

**EXAMINING THE HIERARCHY OF DESTINATION BRANDS AND THE CHAIN OF EFFECTS BETWEEN THE BRAND EQUITY DIMENSIONS**

***Ángel Herrero Crespo (Corresponding Author)***

Associate Professor

Department of Business Administration - Faculty of Economics

University of Cantabria

Avda. de los Castros, s/n, 39005, Santander (SPAIN)

Telephone number: 942 20 39 08; Fax: 942 20 18 90

E-mail: [herreroa@unican.es](mailto:herreroa@unican.es)

***Héctor San Martín Gutiérrez***

Associate Professor

Department of Business Administration - Faculty of Economics

University of Cantabria

Avda. de los Castros, s/n, 39005, Santander (SPAIN)

Telephone number: 942 20 09 57; Fax: 942 20 18 90

E-mail: [smartinh@unican.es](mailto:smartinh@unican.es)

***María del Mar García de los Salmones Sánchez***

Associate Professor

Department of Business Administration - Faculty of Economics

University of Cantabria

Avda. de los Castros, s/n, 39005, Santander (SPAIN)

Telephone number: 942 20 16 06; Fax: 942 20 18 90

E-mail: [gsalmonm@unican.es](mailto:gsalmonm@unican.es)

***Jesús Collado Agudo***

Associate Professor

Department of Business Administration - Faculty of Economics

University of Cantabria

Avda. de los Castros, s/n, 39005, Santander (SPAIN)

Telephone number: 942 20 39 06; Fax: 942 20 18 90

E-mail: [colladoj@unican.es](mailto:colladoj@unican.es)

1           **EXAMINING THE HIERARCHY OF DESTINATION BRANDS AND THE**  
2  
3           **CHAIN OF EFFECTS BETWEEN THE BRAND EQUITY DIMENSIONS**  
4

5  
6  
7  
8           **Abstract**  
9

10           This paper focuses on the customer-based brand equity for a tourist destination, and  
11           develops a model including the dimensions of this construct (i.e. awareness, image,  
12           perceived quality and loyalty). Accordingly, loyalty is considered the main dependent  
13           variable in our model. One main contribution of our paper to the literature is that it takes  
14           into account the hierarchy of destination brands and analyzes, not only the chain of  
15           effects between the dimensions of brand equity for a regional destination, but also the  
16           influence of country destination image (i.e. country is considered an umbrella brand) on  
17           the image perceived of one of its regional destinations. Other significant contribution is  
18           made by examining the moderating effect of the country familiarity on the relationship  
19           between both types of image. The empirical evidence obtained from a sample of 253  
20           international tourists visiting a regional destination in Spain supports that loyalty  
21           towards the destination is positively influenced by the perceived quality of the  
22           destination, which in turn is directly influenced by the image and awareness of the  
23           destination. Additionally, our results support for the idea that the perceptions of a  
24           regional destination are positively influenced by the perceptions of the country  
25           destination where the region is located. However, the moderating effect of country  
26           familiarity on the relationship between both types of image is not supported in this  
27           research. This result could be because, in a country where there are a lot of destination  
28           brands, being more familiar with a country does not necessarily imply a more accurate  
29           knowledge of its regional destinations.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

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

**Key words:**

Destination branding, country destination, regional destination, brand equity, image,  
perceived quality, awareness, loyalty

## 1. Introduction

Tourist destinations should be considered products (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Boo, Busser & Baloglu, 2009) that the destination marketing organizations (DMOs) should adequately manage to attract visitors and build loyalty. To that end, in a global and competitive environment such as the current one, having a strong brand is a good strategy for achieving positive returns, providing the differentiation needed from competitor destinations and gaining competitive advantage (Hanna & Rowley, 2007; Pike, 2009). “Place branding” is the application of product branding to places (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2006). Despite the interest it has garnered, it is one of the newest research areas (Cai, 2002), and is still considered to be in its infancy (Konecnik, 2006; Pike, Bianchi & Kerr, 2010). Until now, the literature available has been greatly fragmented (Gertner, 2011), and concepts such as “brand loyalty”, “brand equity”, “brand architecture”, which have an extensive background in the marketing literature (Keller, 1993; Aaker, 1996; Aaker & Joachimsthaler, 2000), have rarely been explored in the field of tourism (Dooley & Bowie, 2005; Konecnik, 2006; Pike, 2007; Harish, 2010).

Kavaratzis & Ashworth (2006) wonder if city branding is a transitory marketing trick. Furthermore, they question if place branding may be impossible because places are not exactly products, and governments and users are not producers and consumers, respectively. Their conclusion is that place branding “is not only possible but that it is, and has been, practiced consciously or unconsciously for as long as cities have competed with each other for trade, populations, wealth, prestige or power” (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2006, p. 188). With regard to this, Hankinson (2001) confirmed after reviewing the practices of branding in twelve English cities that marketing tools applied

1 to places were widely used, but little understood. The point is then to create an  
2  
3 integrated framework that clarify all aspects of developing a place brand and will give  
4  
5 guidance for managing it (Kavaratzis & Ashworth, 2006).  
6  
7

8 Place branding is based on the conceptual domains of tourism and urban policy.  
9  
10 However, since year 2000, there has been a growing contribution to the place branding  
11  
12 literature from service marketing studies and, above all, corporate branding studies. The  
13  
14 theoretical developments of both research lines led to a richer and more useful theory of  
15  
16 place branding (Hankinson 2009, 2010). In this regard, “brand identity”, “brand  
17  
18 architecture” or “brand equity”, among others, become interesting research fields. In the  
19  
20 case of “brand equity”, Pike (2009) includes this concept as one potential research gap,  
21  
22 suggesting that further research in this area might usefully be extended to the  
23  
24 measurement of re-branding and re-positioning strategies. However, the studies about  
25  
26 destination brand equity are scarce and supported mainly in past research on destination  
27  
28 image. Additionally, more diversified quantitative methods are required to successfully  
29  
30 identify the elements and dimensions of brand equity (Chan & Marafa, 2013).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Taking into account its potential, we used as starting point the model of  
38  
39 consumer-based brand equity (CBBE), developed by Aaker (1996) and Keller (1993,  
40  
41 2003), and applied in this case to a regional tourist destination. This model is based on  
42  
43 the premise of developing an understanding of how marketing initiatives are impacting  
44  
45 on consumer learning and recall of brand information (Pike, 2000). In particular, four  
46  
47 dimensions related to perceptions and reactions of consumers to the brands are  
48  
49 established: awareness, associations, quality, and loyalty.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The aim of destination branding should be to stimulate intent to visit and revisit  
56  
57 the place, which are indicators of brand loyalty (Pike & Bianchi, 2013). The loyalty is  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 in the highest level (Pike, 2000), so we consider this construct as the main outcome  
2  
3 variable and analyze empirically the causal relationships or chain of effects existing  
4  
5 between the four dimensions of CBBE. Furthermore, and taking into account the brand  
6  
7 architecture and the hierarchy of destination brands, this paper explores the influence of  
8  
9 the image of a country as tourist destination on the image of one of its regional  
10  
11 destinations. More concretely, we study the case of Spain, which is one of the most  
12  
13 important tourist destinations in the world. It is a country with a “house of brands”  
14  
15 strategy in tourism (Dooley & Bowie, 2005; Harish, 2010) because each of its regions  
16  
17 promotes its own destination brand. With this in mind, this study carried out an  
18  
19 empirical research with international tourists visiting Spain and focused on the  
20  
21 relationship between country destination image and regional destination image,  
22  
23 assuming the existence of a hierarchy of brands between different territorial entities  
24  
25 (Cubillo, Sánchez & Cerviño, 2006).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In addition, it is important to indicate that individuals usually have a different  
34  
35 image of countries, regions and cities (Kapferer, 2000), based on their experiences and  
36  
37 information about each territorial entity, but those images are interrelated among them  
38  
39 (Ashworth & Kavaratzis, 2007). In particular, when evaluating a specific foreign  
40  
41 destination (for example, a region located in a specific country), the familiarity of  
42  
43 tourists with the country may play a key role in the formation of their regional  
44  
45 destination image, especially when they have little information about the regional  
46  
47 destination. Under these circumstances, it is expected that the relationship between the  
48  
49 country destination image and the regional destination image is moderated by country  
50  
51 familiarity (Balabanis, Mueller & Melewar, 2002). Our paper will take into account the  
52  
53 Information Processing Theory and the Theory of Attitude Stability in order to better  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 understand how are formed, in terms of reliability and strength, the perceptions of the  
2  
3 country as a tourist destination depending on the familiarity of tourists with the country.  
4  
5 This information will let us to better explain the moderating influence of country  
6  
7 familiarity on the relationship between the country destination image and the regional  
8  
9 destination image.  
10  
11

