

Steven PIKE\*

**MJERENJE UČINKOVITOSTI MARKE DESTINACIJE TIJEKOM VREMENA:  
PRAĆENJE PERCEPCIJA KLIJENATA KONKURENTSKOG SKUPA  
DESTINACIJA U DESETOGODIŠNJEM RAZDOBLJU**

**DESTINATION BRAND PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OVER TIME:  
TRACKING CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS OF A COMPETITIVE SET OF  
DESTINATIONS OVER A 10 YEAR PERIOD**

---

**SAŽETAK:** Vrlo je malo istraživanja koja se bave praćenjem promjena imidža turističke destinacije tijekom vremena. S obzirom na to da se sve više ulaže u brendiranje destinacija, nedostaje istraživanja koja bi omogućila bolje razumijevanje načina na koje se u određenom vremenskom razdoblju može pratiti učinkovitost marke turističke destinacije, a čiji je ključni konstrukt imidž turističke destinacije. Ovaj rad opisuje rezultate četiriju istraživanja koja su analizirala učinkovitost marki pet međusobno konkurentnih destinacija između 2003. i 2012. godine. Rezultati pokazuju da je došlo do minimalnih promjena u percepciji tih pet destinacija u navedenih 10 godina, što potvrđuje tvrdnju Gartnera (1986) te Gartnera i Hunta (1987) da do promjene imidža turističke destinacije sporo dolazi. Iako je ovo istraživanje provedeno u Australiji, ono organizacijama za upravljanje turističkim destinacijama u drugim dijelovima svijeta pruža praktični alat za evaluaciju učinkovitosti marke u određenom razdoblju, mjerila učinkovitosti prošlih marketinških komunikacija i indikatore buduće učinkovitosti.

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** destinacijske marketinške organizacije, kontekst putovanja, tržišna vrijednost marke iz perspektive potrošača, imidž destinacije

**SUMMARY:** There has been a paucity of research published in relation to the temporal aspect of destination image change over time. Given increasing investments in destination branding, research is needed to enhance understanding of how to monitor destination brand performance, of which destination image is the core construct, over time. This article reports the results of four studies tracking brand performance of a competitive set of five destinations, between 2003 and 2012. Results indicate minimal changes in perceptions held of the five destinations of interest over the 10 years, supporting the assertion of Gartner (1986) and Gartner and Hunt (1987) that destination image change will only occur slowly over time. While undertaken in Australia, the research approach provides DMOs in other parts of the world with a practical tool for evaluating brand performance over time; in terms of measures of effectiveness of past marketing communications, and indicators of future performance.

**KEYWORDS:** destination marketing organizations, travel context, consumer-based brand equity, destination image

---

\* Associate Professor Steven Pike, Ph.D., Queensland University of Technology, Marketing QUT Business School, Australia, e-mail: sd.pike@qut.edu.au

## 1. UVOD

Tema brendiranja prvi se puta javlja u marketinškoj literaturi prije više od 70 godina (vidi Guest 1942; Banks 1950; Gardner i Levy, 1955). Međutim, brendiranje turističkih destinacija počinje se razvijati kao posebno područje tek 1998. godine (vidi Došen, Vranešević i Prebežac, 1998; Pritchard i Morgan, 1998). Od tada je ta nova tema privukla veliko zanimanje akademske zajednice tako da nedavni pregled literature o brendiranju turističkih destinacija (Pike, 2009) navodi 74 publikacije 102 autora objavljene između 1998. i 2007. godine. Napisan je i niz članaka o brendiranju destinacija (vidi Morgan, Pritchard i Pride, 2002, 2004, 2011; Baker, 2007, 2012; Donald i Gammack, 2007; Cai, Gartner i Munar, 2009; Moilanen i Rainisto, 2009). S jedne strane, studije slučaja pokazale su da se turističke destinacije mogu brendirati (vidi npr. Crockett i Wood, 1999; Curtis, 2001; Morgan, Pritchard i Piggott, 2002; Pride, 2002), ali, usprkos sve većem zanimanju akademske zajednice za to područje, malo je radova koje se bave mjerenjem učinkovitosti marke turističke destinacije *tijekom vremena* (Pike i Page, 2014). Taj vremenski aspekt nedovoljno je obrađen u literaturi, osobito ako se uzme u obzir da su i) destinacijske marketinške organizacije od 1990-ih sve više ulagale u operacije brendiranja, koje su uključivale i pokušaje rebrendiranja i repositioniranja, te ii) da je još prije tri desetljeća utvrđeno da se imidž destinacije sporo mijenja (vidi Gartner, 1986; Gartner i Hunt, 1987).

Marketinški stručnjaci za robu široke potrošnje koncept tržišne vrijednosti marke rabe kao indikator tržišne učinkovitosti te se ona u bilanci tvrtke navodi kao financijska vrijednost. Međutim, takva vrijednost nematerijalne imovine marke bit će od male praktične koristi destinacijskim marketinškim organizacijama i njihovim dionicima. Drugi alat za mjerenje djelotvornosti marke koji više odgovara destinacijskim marke-

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The topic of branding first appeared in the marketing literature over 70 years ago (see Guest 1942; Banks 1950; Gardner and Levy, 1955). However, the tourism destination branding field did not commence until 1998 (see Došen, Vranešević and Prebežac, 1998; Pritchard and Morgan, 1998). In the time since, this emergent topic has attracted increasing academic interest, with a recent review of the destination branding literature (Pike, 2009) tabling 74 publications by 102 authors published between 1998 and 2007. A number of destination branding texts have also been published (see Morgan, Pritchard and Pride, 2002, 2004, 2011; Baker 2007, 2012; Donald and Gammack 2007; Cai, Gartner and Munar, 2009; Moilanen and Rainisto, 2009). While case studies have shown destinations can be branded (see for example Crockett and Wood, 1999; Curtis, 2001; Morgan, Pritchard and Piggott, 2002; Pride, 2002), and in spite of the increasing academic interest in the field, little has been reported on the measurement of destination brand performance *over time* (Pike and Page, 2014). This temporal aspect is an important gap in the literature, given i) the increasing investments being made in branding initiatives by destination marketing organisations (DMO) since the 1990s, which have included rebranding and repositioning attempts, and ii) the proposition three decades ago that destination image change will only occur slowly over time (see Gartner, 1986; Gartner and Hunt, 1987).

For marketers of consumer goods, the concept of *brand equity* is commonly used as an indicator of market performance, and is reported as a financial value on the corporate balance sheet. However, such an intangible asset value of the brand will be of little practical use to DMOs and their stakeholders. An alternative tool in brand effectiveness measurement that is better suited to DMOs

tinškim organizacijama je tržišna vrijednost marke s aspekta potrošača (CBBE) koju zagovaraju Aaker (1991, 1996) i Keller (1993, 2003). Literatura koja ispituje potencijal tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive potrošača za destinacije javlja se 2006. godine (vidi Konečnik, 2006; Konečnik i Gartner, 2007; Pike 2007, 2009, 2010; Boo, Busser i Baloglu, 2009; Kim, Kim i An, 2009; Chen i Myagmarsuren, 2010; Pike, Bianchi, Kerr i Patti, 2010; Gartner i Konecnik Ruzzier, 2011; Bianchi i Pike, 2011; Lim i Weaver, 2012; Im, Kim, Elliot i Han, 2012; Bianchi, Pike i Lings, 2014). Cilj ovoga rada je istražiti upotrebu hijerarhije tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive potrošača za praćenje percepcija konkurentskog skupa pet australskih turističkih destinacija u desetogodišnjem razdoblju, od 2003. do 2012. godine.

U državi Queensland u Australiji, državna organizacija za turizam (STO) službeno priznaje 13 regionalnih turističkih organizacija (RTO). *Tourism and Events Queensland* (vidi [www.tq.com.au](http://www.tq.com.au)) pruža financijsku pomoć i pomoć u ljudskim resursima regionalnim turističkim organizacijama. Većina te pomoći je od početka stoljeća pružena upravo za razvoj kampanja za brendiranje destinacije. Brisbane, glavni grad, predstavlja najvažnije tržište po broju posjetitelja od svih regionalnih turističkih organizacija Queenslanda sa svojih 2,07 milijuna stanovnika, što čini 46,7% od 4,3 milijuna stanovnika koliko prema popisu iz 2011. godine ima ta država (Državni zavod za statistiku Australije, 2011).

Ovaj se rad bavi područjem Bundaberga kojeg je organizacija *Tourism and Events Queensland* klasificirala kao *destinaciju u nastajanju*. To je raznoliko područje koja pokriva 26.000 kvadratnih kilometara i sastoji se od 11 administrativnih cjelina. Područje Bundaberg nalazi se na četiri sata vožnje sjeverno od grada Brisbanea i obuhvaća veliko ruralno zaleđe, u kojemu je Bundaberg (45.000 stanovnika) najveći grad te dugačku obalu koja obuhvaća i južni početak slavnog Velikog koraljnog grebena. *Tourism Queensland* organizirao je 2002. godine niz fokus

is consumer-based brand equity (CBBE), promoted by Aaker (1991, 1996) and Keller (1993, 2003). The literature testing the potential of CBBE for destinations commenced in 2006 (see Konečnik, 2006; Konečnik and Gartner, 2007; Pike 2007, 2009, 2010; Boo, Busser and Baloglu, 2009; Kim, Kim and An, 2009; Chen and Myagmarsuren, 2010; Pike *et al.*, 2010; Gartner and Konečnik Ruzzier, 2011; Bianchi and Pike, 2011; Lim and Weaver, 2012; Im *et al.*, 2012; Bianchi, Pike and Lings, 2014). The purpose of this paper is to report the use of the CBBE hierarchy to monitor perceptions of a competitive set of five Australian destinations over a 10 year period between 2003 and 2012.

In the state of Queensland, Australia, 13 regional tourism organisations (RTO) are officially recognized by the state tourism organization (STO). Tourism and Events Queensland (see [www.tq.com.au](http://www.tq.com.au)) provides financial and human resource assistance to the RTOs, much of which, since the turn of the century, has been invested in the development of destination brand campaigns. Brisbane, the state capital, is the most important market in terms of visitor arrivals for all Queensland RTOs, with the 2.07 million residents representing 46.7% of the state's 4.3 million Census population in 2011 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011).

In this project the destination of interest is the Bundaberg region, which has been classified by Tourism and Events Queensland as an *emerging destination*. This is a diverse region covering 26,000 square kilometres and 11 local government areas. Located a four hour drive north of Brisbane city, the Bundaberg region encompasses a large rural hinterland, for which Bundaberg (population 45,000) is the largest city, and a lengthy coastline that includes the southern starting point of the iconic Great Barrier Reef. In 2002, Tourism Queensland undertook a series of focus groups with Brisbane residents to investigate perceptions of the Bundaberg region. The study found the area lacked a

grupa sa stanovnicima Brisbanea kako bi se istražila percepcija područja Bundaberg. Istraživanje je otkrilo da tom području nedostaje jasan identitet turističke destinacije (Tourism Queensland, 2003). Kako bi riješile taj problem, regionalne turističke organizacije i državna organizacija za turizam razvile su i 2003. godine lansirale novu marku destinacije koja je imala tri cilja:

- razviti svijest o turističkoj destinaciji
- educirati tržište o tome što se na toj destinaciji može raditi
- stimulirati zanimanje za destinaciju i povećati posjećenost.

