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Abstract
From the perspective of complexity and performance, destination branding can be considered as one of the most dynamic and challenging processes in marketing theory and practice. It has long been recognized that brand, as an intangible asset, is extremely valuable in differentiation of products, services and places from those of competitors. In this respect, brand strength is seen as an important indicator of the destination branding efficiency, which directly depends on visitors’ perceptions, behaviors and loyalty, but also on the brand awareness of the supply side, free exchange of ideas, innovations and synergic interaction between stakeholders. In the context of this paper, a full implementation of the branding strategy is seen as a kind of turning point for tourism destinations that strive to build a strong brand in order to improve their market visibility, strengthen competitiveness and increase economic efficiency. This paper is focused on the capital cities of the European Union (EU) member states as the world’s leading group of tourism receiving countries, which has accounted for 39% of all international tourist arrivals and 34% of international tourism receipts worldwide in 2012. Having in mind that EU capital cities are frequently the most developed urban areas and highly attractive tourism destinations for wide array of reasons, analysis of the linkage between brand strength and tourism intensity indices seems to be a valuable step forward in better understanding of urban tourism development dynamics and sustainability. While the growth of tourism intensity index indicates the increase in number of temporary visitors comparing to the size of local population, the growth of the brand strength indicates destination’s strong branding activity towards more sophisticated market segmentation and attraction of target market segments. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to determine to what extent the implementation of branding process can have impact on building destination’s brand strength and tourism economic performance in the EU capital cities. The relevance of this paper stems from the fact that tourism intensity in EU capital cities are among the highest in the world, which raises the concern about the sustainability of tourism development in these destinations. So far, the literature that interrelate tourism destination brand strength and tourism intensity indices in the context of capital cities is scant and much remains to be investigated and elucidated. From that point of view, the approach used in this paper can be considered as a pioneer in this particular field of research.
The methodology used in this research was based on the literature study related to tourism destination branding, and comparative analysis of the main tourism development indicators among EU capital cities. For the latter, a simple relationship analysis between brand strength and tourism intensity was performed by using a cross-section analysis. The findings of this research reveal that tourism intensity index is directly related to destination brand strength index. Therefore, paper concludes that destination branding process is an important lever for creating and maintaining competitive advantages among capital cities on mature and saturated European tourism market.
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INTRODUCTION

In the last three decades the concept of destination branding has become one of the most important topics within the tourism research literature. It is often referred to as one of the most powerful and innovative tools of destination marketing strategy (Caldwell and Freire, 2004; Paskaleva-Shapira, 2007; Marzano and Scott, 2009) but at the same time, one of the least understood (Laroche and Parsa, 2000; Blain, Levy and Ritchie, 2005). Based on the analysis of 74 destination branding papers, published in period 1998 – 2007, Pike (2009) identified numerous research gaps from the area of destination branding that need to be addressed in the future. One of the important research gaps identified by Pike (2009) is related to the deeper understanding and operationalization of the consumer based brand equity (CBBE) and its key components – brand salience (brand strength), brand associations, brand resonance and brand loyalty. At the same time, the importance of city tourism is gaining momentum and cities around the world are increasingly competing, not only to attract their share of visitors, but also to attract educated professionals, international corporations and to promote themselves as a pleasant place to live. According to the UNWTO (2012) the importance of city tourism is increasing as tourism is considered to be “a key resource for cities and its residents which can bring substantial economic benefits and play an important role in achieving economic, social and environmental stability while, at the same time, offering the best experience for visitors” (pp. 48). In this context, it can be argued that the role of tourism for the world cities is increasing as tourism is being perceived as a powerful vehicle for delivering various socio-economic benefits to the local communities around the world.