12  
13 Therefore, this research aims to provide two main contributions to the academic  
14  
15 literature on destination marketing: 1) the development of an integrative model that  
16  
17 considers, not only the chain of effects between the dimensions of customer-based  
18  
19 brand equity for a regional destination, but also the role of country destination image in  
20  
21 the formation of the regional destination image due to that the country brand would act  
22  
23 as an umbrella brand in the tourist mind; 2) the examination of the influence of country  
24  
25 destination image on regional destination image by considering, as a moderator  
26  
27 variable, the level of familiarity of the international tourists with the country under  
28  
29 investigation.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 **2. Literature review and research hypothesis**

### 39 ***2.1. Customer-based brand equity of a place***

40  
41  
42 “Place branding” is becoming a focal area for marketers, with a growing number  
43  
44 of academic works, particularly in the field of destination and tourism marketing  
45  
46 (Kaplan, Yurt, Guneri & Kurtulus, 2010). So far, the topic has been partly covered by  
47  
48 studies about destination image (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Pike & Ryan, 2004; San  
49  
50 Martín & Rodríguez del Bosque, 2008), but place branding is a complex and extensive  
51  
52 field of research, and it cannot be limited to destination image studies only (Kaplan et  
53  
54 al., 2010). The effectiveness of place brands can be measured by customer-based brand  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 equity -CBBE- (Konecnik, 2006; Konecnik & Gartner, 2007; Pike et al., 2010; Im, Kim,  
2  
3 Ellio & Han, 2012), a multidimensional construct initially proposed by Keller (1993)  
4  
5 and Aaker (1996) in the field of goods and services, and now extended to territories.  
6  
7

8         Despite its potential for tourist destinations, the study of brand equity has only  
9  
10 recently attracted the attention of academic researchers (Boo et al., 2009), with  
11  
12 relatively few works testing the CBBE model in relation to destination branding (Pike &  
13  
14 Bianchi, 2013). According to Aaker (1991), customer-based brand equity can be defined  
15  
16 as “a set assets and liabilities linked to a brand, its name and symbol that add to or  
17  
18 subtract from the value provided by a product to a firm and/or the firm’s customers”. In  
19  
20 addition, four dimensions of CBBE are well established in the previous literature  
21  
22 (Aaker, 1991, 1996; Konecnik, 2004): awareness, image, quality, and loyalty. Firstly,  
23  
24 brand awareness refers to the ability to recognize or recall that a brand is a member of a  
25  
26 product category. Secondly, brand image consists of the beliefs and attitudes in relation  
27  
28 to the perceived benefits of a brand. Thirdly, brand quality is the judgment of the overall  
29  
30 excellence or superiority of a brand relative to the alternatives in the market. Finally,  
31  
32 brand loyalty is considered the commitment of individuals with regards to a determined  
33  
34 brand over time.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42         In the context of tourist destinations, brand awareness can be conceived as the  
43  
44 presence of a destination in the minds of people when a given travel context is  
45  
46 considered; brand image represents the set of associations or impressions attached to the  
47  
48 destination, composed of a variety of individual perceptions relating to several attributes  
49  
50 of the destination; brand quality is concerned with perceptions about the way in which  
51  
52 the destination attempts to meet tourists’ functional needs, a holistic judgment made on  
53  
54 the basis of the excellence or overall superiority of the service (Bigné, Sánchez & Sanz,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 2005); and brand loyalty, which represents the core dimension of the CBBE concept  
2  
3 (Aaker, 1996) and the main source of customer-based brand equity (Keller, 2003), is  
4  
5 usually measured in tourism research by intention to return to the tourist destination and  
6  
7 willingness to recommend it to other people (Pike, 2007; Chen & Myagmarsuren, 2010;  
8  
9 Prayag, 2012).

10  
11  
12  
13 Destination image is therefore central to brand evaluation and brand equity, but  
14  
15 other dimensions are also necessary to truly measure customer-based brand equity  
16  
17 (Konecnik & Gartner, 2007; Boo et al., 2009). The study of Konecnik and Gartner  
18  
19 (2007) was one the first destination brand equity works. In this paper the authors  
20  
21 analyzed the whole concept of consumer-based brand equity, although proposed in  
22  
23 future research the need to study the direction of the relationships among its  
24  
25 dimensions. In this line, Boo et al. (2009) analyzed the influence of awareness, quality  
26  
27 and image on destination brand value and loyalty, whereas Pike and Biachi (2013)  
28  
29 considered the direct relationship of these dimensions on destination loyalty. Pike et al.  
30  
31 (2010) and Bigné et al. (2013) went beyond to propose the possible interrelationships  
32  
33 between the constructs. Therefore, there are antecedents in the literature about the  
34  
35 existence of hierarchical relationships among the dimensions, although this issue needs  
36  
37 further research.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

## 47 ***2.2. Relationships between the dimensions of customer-based brand equity for a*** 48 49 ***regional tourist destination***

50  
51  
52 Different models of consumer behavior establish that awareness is a first and  
53  
54 necessary step to loyalty (Konecnik, 2006), the foundation of the hierarchy of brands  
55  
56 (Pike, 2000; Pike et al., 2010) and “the ticket to enter the market” (Pike, 2007).  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Awareness is the necessary basis for individuals to generate meaning about a brand. The  
2  
3 higher the level of awareness, the more dominant is the brand in the mind of individuals  
4  
5 and it is more likely that they consider the brand in their decision-making processes  
6  
7 (Yasin, Noor & Mohamad, 2007). According to the associative network model, memory  
8  
9 consists of nodes, defined as stored information connected by links that vary in strength  
10  
11 (Anderson, 1993). Brand awareness reflects the strength of the brand node in the minds  
12  
13 of consumers, and it generates differences in information processing (Hoyer & Brown,  
14  
15 1990). On the one hand, if customers are aware of a certain product or brand, the  
16  
17 possibility that they have a favorable image of that product or brand is higher (Hoyer &  
18  
19 Brown, 1990; Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2001). On the other hand, brand awareness could  
20  
21 have a positive effect on consumers' perceptions of quality (Dodds et al. 1991; Ming et  
22  
23 al. 2011). Brand awareness serves as a platform to ensure credibility and position of the  
24  
25 product by decreasing the risk and the information costs as perceived by consumers, and  
26  
27 the reduction of uncertainty leads to higher quality expectations among consumers  
28  
29 (Erdem & Swait, 1998).

