0.70 to 0.91. SMC values vary from 0.49 to 0.82, construct reliability is at the level  
26  
27 of 0.86 and the AVE value amounts to 0.62.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 7 HERE\*\*\*  
35  
36  
37

38 Table 8 shows the result of Discriminant Validity evaluation which is fully confirmed  
39  
40 for all proposed model constructs. Thus, the results of the CFA are satisfactory as both  
41  
42 Convergent and Discriminant Validity are confirmed (Hair et al. 2010). As the next step, the  
43  
44 validated measurement model is transformed into a structural model (Figure 4).  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 \*\*\*INSERT TABLE 8 HERE\*\*\*  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Figure 4.** Standardized path estimates for the revised CBDDBE Structural Model (Replicated study)

AW – awareness; DRES – destination resources; SKI – tangible resources/skiing; SER – tangible resources/service; INT – intangible destination resources; SOC – social destination resources; VIU – value-in-use/emotional value; VFM – value-for-money; LOY - loyalty

Goodness-of fit statistics for the path model are all satisfactory (GFI = 0.874; RMSEA = 0.066 (LL 0.063; UL 0.070); SRMR = 0.076;  $\chi^2/df = 4.291$  (1351.587/315); TLI = 0.92; CFI = 0.93; AGFI = 0.85). The AVE value for the DRES construct amounts at 0.60 (Hair et al. 2010). All hypothesized relationships between model constructs are statistically significant (Table 9). The hierarchical structure of the CBDDBE model has been

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

repeatedly confirmed, thus, demonstrating high reliability and empirical robustness of the proposed destination brand equity modelling approach (Hair et al. 2010).

\*\*\*INSERT TABLE 9 HERE\*\*\*

For Peer Review

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research contributes to the development of knowledge on transferring the concept of customer-based brand equity to a tourism destination context (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al. 2010). The proposed CBDBE model was repeatedly tested for the leading Swedish ski destination Åre with data from international tourists visiting Åre (winter season 2009/2010) and a second sample consisting of domestic and international tourists (winter season 2012/2013). Results from a repeated test confirmed the hierarchical structure and demonstrated reliability and empirical robustness of the proposed CBDBE model. The explanation power of the CBDBE model is high and Squared Multiple Correlations (SMC) for destination value-in-use and loyalty exceed the value of 0.50 for both tourist samples. Similarly, the chain of causal relationships between customers' perception of destination resources, value-in-use and destination loyalty is strong and significant across both samples.

Findings are in line with previous research (Konecnik and Gartner 2007; Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al. 2010) and confirm the multidimensional nature of the tourism destination brand equity model which integrates the concepts of destination brand awareness, attribute-based perception of image and quality of tourism destinations, value-for-money and destination loyalty as isolated CBDBE model constructs.

Examination of the hypothesized relational structure within the CBDBE model confirmed previous findings regarding relationships between destination awareness and tourists' perception of tangible, intangible and social destination resources (Pike et al. 2010; Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010; Kladou and Kehagias 2014). However, this relationship is consistently weak and its contribution towards explaining tourists' perception of destination resources is only minor. Moreover, this study repeatedly confirms the significant, strong and positive relationship between tourists' perception of destination resources and destination value-in-

1  
2  
3 use. This finding is in line with prior studies' results demonstrating the positive influence of  
4  
5 attribute-based destination image and quality on tourists' perception of desired destination  
6  
7 benefits (Chi and Qu 2008; Chen and Tsai 2007; Klenosky 2002; Pike et al. 2010; Yoon and  
8  
9 Uysal 2005; Zabkar et al. 2010). Similarly, the relationship between customers' perception of  
10  
11 destination resources and value-for-money is significant, strong and in line with the  
12  
13 traditional conceptualization of consumer value as the interplay between consumers' benefits  
14  
15 and sacrifices (Zeithaml 1988).

16  
17  
18 The confirmation of the hypothesis that destination value-in-use is a direct antecedent of  
19  
20 destination loyalty is, indeed, an important finding which has not been previously discussed  
21  
22 in the literature. Nevertheless, the result is in line with studies demonstrating that overall  
23  
24 judgements of destination performance and the consistency of destination image with the  
25  
26 tourist's own image positively influence destination brand loyalty (Boo et al. 2009; Im et al.  
27  
28 2012; Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Pike et al. 2010).

29  
30  
31 Finally, the study confirms the relationship between value-for-money and destination  
32  
33 loyalty (Chen and Tsai 2007). However, the relationship is comparatively weak, thereby,  
34  
35 indicating that under certain circumstances, the evaluation of sacrifice is only a minor factor  
36  
37 in the process of destination loyalty formation.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **Theoretical implications**

44  
45 This study corroborates the assumption that the integration of the value-co-creation  
46  
47 perspective into the destination brand equity framework provides an adequate extension to  
48  
49 better understand the relationship-building process between tourists and destination brands by  
50  
51 taking into consideration the complex and multidimensional nature of destinations as well as  
52  
53 the heterogeneous consumption patterns of tourist segments (Moeller 2010). As the main  
54  
55 theoretical contribution of this study, the inner core of the CBDDBE model has been  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 conceptualized as the “perceived destination promise” depicting customers’ evaluation of the  
4  
5 service process comprising the resources offered by the destination and the transformation of  
6  
7 these resources into customers’ value-in-use (Vargo and Lusch 2008). Hence, this study  
8  
9 introduced value-in-use as a new isolated CBDBE dimension.  
10

11 This study emphasizes the need to understand the destination-specific and customer (i.e.  
12  
13 segment) specific benefits of destination visitation by considering the unique, experiential  
14  
15 and contextually dependent nature of value-in-use (Vargo and Lusch 2008). Most  
16  
17 importantly, the findings support the co-creation logic behind the destination value promise  
18  
19 to provide destination resources and to transform them into emotional values for tourists  
20  
21 (Moeller 2010; Sheth et al. 1991). Therefore, findings also corroborate the conceptual  
22  
23 distinction between value-in-use and value-in-exchange (Vargo and Lusch 2004, 2008).  
24  
25  
26

27 Moreover, study findings bring up the discussion about the role destination awareness  
28  
29 plays in the brand equity formation process, particularly in situations where tourists have  
30  
31 already visited the destination (Milman and Pizam 1995). As Gartner and Konecnik Ruzzier  
32  
33 (2011) reveal, the awareness dimension is more important for the renewal market compared  
34  
35 to the repeat market. Therefore, the focus on customers which already visited the destination  
36  
37 clarifies the rather low explanation power of the awareness construct in our study.  
38  
39