Having in mind all of the above, this paper aims to investigate the relationship between brand strength, as one of the components of the CBBE, on the one hand, and tourism intensity of the selected EU capital cities, on the other hand. This paper utilizes brand strength indicators for selected EU capital cities available from the Saffron European City Brand Barometer (2014), a report periodically produced by Saffron Consultants, a leading consulting company for urban branding. At the same time, tourism intensity represents a measure which is commonly used to describe relative importance of tourism for a region or a physical pressure that tourism exerts on a region. According to Eurostat (2010), tourism intensity provides more objective measure of economic significance of tourism for a region compared to absolute numbers of tourist arrivals or overnight stays. By comparative analysis of brand strength and tourism intensity this paper will try to investigate the nature and extent of the relationship between those two important indicators. Building on the theory from the field of destination branding and other available theoretical underpinnings, it would be reasonable to assume that those cities with
stronger brand, at the same time, have higher level of tourism intensity or in other words, that those two indicators would be characterized by a strong, positive and statistically significant correlation. In order to accomplish previously stated objectives, this paper is organized in the following manner: First, a brief overview of the literature from the area of destination branding is provided. Next, the methodology and rationale for comparative analysis of brand strength and tourism intensity is explained. This is followed by the discussion of research results, the conclusion and managerial implications.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a general agreement among both scholars and practitioners that branding is a powerful means for product differentiation and that differentiation is an effective marketing strategy in a competitive environment (e.g. Kotler, Heider and Rein, 1993; Keller, 2003; Pappu, Quester, and Cooksey, 2005; Tasci, Gartner, and Cavusgil, 2007). The term brand appeared during the 1970’s in marketing papers about positioning and many academics and practitioners were protesting due to the similarity of the branding concept and the positioning concept (Kotler and Lee, 2007). Subsequent research on this subject has shown that there indeed is a significant difference between branding and positioning. Unlike the positioning, which represents a general picture of the product in the minds of consumers, the brand represents a much wider concept and its elements are its features that can be protected by trademark, brand names, URLs, logos, symbols, characters, spokespersons, slogans, advertisements. These are used to identify and distinguish a brand on the market (Kotler and Keller, 2012). Although the product might have a name, a trademarked logo, unique packaging and other design features, a brand does not necessarily have to exist in the mind of the consumers (Holt, 2004). Names, logos and designs should thus be regarded as the material markers of the brand. If the product does not yet have a history, those markers are typically empty. Conversely, famous brands also have markers, but these have been filled with customer experiences. Well known and accepted brands then draw customers on the basis of the product offer that is embodied in their strategy (Kotler and Keller, 2009). Moreover, strong brands can simplify the choices that have to be made and increase the satisfaction derived from consuming a product or service. For example, a stay at the Plaza Hotel in New York is a memorable experience simply because of the power of the brand name and the reputation that goes with it.

Within the tourism context, the concept of branding is considered to have important implications for the management of tourism destinations. This is because the ever-increasing number of potential tourism destinations has resulted in increased substitutability of destinations and a lack of differentiation among destinations with similar tourism products (e.g. sun-and-sea tourism, business tourism, health tourism etc.). Accordingly, it can be argued that the global tourism marketplace is becoming a fiercely competitive environment, why tourism destinations are under extreme pressure to reinvent their selves in order to differentiate against their competitors (Krešić and Prebežac, 2012). Moreover, since 70% of international travelers visit only 10 countries on earth, all other countries are competing for the remaining 30% of international tourist arrivals (e.g. Morgan, Pritchard, and Pride, 2004). Bearing this in mind, it becomes clear why the marketing of places has become a very important destination management activity (Anholt, 2007). Places differ in their histories, cultures, politics, leadership, and particular ways of managing their public-private relationships, and they must see themselves as competitive with other places in order to retain and enhance their resources
(Govers, 2011). Generally, place marketing refers to the broad set of efforts by country, regional and city governments, and by industry groups, aimed at marketing the places and sectors they represent. From a place marketing perspective, an analogy could be drawn between the place brand as an umbrella brand covering the destination brand, and the corporate brand as opposed to the category or product brand. As branding has evolved, place branding, while not necessarily identified by that term, has become a significant marketing issue, whereas country image has already been subject to extensive research since the early 1970s (Nebenzahl, 2004). Regarding its function, place branding should inform place marketing and act as a strategic compass. Here, one also needs to think about how tourism, export or investment policy can contribute to building a strong brand (Govers, 2011). Moreover, the need for place branding, as it has surfaced over the last decade and a half, can be regarded as an evolution of place marketing. Therefore, even though place branding is obviously related to place marketing, it still represents a separate research area, which is subject to its own theory and practice. From the other side, destination branding, as a new aspect of place marketing, can help the place to move to a more sophisticated level in their place marketing practices (Rainisto, 2004). Destination branding should thus be seen as a narrower concept of place branding, mainly induced by the globalization process, by the appearance and wider utilization of human technologies, typical of post-industrial economies.