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 These relationships have been examined in consumer goods products (Esch et al.,  
39  
40 2006; Ming et al. 2011). In the field of tourist destinations, empirical research is less  
41  
42 advanced although there are some evidences that prove that a greater awareness of a  
43  
44 destination will enhance the associations linked to it, both those that comprise the brand  
45  
46 image (Bigné, Andreu & Zanfardini, 2013; Pike et al. 2010) and the quality perceptions  
47  
48 (Pike et al., 2010). On the basis of this theoretical approach, we establish the following  
49  
50 hypotheses in the context of a regional tourist destination:  
51  
52

53  
54  
55 *H1: Awareness of the regional destination will have a direct and positive influence on*  
56  
57 *the regional destination image.*  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 *H2: Awareness of the regional destination will have a direct and positive influence on*  
2  
3 *the perceived quality of the regional destination.*  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 In research on consumer behavior, it has been widely recognized that perceptions  
9 of quality are influenced by the image of the product or service (Bloemer, de Ruyter &  
10 Peeters, 1998). More concretely, Lee, Lee, & Wu (2011) establish that perceived quality  
11 is influenced by intrinsic cues (e.g. brand features) and other extrinsic cues such as  
12 brand image. In tourism, image plays an important role in the evaluations and  
13 behavioral intentions of tourists (Lee, Lee & Lee, 2005). In particular, the relationship  
14 between image and perceived quality has been confirmed in several works focused on  
15 tourist destinations (Bigné, Sánchez & Sánchez, 2001; Bigné et al., 2005; Hankinson,  
16 2005; Chen and Tsai, 2007; Kim, Holland & Han, 2013). The image that tourists form  
17 of a destination influences the way they perceive the destination's quality. In particular,  
18 given that destination image is formed on the basis of a tourist's perceptions of the  
19 destination's resources and attractions, an improved image will reinforce the quality  
20 perceived in the destination as a whole. With this in mind, we establish the third  
21 hypothesis of this research:  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 *H3: The regional destination image will have a direct and positive influence on the*  
43 *perceived quality of the regional destination.*  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The relationship between perceived quality and loyalty has been widely supported  
51 in literature on service marketing (Boulding et al. 1993; Zeithaml et al. 1996; Bloemer  
52 et al. 1999; Hennig-Thurau, 2001). In tourism research, Hsu et al (2011) provided  
53 empirical evidence of this relationship in the hospitality industry. In the field of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 destinations, perceived quality is considered a very important variable because it  
2  
3 influences on tourist behavior (Kim et al., 2013). In this sense, Baker and Crompton  
4  
5 (2000) establish that the main motivation of tourism providers for investing effort in  
6  
7 evaluating and improving their quality of performance is that such improvements will  
8  
9 result in increased visitation. Since perceived quality is the evaluation of a destination's  
10  
11 offerings made by tourists (Zabkar, Brencic & Dmitrovic, 2010), it is reasonable to  
12  
13 propose a positive relationship between perceived quality and loyalty toward the  
14  
15 destination. A high level of perceived quality will affect positively the intention to  
16  
17 return and the intention to recommend other people the tourist destination (Bigné et al.  
18  
19 2013). This causal relationship, which is supported by previous studies in tourism (Pike  
20  
21 et al., 2010; Zabkar et al., 2010; Jin, Lee & Lee, 2013; Kim et al., 2013; Moon, Kob,  
22  
23 Connaughton & Lee, 2013; Bigné et al. 2013), prompts the fourth hypothesis of this  
24  
25 research:  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 *H4: The perceived quality of the regional destination will have a direct and positive*  
33 *influence on loyalty toward the regional destination.*  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **2.3. Influence of country destination image**

41  
42 The “place” construct may refer to various geographical entities: countries,  
43  
44 regions, cities and towns (Hanna & Rowley, 2007). Many studies on place branding  
45  
46 concentrate on initiatives in one of these units, adopting a monolithic understanding of  
47  
48 space (Syssner, 2009), but we should not forget that cities, regions and nations are  
49  
50 interrelated. In this sense, it is interesting to take into account the hierarchies of  
51  
52 territories and brand architecture strategy adopted. This theory belongs to conventional  
53  
54 branding, and describes a process of managing and designing a portfolio of brands  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 (Kapferer, 2000). Aaker & Joachimsthaler (2000) introduce the concept of “brand  
2  
3 architecture” and define it as an organizing structure of the brand portfolio that specifies  
4  
5 the brand roles and the nature of relationships between brands. These authors establish  
6  
7 four alternatives: the house of brands, endorsed brand, sub-brand, and branded house  
8  
9 strategies. Taking into account this theory, Dooley & Bowie (2005) analyze each  
10  
11 strategy using relevant place brand examples (e.g. Egypt as branded house; Scandinavia  
12  
13 as sub-brand; Western Australia as endorsed brands, and Spain as house of brands). In  
14  
15 choosing the most suitable strategy one would need to look at the specific driver role  
16  
17 that each brand plays in the formation of purchase intentions of consumers (Aaker and  
18  
19 Joachimsthaler, 2000; Dooley & Bowie, 2005).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 In our study, we will be studying the case of a “house of brands” strategy, which  
26  
27 can be defined as one that includes a port-folio of sub-brands that act independently of  
28  
29 each other and in relation to the master brand (Kapferer, 2000). In the case of Spain, the  
30  
31 country is divided into seventeen autonomous regions, each of which promotes its own  
32  
33 destination brand, independently of the master brand (Gilmore, 2002; Dooley & Bowie,  
34  
35 2005). According to Dooley & Booley (2005), there appears to be a greater degree of  
36  
37 coordination between Spain’s national tourism board and their counterparts for regions,  
38  
39 although there may still be room for cohesion on a regional sub-brand level. In this  
40  
41 regard, the advances have been important, and Tourspain has acquired a relevant role in  
42  
43 the value creation in the tourism industry, being “Spain brand, Marketing and  
44  
45 Knowledge” its claim. Country and city/regional branding should be a key tool for  
46  
47 capturing tourists (Zhang & Zhao, 2009; Zenker et al., 2013) and these territories should  
48  
49 act jointly, at least in the tourist mind.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Specifically, there is a hierarchy between both territory brands, which is derived  
2  
3 from the physical dimensions and the notoriety of the different geographical areas.  
4  
5 Taking into account the perceptions of individuals, country brand is the master brand  
6  
7 which would act as an umbrella brand and it can be expected that country image  
8  
9 influences the image of the cities or regions located in that country (Cubillo et al.,  
10  
11 2006). According to the Information Processing Theory (Bettman and Kakkar, 1977;  
12  
13 Tybout et al, 1981), processing information is conditioned by, among other aspects, the  
14  
15 solidness with which the different informational cues are structured (Peterman, 1997).  
16  
17 Individuals usually have more concrete beliefs about countries, while their beliefs about  
18  
19 regions or cities are usually less clear (Ashworth and Kavaratzis, 2007), so it can be  
20  
21 postulated that the country image will affect the perceptions or images of the cities  
22  
23 located in them (Cubillo et al, 2006; Herrero et al. 2015). There are special cases in  
24  
25 which specific cities have a stronger notoriety, thereby producing the opposite effect.  
26  
27 That is, cities such as New York, Paris, London or Tokio, among others, are striking  
28  
29 examples of cities which outperforms its own country in brand power. However, those  
30  
31 are exceptional cases (Anholt, 2006).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Most papers related to the influence of country image are focused on the  
41  
42 evaluation of products or services (Javalgi, Cutler & Winans, 2001; Ahmed, Johnson,  
43  
44 Ling, Fang & Hui, 2002; Yasin et al., 2007). They show that country image, considered  
45  
46 as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that people have about a country (Kotler,  
47  
48 Haider & Rein., 1993), has a great impact on consumer evaluations. This way, country  
49  
50 image includes stereotypes and perceptions about the country that, above all when  
51  
52 consumers are unfamiliar with the product, are commonly used as short-cuts for  
53  
54 information processing and consumer decision heuristics (Kotler & Gertner, 2002), and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 serve as a "halo effect", through which consumers infer product attributes (Ham, 1989;  
2  
3 Ahmed et al., 2002). Along the same lines we postulate that, in the tourism field, the  
4  
5 image of the country as tourist destination will influence the regional destination image,  
6  
7 a theoretical relationship posited by Cubillo et al. (2006) but not proven empirically.  
8  
9