40 Similarly, the significant but weak relationship between value-for-money and destination  
41  
42 loyalty is in line with the concept of the zone-of-tolerance (Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman  
43  
44 1996). This implies the existence of critical levels of sacrifices which may influence tourists’  
45  
46 behavior in case of a negative or positive service perception.  
47  
48

49 This study solely integrates monetary sacrifices (value-for-money). However, as  
50  
51 emphasized by Fuchs (2004) and Moeller (2010), there exist additional types of tourists’  
52  
53 sacrifices, such as time required for travelling to the destination and physical efforts which  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 should be integrated in future CBDBE models following the logic of the value-co-creation as  
4  
5 highlighted in this study.  
6

7 To conclude, although the presented study empirically confirms the overall hierarchical  
8  
9 structure of the proposed CBDBE model, the inner composition of the core model dimension  
10  
11 “perceived destination promise” and its measurement remains a challenging task for future  
12  
13 research, as it requires a better understanding of destination-specific consumption patterns  
14  
15 across various tourism segments. Therefore, further empirical examination is required to  
16  
17 validate the complex nature of CBDBE constructs as well as theoretically grounded  
18  
19 relationships between these constructs.  
20  
21

### 22 23 24 25 **Managerial implications**

26  
27 The proposed CBDBE model rests upon a resource-based view of marketing strategy  
28  
29 (Fuchs 2004; Palmer 2010; Zabkar et al. 2010; Moeller 2010). This implies that for the most  
30  
31 effective destination management, knowledge on the co-creative nature of unique destination  
32  
33 experiences made by various customer segments is of utmost importance (Ek et al. 2008;  
34  
35 Moeller 2010). By tracking awareness, tourists’ perceptions of tangible, intangible and social  
36  
37 destination resources for various customer segments, value-in-use of destination stay, value-  
38  
39 for-money and attitude-based loyalty, the brand equity model can be successfully utilized as a  
40  
41 tool for brand monitoring, diagnostics and the implementation of effective brand  
42  
43 development strategies.  
44  
45

46  
47 As a managerial tool, the brand equity model proposed and validated in this paper clearly  
48  
49 separates between value-in-use and value-for-money as drivers behind customer loyalty. This  
50  
51 study finds that value-in-use affects loyalty to a larger extent than value-for-money.  
52  
53 Managers cannot directly control value-in-use and value-for-money, which represent the  
54  
55 customer’s perception of the benefits and sacrifices of a destination stay. However, the study  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 exemplifies the complexity of destination consumption by tourists and shows the  
4  
5 transformation process of tangible, intangible and social resources into value-in-use and  
6  
7 value-for-money, which now can be better understood and controlled. It enables destination  
8  
9 managers to effectively implement brand development strategies by formulating segment-  
10  
11 specific value propositions, which include respective destination resources relevant for  
12  
13 customers' expected value outcomes of a destination stay (Vargo and Lusch 2008). By doing  
14  
15 so, managers can effectively build customer loyalty. For instance, for winter tourists of the  
16  
17 Swedish mountain destination Åre, skiing, service quality, intangible destination resources,  
18  
19 such as family-friendliness, tidiness and safety and interaction with other tourists, serve as the  
20  
21 main resource inputs to the generation of emotional value for a destination stay. The study  
22  
23 also showed the importance of key emotional value dimensions, such as fun, thrill and  
24  
25 variety. Thus, the amplifying relationship between resources and value-in-use will be  
26  
27 communicated through the destination brand.  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 Managerial relevance of the proposed customer-based brand equity goes beyond brand  
33  
34 communication development, as it also provides opportunities for discovering promising  
35  
36 innovation potentials. Insights obtained by applying the CBDDBE model in an empirical  
37  
38 context translate into a valuable source of customer-based knowledge and, therefore,  
39  
40 represent an important element of organizational learning and innovation in tourism  
41  
42 destinations (Fuchs, Höpken, and Lexhagen 2014).  
43  
44

45  
46 The proposed CBDDBE model enables destination managers to measure customers' brand  
47  
48 perceptions on different stages of the brand value co-creation process and, ultimately, the  
49  
50 measurement of the value of the destination brand. Particularly, the model integrates  
51  
52 customers' evaluation of various brand messages associated with the destination brand.  
53  
54 However, beyond brand messages controlled by the destination management (e.g. promotion  
55  
56 campaigns, online and offline destination information provided by the destination  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 management organization, tourism firms operating at the destination, as well as travel  
4  
5 agencies), there are uncontrolled and unplanned brand messages, such as information in  
6  
7 “various media channels (TV, magazines and newspapers), social media (e.g. online  
8  
9 communities and customers’ review websites, such as TripAdvisor) and word-of-mouth from  
10  
11 family members, friends and acquaintances.  
12

13  
14 Furthermore, destination managers and marketers can evaluate the brand’s ability to  
15  
16 promise value to customers and to facilitate this value by guiding tourists on how to assemble  
17  
18 (configure), use, and interpret destination resources during their destination stay. Hence, the  
19  
20 model provides managers with a tool to evaluate the individual contribution of destination  
21  
22 stakeholders (e.g. hotels, restaurants, activity providers etc.) in creating the total destination  
23  
24 experience of tourists’ visitation.  
25  
26

27  
28 The proposed CBDDBE model enables the evaluation of the destination brand’s ability to  
29  
30 encourage existing and potential customers to establish and maintain stable and mutually  
31  
32 beneficial relationships with the destination brand and to identify the nature, strength and  
33  
34 stability of these relationships. However, a current brand equity evaluation reflects both the  
35  
36 past and the future of the brand, and, is thus, only the first step in the long-term process of  
37  
38 (destination) brand value creation (Keller and Lehmann 2009). Hence, a longitudinal  
39  
40 measurement of destination brand performance should be considered in a managerial context.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

#### 46 **Limitations and future research**

47  
48 For the study at hand, the following limitations were identified. Notably, alternative  
49  
50 aspects of customers’ benefits, such as social value, remained outside the model. Another  
51  
52 limitation arises from testing the model only for actual visitors. Moreover, operationalization  
53  
54 of destination brand awareness needs improvement, as there is a need to properly  
55  
56 conceptualize the construct of destination awareness relevant to both, repeat, new and  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 potential customers, respectively. Although not yet intensively discussed in the literature  
4  
5 (Konecnik and Gartner 2007) but supported by the findings of this study, the CBDBE  
6  
7 dimension “awareness” can be assumed to be relatively more important for a destination at  
8  
9 the national level (i.e., country’s tourism brand). By contrast, for local or regional destination  
10  
11 brands, functional characteristics become more critical.  
12