Tema novog pozicioniranja marke iz 2003. godine bila je *Dajte si vremena da otkrijete Bundaberg, Koralljne otoke i unutrašnjost*. Neposredno pred pokretanje te kampanje 2003. godine, na tržištu Brisbanea, a u sklopu ovog istraživačkog projekta, počele su se uspoređivati percepcije ove turističke destinacije s onima konkurentskih turističkih područja. Cilj je bio pratiti percepcije tržišta tijekom vremena, s obzirom na tri navedena cilja. U prvom desetljeću postojanja marke, između 2003. i 2012. godine, provedena su četiri takva istraživanja.

## 2. PREGLED LITERATURE

Dugo se već zna da jaka konkurencija među turističkim destinacijama koje imaju sličnu ponudu i prednosti vodi ka tomu da mnoga mjesta postaju međusobno zamjenjiva na tržištu (Cohen 1972:172; Phelps, 1986; Gilbert, 1990). Pošto su kupci razmaženi velikim izborom proizvoda i usluga, djelotvorno brendiranje danas se smatra korisnim i iz perspektive potražnje i iz perspektive ponude; kupcu pomaže da jednostavnije done-se odluku i smanji rizik prilikom kupovine, a istovremeno marketinškim stručnjacima omogućava da stvore očekivanja i ispune ih tako što svoju ponudu diferenciraju u odnosu na onu konkurenata (Keller, 2003). U turizmu, turističke destinacije predstavljaju najveće marke (Morgan, Pritchard i Pride,

clear identity as a tourism destination (Tourism Queensland, 2003). To address this problem a new destination brand, developed by the RTO and STO, was launched in 2003 with three objectives:

- to raise awareness of the destination
- to educate the market about things to do
- to stimulate increased interest in, and visitation to the region

The new 2003 brand positioning theme was *Take time to Discover Bundaberg, Coral Isles and Country*. Also in 2003, this research project commenced to benchmark perceptions of the destination, relative to competing regions, in the Brisbane market, immediately prior to the campaign launch. The aim was to monitor market perceptions over time, relative to the three objectives. Four studies were undertaken between 2003 and 2012 over the first decade of the brand's existence.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

It has long been recognised that intense competition between destinations offering similar features and benefits would lead to many places becoming increasingly substitutable in the market place (Cohen 1972:172; Phelps, 1986; Gilbert, 1990). Since consumers are spoilt by choice of products and services, effective branding is now regarded as mutually beneficial for both the demand and supply perspectives; helping the consumer simplify decision making and reduce purchase risk, while enabling the marketer to create and deliver expectations, in a way that differentiates the offering from rivals (Keller, 2003). In the tourism industry, destinations have emerged as the biggest brands (Morgan, Pritchard and Pride, 2002). Academic interest in the destination branding field has been underpinned by increasing DMO investments in destination brand campaigns, particularly since the 1990s. While there is

2002). Akademsko zanimanje za brendiranje turističkih destinacija je povećano i time što organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama sve više investiraju u kampanje brendiranja destinacija, osobito od 1990-ih godina. Iako do sada nije jednoglasno prihvaćena ni jedna definicija brendiranja turističke destinacije (vidi Park i Petrick, 2006; Nuttavuthisit, 2007), ona koja u najvećoj mjeri obuhvaća sve njegove aspekte je definicija koju nude Blain, Levy i Ritchie (2005:337):

“Brendiranje turističke destinacije je skup marketinških aktivnosti (1) koje se odnose na stvaranje imena, simbola, loga, grafičko oblikovanje imena i drugih grafičkih elemenata koji brzo *identificiraju* i *diferenciraju* turističku destinaciju; koje (2) dosljedno stvaraju očekivanje nezaboravnog turističkog *iskustva*; koje (3) služe tome da se *uspostavi* i *učvrsti emocionalna veza* između posjetitelja i turističke destinacije; i da se (4) kupcu smanje *troškovi traženja* i *percipiran rizik*. Sve zajedno, te aktivnosti služe tome da se stvori *imidž destinacije* koji pozitivno utječe na *odabir destinacije* od strane kupca”.

Za komercijalne tvrtke, tržišna vrijednost marke se u bilanci tvrtke tradicionalno navodi kao nematerijalna imovina koja predstavlja neto sadašnju vrijednost budućeg prihoda. Pošto marka postoji u svijesti kupca (Dyson, Farr i Hollis, 1996), percepcije tržišta o marki pružaju osnovu za financijsku evaluaciju tržišne vrijednosti marke. Stoga se tržišna vrijednost marke iz perspektive kupca počela koristiti za mjerenje učinkovitosti marke zato što odražava i prošle marketinške komunikacije i pruža indikatore buduće učinkovitosti (Keller, 2003:59). Hijerarhija tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupca pokazala se korisnom za dionike organizacija za upravljanje destinacijama, za koje financijska mjerila marke turističke destinacije nemaju veliku praktičnu vrijednost. Prema Aakeru (1991, 1996) i Kelleru (1993, 2003), tržišna vrijednost marke destinacije iz perspektive kupca predstavlja hijerarhiju razine svjesnosti o marki, asocijacija koje se

not yet a universally accepted definition of destination branding (see Park and Petrick, 2006; Nuttavuthisit, 2007), the most comprehensive to date is that offered by Blain, Levy and Ritchie (2005:337):

“Destination branding is the set of marketing activities (1) that support the creation of a name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic that readily *identifies* and *differentiates* a destination; (2) that consistently convey the *expectation* of a memorable travel *experience*; (3) that serve to *consolidate* and *reinforce* the *emotional connection* between the visitor and the destination; and (4) that reduce consumer *search costs* and *perceived risk*. Collectively, these activities serve to create a *destination image* that positively influences consumer *destination choice*.

For commercial firms, brand equity has traditionally been reported as an intangible balance sheet asset representing the net-present-value of future earnings. Since the brand exists in the mind of the consumer (Dyson, Farr and Hollis, 1996), market perceptions toward a brand provide the platform for any financial valuation of brand equity. This understanding led to the development of CBBE to measure brand performance, by providing both a reflection of past marketing communications, as well as an indicator of future performance (Keller, 2003:59). The CBBE hierarchy appears relevant to DMO stakeholders, for whom financial measures of a destination brand are of little practical relevance. Following Aaker (1991, 1996) and Keller (1993, 2003), destination CBBE is conceptualised as a hierarchy of brand salience, brand associations and brand loyalty. Recent structural equation modelling has demonstrated the relationships between these three constructs (see Konečnik and Gartner 2007; Boo, Busser and Baloglu, 2009; Gartner and Ruzzier, 2011; Bianchi and Pike, 2011; Im *et al.*, 2012; Bianchi, Pike and Lings, 2014).

vezuju uz marku i lojalnosti marki. Najnovija modeliranja strukturnih jednadžbi pokazala su da su ta tri konstrukta u međusobnom odnosu (vidi Konečnik i Gartner 2007; Boo, Busser i Baloglu, 2009; Gartner i Ruzzier, 2011; Bianchi i Pike, 2011; Im, Kim, Elliot i Han, 2012; Bianchi, Pike i Lings, 2014).

*Razina svjesnosti o marki* predstavlja osnovu hijerarhije tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupca i pokazuje u kojoj je mjeri turistička destinacija prisutna u svijesti kupca prilikom planiranja putovanja. Najbolju razinu svjesnosti pokazuje izdvojena dominantna marka (prvo spomenuta marka kod većine ispitanika) (ToMA), pošto je ToMA pokazatelj preferencija pri kupnji (vidi Axelrod, 1968; Wilson, 1981; Woodside i Wilson, 1985). Koristeći teoriju skupova odluka kupaca (vidi Howard, 1963; Howard i Sheth, 1969), niz istraživanja potvrdilo je stajalište da je broj destinacija koje putnik ustvari razmatra tijekom procesa kupnje ograničen na četiri plus ili minus dvije (vidi npr. Woodside i Sherrell, 1977; Thompson i Cooper, 1979; Woodside i Lyonski, 1989; Goodall i Ashworth, 1990; Goodall, 1991; Crompton, 1992; Pike i Ryan, 2004; Pike, 2006). Turističke destinacije koje ne čine dio skupa destinacija između kojih kupac bira nemaju razinu svjesnosti te stoga imaju konkurentski nedostatak (Pike, 2015). Ta dimenzija tržišne vrijednosti marke destinacije iz perspektive kupca vezana je uz glavni cilj brendiranja kojim se bave organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama: *Povećati svijest o destinaciji*.

*Asocijacije vezane uz marku* obuhvaćaju sve ono što kupac u svojoj svijesti veže uz turističku destinaciju. Ta dimenzija tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupca vezana je uz drugi cilj organizacija za upravljanje destinacijama: *Educirati tržište o svemu što se u destinaciji može raditi*. Pregledom bogate literature o imidžu destinacija (vidi Chon, 1990; Echtner i Ritchie, 1991; Pike, 2002, 2007; Gallarza, Saura i Garcia, 2002; Tasci, Gartner i Cavusgil, 2007; Stepchenkova i Mills, 2010) može se ustanoviti da nema suglasja oko konceptualizacije konstrukta te

*Brand salience* is at the foundation of the CBBE hierarchy, and represents the strength of the destination's presence in the mind of the consumer when a given travel situation is being considered. Salience is best operationalized through unaided top of mind awareness (ToMA), since ToMA is an indicator of purchase preference (see Axelrod, 1968; Wilson, 1981; Woodside and Wilson, 1985). Using the theory of consumer decision sets (see Howard, 1963; Howard and Sheth, 1969), a number of studies have supported the assertion that the number of destinations a traveller will actually consider in the purchase process is limited to four plus or minus two (see for example Woodside and Sherrell, 1977; Thompson and Cooper, 1979; Woodside and Lyonski, 1989; Goodall and Ashworth, 1990; Goodall, 1991; Crompton, 1992; Pike and Ryan, 2004; Pike, 2006). Destinations not positioned in the consumer's decision set are not *salient*, and are therefore at a competitive disadvantage (Pike, 2015). This CBBE dimension relates to the first brand objective of the DMO: *To increase awareness of the destination*.

*Brand associations* are anything linked in memory to the destination. This CBBE dimension relates to the second DMO objective: *To educate the market about things to do*. Reviews of the extensive destination image literature (see Chon, 1990; Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Pike, 2002, 2007b; Gallarza, Saura and Garcia, 2002; Tasci, Gartner and Cavusgil, 2007; Stepchenkova and Mills, 2010) indicate there is no commonly agreed conceptualisation of the construct, and therefore no accepted scale index. Mayo and Jarvis (1981) proposed an individual would make a brand selection based on what is "important and relevant to them" (p. 68), and so associations need to be measured in terms of attributes deemed determinant to individuals for a given travel situation. Determinance has been defined in the marketing literature as (Myers and Alpert, 1968:13): "Attitudes toward features which are most

stoga ne postoji ni jednoglasno prihvaćena skala indeksa. Mayo i Jarvis (1981) smatraju da pojedinac bira marku prema onome što je „važno i relevantno za njega/nju” (str. 68) tako da asocijacije treba mjeriti prema atributima koji se smatraju odlučujućim za pojedince u pojedinoj situaciji na putovanju. Pojam *odlučujući* se u literaturi s područja marketinga definira na sljedeći način (Myers i Alpert, 1968:13): „Stavovi o obilježjima koja su najuže vezana uz preferencije ili stvarne odluke o kupovini smatraju se odlučujućima; preostale karakteristike ili stavovi – ma kako pozitivni – nisu odlučujući”.