10 Therefore, the fifth hypothesis is:

11  
12 *H5: The country destination image will have a direct and positive influence on the*  
13  
14 *regional destination image.*  
15  
16  
17

#### 18 19 20 **2.4. The moderating effect of country familiarity** 21

22  
23 In order to better understand the formation of the regional destination image, the  
24  
25 concept of country familiarity is considered in this paper, since it has been found to  
26  
27 affect the attitudes and preferences of individuals. In the literature on consumer  
28  
29 behavior, familiarity has been defined as consumer experience with a product and it  
30  
31 reflects the direct and indirect knowledge available to an individual (Alba &  
32  
33 Hutchinson, 1987). Familiarity therefore goes beyond the mere experience of an  
34  
35 individual (Cordell, 1997) and it is also based on advertising exposure, information  
36  
37 searches and, of course, product use. In our context, country familiarity can be defined  
38  
39 as the direct and indirect knowledge of a country based on previous experience and the  
40  
41 information available to an individual.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 The moderating effect of country familiarity on the relationship between country  
48  
49 destination image and regional destination image can be explained by taking the  
50  
51 Information Processing Theory. Particularly, Park and Lessig (1991) establish that the  
52  
53 familiarity with a brand helps to be more confident with the brand in the decision-  
54  
55 making processes. This argument can be used in the specific field of tourist  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 destinations; in a context of high familiarity where individuals have a wide knowledge  
2  
3 of the country, it is likely that they perceive as more precise and reliable their  
4  
5 information about the tourism options and opportunities of the country (Han, 1989).  
6  
7 Under these circumstances the images of the country destination, as perceived by these  
8  
9 individuals (in comparison to people less familiar with the country), will have a more  
10  
11 significance in the formation of the images perceived of the regional destinations in that  
12  
13 country (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991).  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 In a similar way, according to the Theory of Attitude Stability, several studies  
19  
20 establish that as the number of experiences and the amount of information in relation to  
21  
22 an object (for example, a country) increases, the individuals' attitudes towards the  
23  
24 object (for example, images of the country destination) will be stronger and will have a  
25  
26 higher influence on their perceptions and behaviors (Priester et al., 2004). Therefore,  
27  
28 following both theoretical approaches, we postulate the following hypothesis in our  
29  
30 research context:  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 *H6: The stronger the familiarity with a country, the stronger the influence of the*  
38  
39 *country destination image on the regional destination image.*  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Figure 1 summarizes the hypotheses of this research.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Figure 1. Theoretical model  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



### 3. Methodology

Quantitative research was carried out to test the hypotheses. Data was collected using a personal questionnaire that included the following main questions: 1) the image of Spain as a tourist destination; 2) the dimensions of brand equity for Cantabria as a regional destination; and 3) the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. It is necessary to emphasize that Cantabria is a region in the north of Spain on the shore of the Bay of Biscay. This region is placed in the touristy area labelled as “Green Spain” together with other three regions: Basque Country, Galicia and Asturias. The famous Altamira Caves, which contain some of the best pre-historic paintings in the world, the Cabarceno Natural Park, an amazing wildlife park created on a karstic landscape on 750 hectares, or the Cantabrian Route of the Camino de Santiago, which is included in the World Heritage List (UNESCO), are some of the most value attractions in the region of Cantabria. These attractions, and in general its beautiful landscapes, its impressive cultural and historic heritage and its unique local cuisine, provokes that Cantabria is one of most important Spanish regions in terms of cultural and natural tourism.

Each variable of the model was measured using a multi-attribute instrument adapted from previous works in order to assure the content validity in the operationalization of each construct (see appendix). Particularly, a 10-point Likert scale is used in order to maximize the potential variation in responses, which facilitate the estimation of the parameters involved in the research model. Destination awareness was measured with three items, taking the work of Boo et al. (2009) and Pike et al. (2010) as a basis; the scale used to measure destination image was adapted from San Martín and Rodríguez del Bosque (2008); perceived quality was measured by a scale adapted from Boo et al. (2009); and the scale of loyalty was derived from Konecnik and Gartner

1 (2007), Boo et al. (2009) and Pike et al. (2010). Finally, country familiarity was  
2  
3 measured in line with the bidimensional approach (i.e. informational and experiential  
4  
5 dimensions) proposed by Baloglu (2001).  
6  
7

8 The target population of the quantitative research was international tourists above  
9  
10 18 years old. The quota method (i.e. a non-probabilistic procedure) was used to select  
11  
12 the sample in this research. More concretely, the characteristics of the population under  
13  
14 investigation with regard to gender and age (information provided by the Spanish  
15  
16 Institute of Tourism Studies) were used as a reference to select the respondents (Table  
17  
18 1). Data collection was conducted through a personal survey of international tourists  
19  
20 visiting Cantabria (Spain) during the summer of 2013. Tourists were contacted in the  
21  
22 international airport, when they were taking the return flight to their country. A total of  
23  
24 253 valid responses were obtained (several socio-demographic characteristics of the  
25  
26 sample are indicated in Table 1). Particularly, the dominant profile of respondents is  
27  
28 male, aged 25 to 44 years, university level and worker. In addition, the main country of  
29  
30 origin of the tourists is United Kingdom.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **4. Results**

### 46 **4.1. Estimation of the model**

47  
48 Before estimating the Structural Equation Model (SEM) and testing the research  
49  
50 hypotheses, the reliability and validity of the measurement scales were checked by  
51  
52 means of a confirmatory factor analysis, using EQS 6.1 software. The results confirm  
53  
54 the reliability and convergent validity of the scales jointly studied (see Table 2). The fit  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 criteria indicate the extent to which the factorial model fits the empirical data. In  
2  
3 particular, three main classes of fit criteria are indicated: measures of absolute fit  
4  
5 (BBNNFI is near to the 0.90 threshold and RMSA is below 0.08); measures of  
6  
7 incremental fit (IFI and CFI are equal to 0.90); and measures of parsimonious fit  
8  
9 (normed  $\chi^2$  is below 5). None of the confidence intervals for pairs of latent constructs  
10  
11 include 1.0 (Anderson & Gerbin, 1998), thus supporting discriminant validity of the  
12  
13 model (Table 3).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Table 3. Confidence intervals for the correlations between pairs of latent variables  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 The research model was estimated following a SEM approach and using the  
31  
32 statistical software EQS 6.1 (Figure 2). The analyses were run using a robust maximum-  
33  
34 likelihood estimation procedure in order to avoid problems of non-normality with the  
35  
36 data. The goodness-of-fit indexes obtained were within the recommended intervals, thus  
37  
38 confirming that the research model adequately fits to the data. All causal relationships  
39  
40 between variables were found to be statistically significant and in the direction  
41  
42 postulated in this study.  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Loyalty towards the regional tourist destination was positively influenced by the  
48  
49 perceived quality of the destination, which in turn was directly influenced by image and  
50  
51 awareness. Accordingly, the better the image and awareness attributed by tourists to the  
52  
53 regional destination, the better its perceived quality will be and, therefore, tourists will  
54  
55 be more loyal to that destination in terms of intention to return and willingness to  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 recommend it to other people. The regional destination image was significantly  
2  
3 influenced by the country destination image. In consequence, country destination acts as  
4  
5 an “umbrella brand” that contributes to forming the image of regional destinations in the  
6  
7 tourist’s mind.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Figure 2. Estimation of the model  
14  
15  
16  
17

