

Journal of Travel Research

<http://jtr.sagepub.com/>

Three Tales of a City: Stakeholders' Images of Eilat as a Tourist Destination

Dimitrios Stylidis, Yaniv Belhassen and Amir Shani

Journal of Travel Research published online 7 May 2014

DOI: 10.1177/0047287514532373

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jtr.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/05/07/0047287514532373>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Travel and Tourism Research Association](http://www.ttra.org)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Travel Research* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/05/07/0047287514532373.refs.html>

>> [OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - May 7, 2014

[What is This?](#)

Three Tales of a City: Stakeholders' Images of Eilat as a Tourist Destination

Journal of Travel Research
1–15
© 2014 SAGE Publications
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0047287514532373
jtr.sagepub.com


Dimitrios Styliadis¹, Yaniv Belhassen², and Amir Shani³

Abstract

Research on destination image has predominantly focused on tourists' perceptions, with only limited attention being paid to the other stakeholders of the destination. The present study seeks to address this oversight by examining the images that tourists, local residents, and the tourism sector have formed of Eilat, a prominent resort town in Israel. Analysis was based on a sample of 608 stakeholders. Results indicate that there were significant differences in perceptions between the three stakeholder groups in regard to 27 of the 30 destination attributes examined. Tourists held the most favorable image of Eilat, while local residents chose the lowest scores for all destination attributes. The study expands current understandings of stakeholder theory in destination marketing and delineates practical implications for sustainable marketing and the design of internal campaigns aiming to enhance stakeholders' images of the destination.

Keywords

destination image, stakeholder theory, stakeholder image, residents' destination image, Eilat

Introduction

Intense competition between places on the national and international stages has elevated the role of place marketing in the agenda of urban management. The increased focus on place marketing stems from the dominant belief that it is image, rather than factual knowledge, that influences people's perceptions and behaviors (e.g., Boulding 1956; Echtner and Ritchie 1991; Kearsley 1990). Place marketing is not considered a new phenomenon (Kavaratzis and Ashworth 2008). Its roots trace back to the establishment of the *polis*, city-states in ancient Greece, such as Athens and Sparta, which strove consciously to assert their uniqueness. In a somewhat similar vein, contemporary place images—harking back to 19th-century “booster” images in the United States—are designed to attract investors, tourists, and high-skilled employees, to appeal to government officials and to build civic pride among local residents (Bramwell and Rawding 1996; Gold and Ward 1994), with a view to helping places maximize their socioeconomic potentials (Ashworth and Voogd 1990).

Place (i.e., city) marketing strategy should be based on a variety of elements, including extensive research on the city's assets and opportunities and formulation of a vision for the image of the city with the collaboration and agreement of a broad range of stakeholders (Ashworth and Voogd 1990; Kavaratzis and Ashworth 2008). Similarly, in the context of tourism, where the focus is on images of places as tourism destinations, stakeholders' participation in the planning and marketing of tourism is considered vital (e.g., Bigne, Sanchez, and Sanz 2005; Byrd, Bosley, and Dronberger

2009), because without their consensus or support, it would be difficult to develop a sustainable tourism industry in the community (Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal 2002; Styliadis and Terzidou 2014). Given that marketing efforts must be adjusted to the needs of each stakeholder—tourists, residents, the tourism sector, and government officials—elucidating the images held by each of the diverse stakeholders is critical for the success of destination promotion (Merrilees, Miller, and Herington 2012; Shani and Wang 2011).

Acknowledging the crucial role of the stakeholders in destination marketing, a plethora of studies have explored the perceptions and images individual stakeholders hold of a place (e.g., do Valle, Mendes, and Guerreiro 2012; Sun, Ryan, and Pan, forthcoming). Most tourism studies, however, have focused on the destination image retained by tourists (e.g., Hallmann, Zehrer, and Muller 2014; Stepchenkova and Li 2013), exploring the factors that shape their image and the tourists' behavioral intentions (e.g., Assaker and Hallak 2013; Chen, Lin, and Petrick 2013; Lee, Lee, and Lee 2014; Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou, and Kaplanidou 2014; Prayag and Ryan 2012), or the implications of that image for destination competitiveness

¹Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat campus, Israel

²Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat campus, Israel

³Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat campus, Israel

Corresponding Author:

Dimitrios Styliadis, Guilford Glazer Faculty of Business and Management, Department of Hotel and Tourism Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat Campus, 162 Hatmarim Blvd., Eilat 88000, Israel.
Email: styliadis@post.bgu.ac.il

(e.g., Andrades-Caldito, Sánchez-Rivero, and Pulido-Fernández 2013). Only limited research has been devoted to the images held by other stakeholders, such as local residents (e.g., do Valle et al. 2012; Hudson and Ritchie 2002; Schroeder 1996), or to comparing the destinations images held by the diverse stakeholder groups (e.g., Henkel, Henkel, Agrusa, Agrusa and Tanner 2006; Sternquist-Witter 1985).