13  
14 Analysis of discriminant validity suggests the need to further strengthen the destination  
15  
16 loyalty construct operationalization. For future research, we propose to further develop the  
17  
18 theoretical conceptualization of destination brand loyalty as the endogenous CBDBE model  
19  
20 construct. In particular the construct should combine items reflecting both the degree of  
21  
22 cognitive and affective attachment to the brand, future purchase intentions and the extent of  
23  
24 using the brand when communicating to other customers, searching for information and  
25  
26 responding to promotion activities (Back and Parks 2003; Oliver 1999; Keller 2008).  
27  
28

29  
30 Further limitations refer to the issues of study design and data collection and, specifically,  
31  
32 a relatively high number of missing values. The high share of missing values, however, is not  
33  
34 merely a measurement problem, but rather illustrates the complexity of the consumption  
35  
36 process across different tourism segments. Interestingly, only few resources are commonly  
37  
38 utilized, thus, experienced by customers. This observation is in line with the nature of both  
39  
40 value-in-use (Vargo and Lusch 2004; Grönroos 2008) and the service co-creation process  
41  
42 (Moeller 2010). Nevertheless, additional exploration of survey data is necessary to identify  
43  
44 valuable customer segments based on consumption patterns during destination stay (Park and  
45  
46 Almeida Santos 2016).  
47  
48

49  
50 To increase the generalizability of the findings for (mountain) destinations, we propose to  
51  
52 re-test the model for different seasonal products and validate the model for different markets  
53  
54 (a priori segments) in terms of country of origin, age groups and travel group composition as  
55  
56 well as for customer segments based on homogeneous destination activity patterns (a-  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 posteriori segments). Furthermore, we recommend to test the CBDDBE model for other  
4  
5 destinations, including destinations at higher geographical aggregate levels (e.g. provinces or  
6  
7 countries).  
8

9  
10 Future research should also consider the time dimension in CBDDBE modelling, as the  
11  
12 hierarchy of the CBDDBE model dimensions inherently reflects stages of relationship  
13  
14 development between tourists and destination brands (Keller 2009; Park and Almeida Santos  
15  
16 2016). Finally, ethical aspects of brand relationship building were left beyond the scope of  
17  
18 this study. However, ethical aspects are embedded within the value-co-creation paradigm  
19  
20 (Vargo and Lusch 2008). As discussed by Williams and Aitken (2011), value-co-creation  
21  
22 implies mutual dependency and reciprocal exchange, thus, it is the result of differences in  
23  
24 goals and desires of economic actors. Goals and desires, vary because actors have different  
25  
26 access to resources and different values and judgments about what is 'good' and 'bad'. In  
27  
28 contemporary digital societies characterized by a heavy use of social media, failure to make  
29  
30 ethically sound decisions spread globally in near-real time and have immediate impact on  
31  
32 brand value. Thus, global connectedness implies that target audiences for marketing  
33  
34 communications have expanded far beyond the traditional set of potential customers. Indeed,  
35  
36 everyone has the power to amplify or weaken the value of a (destination) brand in accordance  
37  
38 to the coherence of brand-related messages.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## REFERENCES