#### 18 ***4.2. Testing the moderating effect of country familiarity*** 19 20

21 Following to Ro (2012) and Kim, Murrmann and Lee (2009), the analysis of the  
22  
23 moderating effect of country familiarity on the relationship between country destination  
24  
25 image and regional destination image is based on a multi-step hierarchical multiple  
26  
27 regression, which include the following steps: first, the independent variable (i.e.  
28  
29 country destination image) and the moderator variable (i.e. country familiarity) were  
30  
31 entered into the model as predictors of the dependent variable (i.e. regional destination  
32  
33 image). Second, an interaction term, which is the product of the independent and  
34  
35 moderator variables, was entered into the regression model in order to represent the  
36  
37 moderator effect. Third, before the estimation of the regression model, multicollinearity  
38  
39 was eliminated by the residual-centering procedure (Lance, 1988). Particularly, the  
40  
41 interaction effect is replaced by a new variable resulting from a comparison between the  
42  
43 interaction and the expression extracted from the regression of the two variables on the  
44  
45 interactive effect.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 The results of the estimates using the program IBM SPSS are summarized in  
54  
55 Table 4 (each variable included in the statistical software is based on the average of its  
56  
57 items). As observed in the step 1, the model explains a significant percentage of the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 observed variance (32.0%), and only the country destination image has a significant  
2  
3 influence on regional destination image. In the step 2, it can be observed that the  
4  
5 interaction term is not a significant predictor of regional destination image, so H6 is not  
6  
7 supported according to our empirical evidence.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis for testing the moderating effect  
14  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **5. Conclusions**

19  
20 The present paper examines the chain of effects existing between the dimensions  
21  
22 of the customer-based brand equity for a regional tourist destination, considering the  
23  
24 loyalty as the main outcome variable for explanation in the theoretical model.  
25  
26 Moreover, this paper takes into account the hierarchy of destination brands and analyzes  
27  
28 the influence of country destination image on the regional destination image by  
29  
30 developing an empirical research with international tourists visiting Spain (a country  
31  
32 with a “house of brands” strategy in tourism). The moderating effect of country  
33  
34 familiarity on the relationship between the two types of image is also examined in this  
35  
36 research in order to generate new knowledge in tourism research.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 With regard to the hierarchy of effects between customer-based brand equity, the  
43  
44 empirical evidence obtained from a sample of 253 international tourists visiting a  
45  
46 regional destination supports the theory that loyalty towards the destination is positively  
47  
48 influenced by the perceived quality of the destination, which in turn is directly  
49  
50 influenced by the image and awareness of the destination. Accordingly, the influence of  
51  
52 the awareness and image of a destination on the intentions of tourists to return and to  
53  
54 recommend the destination is mediated by the perceived quality. In this sense,  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 destination image (in terms of perceptions of tourist attractions) is the main determinant  
2  
3 of perceived quality of the tourist destination, exerting an indirect effect on tourist  
4  
5 loyalty. Moreover, the results obtained show that more recognizable or renowned  
6  
7 destinations will be perceived as being of higher quality, which intuitively shows that  
8  
9 tourists use the destination's "fame" as a signal of its quality. This way, awareness  
10  
11 indirectly influences tourist loyalty towards the destination.  
12  
13  
14

15 This research also considers the hierarchy of destination brands and examines the  
16  
17 influence that the country destination image exerts on the regional destination image.  
18  
19 Empirical evidence obtained supports for the idea that the perceptions of international  
20  
21 tourists of a regional destination are positively influenced by their perceptions of the  
22  
23 country destination where the region is located. The country's brand therefore acts as an  
24  
25 "umbrella brand" for the region's brand. This research doesn't support the moderating  
26  
27 effect of country familiarity on the relationship between both constructs of image,  
28  
29 however. This may be because, in a context where there are many destination brands  
30  
31 (i.e. regional destinations), being familiar with a country does not necessarily imply a  
32  
33 more elaborate and precise knowledge of the different regions located in that country.  
34  
35 The result could also be explained by the distinctive characteristics of Cantabria as  
36  
37 tourist destination, which are mostly related to nature and "green" tourism, and less so  
38  
39 to the sun and beach tourism that is predominant in Spain. Tourists with a stronger  
40  
41 familiarity with the country will therefore not necessarily make a stronger association  
42  
43 between country and region in their minds.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 ***5.1. Managerial implications*** 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1           These results have implications for the management of regional destinations, and  
2  
3 especially for the attraction and loyalty of international tourists. First of all, in line with  
4  
5 Konecnik and Gartner (2004), Pike et al. (2010) and Pike and Bianchi (2013) the  
6  
7 empirical evidence obtained supports that regional DMOs should focus marketing  
8  
9 efforts on fostering destination brand equity for international tourists. According to this  
10  
11 would require a strong stress on communication and promotion campaigns.  
12  
13  
14

15           Moreover, the identification of a chain of effects between the dimensions of the  
16  
17 customer-based brand equity for a tourist destination, provides new insight for  
18  
19 marketing management as it evidences the convenience on focusing more on some  
20  
21 dimensions (e.g. brand awareness and image) before putting the stress on more  
22  
23 elaborated dimensions such as perceived quality and brand loyalty. Thus, to the extent  
24  
25 that our results confirms that perceived quality and brand loyalty are built on the basis  
26  
27 of the perceptions regarding brand awareness and image (Konecnik and Gartner, 2004;  
28  
29 Boo et al., 2009; Pike, 2007, 2010), these two dimensions should be the center of  
30  
31 promotion campaigns in a first stage.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37           Accordingly, developing a higher renown for a destination will be associated with  
38  
39 higher perceptions of quality, which will lead to stronger intentions of return and  
40  
41 willingness to recommend it to other people. Regarding brand image, communication  
42  
43 campaigns should be designed to build brand associations based on the main resources  
44  
45 of the destination demanded by the target segment, and in which the destination has  
46  
47 competitive advantages (Qu et al., 2011; Pike and Bianchi, 2013). That is to say, the  
48  
49 destination should be clearly recognizable and to have brand associations that  
50  
51 differentiate it so tourists perceived it as a high quality destination which, in turn, would  
52  
53 lead them to have a high loyalty.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1           The design of promotion and communication campaigns should be based on a  
2  
3 market-orientation approach, both with regard to the identification of relevant countries  
4  
5 for tourist attraction (Pike and Bianchi, 2013), and to market segmentation in each  
6  
7 country of origin. In particular, small and specialized regional destinations (such as  
8  
9 Cantabria), with limited resources for brand promotion, should focus on a few nearby  
10  
11 countries to be efficient in the generation of brand awareness (Konecnik and Gartner,  
12  
13 countries to be efficient in the generation of brand awareness (Konecnik and Gartner,  
14  
15 2004). Reaching the group of tourists interested in the main attractions of the  
16  
17 destination is fundamental for success in the creation of an international brand image,  
18  
19 and this requires in-depth analysis of the characteristics and preferences of tourists in  
20  
21 each country of origin (Pike and Bianchi, 2013). Regional destinations should therefore  
22  
23 identify those countries nearby where are more valued by potential tourists, target the  
24  
25 tourists most suited for the destination, and design communication campaigns focused  
26  
27 on those tourist attractions in which the regional destination is able to add value to the  
28  
29 target groups.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35           The influence that country destination image exerts on the regional destination  
36  
37 image according to our results, has also relevant implications for the management of  
38  
39 tourism destinations. First, regional DMOs should try to take advantage of the country  
40  
41 destination image to reinforce the regional brand (Cubillo et al., 2006; Herrero et al.,  
42  
43 2015). This is particularly recommended in the case of regions that are not very  
44  
45 renowned as tourist destinations, but that are located in countries with a well-known  
46  
47 tourism brand, as is the case of Cantabria and Spain. Linking a regional destination to a  
48  
49 country destination would help to international tourists better understand and evaluate  
50  
51 such a destination, which would lead to a better brand image (Cubillo et al., 2006). This  
52  
53 is especially recommendable if both, country and region, have valuable attributes in  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 common (for example, resources such as beaches, cultural heritage and gastronomy in  
2  
3 the case of Cantabria and Spain). International tourists with less knowledge of a  
4  
5 regional destination may therefore have a better perception of that destination if they  
6  
7 associate it with the country destination.  
8  
9