Over the last 30 years, branding has become a very important marketing approach which involves many heterogeneous stakeholders who must collaborate in order to achieve a successful outcome (Green, 2005). The branding of tourism destinations is, however, still a relatively recent area of research. A review of the literature on destination marketing and destination branding clearly shows that destination branding is becoming an increasingly popular area of tourism research. Since 1998, when the first papers on destination branding emerged, more than 100 papers and articles covering this topic have been published (Pike, 2009; Saraniemi, 2009). The focus of the published papers evolved from the place image, place marketing and place branding topics, to destination branding topics, mostly related to measuring success in destination marketing and branding efforts. The great researcher interest is also reflected by the fact that a specialized journal has recently been launched by Elsevier covering marketing management issues at the tourism destination level (i.e. the Journal of Destination Marketing and Management is published by Elsevier since 2012). The key of branding is that consumers perceive a difference among brands in a product category because a distinctive and unique brand is hardly to be replaced by other brands (Qu, Kim and Im, 2011). Morgan et al. (2004), point out that a brand has become the key for destination success, along with products and price. Kotler, Bowen and Makens (2006), also argue that products and brands are extremely important for the success of the destination and that the destination must constantly manage its products. In other words, brand development can be perceived as a way to communicate a destination’s unique identity and it can be considered mutually beneficial from both the supply and demand perspectives (Pike, 2009). Since the role of destination branding is to communicate the promise and benefits that the destination has to offer, the concept of destination branding is becoming more immanent for the destination management process and therefore a more important factor of the competitiveness of the destination (Miličević, Skoko and Krešić, 2012).

When it comes to the destination branding process, there is, in fact, almost no difference towards products, except that the destination branding process is more complex. Thereby the complexity again arises primarily from the multi-attributed nature of destinations, as well as the heterogeneity of existing and potential generating markets (Pike, 2007). Given the fact that the tourism product represents a mix of different physical products and intangible services,
which can be, and usually are branded separately, the destination branding process is more comparable to the corporate branding process aimed at creating an umbrella brand for a corporation, rather than to the branding process of single products or services. This point of view is supported by Morgan and Pritchard (2005) who claim that, even though there are numerous similarities between product branding and destination branding, at the end a destination cannot be branded as if it was a single product. Morgan and Pritchard (2005) further emphasize that a destination branding process is a long-time effort whose results are not always visible in the short run. The main objective of destination branding process is to create a desirable and appealing destination image, based on the distinctive destination features, and to accurately convey this image to the potential visitors (Blain, Levy and Ritchie, 2005).

According to Pike (2005), destination branding is considered to be a vital instrument of contemporary destination management practice and any destination, which is striving to achieve favorable and long-term sustainable market positions, must undergo the destination branding process.

Another important area of research within the context of destination branding centers on brand performance, a concept that could be referred to as the most important outcome of the destination branding process. Generally, brand performance in marketing and management research is mostly expressed in terms of brand equity (Pike, 2007). Whereas three different perspectives of brand equity have been evidenced in the literature; a) financial perspective; b) customer-based perspective; and c) combined perspective (Kim and Kim, 2005; Xu and Chan, 2010), conceptualizing brand equity from the customer-based perspective is crucial as it provides both specific guidelines for marketing strategies and areas where research can be convenient in assisting the decision making process in management (Keller, 2009). In addition, So and King (2010) evidenced that further research on customer-based brand equity is necessary because the financial perspective might have little meaning until brand equity from the consumer perspective is primarily ascertained. For tourism destinations, whose product is highly intangible and complex, it would further be rather difficult to express the value if its brand in a financial way. Measurement of brand performance via financial brand equity thus is of low practical value for destination management organizations. In research and practice, emphasis is therefore given to the customer-based perspective, which holds true for research on both brand equity, in general, and destination brand equity, in particular. Typically, brand performance measurement via customer-based brand equity, involves measures of:

- brand loyalty;
- brand awareness among key market segments;
- perceptions of quality embodied in the brand strategy;
- the appeal of ideas or associations linked with the brand; and
- proprietary brand assets such as trademarks and distribution channel linkages.