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Aaker, D. A. 1991. *Managing brand equity*. New York: The Free Press.
- 8  
9  
10 Aaker, D. A. 1996. *Building strong brands*. New York: The Free Press.
- 11  
12 Arnould, E. J., L. L. Price, and P. Tierney. 1998. "Communicative Staging of the Wilderness  
13  
14 Servicescape. *The Service Industries Journal* 18 (3): 90-115.  
15  
16 doi:10.1080/02642069800000034.
- 17  
18 Back, K. J., and S. C. Parks. 2003. "A Brand Loyalty Model involving cognitive, affective  
19  
20 and conative Brand loyalty and customer satisfaction". *Journal of Hospitality and*  
21  
22 *Tourism Research* 27 (4): 419-435. doi:10.1177/10963480030274003.
- 23  
24 Baker, D., and J. Crompton. 2000. "Quality, Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions". *Annals*  
25  
26 *of Tourism Research* 27: 785-804. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5.
- 27  
28  
29 Baloglu, S. 2001. "Image variations of Turkey by familiarity index: informational and  
30  
31 experiential dimensions". *Tourism Management* 22: 127-133. doi:10.1016/S0261-  
32  
33 5177(00)00049-2.
- 34  
35  
36 Baloglu, S., and K. W. McCleary. 1999. "A model of destination image formation". *Annals of*  
37  
38 *Tourism Research* 26 (4): 868-897. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00030-4.
- 39  
40  
41 Baron, S., and K. Harris. 2010. "Toward and understanding of consumer perspective on  
42  
43 experiences". *Journal of Services Marketing* 24 (7): 518-531.  
44  
45  
46 doi:10.1108/08876041011081078.
- 47  
48 Beerli, A., and J. D. Martin. 2004. "Factors influencing destination image". *Annals of*  
49  
50 *Tourism Research* 31 (3): 657-681. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.01.010.
- 51  
52 Beritelli, P., T. Bieger, and C. Laesser. 2014. "The New Frontiers of Destination  
53  
54 Management: Applying Variable Geometry as a Function-Based Approach". *Journal of*  
55  
56 *Travel Research* 53 (4): 403-417. doi:10.1177/0047287513506298.
- 57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Berry, L. L. 2000. "Cultivating Service Brand Equity". *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*  
4  
5 *Science* 28 (1): 128-137. doi:10.1177/0092070300281012.  
6  
7 Bianchi, C., S. Pike, and I. Ling. 2014. "Investigating attitudes towards three South American  
8  
9 destinations in an emerging long haul market using a model of consumer-based brand  
10  
11 equity (CBBE)". *Tourism Management* 42: 215-223. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2013.11.014.  
12  
13 Blain, C., S. E. Levy, and J. R. B. Ritchie. 2005. "Destination branding: insights and practices  
14  
15 from destination management organizations". *Journal of Travel Research* 43: 328-338.  
16  
17 doi:10.1177/0047287505274646.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Boo, S., J. Busser, and S. Baloglu. 2009. "A model of customer-based brand equity and its  
22  
23 application to multiple destinations". *Tourism Management* 30 (2): 219-231.  
24  
25 doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.06.003.  
26  
27  
28 Brown, T.A. 2006. *Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research*. New York, London:  
29  
30 The Guilford Press.  
31  
32 Buhalis, D. 2000. "Marketing the competitive destination of the future". *Tourism*  
33  
34 *Management* 21: 97-116. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00095-3.  
35  
36  
37 Chen, C. F., and D. Tsai. 2007. "How destination image and evaluative factors affect  
38  
39 behavioral intentions?" *Tourism Management* 28 (4): 1115-1122.  
40  
41 doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2006.07.007.  
42  
43  
44 Chen, C.-F., and O. Myagmarsuren. 2010. "Exploring relationships between Mongolian  
45  
46 destination brand equity, satisfaction and destination loyalty". *Tourism Economics*  
47  
48 16 (4): 981-994. doi:10.5367/te.2010.0004.  
49  
50  
51 Chi, C. G. Q., and H. L. Qu. 2008. "Examining the structural relationships of destination  
52  
53 image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach". *Tourism*  
54  
55 *Management* 29 (4): 624-636. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.007.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Christodoulides, G., and L. de Chernatony. 2010. "Consumer-based brand equity  
4 conceptualisation and measurement. A literature review". *International Journal of*  
5 *Market Research* 52 (1): 43-66. doi:10.2501/S1470785310201053.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method*  
11 *Approaches*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.  
12  
13  
14 Crompton, J. L. 1979. "Motivations for pleasure vacation". *Annals of Tourism Research* 6  
15 (4): 408-424. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(79)90004-5.  
16  
17  
18 Davcik, N. S., R. V. da Silva, and Hair, J.F. 2015. "Towards a unified theory of brand equity:  
19 conceptualizations, taxonomy and avenues for future research". *Journal of Product and*  
20 *Brand Management* 24 (1): 3-17. doi:10.1108/JPBM-06-2014-0639.  
21  
22  
23 Davis, R., I. Piven, and M. Breazeale. 2014. "Conceptualizing the brand in social media  
24 community: the five source model". *Journal of Retailing and consumer services* 21 (4):  
25 468-481. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.03.006.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 de Chernatony, L., and M. McDonald. 2003. *Creating Powerful Brands in Consumer, Service*  
32 *and Industrial Markets*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.  
33  
34  
35 de Chernatony, L., F. J. Harris, and G. Christodoulides. 2004. "Developing a brand  
36 performance measure for financial services brands". *Services Industries Journal* 24 (2):  
37 15-33. doi:10.1080/02642060412331301232.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Debbage, K.G., and P. Daniels. 1998. "The tourist industry and economic geography: missed  
43 opportunities". In *The economic geography of the tourist industry*, edited by D.  
44 Ioannides and K. F. Debbage, 17-30. London and New York: Routledge.  
45  
46  
47  
48 del Bosque, I. R., and H. S. Martin. 2008. "Tourist Satisfaction - A Cognitive-Affective  
49 Model". *Annals of Tourism Research* 35 (2): 551-573. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2008.02.006.  
50  
51  
52  
53 Echtner, C. M., and J. R. B. Ritchie. 1991. "The Meaning and Measurement of Destination  
54 Image". *The Journal of Tourism Studies* 2 (2): 2-12.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Echtner, C. M., and J. R. B. Ritchie. 1993. "The Measurement of Destination Image: An  
4  
5 Empirical Assessment". *Journal of Travel Research* 31 (Spring): 3–13.  
6  
7 doi:10.1177/004728759303100402.  
8  
9  
10 Ek, R., J. Larsen, S. B. Hornskov, and O. K. Mansfeldt. 2008. "A Dynamic Framework of  
11  
12 Tourist Experiences: Space-Time and Performances in the Experience Economy".  
13  
14 *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 8 (2): 122-140.  
15  
16 doi:10.1080/15022250802110091.  
17  
18  
19 Ekinci, Y., and M. Riley. 2001. "Validating Quality Dimensions". *Annals of Tourism*  
20  
21 *Research* 28: 202–223. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00029-3.  
22  
23 Evangelista, F., and L. A. N. Dioko. 2011. "Interpersonal influence and destination brand  
24  
25 equity perceptions". *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*  
26  
27 5 (3): 316-328. doi:10.1108/17506181111157005  
28  
29  
30 Faullant, R., K. Matzler, and J. Füller. 2008. „The Impact of Satisfaction and Image on  
31  
32 Loyalty. The Case of Alpine Ski Resorts". *Managing Service Quality* 18 (2): 163-178.  
33  
34 doi:10.1108/09604520810859210.  
35  
36  