10 If it is possible to undertake a coordinated or even joint promotion of the country  
11  
12 and region brands, this could have an impact on building the regional destination brand,  
13  
14 which in turn would strengthen the national touristic demand. Coordinated promotion  
15  
16 campaigns can offer different values for both the country and the regional destination  
17  
18 (Dooley & Bowie, 2005; Harish, 2010). Joint promotion campaigns also allow the cost  
19  
20 to be shared between the country and the regions, which suggests either a cheaper  
21  
22 investment to reach the targeted international markets or a stronger impact with the  
23  
24 same promotional budget. From the country perspective, the coordination of  
25  
26 promotional campaigns allows the projection of a more diverse image of the country,  
27  
28 therefore showing a more varied and valuable offer for international tourists, which  
29  
30 could foster longer stays for tourists to visit more places, or the creation of circuits  
31  
32 complementary to the standard tourism model (sun and beaches in the case of Spain).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 From the point of view of regional destinations, coordinated promotion campaigns  
41  
42 could serve to build new trans-regional destination images within the country, by  
43  
44 linking the tourism offer of a region with the offer of other regions which have common  
45  
46 or complementary attributes (for example, natural resources as mountains or forests,  
47  
48 cultural resources as castles, Romanic or Modernist buildings, local products such as  
49  
50 wine or olive oil, or gastronomy such as “tapas” in the north of Spain or “paella” on the  
51  
52 Mediterranean shore).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 5.2. *Limitations and further research*

It is important to highlight that, despite the rigorous methodology used in our empirical research, this study has several limitations. The fact that this research focuses on a specific regional destination (Cantabria) and a country destination (Spain), could limit the generalization of the results. It would be very interesting to replicate the study in other countries and regions with different degrees of similarity between the brands in tourism. In this sense, Spain should be a relevant benchmark for the understanding of the relationship between regional destination image and country destination image, as it is one of the major tourist destinations in the world. In addition, with the purpose of generating evidence about the robustness of the model, it should be examined the role of different socio-demographic or behavioral characteristics of tourists as control or moderator variable.

Another limitation of this study is related to the composition of the sample in terms of nationality of the tourists (our sample was formed mainly of tourists from countries in Europe). It would be very interesting to develop similar studies examining tourists from countries with very different preferences and cultures. Finally, recent studies have included tourist satisfaction as an antecedent of the loyalty in the models of destination brand equity (Bigné, et al., 2013). Thus, it would be interesting to examine in-depth the role of this variable in future researches in this field.

### **Acknowledgments**

This research has been funded by the Dirección General de Turismo del Gobierno de Cantabria (Spain)

1 **Appendix**  
2  
3

4 Destination image (for the country and the region)

5  
6 *Natural environment (landscape, beaches, natural parks, ...)*

7  
8 *Cultural heritage (monuments, museums, folklore, ...)*

9  
10 *Tourist infrastructure (accommodation, restaurants, shopping, ...)*

11  
12 *Leisure and recreation activities (sport, adventure, ...)*

13  
14  
15 *Local cuisine*

16  
17  
18 *Hospitality*  
19

20  
21 Awareness of the regional destination

22  
23 *Cantabria is a clearly recognizable tourist destination*

24  
25 *Cantabria is a famous tourist destination*

26  
27  
28 *Cantabria is a well-known tourist destination*  
29

30  
31 Perceived quality of the regional destination

32  
33 *Tourist resources in Cantabria are attractive*

34  
35 *Tourist products and services in Cantabria are excellent*

36  
37  
38 *Cantabria is a quality tourist destination*  
39

40  
41 Loyalty toward the regional destination

42  
43 *I will try to come back to Cantabria*

44  
45 *I will encourage my family and friends to visit Cantabria*

46  
47  
48 *I would recommend Cantabria if someone asked me*  
49

50  
51 Country familiarity

52  
53 *I have high knowledge about Spain*

54  
55 *I have a precise vision of the characteristics of Spain*

56  
57  
58 *I'm very familiar with Spain*  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **References**  
5

6 Aaker, D.A. (1996). *Building strong brands*. New York: Free Press.  
7

8 Aaker, D.A., & Joachimsthaler, E. (2000). The brand relationship spectrum: Key to the  
9 brand architecture challenge. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 8-23.  
10  
11

12 Ahmed, Z., Johnson, J., Ling, C., Fang, T., & Hui, A.T.Y. (2010). Country-of -origin  
13 and brand effects on consumers' evaluations of cruise lines. *International Marketing*  
14 *Review*, 19(3), 279-302.  
15  
16  
17

18 Alba, J., & Hutchinson, J.W. (1987). Dimensions of consumer expertise. *Journal of*  
19 *Consumer Research*, 13(March), 411-454.  
20  
21  
22

23 Anderson, J R. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge: Harvard University  
24 Press.  
25  
26  
27

28 Anholt, S. 2006. The Anholt-GMI city brands index: How the world sees the worlds  
29 cities. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 2(1): 18–31.  
30  
31  
32

33 Ashworth, G., & Kavaratzis, M. (2007). Beyond the logo: Brand management for cities.  
34 *Journal of Brand Management*, 16(8), 520-531.  
35  
36  
37

38 Baker, D., & Crompton, J. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions.  
39 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 785-804.  
40  
41  
42

43 Balabanis, G., Mueller, R., & Melewar, T.C. (2002). The human values' lenses of  
44 country of origin images. *International Marketing Review*, 19(6), 582-610.  
45  
46  
47

48 Baloglu S., (2001). Image variations of Turkey by familiarity index: informational and  
49 experiential dimensions. *Tourism Management*, 22, 127-133.  
50  
51  
52