*Lojalnost marki*, najviša razina u hijerarhiji, vezana je uz treći cilj organizacija koje se bave upravljanjem destinacijama: *Stimulirati zanimanje za destinaciju i povećati posjećenost*. Tema vjernosti turističkoj destinaciji donedavno se zanemarivala (vidi Gitelson i Crompton, 1984; Gyte i Phelps, 1989; Oppermann 1997, 2000; Chen i Gursoy, 2001; Bigne, Sanchez i Sanchez, 2001; Litvin i Ling, 2001; Rittichainuwat, Qu i Brown, 2001; Niininen, Szivas i Riley, 2004; McKercher i Wong, 2004; Alegre i Juaneda, 2006; Mechinda, Serirat i Guild, 2009; Yuksel, Yuksel i Bilim, 2010; Bianchi i Pike, 2011; Croes, Shani i Walls, 2010; Bošnjak *et al.*, 2011; Phillips *et al.*, 2011; Eusebio i Vieira, 2011; Prayag i Ryan, 2012; Forgas-Coll *et al.*, 2012; McKercher i Tse, 2012; Chi, 2012; Moutinho, Albayrak i Caber, 2012). Taj se konstrukt može mjeriti pomoću dimenzije stava o vjernosti, kao što su iskazana namjera posjete destinaciji i usmena preporuka, i/ili bihevioralne vjernosti, a to je realizirani ponovljeni posjet. Ovo se istraživanje bavi prvim od navedenih aspekata.

### ***Temporalni aspekti mjerenja imidža destinacije***

U literaturi o turizmu opisano je veoma malo istraživanja o temporalnom aspektu percepcije destinacija kod kupaca, od Cromptona (1979), Gartnera (1986) te Gartnera i Hunta (1987). Ta je tema u fokusu ovoga projekta jer se ovo istraživanje bavi problemom imidža s kojim se suočio Bunda-

closely related to preference or to actual purchase decisions are said to be determinant; the remaining features or attitudes – no matter how favourable – are not determinant”.

*Brand loyalty*, the highest level of the hierarchy, is related to the third DMO objective: *To stimulate interest in, and visitation to, the destination*. The topic of destination loyalty has been neglected until relatively recently (see Gitelson and Crompton, 1984; Gyte and Phelps, 1989; Oppermann 1997, 2000; Chen and Gursoy, 2001; Bigne, Sanchez and Sanchez, 2001; Litvin and Ling, 2001; Rittichainuwat, Qu and Brown, 2001; Niininen, Szivas and Riley, 2004; McKercher and Wong, 2004; Alegre and Juaneda, 2006; Mechinda, Serirat and Guild, 2009; Yuksel, Yuksel and Bilim, 2010; Bianchi and Pike, 2011; Croes, Shani and Walls, 2010; Bosnjak *et al.*, 2011; Phillips *et al.*, 2011; Eusebio and Vieira, 2011; Prayag and Ryan, 2012; Forgas-Coll *et al.*, 2012; McKercher and Tse, 2012; Chi, 2012; Moutinho, Albayrak and Caber, 2012). This construct can be measured by attitudinal loyalty, such as stated intent to visit, and word of mouth recommendations, and/or behavioural loyalty such as actual repeat visitation. This study is concerned with the former.

### ***Temporal aspects of destination image measurement***

There has been a paucity of research in the tourism literature related to the temporal aspect of consumer perceptions of destinations, since Crompton (1979), Gartner (1986) and Gartner and Hunt (1987). This is an important issue for this project given the purpose of the research was the image problem faced by Bundaberg and the RTO's development of a new brand to change market perceptions. Gartner and Hunt (1987) found evidence of positive destination image change over a 13-year period, but concluded any change only occurs slowly. While there have been many examples of destination stagnation or decline in the tourist area life cycle (Butler, 1980) following a period

berg i nastojanjem regionalne turističke organizacije da razvije novu marku kako bi se promijenila percepcija tržišta. Gartner i Hunt (1987) dokazali su da se imidž destinacije može popraviti u razdoblju od 13 godina, ali su zaključili da do tih promjena uvijek sporo dolazi. Mnogo je primjera stagnacije ili pada u životnom vijeku destinacija na pojedinim turističkim područjima (Butler, 1980) do kojih je došlo nakon razdoblja rasta (vidi npr. Pike, 2008:334; 2010), ali malo je istraživačkih radova koji se bave time kako su organizacije koje se bave upravljanjem destinacijama uspjele repositionirati svoje destinacije, poput Las Vegasa, Torbaya, i Calvie na Mallorci (vidi Pritchard i Morgan, 1998; Buhalis, 2000; Gilmore, 2002).

Jedan od problema procesa brendiranja destinacije u praksi koji je već istaknut je taj da se prevelik broj tema koje se koriste u pozicioniranju marke destinacije teže pamti, a najbolji primjeri brendiranja destinacije ograničavaju se na svega nekoliko jednostavnih slogana, poput 'I ♥ New York' (vidi Dann, 2000; Morgan, Pritchard i Piggott, 2003; Ward i Gold, 1994). Malobrojna istraživanja uspješnih kriterija za slogane marki destinacija (vidi Richardson i Cohen, 1993; Klenosky i Gitelson, 1997; Shanka, 2001; Pike, 2004a; Lee, Cai i O'Leary, 2006; Lehto, Lee i Ismail, 2012) kao ključan problem ističu kratko trajanje mnogih kampanja. Primjerice, u SAD-u, od 47 državnih slogana koje su koristili državni turistički uredi SAD-a 1982. godine (vidi Pritchard, 1982) samo njih šest se još koristilo 1993. godine (vidi Richardson i Cohen, 1993), a od slogana koji su se koristili 1993. godine, njih samo 13 se još koristilo 2003. godine (vidi Pike, 2004a). Woodside (1981) navodi primjer Nove Scottije, koja je u četiri godine imala četiri različite teme promocije destinacije. Razlozi za takve promjene najčešće su: mijenjanje politike (vidi Russell, 2008), utjecaj donika (vidi Vial, 1997 u Pritchard i Morgan, 1998; Ritchie i Ritchie, 1998), i izmjenjivanje donositelja odluka u marketingu. U vezi s potonjim, McKercher i Ritchie (1997) na-

of growth (see for example Pike, 2008:334, 2010), there have been few research papers demonstrating how DMOs have been able to successfully reposition their destination, such as has been the case for Las Vegas, Torbay, and the Calvia Municipality in Mallorca (see Pritchard and Morgan, 1998; Buhalis, 2000; Gilmore, 2002).

One of the problems in destination branding practice that has been highlighted previously is too many destination brand positioning themes have been less than memorable, with best practise limited to a few simple slogans such as 'I ♥ New York (see Dann, 2000; Morgan, Pritchard and Piggott, 2003; Ward and Gold, 1994). While research into success criteria for destination brand slogans remains limited (see Richardson and Cohen, 1993; Klenosky and Gitelson, 1997; Shanka, 2001; Pike, 2004a; Lee, Cai and O'Leary, 2006; Lehto, Lee and Ismail, 2012), a key issue has been the lack of longevity in so many campaigns. For example, in the USA, of 47 state slogans used by USA STOs in 1982 (see Pritchard, 1982) only 6 were still in use in 1993 (see Richardson and Cohen, 1993), and of those slogans being used in 1993, only 13 were still being used in 2003 (see Pike, 2004a). Woodside (1981) offered the example of Nova Scotia, which had four different destination promotion themes in as many years. The reasons for such change generally include: political interference (see Russell, 2008), stakeholder influence (see Vial, 1997 in Pritchard and Morgan, 1998; Ritchie and Ritchie, 1998), and turnover of marketing decision makers. Regarding the latter, McKercher and Ritchie (1997) cited a DMO in Australia that had four managers in six years, leading to four different marketing plans, each with a different positioning statement.

### *Travel context*

Another aspect of destination image measurement that has received scant attention in the literature is travel context (Pike and Page,



vode primjer organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama u Australiji koja je u šest godina promijenila četiri menadžera, što je značilo i četiri različita marketinška plana od kojih je svaki imao drugačiji način pozicioniranja.

### *Kontekst putovanja*

Drugi aspekt mjerenja imidža destinacija kojemu se u literaturi ne pridaje velika pažnja je kontekst putovanja (Pike i Page, 2014), iako se o tom problemu počelo pisati još prije dva desetljeća (vidi npr. Snepenger i Milnerm, 1990; Hu i Ritchie, 1993; Gertner, 2010). Pregled literature o imidžu destinacija objavljene između 1973. i 2007. godine koje donosi Pike (2002, 2007) pokazuje da samo 37 od 262 publikacije pokazuje eksplicitno zanimanje za kontekst putovanja. Drugim riječima, od sudionika većine istraživanja traženo je da ocijene svoje percepcije destinacija neovisno o konkretnim situacijama na putovanju. Takva situacija kojom se bavio ovaj projekt odnosila se na kratke praznike na koje se putuje autom, definirano kao putovanje od jedne do četiri noći izvan mjesta stanovanja (vidi White, 2000). Kratka putovanja automobilom unutar zemlje čine važan aspekt australskih obrazaca putovanja. BTR (2002) procjenjuje da se na 76% putovanja unutar zemlje odlazi automobilom, a 70% od toga odvija se unutar države. Kratka putovanja od jedne do tri noći na koja su turisti odlazili svojim automobilom predstavljala su 68% tržišta putovanja u Queenslandu. Stanovnici Brisbanea razmaženi su izborom od preko 100 destinacija udaljenih najviše četiri sata vožnje. U kontekstu kratkih putovanja automobilom, i imajući na umu tri cilja menadžmenta navedenih u uvodu, ciljevi ovog istraživanja bili su:

- 1a. Identificirati razinu svjesnosti destinacije (izolirana svjesnost) na početku novog procesa brendiranja, u odnosu na konkurente
- 1b. Pratiti razinu svjesnosti destinacije tijekom vremena
- 2a. Mjeriti asocijacije vezane uz marku turističke destinacije na početku novog procesa brendiranja, u odnosu na konkurente

2014), even though the issue was raised over two decades ago (see for example Snepenger and Milnerm, 1990; Hu and Ritchie, 1993; Gertner 2010). Pike's (2002, 2007) reviews of the destination image literature published between 1973 and 2007 found only 37 of the 262 publications had an explicit interest in travel context. In other words, participants of most studies were asked to rate their perceptions of destinations without reference to any particular travel situation. The travel situation of interest for this project was short break holidays by car, defined as a trip of between one and four nights away from home (see White, 2000). Domestic short break drive tourism is an important aspect of Australian travel patterns. BTR (2002) estimated 76% of domestic travel is undertaken by car, 70% of which is intrastate. Short breaks of 1-3 nights represented 68% of the Queensland self-drive market. Brisbane residents are spoiled by choice of over 100 destinations within a four hour drive. In the context of short break holidays by car, and with the three management objectives listed in the introduction in mind, the research aims were:

- 1a. To identify the level of destination salience (unaided awareness) at the commencement of the new branding, relative to competitors
- 1b. To monitor destination salience over time
- 2a. To measure destination brand associations at the commencement of the new branding, relative to competitors
- 2b. To monitor destination brand associations over time
- 2c. To test the efficacy of using a 'don't know' option to minimise uninformed responses.
- 3a. To measure intentions to visit the destination, at the commencement of the new Branding, relative to competitors
- 3b. To monitor intentions to visit over time.

- 2b. Pratiti asocijacije vezane uz marku destinacije tijekom vremena
- 2c. Testirati djelotvornost korištenja opcije „ne znam“ kako bi se smanjili nasumični odgovori
- 3a. Mjeriti namjere posjete određenoj destinaciji, na početku novog procesa brendiranja, u odnosu na konkurente
- 3b. Pratiti namjere da se destinacija posjeti tijekom vremena.