Historically, the brand equity concept has first been examined from the perspective of product settings, later it has been transferred to services industries, and finally it has also been expanded to the tourism domain (Ritchie and Ritchie, 1998; Buhalıs, 2000; d’Hauteserre, 2001; Williams, Gill, and Chura, 2004; Konecnik and Gartner, 2007; Woodside, Cruickshank and Dehuang, 2007). Brand equity in tourism, however, is significantly different from product brand equity, since the idiosyncrasies of tourism activities, which involve pure services, suppose different goals and challenges. These differences imply that the academic concepts developed so far are of limited applicability, meaning that greater efforts are required to build an integrated conceptual framework.
METHOD AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

In order to evaluate the relationship between brand strength and tourism intensity, this study uses a sample of 20 European Capitals-city tourism destinations. The sample size was mainly determined by (un-)availability of adequate data. On the one hand, tourism intensity levels for each destination were obtained by calculating respective scores of tourist overnights per capita. Data on overnights were obtained from the TourMis database (www.tourmis.info, 2014), while the population size of analyzed cities was obtained from respective national statistics bureaus. On the other hand, data on brand strength are obtained from the Saffron European City Brand Barometer (2014), a report periodically produced by Saffron Consultants, a leading consulting company for urban branding. In this report, which analyzes overall 72 cities (European cities with populations of 450,000 or more, plus Manchester, Bristol, Cardiff, Leeds and Newcastle) brand strength is calculated by using four equally weighted factors (Saffron Consulting, 2014):

- **Quantity/strength of positive/attractive associations** (weight: 25%): This indicator looks at prompted and unprompted (top-of-mind) associations people have of a city.
- **Pictorially recognized** (weight: 25%): This indicator looks at whether many people could recognize the city from a postcard without reading the description on the back.
- **Conversational value** (weight: 25%): This indicator looks at how interesting it would be to tell people at a cocktail party that you have just returned from a particular destination.
- **Media recognition** (weight: 25%): The indicator is simply a count of press mentions of each of the city destinations over a certain period of time.

As mentioned in the Saffron report (2014), these four indicators are subjective in that they are Saffron’s chosen factors, but however, they are based on extensive place branding experience and thus considered valid from an expert standpoint. In order to rate the city destinations along these four indicators, an expert panel is used. An overview of the data used in this analysis is provided in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Capital city</th>
<th>Number of bed nights (2013)a</th>
<th>Size of populationb</th>
<th>Tourism intensity</th>
<th>Brand strengthc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Austria</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>13,544,798</td>
<td>1,727,330</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bulgaria</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>1,401,703</td>
<td>1,291,591</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Croatia</td>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1,333,892</td>
<td>790,017</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Czech</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>14,654,282</td>
<td>1,243,201</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Denmark</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>6,423,830</td>
<td>722,079</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Finland</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>3,263,227</td>
<td>603,968</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>36,679,245</td>
<td>2,274,880</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>26,942,082</td>
<td>3,375,222</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hungary</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>7,300,022</td>
<td>1,735,041</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Ireland</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>6,496,000</td>
<td>527,612</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Italy</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>24,160,505</td>
<td>2,616,068</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Latvia</td>
<td>Riga</td>
<td>1,186,000</td>
<td>658,640</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Overnights</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Vilnius</td>
<td>1,648,466</td>
<td>524,868</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>11,262,000</td>
<td>1,291,735</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>4,633,900</td>
<td>2,666,278</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>7,268,870</td>
<td>547,733</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Bratislava</td>
<td>1,919,823</td>
<td>411,228</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>14,873,643</td>
<td>6,183,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>7,300,707</td>
<td>1,372,565</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>124,876,000</td>
<td>4,942,100</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Data on bed nights were obtained from the *TourMis database* (www.tourmis.info, 2014); Data on size of population were obtained from respective national statistics offices; Brand strength data were obtained from the *The Saffron European City Brand Barometer* (Saffron Consultants, 2014), maximum value=100.

In order to evaluate the relationship between calculated scores of tourism intensity and brand strength for the 20 European capitals, we first plotted the two measures against each other into a two-dimensional matrix (Figure 1). Subsequently, correlation analysis to quantify the strength of this relationship was used. Here, overnights and population size into the analysis to see are included, in an exploratory manner, how these “ingredient variables” of tourism intensity behave when opposed to brand strength (Table 2).