37 Ferns, B. H., and A. Walls. 2012. „Enduring travel involvement, destination brand equity,  
38  
39 and travellers' visit intentions: A structural model analysis". *Journal of Destination*  
40  
41 *Marketing and Management* 1: 27-35. doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2012.07.002.  
42  
43  
44 Field, A. 2005. *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: SAGE Publications.  
45  
46 Fuchs, M. 2002. "Benchmarking indicator systems and their potential for tracking guest  
47  
48 satisfaction". *Tourism - An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 50 (2): 141-155.  
49  
50 Fuchs, M. 2004. "Strategy development in tourism destinations: A data envelopment  
51  
52 analysis approach". *Poznan University Economics Review* 4 (1): 52-73.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fuchs, M., W. Höpken, and M. Lexhagen. 2014. "Big Data Analytics for Knowledge  
4  
5 Generation in Tourism Destinations – A Case from Sweden". *Journal of Destination*  
6  
7 *Marketing and Management* 3 (4): 198-209. doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2014.08.002.  
8  
9  
10 Gallarza, M. G., I. G. Saura, and H. C. Garcia. 2002. "Destination image - Towards a  
11  
12 conceptual framework". *Annals of Tourism Research* 29 (1): 56-78. doi:10.1016/S0160-  
13  
14 7383(01)00031-7.  
15  
16 Garcia, J. A., M. Gómez, and A. Molina. 2012. "A destination-branding model: An empirical  
17  
18 analysis based on stakeholders". *Tourism Management* 33: 646-661.  
19  
20 doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.07.006.  
21  
22  
23 Gartner, W. C. 2009. "Deconstructing brand equity". *Tourism Branding: Communities in*  
24  
25 *Action. Bridging Tourism Theory and Practice* 1: 51-63.  
26  
27  
28 Gartner, W. C., and M. Konecnik Ruzzier. 2011. "Tourism Destination Brand Equity  
29  
30 Dimensions: Renewal versus Repeat Market". *Journal of Travel Research* 50 (5): 471-  
31  
32 481. doi:10.1177/0047287510379157.  
33  
34  
35 Gnoth, J. 2007. "The structure of destination brands: leveraging values". *Tourism Analysis*  
36  
37 12 (5/6): 345–358. doi:10.3727/108354207783227939.  
38  
39  
40 Goodall, B., and G. Ashworth., eds. 1988. *Marketing in the tourism industry: The promotion*  
41  
42 *of destination regions*. London: Groom Helms.  
43  
44  
45 Grönroos, C. 2000. *Service Management and Marketing. A customer relationship*  
46  
47 *management approach*. 2nd edition. Chichester: Wiley.  
48  
49  
50 Grönroos, C. 2006. "Adopting a Service Logic for Marketing". *Marketing Theory* 6 (3): 317-  
51  
52 333. doi:10.1177/1470593106066794.  
53  
54  
55 Grönroos, C. 2008. "Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates?"  
56  
57 *European Business Review* 20 (4): 298-314. doi:10.1108/09555340810886585.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Grönroos, C. 2009. "Marketing as promise management: regaining customer management for  
4 marketing". *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 24/5/6: 351-359.  
5  
6 doi:10.1108/08858620910966237.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Hair, J. F. Jr., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson. 2010. *Multivariate Data*  
11 *Analysis. A Global Perspective*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.  
12  
13  
14 Holbrook, M. B. 2006. "Consumption experience, customer value, and subjective personal  
15 introspection: An illustrative photographic essay". *Journal of Business Research* 59:  
16 714-725. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.01.008  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Horng, J.-S., C.-H. Liu, H.-Y. Chou, and C.-Y. Tsai. 2012. "Understanding the impact of  
22 culinary brand equity and destination familiarity on travel intentions". *Tourism*  
23 *Management* 33: 815-824. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.09.004.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Hudson, S., and G. W. H. Shephard. 1998. "Measuring Service Quality at Tourist  
29 Destinations: An Application of Importance-Performance Analysis to an Alpine Ski  
30 Resort". *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 7 (3): 61-77.  
31  
32 doi:10.1300/J073v07n03\_04.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 Hunter, J. E., and F. L. Schmidt. 1990. *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias*  
38 *in research findings*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.  
39  
40  
41 Im, H. H., S. S. Kim, S. Elliot, and H. Han. 2012. "Conceptualizing Destination Brand Equity  
42 Dimensions from a Consumer-Based Brand Equity Perspective". *Journal of Travel and*  
43 *Tourism Marketing* 29 (4): 385-403. doi:10.1080/10548408.2012.674884.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Jung, Y. N., S. Kim, and S. Kim. 2014. "Influence of consumer attitude toward online brand  
49 community on revisit intention and brand trust". *Journal of retailing and consumer*  
50 *services* 21 (4): 581-589. doi:10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.04.002.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Keller, K. L. 1993. "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand  
56 equity". *Journal of Marketing* 57: 1-22. doi:10.2307/1252054.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Keller, K. L. 2008. *Strategic Brand Management Building, Measuring and Managing Brand*  
4  
5 *Equity*. 3rd ed. Ney Jersey: Pearson Education.  
6  
7 Keller, K. L. 2009. "Building strong brands in a modern marketing communications  
8  
9 environment". *Journal of Marketing Communications* 15 (2-3): 139-155.  
10  
11 doi:10.1080/13527260902757530.  
12  
13 Keller, K. L., and D. R. Lehmann. 2009. "Assessing long-term brand potential". *Brand*  
14  
15 *Management* 17 (1): 6-17. doi:10.1057/bm.2009.11.  
16  
17 Kim, S.-H., H.-S. Han, S. Holland, and K. K. Byon. 2009. "Structural relationships among  
18  
19 involvement, destination brand equity, satisfaction and destination visit intentions: The  
20  
21 case of Japanese outbound travelers". *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 15 (4): 349-365.  
22  
23 doi:10.1177/1356766709335835.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Kladou, S., and J. Kehagias . 2014. "Assessing destination brand equity: An integrated  
28  
29 approach". *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management* 3: 2-10.  
30  
31 doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2013.11.002  
32  
33  
34 Klenoski, D. B., C. E. Gengler, and M. S. Mulvey. 1993. "Understanding the Factors  
35  
36 Influencing Ski Destination Choice: A Means-End Analytic Approach". *Journal of*  
37  
38 *Leisure Research* 25 (4): 362-379.  
39  
40  
41 Klenosky, D. B. 2002. "The "Pull" of Tourism Destinations: A Means-End Investigation".  
42  
43 *Journal of Travel Research* 40 (4): 385-396. doi:10.1177/004728750204000405.  
44  
45  
46 Komppula, R. 2005. "Pursuing Customer Value in Tourism – A Rural Tourism Case-Study".  
47  
48 *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 3 (2): 83-104.  
49  
50 Komppula, R., and T. Laukkanen. 2009. "Ski Destination Profile Based on Attributes of Ski  
51  
52 Destination Choice". In *3rd International Conference on Destination Branding and*  
53  
54 *Marketing*, Macau, December 2-4, edited by L. Dioko and Li Xiang, 238-249.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Konecnik, M., and W. C. Gartner. 2007. "Customer-based Brand Equity for a Destination".  
4  
5 *Annals of Tourism Research* 34 (2): 400-421. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2006.10.005.  
6  
7  
8 Larsen, S. 2007. "Aspects of a Psychology of the Tourist Experience". *Scandinavian Journal*  
9  
10 *of Hospitality and Tourism* 7 (1): 7-18. doi:10.1080/15022250701226014.  
11  