### 3. METODA

Ovo poglavlje opisuje postupke provedene u tri odvojena istraživanja između 2003. i 2012. godine.

#### *Istraživanje 1 – 2003. godine*

Inicijalno istraživanje iz 2003. godine bilo je longitudinalno i sastojalo se od dvije faze, pri čemu je korišten sistematičan slučajni uzorak odabran iz telefonskog imenika Brisbanea. U prvoj fazi ispitanicima je poslan upitnik u papirnatom obliku koji se sastojao od pitanja o nedavnim kratkim praznicima i onima na koje se ispitanici uskoro spremaju, skupa preferencija ToMA/odluke i skale ocjena važnosti popisa atributa destinacija. Drugi upitnik poslan je poštom u papirnatom obliku istim ispitanicima tri mjeseca kasnije, a sastojao se od pitanja o doista ostvarenim putovanjima u razdoblju od prvog upitnika i percepcija konkurentskog skupa pet destinacija s popisom atributa.

#### *Istraživanje 2 – 2007. godine*

Istraživanje iz 2007. godine provedeno je na novom uzorku, nasumično odabranom iz osvježene verzije telefonskog imenika Brisbanea, ponovno pomoću upitnika u papirnatom obliku koji je ispitanicima poslan poštom, a kojim je trebalo ustanoviti promjene percepcije od 2003. godine.

#### *Istraživanje 3 – 2012. godine*

Istraživanje iz 2012. godine provedeno je na novom uzorku odabranom iz panela ko-

### 3. METHOD

This section reports the procedures undertaken in three separate studies between 2003 and 2012.

#### *Study 1 - 2003*

The initial 2003 study was a longitudinal design involving two stages, using a systematic random sample drawn from the Brisbane telephone directory. The stage one paper-based mail questionnaire contained questions about recent and intended short break holiday activity, ToMA/decision set preferences, and importance ratings of a battery of destination attributes. The second paper-based mail questionnaire, distributed to the same participants three months later, involved questions about actual travel undertaken since the first questionnaire, and perceptions of the competitive set of five destinations across the battery of attributes.

#### *Study 2 - 2007*

The 2007 study used a new sample, randomly drawn from an updated Brisbane telephone directory, and again a paper based mail questionnaire was used, to identify any changes in perceptions since 2003.

#### *Study 3 - 2012*

The 2012 study used a new sample invited from the panel of a commercial marketing research firm, and the questionnaire was administered online. The questionnaire used in 2007 and 2012 consisted of 173 items in three sections. The first section included filter questions about attitudes towards short breaks, two unaided questions to elicit the top of mind awareness (ToMA) destination and decision set composition, and a battery of 22 destination attribute-importance items using a seven point scale (1 = not important, 7 = very important). The attribute list was developed from a review of the literature, practitioner opinion, and personal interviews with Brisbane residents. A ‘don’t know’ option was also provided for each scale item.

mercijalnih tvrtki za marketinška istraživanja, a upitnik je poslan *online* putem. Upitnik iz 2007. i 2012. godine sastojao se od 173 pitanja podijeljenih u tri poglavlja. Prvo poglavlje sadržavalo je filter pitanja o stavovima prema kratkim praznicima, dva izolirana pitanja u kojima je trebalo navesti dominantnu marku (ToMA) destinacije i set odluka, te popis od 22 atributa važnosti destinacije pri čemu je korištena skala od sedam (1 = nevažno, 7 = veoma važno). Popis atributa razvijen je na osnovu pregledane literature, mišljenja ljudi iz prakse i osobnih intervjua sa stanovnicima Brisbanea. Za svaku stavku ponuđen je i odgovor „ne znam“. Atributi su odabrani iz rezultata istraživanja iz 2003. godine, a dodani su im atributi odabrani na osnovu rezultata daljnjih istraživanja provedenih među stanovnicima Brisbanea u kojima je grupno primjenjivan Repertory test (vidi Pike, 2007c). U drugom dijelu od ispitanika se tražilo da ocijene percipiranu djelotvornost područja Brisbanea i četiri konkurentne destinacije odabrane na osnovu dobivenog skupa destinacija iz istraživanja od 2003. godine, kroz 22 stavke na kognitivnoj skali i dvije stavke na afektivnoj skali. Korištena su i pitanja kojima su se trebale ustanoviti mjere prethodne posjete, namjere da se destinacija posjeti i usmene preporuke za svaku od pet destinacija.

#### 4. REZULTATI

Veličina uzorka 2003. godine bila je 521, 2007. godine 444 i 2012. godine 541. Karakteristike sudionika, prikazane u Tablici 1, uglavnom odgovaraju onima šireg stanovništva Brisbanea. Rezultati pokazuju da su ispitanicima dobro poznati takvi oblici putovanja te da su godišnje prosječno tri puta odlazili na kratke praznike automobilom u 2003. i 2007. godini te 2,5 puta u 2012. godini.

These attributes were selected from the results of the 2003 study, supplemented by attributes from further exploratory research using group applications of the Repertory Test (see Pike, 2007c), with Brisbane residents. The second section asked participants to rate the perceived performance of the Bundaberg region, along with four competing destinations selected from the decision set findings of the 2003 study, across the 22 cognitive scale items, and two affective scale items. Questions were also used to identify measures of previous visitation, intent to visit and word of mouth recommendations for each of the five destinations.

#### 4. RESULTS

The useable sample sizes were 521 in 2003, 444 in 2007 and 541 in 2012. The characteristics of the participants, which are summarised in Table 1, are generally similar to the wider Brisbane Census population. Participants indicated a strong familiarity with short break holidays, with a mean of three such trips by car per year in 2003 and 2007, and 2.5 in 2012.

**Tablica 1: Karakteristike ispitanika 2003.-2007.-2012.**

		<b>2003 n</b>	2003 Valjan %	2007 n	2007 Valjan %	2012 n	2012 Valjan %
Spol	Muški	199	38,0%	169	38,1%	313	57,9%
	Ženski	324	62,0%	275	61,9%	228	42,1%
	Ukupno	521		444		541	
Dob	18-24	16	3,1%	16	3,6%	18	3,3%
	25-44	212	40,6%	166	37,5%	175	32,3%
	45-64	244	46,7%	205	46,3%	190	35,1%
	65+	50	9,6%	56	12,6%	158	29,2%
	Ukupno	522		443		541	
Godišnji prihod kućanstva	Manje od 78.000 USD	372	73,2%	243	56,1%	340	62,8%
	78.000 USD ili više	136	26,8%	190	43,9%	201	37,2%
	Ukupno	508		433		541	
Bračno stanje	Neudata/neoženjen	57	10,9%	50	11,3%	96	17,7%
	Oženjen/udata/stalan partner	395	75,7%	335	75,6%	369	68,2%
	Razdvojen, rastavljen, udovac/udovica	70	13,4%	58	13,1%	76	14,0%
	Ukupno	522		443		541	
Broj uzdržavane djece	0	283	54,1%	238	53,5%	394	72,8%
	1-2	182	34,8%	163	36,6%	124	22,9%
	3+	56	10,7%	44	9,9%	23	4,9%
	Ukupno	521		445		541	
Najviša razina obrazovanja	Srednja škola	211	40,6%	149	33,5%	184	34,0%
	Visoka škola	123	23,7%	101	22,7%	141	26,1%
	Diplomska razina	164	31,5%	147	33,0%	186	34,4%
	Drugo	22	4,2%	48	10,8%	30	5,5%
	Ukupno	520		445		541	

**Table 1: Characteristics of participants 2003-2007-2012**

		<b>2003 n</b>	2003 Valid %	<b>2007 n</b>	2007 Valid %	<b>2012 n</b>	2012 Valid %
Gender	Male	199	38.0%	169	38.1%	313	57.9%
	Female	324	62.0%	275	61.9%	228	42.1%
	Total	521		444		541	
Age	18-24	16	3.1%	16	3.6%	18	3.3%
	25-44	212	40.6%	166	37.5%	175	32.3%
	45-64	244	46.7%	205	46.3%	190	35.1%
	65+	50	9.6%	56	12.6%	158	29.2%
	Total	522		443		541	
Annual household income	Less than \$78,000	372	73.2%	243	56.1%	340	62.8%
	\$78,000 or more	136	26.8%	190	43.9%	201	37.2%
	Total	508		433		541	
Marital status	Single	57	10.9%	50	11.3%	96	17.7%
	Married/permanent partner	395	75.7%	335	75.6%	369	68.2%
	Separated, divorced, widowed	70	13.4%	58	13.1%	76	14.0%
	Total	522		443		541	
Number of dependent children	0	283	54.1%	238	53.5%	394	72.8%
	1-2	182	34.8%	163	36.6%	124	22.9%
	3+	56	10.7%	44	9.9%	23	4.9%
	Total	521		445		541	
Highest level of education	High school	211	40.6%	149	33.5%	184	34.0%
	College	123	23.7%	101	22.7%	141	26.1%
	University graduate	164	31.5%	147	33.0%	186	34.4%
	Other	22	4.2%	48	10.8%	30	5.5%
	Total	520		445		541	

***Razina svjesnosti marke destinacije***

Prosječan broj destinacija navedenih u popisu skupa odluka bio je 3,8 u 2003. godini, 3,1 u 2007. godini i 2,6 u 2012. godini, svi unutar raspona od 4 +/- 2 (vidi npr. Woodside i Sherrell, 1977; Thompson i Cooper, 1979; Woodside i Lysonski, 1989; Goodall i Ashworth, 1990; Goodall, 1991; Crompton, 1992; Pike i Ryan, 2004; Pike, 2006). Praktično, veličina i sastav skupa odluka imaju ozbiljne implikacije za one destinacije koje u njima nisu navedene, pošto je manje vjerojatno da će se te destinacije razmatrati u procesu odabira destinacije. Destinacije u regiji Bundaberg navedene su u skupovima odluka kod svega 58 (11%) ispitanika u istraživanju iz 2003. godine, kod 25 (6%) ispitanika u

***Destination brand salience***

The mean number of destinations listed in decision sets was 3.8 in 2003, 3.1 in 2007 and 2.6 in 2012, all within the theorised range of 4 +/- 2 (see (see for example Woodside and Sherrell, 1977; Thompson and Cooper, 1979; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989; Goodall and Ashworth, 1990; Goodall, 1991; Crompton, 1992; Pike and Ryan, 2004; Pike, 2006). Practically, the decision set size and composition has serious implications for those destinations not elicited, since these destinations are less likely to be considered in the selection process. Bundaberg region destinations were listed in only 58 (11%) participants' decision sets in the 2003 study, 25 (6%) in 2007, and 20 (4%) in 2012.

istraživanju iz 2007. i 20 ispitanika (4%) u onom iz 2012. godine. Pitanjem otvorenog tipa koje se odnosilo na razinu svjesnosti marke došlo se do više od 100 preferiranih ToMA destinacija kod ispitanika 2003., 2007. i 2012. godine. U sažetom obliku popis je kategoriziran u Tablici 2 prema zemljopisnim područjima za koje su pojedine regionalne turističke organizacije nadležne. Rangiranje destinacija bilo je konzistentno u istraživanjima 2003., 2007. i 2012. ToMA i rezultati skupa odluka ukazuju na nedostatak poboljšanja *razine svjesnosti marke* za područje Bundaberga između 2003. i 2012.

The unaided brand salience question elicited over 100 preferred ToMA destinations from participants in 2003, 2007 and 2012. For reporting succinctness the list has been categorized in Table 2 by RTO geographic boundary. The destination ranking was consistent between 2003, 2007 and 2012. The ToMA and decision set findings highlight a lack of improvement in *brand salience* for the Bundaberg region between 2003 and 2012.