**Figure 1**

**BRAND STRENGTH AND TOURISM INTENSITY PLOT FOR EUROPEAN CITY DESTINATIONS**
Table 2
CORRELATION ANALYSIS BETWEEN BRAND STRENGTH AND TOURISM DEMAND INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of bed nights (2013)</th>
<th>Size of population</th>
<th>Tourism intensity index</th>
<th>Brand strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of bed nights</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,615**</td>
<td>0,853**</td>
<td>0,630**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2013)</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of population</strong></td>
<td>0,615*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,307</td>
<td>0,456**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,009</td>
<td>0,231</td>
<td>0,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism intensity</strong></td>
<td>0,853*</td>
<td>0,307</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,728**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>index</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,231</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand strength</strong></td>
<td>0,630**</td>
<td>.456*</td>
<td>0,728**</td>
<td>1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,007</td>
<td>0,038</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **significant correlation at 1%-level; *significant correlation at 5%-level; coefficients were obtained through Pearson correlation analysis.

As can be seen in Figure 1, there is an evident strong, positive relationship between brand strength and tourism intensity. Moreover, a visual examination of the matrix reveals roughly two clusters of cities. The first one comprises mainly destinations from Central and Eastern Europe, which lie on the lower-left end of the matrix. The remaining cities are cities form a second cluster of more successful destinations, whereas Paris and London could even be excluded into a third cluster of city destinations on the upper-right end of the matrix.

The positive relationship between brand strength and tourism intensity is also confirmed by the correlation analysis which provided a high and statistically significant coefficient ($\rho=0,728$). Accordingly, stronger brand strength obviously is connected with a higher level of inbound tourism activity per inhabitant. Although somewhat lower as compared to tourism intensity, the analysis further shows that brand strength is also positively related to absolute inbound tourism activity, as measured by overnights in the present study ($\rho=0,630$). It can thus be concluded that a stronger brand goes along with significant, positive benefits for city tourism destinations, and managing a destination brand thus becomes a strong means of actively managing tourism demand. Based upon this analysis, it is, however, not possible to specify the direction of causality in the relationship between these two variables. On the one hand, it is rather obvious that better brand performance can exhibit a positive influence on tourism demand. On the other hand, however, it is also possible that stronger tourism demand, i.e. larger number of visitors and tourists, contribute to strengthening a destination brand by sharing their experiences with friends and relatives. Accordingly, the relationship between these two variables is likely to be dynamic. The cross-sectional data design and limited sample size in this study do, however, not facilitate analyses that would shed more light on this.
Finally, the relationship between population size and brand strength is also statistically significant and positive, but of medium size. Accordingly, one could argue that, at average, larger cities typically go along with a stronger brand.

CONCLUSION

According to the research results, brand strength, as defined and calculated by the Saffron European City Brand Barometer, is strongly, positively and significantly correlated to the tourism intensity index, to the absolute number of overnights and moderately correlated to the size of a respective city’s population. In fact, the visual analysis of the respective values of brand strength and tourism intensity (Figure 1) roughly revealed two clusters of city destinations – first cluster with lower brand strength and lower tourism intensity and second cluster of destination with higher brand strength and higher tourism intensity. Additionally, visual analysis of the data reveals that none of the EU capital cities are located in the upper left part of matrix, meaning that none of them have low brand strength and high tourism intensity at the same time. At the other hand, there are few EU capitals (located in the lower right part of matrix) whose brand strength is disproportionately high compared to their tourism intensity index. Those cities, among which are Vienna, Rome and Amsterdam, judging only by the strength of their brands, should have much higher tourism intensity index which can consequently suggest that those cities have strong brands which are underutilized. Consequently, it can be argued that city destinations with higher values of brand strengths are also typically characterized by the higher values of tourism intensity index. Therefore, there appears to be an evident causal link between those two values, even though the causality itself is ambiguous and the analysis cannot reveal the direction of this causality. However, based on previous research on tourism destination branding, it can be concluded that this causality is not likely to be unidirectional; it is rather bidirectional whereby an increase in brand strength pushes tourism intensity and, in turn, higher tourism intensity causes the brand strength to rise. Finally, the approach utilized in this study can be considered as novel since, to the knowledge of the authors, this is the first empirical examination that uses quantitative data in order to determine importance of destination branding for overall tourism development. Further research is however needed in order to additionally explore this relationship and to reveal full impact of destination branding on the intensity of tourism development.
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