12 Lassar, W., B. Mittal, and A. Sharma. 1995. "Measuring customer-based brand equity".  
13  
14 *Journal of Consumer Marketing* 12 (4): 11-19. doi:10.1108/07363769510095270.  
15  
16 Lehmann, D. R., K. L. Keller, and J. U. Farley. 2008. "The Structure of Survey-Based Brand  
17  
18 Metrics". *Journal of International Marketing* 16 (4): 29-56. doi:10.1509/jimk.16.4.29.  
19  
20 Li, X., and J. F. Petrick. 2008. "Tourism Marketing in an Era of Paradigm Shift". *Journal of*  
21  
22 *Travel Research* 46 (February): 235-244. doi:10.1177/0047287507303976.  
23  
24  
25 Lusch, R. F., S. L. Vargo, M. Tanniru. 2010. "Service, value networks and learning". *Journal*  
26  
27 *of the Academy of Marketing Science* 38: 19-31. doi:10.1007/s11747-008-0131-z.  
28  
29  
30 Mazanec, J. 1994. "Image Measurement with Self-Organizing Maps: A Tentative Application  
31  
32 to Austrian Tour Operators". *Revue du Tourisme* 49 (3): 9-18. doi:10.1108/eb058159.  
33  
34  
35 Milman, A., and A. Pizam. 1995. "The Role of Awareness and Familiarity with a  
36  
37 Destination: The Central Florida Case". *Journal of Travel Research* 33 (3): 21-27.  
38  
39 doi:10.1177/004728759503300304.  
40  
41  
42 Moeller, S. 2010. "Characteristics of services – a new approach uncovers their value".  
43  
44 *Journal of services Marketing* 24/5: 359-368. doi:10.1108/08876041011060468.  
45  
46  
47 Mossberg, L. 2007. "A Marketing Approach to the Tourist Experience". *Scandinavian*  
48  
49 *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 7 (1): 59-74. doi:10.1080/15022250701231915.  
50  
51  
52 Murphy, P.E. 1985. *Tourism: A Community Approach*. London: Methuen.  
53  
54  
55 Murphy, P., M. P. Pritchard, and B. Smith. 2000. "The destination product and its impact on  
56  
57 traveler perceptions". *Tourism Management* 21: 43-52. doi:10.1016/S0261-  
58  
59 5177(99)00080-1.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Nunkoo, R., H. Ramkissoon, and Gursoy, D. 2013. "Use of Structural Equation Modeling in  
4  
5 Tourism Research: Past, Present, and Future". *Journal of Travel Research* 52 (6): 759-  
6  
7 771. doi:10.1177/0047287513478503.  
8
- 9  
10 Oliver, R. L. 1999. "Whence Consumer Loyalty?" *The Journal of Marketing* 63 (Special  
11  
12 Issue): 33-44. doi:10.2307/1252099.  
13
- 14 Palmer, A. 2010. "Customer experience management: a critical review of an emerging idea".  
15  
16 *Journal of Services Marketing* 24/3: 196-208. doi:10.1108/08876041011040604.  
17
- 18 Parasuraman, A., V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry. 1985. "A Conceptual Model of Service  
19  
20 Quality and Its Implications for Future Research". *Journal of Marketing* 49 (Fall): 41-50.  
21  
22 doi:10.2307/1251430  
23
- 24 Parasuraman, A., V. A., Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry. 1988. "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-item  
25  
26 Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality". *Journal of Retailing*  
27  
28 64 (Spring): 12-37.  
29
- 30 Park, S., and C. Almeida Santos. 2016. "Exploring the Tourist Experience: A Sequential  
31  
32 Approach". *Journal of Travel Research*. Published online January 3.  
33  
34 doi:10.1177/0047287515624017  
35
- 36 Pettersson, R., and D. Getz. 2009. Event Experiences in Time and Space: A Study of Visitors  
37  
38 to the (2007) World Alpine Ski Championships in Åre, Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
39  
40 *Hospitality and Tourism* 9 (2-3): 308-326. doi:10.1080/15022250903119504.  
41  
42
- 43 Pike, S. 2005. "Tourism destination branding complexity". *Journal of Product and Brand*  
44  
45 *Management* 14 (4): 258-259. doi:10.1108/10610420510609267.  
46  
47
- 48 Pike, S. 2009. "Destination Brand Positions of a Competitive Set of Near-Home  
49  
50 Destinations". *Tourism Management* 30 (6): 857-866.  
51  
52 doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.007.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Pike, S., C. Bianchi, G. Kerr, and C. Patti. 2010. "Consumer-based brand equity for Australia  
4 as a long-haul tourism destination in an emerging market". *International Marketing*  
5 *Review* 27 (4): 434-449. doi:10.1108/02651331011058590.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Reisinger, Y., and L. Turner. 1999. "Structural Equation Modelling with LISREL:  
11 Application in Tourism". *Tourism Management* 20 (2): 71-88. doi:10.1016/S0261-  
12 5177(98)00104-6.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Round, G., and S. Roper. 2015. "Untangling the brand name from the branded entity".  
17 *European Journal of Marketing* 49 (11/12): 1941-1960. doi:10.1108/EJM-09-2014-0541.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Sheth, J. N., B. I. Newman, and B. L. Gross. 1991. "Why We Buy What We Buy: A Theory  
22 of Consumption Values". *Journal of Business Research* 22: 159-170. doi:10.1016/0148-  
23 2963(91)90050-8.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M., and H. Baumgartner. 2000. "On the Use of Structural Equation  
28 Models for Marketing Modelling". *International Journal of Research in Marketing*  
29 17 (2): 195-202. doi:10.1016/S0167-8116(00)00016-1.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Vargo, S. L. 2009. "Toward a transcending conceptualization of relationship: a service-  
35 dominant logic perspective". *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 24/5/6, 373-  
36 379. doi:10.1108/08858620910966255.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Vargo, S. L., and R. F. Lusch. 2004. "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing".  
41 *Journal of Marketing* 68: 1-17. doi:10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Vargo, S. L., and R. F. Lusch. 2008. "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution".  
46 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36: 1-10. doi:10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Weiermair, K., and M. Fuchs. 1999. "Measuring tourist judgments on service quality".  
51 *Annals of Tourism Research* 26 (4): 1004-1021. doi:10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00037-7.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Williams, J., and R. Aitken. 2011. "The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing and  
4  
5 Marketing Ethics". *Journal of Business Ethics* 102: 439-454. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-  
6  
7 0823-z.  
8
- 9  
10 Woodruff, R. B. 1997. "Customer Value: The Next Source for Competitive Advantage".  
11  
12 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing science* 25 (2): 139-153. doi:10.1007/BF02894350.  
13
- 14 Yoon, Y., and M. Uysal. 2005. "An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction  
15  
16 on destination loyalty: a structural model". *Tourism Management* 26 (1): 45-56.  
17  
18 doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016.  
19
- 20  
21 Zabkar, V., M. M. Brencic, and T. Dmitrovic. 2010. "Modelling perceived quality, visitor  
22  
23 satisfaction and behavioral intentions at the destination level". *Tourism Management* 31:  
24  
25 537-546. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.005.  
26
- 27  
28 Zeithaml, V. A. 1988. "Consumer Perceptions of Price, Quality, and Value: A Means-End  
29  
30 Model and synthesis of Evidence". *The Journal of Marketing* 52 (3): 2-22.  
31  
32 doi:10.2307/1251446.  
33
- 34  
35 Zeithaml, V. A., L. L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman. 1996. "The Behavioral Consequences of  
36  
37 Service Quality". *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (2): 31-46. doi:10.2307/1251929.  
38
- 39  
40 Zeithaml, V., and M. J. Bitner. 2000. *Service marketing: Integrating customer focus across*  
41  
42 *the firm*. 2nd ed. New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