**Tablica 2: Razine svjesnosti marke: 2003. – 2012.**

Područje	2003 n	2003 %	2007 n	2007 %	2012 n	2012 %
Sunshine Coast	231	45,1%	202	45,9%	174	32,2%
Gold Coast	96	18,8%	72	16,4%	110	20,3%
Northern NSW	57	11,1%	64	14,5%	65	12,0%
Fraser Coast	33	6,4%	24	5,5%	25	4,6%
Područje Bundaberga	11	2,1%	6	1,4%	10	1,8%
Ostalo	84	16,5%	72	16,3%	157	29%
Nedostaje	11		7			
<b>Ukupno</b>	<b>523</b>		<b>447</b>		<b>541</b>	

**Table 2: Brand salience levels: 2003 – 2012**

Region	2003 n	2003 %	2007 n	2007 %	2012 n	2012 %
Sunshine Coast	231	45.1%	202	45.9%	174	32.2%
Gold Coast	96	18.8%	72	16.4%	110	20.3%
Northern NSW	57	11.1%	64	14.5%	65	12.0%
Fraser Coast	33	6.4%	24	5.5%	25	4.6%
Bundaberg region	11	2.1%	6	1.4%	10	1.8%
Other	84	16.5%	72	16.3%	157	29%
Missing	11		7			
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>		<b>447</b>		<b>541</b>	

### *Asocijacije vezane uz marku destinacija*

Tablica 3 pokazuje da se asocijacije vezane uz marku u području Bundaberga nisu popravile ni u jednom od kognitivnih i afektivnih stavaka kroz desetogodišnje razdoblje. Iz perspektive pozicioniranja, područje Bundaberga dosljedno je ocjenjivano najniže kod polovice kognitivnih stavki i kod obje afektivne stavke, ali najviše kod tri atributa. Dva od njih, *ljubazno lokalno stanovništvo* i *nema gužve*, predstavljaju tržišnu poziciju koju bi regionalna turistička organizacija trebala bolje iskoristiti. Na primjer, tijekom 2004. godine jedan od gradića u toj destinaciji, Bargara, dobio je nagradu organizacije Turizam Queenslanda „Najbolja plaža“ (vidi Tourism Queensland, 2005). Cronbachov alfa koeficijent za skalu od 22 kognitivne stavke bio je 0,79 u 2007. godini i 0,90 u 2012. godini. Tablica 4 pokazuje usporedbu učinkovitosti Bundaberga s prosjekom za stavku važnosti. Prosjek važnosti bio je konzistentan tijekom 2003., 2007. i 2012. godine.

### *Destination brand associations*

Table 3 shows the brand associations of the Bundaberg region did not improve across any of the cognitive and affective items over the 10 year period. From a positioning perspective, the Bundaberg region consistently rated lowest on half of the cognitive items and both affective items, but highest on three attributes. Two of these, *friendly locals* and *uncrowded*, represent a market position that the RTO could better exploit. For example, during 2004 one of the destination's small towns, Bargara, was awarded Tourism Queensland's 'Friendliest Beach' (see Tourism Queensland, 2005). The Cronbach Alpha for the 22 cognitive item scale battery was .79 in 2007 and .90 in 2012. Table 4 shows the comparison of the Bundaberg performance with the means for item importance. The importance means were consistent between 2003, 2007 and 2012.

**Tablica 3: Rangiranje asocijacija vezanih uz marku za područje Bundaberga: 2003. – 2012. godine**

Kognitivni atributi	2003. prosjeak	2003. ocjena	2007. prosjeak	2007. ocjena	2012. prosjeak	2012. ocjena
Ugodna klima	5,9	4	5,8	4=	5,4	4=
Nema gužve	5,6	1	5,0	1=	4,4	1=
Nije pretjerano turistički	5,6	1	4,6	1	4,3	1
Dobra vrijednost za novac	5,5	2=	5,1	2=	4,7	3=
Sigurna destinacija	5,5	4	5,4	3	5,1	3
Mjesta za šetnju	5,4	4	4,5	4	4,5	4
Ljubazno lokalno stanovništvo	5,4	2=	5,2	1	4,8	3
Prikladan smještaj	5,2	5	5,1	5	5,0	5
Može se štošta vidjeti i raditi	5,0	5	5,0	5	4,7	5
Dobre plaže	5,1	5	5,1	5	4,8	5
Visoka razina usluge	4,9	4	4,4	5	4,3	5
Dobri kafići i restorani	4,7	4	4,4	4=	4,3	5
Primjerena udaljenost	3,6	5	3,8	5	3,6	5
Cjenovno prihvatljivi aranžmani	-	-	4,9	2	4,5	4
Lijepi krajolici	-	-	5,6	4	5,2	4
Mjesta za plivanje	-	-	5,3	5	5,0	5
Obiteljska destinacija	-	-	5,4	3	4,9	3=
Dobar „šoping“	-	-	4,0	4	3,8	4
Povijesna mjesta	-	-	4,6	1	4,4	1
Morski svijet	-	-	5,3	2=	5,0	3
Trendovska atmosfera	-	-	3,5	5	3,6	5
Vodeni sportovi	-	-	4,7	5	4,6	5
<b>Afektivne prednosti</b>						
Premirno/uzbudljivo	3,8	5	3,7	5	3,6	5
Neugodno/ugodno	5,0	5	4,7	5	4,3	4



**Table 3: Bundaberg region brand associations' performance ranking: 2003 - 2012**

Cognitive attribute	2003 mean	2003 rank	2007 mean	2007 rank	2012 mean	2012 rank
Pleasant climate	5.9	4	5.8	4=	5.4	4=
Uncrowded	5.6	1	5.0	1=	4.4	1=
Not touristy	5.6	1	4.6	1	4.3	1
Good value for money	5.5	2=	5.1	2=	4.7	3=
A safe destination	5.5	4	5.4	3	5.1	3
Places for walking	5.4	4	4.5	4	4.5	4
Friendly locals	5.4	2=	5.2	1	4.8	3
Suitable accommodation	5.2	5	5.1	5	5.0	5
Lots to see and do	5.0	5	5.0	5	4.7	5
Good beaches	5.1	5	5.1	5	4.8	5
High levels of service	4.9	4	4.4	5	4.3	5
Good cafes and restaurants	4.7	4	4.4	4=	4.3	5
Within a comfortable drive	3.6	5	3.8	5	3.6	5
Affordable packages	-	-	4.9	2	4.5	4
Beautiful scenery	-	-	5.6	4	5.2	4
Places for swimming	-	-	5.3	5	5.0	5
Family destination	-	-	5.4	3	4.9	3=
Good shopping	-	-	4.0	4	3.8	4
Historical places	-	-	4.6	1	4.4	1
Marine life	-	-	5.3	2=	5.0	3
Trendy atmosphere	-	-	3.5	5	3.6	5
Water sports	-	-	4.7	5	4.6	5
<b>Affective benefits</b>						
Sleepy/arousing	3.8	5	3.7	5	3.6	5
Unpleasant/pleasant	5.0	5	4.7	5	4.3	4

**Tablica 4: Učinkovitost asocijacija marke za područje Bundaberga: 2003. – 2012. godina**

Kognitivne stavke	Prosječna važnost 2003.	Prosječna važnost 2007.	Prosječna važnost 2012.	Učinkovitost Bundaberga 2012.	Ocjena Bundaberga 2012.
Prikladan smještaj	5,9	6,2	6,0	5,0	5
Dobra vrijednost za novac	6,0	6,1	6,0	4,7	3=
Sigurna destinacija	6,0	6,1	6,0	5,1	3
Cjenovno prihvatljivi aranžmani	-	5,4	5,3	4,5	4
Lijepi krajolici	5,6	5,4	5,5	5,2	4
Ugodna klima	5,8	5,3	5,5	5,4	4=
Ne prevelika udaljenost	5,4	5,2	5,2	3,6	5
Dobri kafići i restorani	5,0	5,1	5,2	4,3	5
Ljubazno lokalno stanovništvo	5,0	5,0	5,2	4,8	3
Nema gužve	5,2	5,2	5,1	4,7	1=
Može se štošta vidjeti i raditi	4,8	4,9	5,1	4,7	5
Dobre plaže	5,3	4,8	4,7	4,8	5
Visoka razina usluge	5,4	4,7	4,7	4,3	5
Mjesta za plivanje	4,7	4,7	4,5	5,0	5
Nije pretjerano turistički	4,6	4,4	4,3	4,3	1
Mjesta za šetnju	4,1	4,3	4,1	4,5	4
Obiteljska destinacija	-	4,3	4,1	4,9	3=
Dobar „šoping“	-	3,9	4,1	3,8	4
Povijesna mjesta	-	3,9	4,0	4,4	1
Morski svijet	-	3,9	4,0	5,0	3
Trendovska atmosfera	-	3,0	3,3	3,6	5
Vodeni sportovi	-	3,1	3,2	4,6	5

Kako je već navedeno, uz svaku stavku na skali kognitivnih atributa ponuđena je opcija *ne znam*. Svaka stavka učinkovitosti Bundaberga imala je između 30% i 50% odgovora *ne znam*. Osim što je tako maksimalno smanjen rizik dobivanja nasumičnih odgovora (vidi npr. Gill, 1947; Chapman, 1993; Pike, 2007d) u kojima ispitanici mogu dati krivi odgovor na pitanje o kojem ništa ne znaju, ovi podaci pružaju dodatne informacije marketinškim stručnjacima. Za regionalnu turističku organizaciju Bundaberga vidljivo je da je potrebno uložiti dodatan napor kako bi se popravila svijest o tome što ta destinacija nudi.

#### ***Vjernost marki destinacije***

Više od 90% ispitanika prethodno je posjetilo svoju izdvojenu ToMA destinaciju u

As mentioned, a *don't know* option was provided alongside each of the cognitive attribute scale items. Every Bundaberg performance item attracted a *don't know* response of 30% to 50%. As well as minimising the risk of uninformed responses (see for example Gill, 1947; Chapman, 1993; Pike, 2007d) where participants might give a false answer to a question they have no knowledge of, this data provides additional information for the marketer. For the Bundaberg RTO, the implication is that more work is needed to improve cognition of what the destination has to offer.