53 Baloglu S., & McCleary, K. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of*  
54 *Tourism Research*, 26(4), 868-897.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Bigné, E., Sánchez, I., & Sánchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and  
2 after purchase behaviour: Inter- relationship. *Tourism Management*, 22(6), 607-616.  
3  
4  
5 Bigné, E., Sánchez, I., & Sanz, S. (2005). Relationships among residents' image,  
6 evaluation of the stay and post-purchase behavior. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 11(4),  
7  
8  
9 291-302.  
10  
11  
12 Bigné E., Andreu, L., & Zanfardini, M. (2013). *El valor de la Responsabilidad Social*  
13  
14  
15 *Corporativa en la equidad de marca de destinos turísticos*. Investigación Turística:  
16  
17 Editorial Ramón Areces.  
18  
19  
20 Bloemer, J., De Ruyter, J., & Peeters, P. (1998). Investigating drivers of bank loyalty:  
21 the complex relationship between image, service quality and satisfaction. *International*  
22  
23 *Journal of Bank Marketing*, 16(7), 276-286.  
24  
25  
26  
27 Bloemer, J., De Ruyter, J., & Wetzels, M. (1998). Linking perceived service quality and  
28 service loyalty: a multi-dimensional perspective. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33  
29  
30  
31 (11/12), 1082-1106.  
32  
33  
34  
35 Boo, S., Busser, J., & Baloglu, S. (2009). A model of customer-based brand equity and  
36 its application to multiple destinations. *Tourism Management*, 30, 219-231.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Boulding W, Kalra A, Staelin R, Zeithaml V (1993). A dynamic process model of  
41 service quality: from expectations to behavioural intentions. *Journal of Market*  
42  
43 *Research*, 30 (7),7-27.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Chan, C. and Marafa, L. (2013). A review of place branding methodologies in the new  
48 millennium. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 9 (4), 236–253  
49  
50  
51  
52 Chen, C-S., & Myagmarsuren, O. (2010). Exploring relationships between Mongolian  
53 destination brand equity, satisfaction and destination loyalty. *Tourism Economics*,  
54  
55  
56 16(4), 981-994.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Chen, C-F., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect  
2 behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28, 1115-1122.  
3  
4  
5  
6 Cordell, V.V. (1997). Consumer knowledge measures as predictors in product  
7 evaluation. *Psychology, & Marketing*, 14(3), 241-260.  
8  
9  
10  
11 Cubillo, J.M., Sánchez, J., & Cerviño, J. (2006). International students' decision-making  
12 process. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(2), 101-115.  
13  
14  
15  
16 Dooley, G., & Bowie, D. (2005). Place brand architecture: Strategic management of the  
17 brand portfolio. *Place Branding*, 1(4), 402-419.  
18  
19  
20  
21 Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store  
22 information on buyers' product evaluations, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28 (3),  
23 307-319.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Erdem, T. & Swait, J. (1998), Brand equity as a signaling phenomenon, *Journal of*  
29 *Consumer Psychology*, 7 (2), 131-157.  
30  
31  
32  
33 Esch, F. R., Langner, T., Schmitt, B.H., & Geus, P. (2006), Are brands forever?  
34 How brand knowledge and relationships affect current and future purchases, *Journal of*  
35 *Product & Brand Management*, 15 (2), 98-105.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Fakeye, P.C., & Crompton, J.L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-  
41 time and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*,  
42 30(2), 10-16.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Gertner, D. (2011). Unfolding and configuring two decades of research and publications  
48 on place marketing and place branding. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 7(2),  
49 91-106.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Gilmore, F. (2002). A country - Can it be repositioned? The success story of Spain.  
56 *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4/5), 281-293.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 Han, C.M. (1989). Country image: Halo or summary construct? *Journal of Marketing*  
2  
3 *Research*, 26(2), 222-229.  
4
- 5 Hanna, S., & Rowley, J. (2007). An analysis of terminology use in place branding.  
6  
7 *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 4, 61-75.  
8  
9
- 10 Hankinson, G. (2001). Location branding: A study of the branding practices of 12  
11  
12 English cities, *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 127–142.  
13  
14
- 15 Hankinson, G. (2005). Destination brand images: a business tourism perspective. *The*  
16  
17 *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(1), 24-32.  
18  
19
- 20 Hankinson , G . ( 2009 ) Managing destination brands: Establishing a theoretical  
21  
22 foundation . *Journal of Marketing Management* 25 (1 – 2) : 97 – 115 .  
23  
24
- 25 Hankinson (2010). Place branding research: A cross-disciplinary agenda and the views  
26  
27 of practitioners. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 6 (4), 300-315.  
28  
29
- 30 Harish, R. (2010). Brand architecture in tourism branding: the way forward for India.  
31  
32 *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 2(3), 153-165.  
33  
34
- 35 Hennig-Thurau, T., Langer, M. & Hansen, U. (2001). Modeling and managing student loyalty:  
36  
37 An approach based on the concept of relationship quality. *Journal of Service Research*, 3 (4),  
38  
39 pp. 331-344.  
40
- 41 Herrero, A., San Martín, H., García de los Salmenes, M.M., & Del Río Peña, A. (2015).  
42  
43 Influence of country and city images on students' perception of host universities and  
44  
45 their satisfaction with the assigned destination for their exchange programmes. *Place*  
46  
47 *Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 11, 190-203.  
48  
49
- 50 Hoyer, W. D. & Brown, S. P. 1990. Effects of brand awareness on choice for a  
51  
52 common, repeatpurchase product. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17 (2), 141-148.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Im, H., Kim, S., Ellio, S., & Han, H. (2012). Conceptualizing destination brand equity  
2 dimensions from a customer-based equity perspective. *Journal of Travel, & Tourism*  
3 *Marketing*, 29(4), 385-403.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Javalgi, R.G., Cutler, B., & Winans, B. (2001). At your service! Does country of origin  
9 research apply to services. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 15(6/7), 565-582.  
10  
11  
12 Jin, N., Lee, H., & Lee, S. (2013). Event quality, perceived value, destination image,  
13 and behavioral intention of sports events: The case of the IAAF World Championship,  
14 Daegu, 2011. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(8), 849-864.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Kapferer, J.N. (2000). *Strategic Brand Management*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London, UK: Kogan  
21 Page.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Kim, M., Yurt, O., Guneri, B., & Kurtulus, K. (2010). Branding places: applying  
brand personality concept to cities. *European Journal of Marketing*, 4(9/10), 1286-  
1304.

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

Keller, K.L. (2003). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing  
brand equity*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kim, B.P., Murrmann, S.K., & Lee, G. (2009). Moderating effects of gender and  
organizational level between role stress and job satisfaction among hotel employees.  
*International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28, 612-619.

Kim, S-H., Holland, S., & Han, H-S. (2013). A structural model for examining how  
destination image, perceived value, and service quality affect destination loyalty: a case  
study of Orlando. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 313-328.