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

**Table 1.** Comparison of CBBE measurement models in previous tourism destination studies

Previous Study	Brand Building Blocks			
	I. Brand Salience (Identity)	II. Performance and Imagery (Meaning)	III. Judgments and Feelings (Response)	IV. Brand Resonance (Relationships)
Bianchi et al. 2014	- Brand salience	- Quality	- Image - Value	- Loyalty
Boo et al. 2009	- Awareness	- -	- Image - Quality - Experience (revised model) - Value	- Loyalty
Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010	- Awareness	- Image - Quality	- Satisfaction (*)	- Loyalty (*)
Evangelista and Dioko 2011	- -	- -	- Image - Performance - Trust - Value	- Attachment

Ferns and Walls 2012	-	Awareness	-	Image	-	-	-	Loyalty
				-	Quality			-
				-	Experience (revised model)			-
Garcia et al. 2012	-	Presented Brand (*)	-				-	Brand meaning (*)
		-	Awareness (*)				-	Quality
Horng et al. 2012	-	Awareness	-	Image	-	-	-	Loyalty
				-	Quality			-
Im et al. 2012	-	Awareness	-	Image	-	Brand associations	-	Overall Brand Equity
								-
								Loyalty

(\*) The construct is included into the respective study but it is considered outside of the CBBE model

**Table 2.** Summary of findings in previous tourism destination brand equity studies

Relationships between Brand Building Blocks (BbB)	Hypothesis tested	Findings	Destination Brand Equity Study by
<b>Brand salience (BbB I) → Performance and Imagery (BbB II)</b>	AST → Pqatt	post-hoc confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014
	AW → IMatt	confirmed	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
	AW → PQatt	confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Pike et al. 2010
		n.s.	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
<b>Brand salience (BbB I) → Judgements and Feelings (BbB III)</b>	AW → BA	confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014
	PB → BM	confirmed	Garcia, Gomez and Molina 2012;
	AW → EX	confirmed	Boo et al. 2009
	AW → IM	confirmed	Pike et al. 2010
	AW → V	n.s.	Boo et al. 2009
<b>Brand salience (BbB I) → Brand resonance (BbB IV)</b>	AW → LOY	confirmed for 2 out of 3 samples	Bianchi et al. 2014
		n.s.	Im et al. 2012
		post-hoc confirmed	Pike et al. 2010
	AW → VI	confirmed	Ferns and Walls 2012; Horng et al. 2012

	<i>AW</i> → <i>OBE</i>	confirmed	Im et al. 2012
<b>Performance and Imagery (BbB II) →</b>			
<b>Judgements and Feelings (BbB III)</b>	PQatt → IM	post-hoc confirmed	Pike et al. 2010
	PQatt → SAT	confirmed	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
	IMatt → SAT	n.s.	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
<b>Performance and Imagery (BbB II)</b>			
<b>← Judgements and Feelings (BbB III)</b>	PQatt → BA	post-hoc confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014
<b>Performance and Imagery (BbB II) →</b>			
<b>Brand resonance (BbB IV)</b>	IMatt → LOY	confirmed	Im et al. 2012
		n.s.	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
	IMatt → VI	confirmed	Hornig et al. 2012
	IMatt → OBE	n.s.	Im et al. 2012
	PQatt → LOY	confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Pike et al. 2010
		n.s.	Bianchi et al. 2014; Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
	PQatt → VI	confirmed	Hornig et al. 2012
	EXatt → VI	confirmed	Ferns and Walls 2012
<b>Judgements and Feelings (BbB III) →</b>			
<b>Brand resonance (BbB IV)</b>	BA → LOY	confirmed	Kladou and Kehagias 2014; Im et al. 2012
	IM → LOY	confirmed	Bianchi et al. 2014; Boo et al. 2009; Pike et al.

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

---

		2010
PQ → LOY	confirmed	Boo et al. 2009
	confirmed	Bianchi et al. 2014
V → LOY	confirmed for 1 out of 2 samples; confirmed for revised model	Boo et al. 2009
EX → LOY	n.s.	Boo et al. 2009
BA → OBE	confirmed	Im et al. 2012
SAT → LOY	confirmed	Chen and Myagmarsuren 2010
SAT → VI	confirmed	Kim et al. 2009
SAT → WtS	confirmed	Kim et al. 2009

---

AST – brand assets; AW – awareness, PQatt – perceived quality of destination attributes; IMatt – attribute-based image; BA – brand associations; PB – Presented brand; BM – brand meaning; EX – destination experience; IM – social image and self-image; V – value-for-money; LOY – loyalty; VI – intention to (re)visit; OBE – overall brand equity; SAT – satisfaction; EXatt – experience of destination attributes; PQ – perceived destination quality; WtS – willingness to spend money

**Table 3.** CBDBE Measurement Model: CFA Goodness-of-Fit Statistics

Indicator [Threshold value]	Statistic value
<b>Absolute Fit Measures</b>	
Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) [ $>0.90$ ]	0.852
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	0.058
[ $<0.08$ : acceptable fit; $<0.05$ : good fit]	
90 percent confidence interval for RMSEA [0.05;0.08]	(0.051; 0.065)
Standardized root mean residual (SRMR) [ $<0.08$ ]	0.059
Normed-Chi-Square ( $\chi^2/df$ ) [ $<2$ ]	640.09/349=1.834
<b>Incremental Fit Indices</b>	
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) [ $>0.90$ ]	0.92
Comparative Fit Index (CFI) [ $>0.90$ ]	0.93
<b>Parsimony Fit Indices</b>	
Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) [ $>0.80$ ]	0.81

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

**Table 4.** CBDBE Measurement Model: Test Statistics

Construct	Scale Item	Reliability	Std. Loadings	t-Value (CR)	SMC	AVE
Awareness (AW)	AW1 I see a lot of ads about Åre	0.85	0.871	-*	0.758	0.66
	AW2 I often read about Åre in newspapers and magazines		0.898	14.326	0.807	
	AW3 Many people know the Åre ski resort		0.638	10.764	0.407	
Tangible destination resources. Skiing (SKI)	SKI1 Snow reliability	0.85	0.622	-	0.387	0.60
	SKI2 Number and variety of ski slopes		0.753	9.505	0.567	
	SKI3 Overall quality of alpine skiing		0.840	10.329	0.705	
	SKI5 Overall quality of skiing experience		0.859	10.483	0.738	
Tangible destination resources. Service (SER)	SER1 Overall quality of accommodation (e.g., hotel, cabin, apartment)	0.80	0.699	-	0.489	0.50
	SER2 Service level of the staff in accommodation facilities		0.702	10.011	0.492	
	SER3 Quality of food and beverages		0.712	9.457	0.507	
	SER4 Service level of the staff in restaurants and bars		0.715	9.422	0.512	
Intangible destination resources (INT)	INT1 Åre has a peaceful and restful atmosphere	0.85	0.654	-	0.427	0.55
	INT2 Åre is family-friendly		0.803	10.729	0.645	
	INT3 Åre is clean and tidy		0.875	11.019	0.766	
	INT4 Åre is safe and secure		0.775	10.145	0.600	
	INT6 Landscape and scenery are beautiful in Åre		0.538	7.528	0.289	