#### ***Destination brand loyalty***

Over 90% of participants had previously visited their unaided ToMA destination in

**Table 4: Bundaberg region brand associations performance: 2003 - 2012**

Cognitive items	Mean importance 2003	Mean importance 2007	Mean importance 2012	Bundaberg performance 2012	Bundaberg Rank 2012
Suitable accommodation	5.9	6.2	6.0	5.0	5
Good value for money	6.0	6.1	6.0	4.7	3=
A safe destination	6.0	6.1	6.0	5.1	3
Affordable packages	-	5.4	5.3	4.5	4
Beautiful scenery	5.6	5.4	5.5	5.2	4
Pleasant climate	5.8	5.3	5.5	5.4	4=
Within a comfortable drive	5.4	5.2	5.2	3.6	5
Good cafes and restaurants	5.0	5.1	5.2	4.3	5
Friendly locals	5.0	5.0	5.2	4.8	3
Uncrowded	5.2	5.2	5.1	4.7	1=
Lots to see and do	4.8	4.9	5.1	4.7	5
Good beaches	5.3	4.8	4.7	4.8	5
High levels of service	5.4	4.7	4.7	4.3	5
Places for swimming	4.7	4.7	4.5	5.0	5
Not touristy	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3	1
Places for walking	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.5	4
Family destination	-	4.3	4.1	4.9	3=
Good shopping	-	3.9	4.1	3.8	4
Historical places	-	3.9	4.0	4.4	1
Marine life	-	3.9	4.0	5.0	3
Trendy atmosphere	-	3.0	3.3	3.6	5
Water sports	-	3.1	3.2	4.6	5

2003., 2007. i 2012. godini. Iz toga proizlazi da postoji mala vjerojatnost odabira ToMA bez prethodne posjete, što je veoma važno s obzirom na vezu između navedene namjere i stvarnog putovanja koje je ustanovljeno u prvom istraživanju. Kako je pokazano u Tablici 5, dok je oko 40% ispitanika 2012. godine navelo da je prethodno posjetilo područje Bundaberga, prosječna vjerojatnost posjete područja Bundaberga unutar sljedeće godine bila je 2,7, što pokazuje da nema napretka u odnosu na 2003. ili 2007. godinu. Kako je to indikator moguće buduće učinkovitosti, to je bila najniže rangirana destinacija unutar skupa konkurentskih destinacija, jednako kao i 2003. i 2007. godine. Od ispitanika se također tražilo da ocijene u kojoj bi mjeri svaku destinaciju preporučili prijateljima. Na skali

2003, 2007 and 2012. The implication that there is a low likelihood of ToMA selection without previous visitation is important given the link between stated intent and actual travel identified in the first study. As shown in Table 5, while around 40% of the 2012 participants indicated having previously visited the Bundaberg region, the mean likelihood of visiting the Bundaberg region within the next year was 2.7, which showed no improvement from 2003 or 2007. An indicator of possible future performance, this was the lowest of the competitive set of destinations, as it was in 2003 and 2007. Participants were also asked to rate the extent to which they would recommend each destination to friends. On this seven point scale (1 = definitely not, 7 = definitely) the mean for the

od sedam (1 = definitivno ne, 7 = svakako) prosjek za područje Bundaberga bio je 3,9 u 2007. i 3,7 u 2012. godini. Taj rezultat, kako ga pokazuje Tablica 6, a koji nije bio mjereno 2003. godine, bio je najniži od svih pet destinacija.

Bundaberg region was 3.9 in 2007 and 3.7 in 2012. This result, as shown in Table 6, which was not measured in 2003, was the lowest of the five destinations.

**Tablica 5: Prethodni posjeti i namjera posjeta**

	2007. Prethodno posjećen	2012. Prethodno posjećen	2003. Vjerojatnost posjete u narednih 12 mjeseci	2007. Vjerojatnost posjete u narednih 12 mjeseci	2012. Vjerojatnost posjete u narednih 12 mjeseci
Sunshine Coast	94,6%	87,2%	6,0	5,1	4,8
Gold Coast	93,5%	88,7%	5,5	3,9	3,9
Northern NSW	72,4%	62,5%	4,3	3,7	3,7
Fraser Coast	64,9%	51,6%	3,9	3,3	3,3
Područje Bundaberga	42,8%	39,0%	3,1	2,7	2,7

**Table 5: Previous visitation and intent to visit**

	2007 Previously visited	2012 Previously visited	2003 Likelihood of visit in next 12 months	2007 Likelihood of visit in next 12 months	2012 Likelihood of visit in next 12 months
Sunshine Coast	94.6%	87.2%	6.0	5.1	4.8
Gold Coast	93.5%	88.7%	5.5	3.9	3.9
Northern NSW	72.4%	62.5%	4.3	3.7	3.7
Fraser Coast	64.9%	51.6%	3.9	3.3	3.3
Bundaberg region	42.8%	39.0%	3.1	2.7	2.7

**Tablica 6: Usmena preporuka: 2007. – 2012. godina**

	2007.	2012.
Sunshine Coast	5,8	5,5
Northern NSW	4,8	4,5
Fraser Coast	4,8	4,3
Gold Coast	4,4	4,2
Bundaberg region	3,9	3,7

**Table 6: Word of mouth recommendation: 2007 - 2012**

	2007	2012
Sunshine Coast	5.8	5.5
Northern NSW	4.8	4.5
Fraser Coast	4.8	4.3
Gold Coast	4.4	4.2
Bundaberg region	3.9	3.7

## 5. RASPRAVA

Kako bi diferencirale destinaciju od konkurentskih mjesta koja nude slične karakte-

## 5. DISCUSSION

To differentiate a destination from competing places offering similar features,

ristike, organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama sve se više bave brendiranjem mjesta. Svrha ovog istraživačkog projekta bila je upotrijebiti ovaj oblik istraživanja za praćenje djelotvornosti brendiranja destinacija tijekom vremena. Rezultati ukazuju na složene izazove s kojima se organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama susreću u nastojanjima da poboljšaju tržišnu poziciju svojih destinacija na konkurentskom tržištu. Na razinu svjesnosti i imidž mjesta te vjernost mjestu snažno utječu makro-okolišne sile nad kojima organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama nemaju kontrolu. Istraživanje je ustanovilo minimalne promjene u percepciji konkurentskog skupa od pet destinacija tijekom jednog desetljeća, na njihovom najbližem i najvažnijem tržištu. U ovom projektu, hijerarhija tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupca iskušana je kao način mjerenja učinkovitosti tri ključna univerzalna cilja organizacija za upravljanje destinacijama.

Za područje Bundabega, struktura rezultata pruža mjerila za razinu svjesnosti marke, asocijacije koje se vežu uz marku i vjernost marki na najvažnijem tržištu za tu destinaciju, u kontekstu kratkih praznika na koje se odlazi automobilom, nakon 10 godina kampanje za novu marku. Usto, struktura tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupca daje indikatore, koji se odnose na ciljeve kampanje brendiranja, pomoću kojih se može evaluirati djelotvornost budućih promotivnih aktivnosti. Na primjer, prvi cilj nove kampanje marke destinacije bila je povećati svijest o tom području. *Razina svjesnosti marke* temelj je hijerarhije i, kad je riječ o obzirom na izoliranu svjesnosti, destinacija nije postigla poboljšanje između 2003. i 2012. godine. Drugi cilj bio je educirati kupce o tome što se na lokaciji može vidjeti i što se može raditi. *Asocijacije vezane uz marku* mjerene su na način da se od ispitanika tražilo da ocijene učinkovitost konkurentskog skupa destinacija pomoću popisa odlučujućih atributa. Kad je riječ o *vjernosti marki*, treći cilj bio je stimulirati zanimanje za destinaciju i putovanja u destinaciju. Destinaciju je prethodno po-

DMOs are increasingly engaging in place branding. The purpose of this research project was to implement a research design to monitor the effectiveness of destination branding over time. The findings highlight the complex challenges faced by DMOs in attempting to enhance the market position of their destination in a competitive market. Place salience, image and loyalty are affected more powerfully by macro-environmental forces over which the DMO has no control. The research identified minimal changes in perceptions of a competitive set of five destinations, over a decade, in their closest and most important visitor market. In this project, a hierarchy of CBBE was trialled as a means of measuring the effectiveness three key universal DMO objectives.

For the Bundaberg region, the structure of the results provides measures of brand salience, brand associations, and brand loyalty in the destination's most important market, in the context of short breaks by car, after 10 years of a new brand campaign. Also, the CBBE structure provides indicators, related to the brand campaign objectives, for which the effectiveness of future promotional activity can be evaluated. For example, the first objective of the new destination brand campaign was to increase awareness of the region. *Brand salience* is the foundation of the hierarchy, and in terms of unaided awareness, the destination achieved no improvement between 2003 and 2012. The second objective was to educate consumers about what there is to see and do. *Brand associations* were measured by asking participants to rate the performance of a competitive set of destinations across a list of determinant attributes. In terms of *brand loyalty*, the third objective was to stimulate interest in and travel to the destination. While 40% of participants had previously visited the destination, the stated intent to visit in the future has been consistently the lowest of the competitive set of destinations.

The attribute-based approach of the CBBE hierarchy enables destination market-

sjetilo 40% ispitanika, ali izražena namjera posjete u budućnosti bila je dosljedno najniža od svih destinacija u konkurentskom skupu.

Pristup zasnovan na atributima u hijerarhiji tržišne vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupaca marketinškim stručnjacima omogućava da ustanove koje su mogućnosti za pozicioniranje. Rezultati su ukazali na to da postoji prilika za pozicioniranje koju destinacija još nije iskoristila. Ti atributi mogli bi se izravnije iskoristiti u budućim promocijama marke, pošto se do svijesti potrošača može najlakše doći tako da se učvrste postojeće pozitivne percepcije umjesto da se njihovo mišljenje pokuša promijeniti (vidi Ries i Trout, 1982). Razlog je tome to što je imidž često samo labavo i neizravno vezan s činjenicama (Reynolds, 1965). Međutim, poklapaju li se doista percipirane slike pojedinca s markom manje je važno od onoga za što kupac doista vjeruje da je istinito. Ta tvrdnja neprestano se potvrđuje u istraživanjima ponašanja kupaca, a može se sažeti s *percepcija je stvarnost*, što dolazi od Thomasovog teorema: „Ono što ljudi definiraju ili percipiraju stvarno je po svojim posljedicama“ (Thomas i Thomas, 1928:572, citiran u Patton 2002). Anholt (2010:27) o tom fenomenu govori kao o „tiraniji javnog mišljenja“.

## 6. ZAKLJUČAK

Iz perspektive prakse jasno je da su promotivna nastojanja koja je u desetogodišnjem razdoblju poduzelo pet regionalnih turističkih organizacija služila samo tome da se održi pozicija na tržištu. To potvrđuje tvrdnju da se imidž destinacije mijenja sporo, tijekom duljeg razdoblja. Stoga je važno da znanstvenici i ljudi iz prakse dobro razumiju posljedice svakog pokušaja repozicioniranja destinacije. Znanstvenicima je lako često preporučivati nove strategije pozicioniranja jer takve preporuke predstavljaju opipljivi rezultat i zaključak istraživačkih projekata. Usto, novi se menadžmenti u organizacijama za upravljanje destinacijama često žele

ers to identify positioning opportunities. The results highlighted a positioning opportunity that has not yet been exploited by the destination. These attributes could be used more explicitly in future brand promotions, since the easiest route to the mind is to reinforce positively held perceptions rather than to attempt to try to change opinions (see Ries and Trout, 1982). This is because images may only have a tenuous and indirect relationship to fact (Reynolds, 1965). However, whether an individual's perceived images are congruent with the brand identify is not as important as what the consumer actually believes to be true. This proposition continues to underpin consumer behaviour research, referred to as *perception is reality*, which originated from Thomas' theorem: "What is defined or perceived by people is real in its consequences" (Thomas and Thomas, 1928:572, cited in Patton 2002). Anholt (2010:27) referred to this phenomenon as "the tyranny of public opinion".