1 Konecnik, M. (2004). Evaluating Slovenia's image as a tourism destination: A self-  
2 analysis process towards building a destination brand. *Journal of Brand Management*,  
3 11(4), 307-316.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 Konecnik, M. (2006). Croatian-based brand equity for Slovenia as a tourism destination.  
9 *Economic and Business Review for Central and South - Eastern Europe*, 8(1), 83-108.  
10  
11  
12 Konecnik, M., & Gartner, W. (2007). Customer-based brand equity for a destination.  
13 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 400-421.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Kotler, P., & Gertner, D. (2002). Country as brand, product, and beyond: A place  
19 marketing and brand management perspective. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(4/5),  
20 249-261.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Kotler, P., Haider, D.H., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing places: Attracting investment,*  
26 *industry and tourism to cities, states and nations.* New York: The Free Press.  
27  
28  
29  
30 Lee, C., Lee, Y., & Lee, B. (2005). Korea's destination image formed by the 2002  
31 world cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 839-858.  
32  
33  
34  
35 Lee, H-M., Lee, C-C., & Wu, C-C. (2011). Brand image strategy affects brand equity  
36 after M&A. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(7), 1091-1111.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Ming, T., Bin, Ismail, H. & Rasiah, D. (2011). *Hierarchical Chain Of Consumer-Based*  
41 *Brand Equity: Review From The Fast Food Industry*, *The International Business &*  
42 *Economics Research Journal*, 10 (9), September, 67-79.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Moon, K-S., Kob, Y.J., Connaughton, D.P., & Lee, J-H. (2013). A mediating role of  
48 destination image in the relationship between event quality, perceived value, and  
49 behavioral intention. *Journal of Sport, & Tourism*, 18(1), 49-66.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Park. C., & Lessig. V.P. (1991). Familiarity and its impact on consumer decision biases  
55 and heuristics. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2, 223-230.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Pike, S.D. (2007). Customer-based brand equity for destinations: Practical DMO  
2  
3 performance measures. *Journal of Travel, & Tourism Marketing*, 22(1), 51-61.  
4  
5 Pike, S.D. (2009). Destination brand positions of a competitive set of near-home  
6  
7 destinations. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 857-866.  
8  
9  
10 Pike, S. (2000). Destination branding case study: tracking brand equity for an emerging  
11  
12 destination between 2003 and 2007. *Journal of Hospitality, & Tourism Research*, 34(1),  
13  
14 124-139.  
15  
16  
17 Pike, S., Bianchi, C., & Kerr, G. (2010). Customer-based brand equity for Australia as a  
18  
19 long-haul tourism destination in an emerging market. *International Marketing Review*,  
20  
21 27(4), 434-449.  
22  
23  
24 Pike, S., & Bianchi, C. (2013). Destination brand equity for Australia: testing a model  
25  
26 of CBBE in short-haul and long-haul markets (2013). *Journal of Hospitality, & Tourism*  
27  
28 *Research*, 10(10), 1–21  
29  
30  
31 Pike, S., & Ryan, C. (2004). Destination positioning analysis through a comparison of  
32  
33 cognitive, affective, and conative perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 333-  
34  
35 342.  
36  
37  
38 Prayag, G. (2012). Paradise for who? Segmenting visitors' satisfaction with cognitive  
39  
40 image and predicting behavioural loyalty. *International Journal of Tourism Research*,  
41  
42 14, 1-15.  
43  
44  
45 Priester, J.R., Nayakankuppam, D., Fleming, M.A., & Godek, J. (2004). The A2SC2  
46  
47 model: The influence of attitudes and attitude strength on consideration and choice.  
48  
49 *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(4), 574-587.  
50  
51  
52 Ro, H. (2012). Moderator and mediator effects in hospitality research. *International*  
53  
54 *Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, 952- 961.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1 San Martín, H., & Rodríguez del Bosque, I.A. (2008). Exploring the cognitive-affective  
2 nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation.  
3  
4  
5  
6 *Tourism Management*, 29, 263-277.
- 7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and  
satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-  
56.
- Zabkar, V., Brencic, M., & Dmitrovic, T. (2010). Modelling perceived quality, visitor  
satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level. *Tourism Management*,  
31, 537-546.
- Zenker, S. (2009). Who's your target? The creative class as a target group for place  
branding. *Journal of Place Management and Development* 2(1), 23-32.
- Zhang L., & Zhao, S.X. (2009). City branding and the Olympic effect: A case study of  
Beijing, *Cities* 26, 245-254.

**Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Population (%)</b>	<b>Sample (%)</b>	
Male	52.0	52.6	
Female	48.0	47.4	
<b>Age</b>	<b>Population (%)</b>	<b>Sample (%)</b>	
15-24 years	12.6	13.8	
25-44 years	44.2	44.7	
45-64 years	33.7	33.2	
64 or more years	9.5	8.3	
<b>Education level</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Country of origin</b>	<b>%</b>
Less than primary	3.6	United Kingdom	23.3
Primary	6.0	Germany	15.0
Secondary	21.5	Ireland	14.6
University	68.9	Netherlands	9.1
<b>Occupation</b>	<b>%</b>	France	6.7
Worker	65.1	Italy	5.1
Student	17.5	Belgium	3.6
Housewife	5.2	United States	2.8
Unemployed/retired	12.2	Other countries	19.8

**Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis**

Factor	Variable	Mean	Standard Coefficient	R <sup>2</sup>	Cronbach's α	Composite Reliability	Goodness of fit indices
Loyalty toward the regional destination	BELOY1. I will try to come back to Cantabria	8.50	0.634	0.401	0.834	0.870	Normed $\chi^2 = 2.02$ BBNNFI = 0.88 IFI = 0.90 CFI = 0.90 RMSEA = 0.06
	BELOY2. I will encourage my family and friends to visit Cantabria	8.77	0.926	0.858			
	BELOY3. I would recommend Cantabria if someone asked me	8.92	0.911	0.829			
Perceived quality of the regional destination	BEQUA1. Tourist resources in Cantabria are attractive	7.71	0.736	0.541	0.829	0.832	
	BEQUA2. Tourist products and services in Cantabria are excellent	7.56	0.828	0.685			
	BEQUA3. Cantabria is a quality tourist destination	8.03	0.803	0.645			
Awareness of the regional destination	BEAWA1. Cantabria is a clearly recognizable tourist destination	5.85	0.833	0.694	0.910	0.912	
	BEAWA2. Cantabria is a famous tourist destination	4.91	0.894	0.798			
	BEAWA3. Cantabria is a well-known tourist destination	5.07	0.912	0.831			
Region's destination image	DICAN1. Natural environment (landscape, beaches, natural parks, ...)	8.78	0.420	0.176	0.703	0.716	
	DICAN2. Cultural heritage (monuments, museums, folklore, ...)	7.38	0.467	0.219			
	DICAN3. Tourist infrastructure (accommodation, restaurants, shopping, ...)	7.79	0.698	0.488			
	DICAN4. Leisure and recreation activities (sport, adventure, ...)	7.59	0.633	0.400			

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

	DICan5. Local cuisine	8.24	0.564	0.319			
	DICan6. Hospitality	8.56	0.465	0.216			
Country's destination image	DISpa1. Natural environment (landscape, beaches, natural parks, ...)	8.51	0.629	0.396	0.836	0.836	
	DISpa2. Cultural heritage (monuments, museums, folklore, ...)	8.21	0.733	0.537			
	DISpa3. Tourist infrastructure (accommodation, restaurants, shopping, ...)	8.16	0.763	0.582			
	DISpa4. Leisure and recreation activities (sport, adventure, ...)	7.80	0.668	0.446			
	DISpa5. Local cuisine	8.48	0.672	0.452			
	DISpa6. Hospitality	8.47	0.599	0.359			

**Table 3. Confidence intervals for the correlations between pairs of latent variables**

	<b>Loyalty</b>	<b>Perceived quality</b>	<b>Awareness</b>	<b>Region's destination image</b>
<b>Perceived quality</b>	0.540 <sup>a</sup> (0.408 ; 0.672) <sup>b</sup>			
<b>Awareness</b>	0.086 (-0.050 ; 0.222)	0.373 (0.241 ; 0.505)		
<b>Region's destination image</b>	0.419 (0.273 ; 0.565)	0.638 (0.508 ; 0.768)	0.275 (0.109 ; 0.441)	
<b>Country's destination image</b>	0.359 (0.217 ; 0.501)	0.565 (0.431 ; 0.699)	0.153 (-0.013 ; 0.319)	0.673 (0.545 ; 0.801)

<sup>a</sup> Correlation among variables; <sup>b</sup> Confidence interval for high correlations


**Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis for testing the moderating effect**

	Regional destination image	
	Step 1	Step 2
<b>Country destination image</b>	0.55 <sup>a***</sup>	0.56 <sup>***</sup>
<b>Country familiarity</b>	0.04 (n.s)	0.04 (n.s)
<b>Country destination image * Country familiarity</b>		0.05 (n.s)
<b>Adjusted R-square</b>	0.32	0.32


<sup>a</sup> Standardized coefficients; \*\*\* p< 0.01; (n.s.) not significant



1  
2  
3  
4 **Figure 1. Theoretical model**  
5  
6



**Figure 2. Estimation of the model**



\*\* Standardized coefficients estimated for each causal relationship are significant for a confidence-level of 95.0% (results in parentheses are t-values related to estimates).