	SOC1	Employees were friendly and professional		0.767	-	0.589	
Social destination	SOC2	I liked the behavior of other tourists		0.579	8.315	0.336	
resources (SOC)	SOC3	It was easy to interact and communicate with other tourists	0.79	0.698	10.245	0.488	0.50
	SOC4	Local people were hospitable and friendly		0.754	11.439	0.568	
Value-in-use.	VIU1	Åre is a thrilling winter destination		0.807	14.435	0.651	
Emotional value	VIU2	Åre offers various winter experiences		0.828	13.973	0.685	
(VIU)	VIU3	Åre offers fun and excitement	0.89	0.854	14.696	0.729	0.68
	VIU4	Åre brings you the joy of achievement		0.806	-	0.650	
Value-for-money		Compared to other destinations, visiting Åre is good value-for-			17.339		
(VFM)	VFM1	money	0.90	0.959		0.919	0.83
	VFM2	Overall, Åre as a skiing destination has reasonable prices		0.855	-	0.731	
Loyalty (LOY)	LOY1	I will come back to Åre in winter within 2 years		0.768	-	0.589	
	LOY2	I consider Åre to be my first choice of a ski resort	0.83	0.803	12.821	0.644	0.61
	LOY3	I will encourage friends and relatives to visit Åre in winter		0.781	11.318	0.611	

\*- indicates: paths fixed to one to estimate parameters



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

**Table 5.** Discriminant validity of the CBDDBE model measurement scale

	AW	SKI	SER	INT	SOC	VIU	VFM	LOY
AW	<b>0.660</b>							
SKI	0.067	<b>0.600</b>						
SER	0.019	0.251	<b>0.500</b>					
INT	0.004	0.295	0.334	<b>0.550</b>				
SOC	0.019	0.323	0.714	0.456	<b>0.500</b>			
VIU	0.094	0.517	0.426	0.255	0.389	<b>0.680</b>		
VFM	0.095	0.460	0.356	0.255	0.343	0.476	<b>0.830</b>	
LOY	0.107	0.521	0.318	0.183	0.275	0.612	0.468	<b>0.610</b>

Note: the bold diagonal elements show AVE values; off-diagonal elements show squared correlations between model constructs

Peer Review

**Table 6.** Structural parameter estimates for the revised CBDBE model

Structural Relationships	Unstandardized	Standard Error	t-Value	Standardized
	Parameter Estimate			Parameter Estimate
H1: AW → DRES	0.119	0.035	3.447	0.265
H2: DRES → VIU	1.192	0.148	8.045	0.841
H3: DRES → VFM	1.335	0.170	7.876	0.794
H4: VIU → LOY	0.816	0.117	6.985	0.596
H5: VFM → LOY	0.119	0.035	3.447	0.265

**Table 7.** CBDDBE Measurement Model: Replicated Test Statistics

Constructs	Scale items	Composite Reliability	Standardized Loadings	t Value (CR)	SMC	AVE
Awareness	AW1		0,878	-*	0,771	
	AW2	0.79	0,805	18,914	0,649	0.57
	AW3		0,541	14,177	0,292	
Tangible destination resources. Skiing	SKI1		0,620	-	0,384	
	SKI2	0.87	0,822	17,787	0,675	0.64
	SKI3		0,856	18,257	0,733	
	SKI5		0,870	18,443	0,757	
Tangible destination resources. Service	SER2		0,621	-	0,386	
	SER3	0.79	0,799	15,651	0,638	0.56
	SER4		0,806	15,647	0,650	
	INT1		0,736	-	0,542	
Intangible destination resources	INT2		0,790	20,764	0,624	
	INT3	0.86	0,768	20,272	0,591	0.56
	INT4		0,808	21,177	0,652	
	INT6		0,638	17,21	0,407	
Social destination resources	SOC2		0,933	-	0,870	
	SOC3	0.89	0,961	48,278	0,924	0.74
	SOC4		0,655	21,751	0,429	
Value-in-use. Emotional value	VIU1		0,870	29,623	0,756	
	VIU2	0.92	0,858	30,297	0,736	0.75
	VIU3		0,887	30,641	0,787	
	VIU4		0,845	-	0,714	

Value-for-	VFM1	0,942	29,338	0,887	
	0.91				0.84
money	VFM2	0,893	-	0,798	
	LOY1	0,731	-	0,534	
Loyalty	LOY2	0,858	23,131	0,736	0.69
	LOY3	0,889	22,807	0,791	

\*- indicates: paths fixed to one to estimate parameters

For Peer Review

**Table 8.** Discriminant Validity of the CBDBE model measurement scale (Replicated study)

	AW	SKI	SER	INT	SOC	VIU	VFM	LOY
AW	<b>0,57</b>							
SKI	0,046	<b>0,64</b>						
SER	0,097	0,234	<b>0,56</b>					
INT	0,081	0,392	0,493	<b>0,56</b>				
SOC	0,039	0,175	0,309	0,464	<b>0,74</b>			
VIU	0,158	0,477	0,378	0,497	0,218	<b>0,75</b>		
VFM	0,048	0,212	0,289	0,392	0,356	0,275	<b>0,84</b>	
LOY	0,083	0,496	0,213	0,324	0,142	0,573	0,245	<b>0,69</b>

Note: the bold diagonal elements show AVE values; off-diagonal elements show squared correlations between model constructs

**Table 9.** Structural parameter estimates for the revised CBDBE model (Replicated study)

Structural Relationships	Unstandardized		Standard Error	t-Value	Standardized	
	Parameter Estimate	Parameter Estimate			Parameter Estimate	Parameter Estimate
H1: AW → DRES	0,145	0,02	7,244	0,145	0,352	
H2: DRES →VIU	1,528	0,116	13,221	1,528	0,798	
H3: DRES →VFM	1,702	0,142	11,95	1,702	0,698	
H4: VIU → LOY	0,724	0,047	15,411	0,724	0,690	
H5: VFM → LOY	0,108	0,029	3,679	0,108	0,131	

1  
2  
3 Dear Prof. Crouch,  
4  
5

6 Thank you very much for careful reviewing process and valuable advice on how to develop the  
7 manuscript. We are submitting the revised version of the manuscript with the following changes  
8 being made:  
9

- 10
- 11 - the phrase "black box" has been removed from both the abstract and the main body of the  
12 paper;
  - 13 - the manuscript has been reduced by about 700 words;'
  - 14 - the manuscript has been proof-read by a native English speaker;
  - 15 - we have carefully revised the references in the manuscript and in the reference list;
  - 16 - by following the artwork guidelines, we inserted the figures in the body of the manuscript (all  
17 figures are created in MS Word). All tables remain in the end of the manuscript;
  - 18 - we have slightly revised the list of keywords.  
19
- 20

21  
22 Yours sincerely,  
23  
24

25  
26 The authors  
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