## 6. CONCLUSION

From a practical perspective, it is evident that the induced promotional efforts of the five RTOs over a 10 year period have only served to maintain market positions. This supports the proposition that destination image change takes place slowly over a long period of time. Thus, researchers and practitioners need to understand the ramifications of any decision to attempt to re-position a destination. It is easy and common for researchers to recommend a new positioning strategy, because such a recommendation represents a tangible output and conclusion of a research project. It is also common for new DMO management to want to show they are making a difference by introducing change. Likewise it is common for advertising agencies to recommend changing marketing campaigns to demonstrate their creativity. There has been limited evidence in the literature of any successful destination

pokazati drugačijima od svojih prethodnika time što uvode promjene. Isto tako, agencije za propagandu često preporučaju promjene marketinških kampanja kako bi pokazale koliko su kreativne. Međutim, malo je dokaza u literaturi o uspješnim repozicioniranjima destinacija. Praktične implikacije rezultata ovog istraživanja su identificiranje onih atributa o kojima ovisi odabir pojedine destinacije u određenoj situaciji na putovanju, a kad se destinacija doživljava pozitivno, da se oni pojačaju u marketinškim komunikacijama umjesto da se pokuša izmijeniti tržišna percepcija. Također, iako je provedeno u Australiji, ovo istraživanje pruža praktičan alat za evaluaciju učinkovitosti marke organizacijama za upravljanje destinacijama u drugim dijelovima svijeta tijekom vremena; onaj za mjerenje djelotvornosti prošlih marketinških komunikacija, kao i indikatore buduće učinkovitosti. Marketing destinacija odvija se u političkom okruženju jer su zaposlenici organizacija za upravljanje destinacijama odgovorni vladinim agencijama koje ih financiraju, lokalnim turističkim tvrtkama, turističkim posrednicima i zajednici domaćinu. Ti dionici mogu vršiti pritisak da se argumentira ili promijeni određeni način brendiranja. Tržišna vrijednost marke iz perspektive kupaca marketinškim stručnjacima za destinacije pruža koristan alat koji će dionicima pomoći da definiraju ciljeve brendiranja, a usto predstavlja praktičan i strukturiran pristup mjerenju učinkovitosti pozicioniranja marke.

Ovo istraživanje daje doprinos znanstvenoj literaturi na dva načina. Prvo, malo je objavljenih istraživanja koja mjere imidž destinacije ili učinkovitost marke destinacije. Većina istraživanja prikazuje statičnu sliku u jednome trenutku, a ovo je istraživanje prvo koje mjeri tržišne percepcije za konkurentski skup destinacija u tri vremenske dionice. Drugo, konzistentnost rezultata u tri odvojena istraživanja pokazuje pouzdanost mjernog instrumenta baziranog na tržišnoj vrijednosti marke iz perspektive kupaca. Općenito u literaturi o turizmu nedostaje ponavljanja istih istraživanja. Glavno ograničenje ovog istra-

repositioning. The practical implication of the results of this study is to identify those attributes that determine destination selection for a given travel situation, and where the destination is perceived to perform favourably, and to reinforce these in marketing communications rather than attempt to change market perceptions. Also, while this research was undertaken in Australia, the research approach provides DMOs in other parts of the world with a practical tool for evaluating brand performance over time; in terms of measures of effectiveness of past marketing communications, as well as indicators of future performance. Destination marketing takes place in a political environment, with DMO staff accountable to government funding agencies, local tourism businesses, travel intermediaries and the host community. Pressure to justify the brand rationale and to change brand initiatives can be exerted by such stakeholders. CBBE provides destination marketers with a useful tool to guide stakeholders on brand objectives, in addition to offering a practical and structured approach towards measuring performance of brand positioning.

The study makes a contribution to the literature in two key ways. First, published studies measuring either destination image or destination brand performance have been rare. Most studies have been snapshots at one point in time, and this study is the first to measure market perceptions for a competitive set of destinations over three points in time. Second, the consistency of the results over the three separate studies demonstrates the reliability of the CBBE-based measurement instrument. There has been a general lack of replication studies in the tourism literature. The main limitation of the study is that it is not a longitudinal study involving the same sample of participants over the three points in time. While the participants of the studies were generally representative of the wider census populations, a different sample of people was used in 2003, 2007 and 2012. In terms of future research, what

živanja je to da ono nije longitudinalno te da ne uključuje isti uzorak ispitanika u tri različita vremenska intervala. Iako su ispitanici u istraživanjima generalno reprezentativni za šire stanovništvo, istraživanje je 2003., 2007. i 2012. godine provedeno na različitim uzorcima. Što se tiče budućih istraživanja, bit će zanimljivo promatrati u kojoj mjeri na razinu svjesnosti, imidž i vjernost destinaciji utječu društveni mediji. Fenomen koji se javlja pojavom Web-a 2.0, a to je da na društvenim mrežama korisnici sami generiraju sadržaje, smanjuje kontrolu koju organizacije za upravljanje destinacijama imaju nad markom destinacije. Modeli koji istražuju odnos između tržišne vrijednosti marke destinacije iz perspektive kupaca i ponašanja kupaca na društvenim mrežama pomoći će organizacijama za upravljanje destinacijama bolje razumijevanje na koji način mogu bolje iskoristiti mogućnosti Web 2.0 tehnologije i aplikacija.

will be interesting to monitor is the extent to which destination salience, image and loyalty is impacted by social media. The phenomenon of user generated content on social media since the advent of Web 2.0 is lessening the control DMOs have over their destination brand. Models examining the relationship between destination CBBE and consumers' engagement with social media will enhance understanding of how and why DMOs need to better take advantage of Web 2.0 technologies and applications.

#### LITERATURA - REFERENCES

1. Aaker, D.A. (1991) *Managing Brand Equity*. New York: Free Press.
2. Aaker, D.A. (1996) *Building Strong Brands*. New York: Free Press.
3. Alegre, J., Juaneda, C. (2006) Destination loyalty: Consumers' economic behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 33. No. 3. pp. 684-706
4. Anholt, S. (2010) *Places: Identity, Image and Reputation*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: MacMillan.
5. Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011) *Brisbanerevealedas2011Censusdataisreleased*. <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/census-home.nsf/4a256353001af3ed4b2562bb00121564/2be03ff57da-97422ca257a22003fcf9e!OpenDocument>. 21 June.
6. Axelrod, J.N. (1968) Attitude measures that predict purchase. *Journal of Advertising Research*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 3-17
7. Baker, B. (2007) *Destination Branding for Small Cities: The Essentials for Successful Place Branding*. Portland, Oregon: Creative Leap Books.
8. Baker, B. (2012) *Destination Branding for Small Cities: The Essentials for Successful Place Branding*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) Portland, Oregon: Creative Leap Books.
9. Banks, S. (1950) The relationship between preference and purchase of brands. *The Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 15 (Oct). pp. 145-157
10. Bianchi, C., Pike, S. (2011) Antecedents of attitudinal destination loyalty in a long-haul market: Australia's brand equity among Chilean consumers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*. Vol. 28. No. 7. pp. 736-750
11. Bianchi, C., Pike, S., Lings, I. (2014) Investigating attitudes towards three South American destinations in an emerging long haul market using a model of consumer-based brand equity



- ty (CBBE). *Tourism Management*. Vol. 42. pp. 215-223
12. Bigne, J.E., Sanchez, M.I., Sanchez, J. (2001) Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: Internationship. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 22. pp. 607-616
  13. Blain, C., Levy, S.E., Ritchie, J.R.B. (2005) Destination branding: Insights and practises from destination management organizations. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 43 (May). pp. 328-338
  14. Boo, S., Busser, J., Baloglu, S. (2009) A model of customer-based brand equity and its application to multiple destinations. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. No. 2. pp. 219-231
  15. Bosnjak, M., Sirgy, M.J., Hellriegel, S., Maurer, O. (2011) Postvisit destination loyalty judgements: Developing and testing a comprehensive congruity model. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 50. No. 5. pp. 496-508
  16. BTR. (2002) *Travel by Australians, 2001: Annual Results of the National Visitor Survey 2001*. Canberra: Bureau of Travel Research.
  17. Buhalis, D. (2000) Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 21. No. 1. pp. 97-116
  18. Butler, R.W. (1980) The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*. Vol. 24. No. 1. pp. 5-12
  19. Cai, L.A., Gartner, W.C., Munar, A.M. (Eds) (2009) *Tourism Branding: Communities in Action*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
  20. Chapman, R.G. (1993) Brand performance comparatives. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*. Vol. 2. No. 1. pp. 42-50
  21. Chen, C.F., Myagmarsuren, O. (2010) Exploring relationships between Mongolian destination brand equity, satisfaction and destination loyalty. *Tourism Economics*. Vol. 16. No. 4. pp. 981-994
  22. Chen, J.S., Gursoy, D. (2001) An investigation of tourists' destination loyalty and preferences. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. Vol. 13. No. 2. pp. 79-85
  23. Chi, C.G.Q. (2012) An examination of destination loyalty: Differences between first-time and repeat visitors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. Vol. 36. No. 1. pp. 3-24
  24. Chon, K. (1990) The role of destination image in tourism: a review and discussion. *The Tourist Review*. Vol. 45. No. 2. pp. 2-9
  25. Cohen, E. (1972) Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*. Vol. 39. pp. 164-182
  26. Crockett, S.R., Wood, L.J. (1999) Brand Western Australia: a totally integrated approach to destination branding. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 5. No. 3. pp. 276-289
  27. Croes, R., Shani, A., Walls, A. (2010) The value of destination loyalty: Myth or reality. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*. Vol. 19. No. 2. pp. 115-136
  28. Crompton, J. (1992) Structure of vacation destination choice sets. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 19. pp. 420-434
  29. Crompton, J.L. (1979) Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*. October/December. pp. 408-424
  30. Curtis, J. (2001) Branding a State: the evolution of Brand Oregon. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 7. No. 1. pp. 75-81
  31. Dann, G.M.S. (2000) Differentiating destination in the language of tourism: harmless hype or promotional irresponsibility. *Tourism Recreation Research*. Vol. 25. No. 2. pp. 63-72

32. Donald, S.H., Gammack, J.G. (2007) *Tourism and the Branded City – Film and Identity on the Pacific Rim*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
33. Došen, D.O., Vranešević, T., Prebežac, D. (1998) The importance of branding in the development of marketing strategy of Croatia as tourist destination. *Acta Turistica*. Vol. 10. No. 2. pp. 93-182
34. Dyson, P., Farr, A., Hollis, N.S. (1996) Measuring and using brand equity. *Journal of Advertising Research*. Vol. 36. No. 6. pp. 9-21
35. Echtner, C.M., Ritchie, J.R.B. (1991) The meaning and measurement of destination image. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*. Vol. 2. No. 2. pp. 2-12
36. Eusebio, C., Vieira, A.L. (2011) Destination attributes' evaluation, satisfaction and behavioural intentions: A structural modelling approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 15. No. 1. pp. 66-80
37. Forgas-Coll, S., Palau-Saumell, R., Sanchez-Garcia, J., Callarisa-Fiol, L.J. (2012) Urban destination loyalty drivers and cross-national moderator effects: The case of Barcelona. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 33. pp. 1309-1320
38. Gallarza, M.G., Saura, I.G., Garcia, H.C. (2002) Destination image: toward a conceptual framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 29. No. 1. pp. 56-78
39. Gardner, B.B., Levy, S.J. (1955) The product and the brand. *Harvard Business Review*. March-April. pp. 33-39
40. Gartner, W.C. (1986) Temporal influences on image change. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 13. pp. 635-644
41. Gartner, W.C., Hunt, J.D. (1987) An analysis of state image change over a twelve-year period (1971-1983). *Journal of Travel Research*. Fall. pp. 15-19
42. Gartner, W.C., Konečnik Ruzzier, M. (2011) Tourism destination brand equity dimensions: Renewal versus repeat market. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 50. No. 5. pp. 471-481
43. Gertner, R.K. (2010) Similarities and differences of the effect of country images on tourist and study destinations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*. Vol. 27. No. 4. pp. 383-395
44. Gilbert, D. (1990) Strategic marketing planning for national tourism. *The Tourist Review*. Vol. 1. pp. 18-27
45. Gill, S.N. (1947) How do you stand on sin? *Tide*. March 14. pp. 72
46. Gilmore, F. (2002) Branding for success. In Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Pride, R. (Eds) *Destination Branding: Creating the unique Destination Proposition*. pp. 57-65
47. Gitelson, R., Crompton, J.L. (1984) Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 11. pp. 199-217
48. Goodall, B. (1991) Understanding holiday choice in Cooper, C. (ed) *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management Volume Three*. pp. 58-77. London: Belhaven.
49. Goodall, B., Ashworth, G. (Eds) (1990) *Marketing in the Tourism Industry: The Promotion of Destination Regions*. London: Routledge
50. Guest, L.P. (1942) The genesis of brand awareness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 26. pp. 800-808
51. Gyte, D.M., Phelps, A. (1989) Patterns of destination repeat business: British tourists in Mallorca, Spain. *Journal of Travel Research*. Summer. pp. 24-28
52. Howard, J.A. (1963) *Marketing Management: Analysis and Planning*. Homewood, Ill: Irwin.
53. Howard, J.A., Sheth, J.N. (1969) *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
54. Hu, Y., Ritchie, J.R. (1993) Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual

- approach. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 32. No. 2. pp. 25-34
55. Im, H.H., Kim, S.S., Elliot, S., Han, H. (2012) Conceptualizing destination brand equity dimensions from a consumer-based brand equity perspective. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*. Vol. 29. pp. 385-403
  56. Keller, K.L. (1993) Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 57 (January). pp. 1-22
  57. Keller, K.L. (2003) *Strategic Brand Management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
  58. Kim, H., Kim, W.G., An, J.A. (2003) The effect of consumer-based brand equity on firms' financial performance. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. Vol. 20. No. 4/5. pp. 335-351
  59. Klenosky, D.B., Gitelson, R.E. (1997) Characteristics of effective tourism promotion slogans. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 24. No. 1. pp. 235-251
  60. Konečnik, M. (2006) Croatian-based brand equity for Slovenia as a tourism destination. *Economic and Business Review*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp. 83-108
  61. Konečnik, M., Gartner, W.C. (2007) Customer-based brand equity for a destination. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 34. No. 2. pp. 400-421
  62. Lee, G., Cai, L.A., O'Leary, J.T. (2006) WWW.branding.states.US: An analysis of brand-building elements in the US state tourism websites. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 27. pp. 815-828
  63. Lehto, X.Y., Lee, G., Ismail, J. (2012) Measuring congruence of affective images of destinations and their slogans. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 16. No. 3. pp. 250-260
  64. Lim, Y., Weaver, P.A. (2012) Customer-based brand equity for a destination: The effect of destination image on preference for products associated with a destination brand. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 16. No. 3. pp. 223-231
  65. Litvin, S.W., Ling, S.N.S. (2001) The destination attribute management model: An empirical application to Bintan, Indonesia. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 22. pp. 481-492
  66. Mayo, E.J., Jarvis, L.P. (1981) *The Psychology of Leisure Travel*. Massachusetts: CBI Publishing Company.
  67. McKercher, B., Ritchie, M. (1997) The third tier of public sector tourism: a profile of local government tourism officers in Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 36. No. 1. pp. 66-72
  68. McKercher, B., Tse, T.S.M. (2012) Is intention to return a valid proxy for actual repeat visitation? *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 51. No. 6. pp. 671-686
  69. McKercher, B., Wong, D.Y.Y. (2004) Understanding tourism behaviour: Examining the combined effects of prior visitation history and destination status. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 43. pp. 171-179
  70. Mechinda, P., Serirat, S., Guild, N. (2009) An examination of tourists' attitudinal and behavioural loyalty: comparison between domestic and international tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 15. No. 2. pp. 129-148
  71. Moilanen, T., Rainisto, S. (2009) *How to Brand Nations, Cities and Destinations: A Planning Book for Place Branding*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
  72. Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Pride, R. (2002) *Destination Branding – Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
  73. Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Pride, R. (2004) *Destination Branding – Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

74. Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Pride, R. (2011) *Destination Brands: Managing Place Reputation*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed) Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.
75. Morgan, N.J., Pritchard, A., Piggott, R. (2002) New Zealand, 100% Pure. The creation of a powerful niche destination brand. *Journal of Brand Management*. Vol. 9. No. 3. pp. 285-299
76. Morgan, N.J., Pritchard, A., Piggott, R. (2003) Destination branding and the role of stakeholders: The case of New Zealand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 9. No. 4-5. pp. 335-354
77. Moutinho, L. Albayrak, T., Caber, M. (2012) How far does overall service quality of a destination affect customers' post-purchase behaviours? *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 14. pp. 307-322
78. Myers, J.H., Alpert, M.I. (1968) Determinant buying attitudes: meaning and measurement. *Journal of Marketing*. 32(October). pp. 13-20
79. Niininen, O., Szivas, E., Riley, M. (2004) Destination loyalty and repeat behaviour: An application of optimum stimulation measurement. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 6. pp. 439-447
80. Nuttavuthisit, K. (2007) Branding Thailand: Correcting the negative image of sex tourism. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 21-30
81. Oppermann, M. (1997) Predicting destination choice – A discussion of destination loyalty. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 5. No. 1. pp. 51-65
82. Oppermann, M. (2000) Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 39. pp. 78-84
83. Park, S.Y., Petrick, J.F. (2006) Destinations' perspectives of branding. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 33. No. 1. pp. 262-265
84. Patton, M.Q. (2002) *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
85. Phelps, A. (1986) Holiday destination image - the problem of assessment. *Tourism Management*. September. pp. 168-180
86. Phillips, W.J., Wolfe, K., Hodur, N., Leisritz, F.L. (2011) Tourist word of mouth and revisit intentions to rural tourism destinations: A case of North Dakota, USA. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 15. No. 1. pp. 93-104
87. Pike, S. (2002) Destination image analysis: a review of 142 papers from 1973-2000. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 23. No. 5. pp. 541-549
88. Pike, S. (2004) *Destination Marketing Organisations*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
89. Pike, S. (2004a) Destination brand positioning slogans – towards the development of a set of accountability criteria. *Acta Turistica*. Vol. 16. No. 2. pp. 102-124
90. Pike, S. (2006) Destination decision sets: A longitudinal comparison of stated destination preferences and actual travel. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 12. No. 4. pp. 319-328
91. Pike, S. (2007) Consumer-based brand equity for destinations: Practical DMO performance measures. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*. Vol. 22. No. 1. pp. 51-61
92. Pike, S. (2007b) Destination image literature: 2001 – 2007. *Acta Turistica*. Vol. 19. No. 2. pp. 107-125
93. Pike, S. (2007c) Repertory Grid Analysis in group settings to elicit salient destination brand attributes. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 10. No. 4. pp. 378-392
94. Pike, S. (2007d) Destination image questionnaires – avoiding uninformed responses. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Research*. 2(Fall). pp. 151-160

95. Pike, S. (2008) *Destination Marketing*. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
96. Pike, S. (2009) Destination brand positions of a competitive set of near-home destinations. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. No. 6. pp. 857-866
97. Pike, S. (2010) *Marketing turističkog odredišta*. Turizmoteka: Zagreb.
98. Pike, S. (2015) *Destination Marketing Essentials*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
99. Pike, S., Bianchi, C., Kerr, G., Patti, C. (2010) Consumer-based brand equity for Australia as a long haul tourism destination in an emerging market. *International Marketing Review*. Vol. 27. No. 4. pp. 434-449
100. Pike, S., Page, S. (2014) Destination Marketing Organizations and destination marketing: A narrative analysis of the literature. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 41. pp. 202-227
101. Pike, S., Ryan, C. (2004) Destination positioning analysis through a comparison of cognitive, affective and conative perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 42. No. 4. pp. 333-342
102. Prayag, G., Ryan, C. (2012) Antecedents of tourists' loyalty to Mauritius: The role and influence of destination image, place attachment, personal involvement, and satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 51. No. 3. pp. 342-356
103. Pride, R. (2002) Brand Wales: 'natural revival'. In Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., Pride, R. (Eds) *Destination Branding*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. pp. 109-123
104. Pritchard, A., Morgan, N. (1998) Mood marketing - the new destination branding strategy: a case of Wales the brand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 4. No. 3. pp. 215-29
105. Pritchard, G. (1982) Tourism promotion: Big business for the states. *The H.R.A. Quarterly*. Vol. 23. No. 2. pp. 48-57
106. Reynolds, W.H. (1965) The role of the consumer in image building. *California Management Review*. Spring. pp. 69-76
107. Richardson, J., Cohen, J. (1993) State slogans: the case of the missing USP. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*. Vol. 2. No. 2/3. pp. 91-109
108. Ries, A., Trout, J. (1982) The enormous competitive power of a selling product name. *Marketing Times*. Vol. 29. No. 5. pp. 28-38
109. Ritchie, J.R.B., Ritchie, R.J.B. (1998) The branding of tourism destinations – past achievements and future challenges. In Keller, P. (Ed) *Destination Marketing – Reports of the 48<sup>th</sup> AIEST Congress*. Marrakech. pp. 89-116
110. Rittichainuwat, B.N., Qu, H., Brown, T.J. (2001) Thailand's international travel image. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 42. No. 2. pp. 82-95
111. Russell, S. (2008) Selling down under. *B & T*. 1 August. p. 13
112. Shanka, T. (2001) Tourist destination slogans as unique selling propositions: The case of African tourism. *Tourism Analysis*. Vol. 6. pp. 53-60
113. Snepenger, D., Milner, L. (1990) Demographic and situational correlates of business travel. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 28. No. 4. pp. 27-32
114. Stepchenkova, S., Mills, J. (2010) Destination image: A meta-analysis of 2000-2007 research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*. Vol. 19. pp. 575-609
115. Tasci, D.A., Gartner, W.C., Cavusgil, S.T. (2007) Conceptualization and operationalization of destination image. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. Vol. 31. No. 2. pp. 194-223

116. Thompson, J.R., Cooper, P.D. (1979) Additional evidence on the limited size of evoked and inept sets of travel destination. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 17. No. 3. pp. 23-25
117. Tourism and Events Queensland. (2013) Domestic Tourism Snapshot: Year Ended December 2012. [www.tq.com.au/research](http://www.tq.com.au/research)
118. Tourism Queensland (2003) *Tourism Queensland Presentation*. Bundaberg. 26 February.
119. Tourism Queensland. (2005) *TQ News*. Issue 1: Summer.
120. Ward, S.V., Gold, J.R. (1994) *The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Regions*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
121. White, A. (2000) Travelling tips. *Leisure Management*. Vol. 20. No. 3. pp. 30-34
122. Wilson, C.E. (1981) A procedure for the analysis of consumer decision making. *Journal of Advertising Research*. Vol. 21. No. 2. pp. 31-36
123. Woodside, A.G., Lysonski, S. (1989) A general model of traveler destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*. Spring. pp. 8-14
124. Woodside, A.G., Sherrell, D. (1977) Traveler evoked, inept, and inert sets of vacation destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 16. pp. 14-18
125. Woodside, A.G., Wilson, E.J. (1985) Effects of consumer awareness of brand advertising on preference. *Journal of Advertising Research*. Vol. 25. No. 4. pp. 41-48
126. Yuksel, A., Yuksel, F., Bilim, Y. (2010) Destination attachment: Effects of customer satisfaction and cognitive, affective and conative loyalty. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 31. pp. 274-284

*Primljeno: 26. travnja 2015. /*

*Submitted: 26 April 2015*

*Prihvaćeno: 16. srpnja 2015. /*

*Accepted: 16 July 2015*