Yet researchers suggest that local residents represent a key element in the tourism planning process (e.g., Hall 2008; Sautter and Leisen 1999). Determining their image of the destination is valuable for understanding their behavioral intentions, such as intention to recommend the destination to others (Bigne et al. 2005; Martin and del Bosque 2008). Local residents harboring a negative destination image are often characterized by lack of civic pride, lack of attachment to the place, and apathy regarding community issues (Avraham 2004). A proper tourism industry cannot successfully operate in the long run without the active participation and goodwill of the hosts, nor can it flourish in a place stigmatized by a negative image and characterized by a high rate of migration.

Because of the key role of residents as advocates and marketers of their place to others (e.g., Leisen 2001; Schroeder 1996), the images held by the residents have a considerable effect on the tourists' own image formulation, decision making, and buying behavior (e.g., Bigne, Sanchez, and Sanz 2005; Gallarza, Saura, and Garcia 2002; Walls, Shani, and Rompf 2008). Campelo, Aitken, Thyne and Gnoth (2014), for instance, highlighted the importance of positioning residents' images at the heart of the branding and marketing strategy, especially as local stakeholders may potentially enhance the tourists' experience (Haugland, Ness, Gronseth and Aarstad 2011). It is therefore crucially important for marketers and local councils to identify any negative destination images among residents. Such negative images can endanger the successful development of tourism in the destination, limiting a town's chances of attracting new residents and tourists (Ward 1998).

The promotional images of a destination are often tailored to the desires, expectations, and fantasies of tourists and the tourism sector (Bandyopadhyay and Morraiz 2005; Hughes and Allen 2005) without regard for the images desired by the locals (Kokosalakis, Bagnall, Selby and Burns 2006). This practice is not in line with the sustainable approach in tourism, which emphasizes that residents should participate in formulating the place image that is being projected by the local tourism boards. Divergences between the stakeholders as regards the destination image may herald future problems, given that multiple visions can result in destination image incongruity or even in conflicts between different stakeholder groups (Michaelidou, Siamagka, Moraes and Micevski 2013; Virgo and de Chernatony 2006). The way to avoid such an unwelcome outcome is to identify these differences in perceptions and equip marketers with realistic knowledge about destination images (Shani and Wang 2011).

The handful of studies that have compared various stakeholders with regard to their images of a given tourist destination have revealed differences in perception between tourists and tourism entrepreneurs (e.g., Sternquist-Witter 1985), as well as between tourists and local residents (e.g., Alhemound and Armstrong 1996; Henkel et al. 2006; Jutla 2000). However, these studies confined themselves to comparing the perceptions of two stakeholder groups, and it appears that no attempt has been made so far to look at all three stakeholder groups concurrently. As a result, limited knowledge is available regarding destination image as perceived by both its internal (local residents, tourism sector) and external stakeholders and hence about the implications of that image for effective destination positioning. This omission has been criticized (e.g., Bigne et al. 2005; Schroeder 1996) on the grounds that for place marketing to succeed it is necessary not only that the expectations of visitors and investors be met, but also that residents and businesses be pleased with their communities (Kotler, Haider, and Rein 1993). Therefore, prior to commencing place marketing, local authorities and marketers should ensure that all voices are heard and that the projected destination image fulfills the needs of residents, visitors, and business people (Avraham 2004; Bramwell and Rawding 1996; Haugland et al. 2011). Only then will sustainable development of a place, its tourism industry, and its image be warranted (Henkel et al. 2006).

This study enhances our current understanding of destination image in two ways: first, in addition to the tourists' image of the destination, it also looks at the images held by residents and by the tourism sector, an aspect that is seldom investigated; and second, it simultaneously explores the level of congruity between these three stakeholders' images. To achieve these aims, the images that tourists, residents, and the tourism sector have formed of the well-established Israeli resort town of Eilat as a tourist destination were measured and contrasted. This study expands current understandings of stakeholder theory in place marketing and offers practical implications for sustainable marketing and for the design of internal campaigns aiming to enhance stakeholders' images of the destination.

Tourism Destination Image and Stakeholder Theory

Destination image has been one of the most pervasive topics in the tourism literature since the early 1970s, and a plethora of studies have examined the perception that actual/potential tourists have of a place as a tourist destination (e.g., Andrades-Caldito, Sánchez-Rivero, and Pulido-Fernández 2013; Assaker and Hallak 2013; Stepchenkova and Li 2013; Sun, Ryan, and Pan, forthcoming). In his frequently cited work, Crompton (1979, p. 18) defined destination image as "the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has

of a destination.” Lawson and Baud Bovy (1977, p. 10) extended this cognitive-based approach by including the affective component in their definition: “the expression of all objective knowledge, impressions, prejudice, imaginations and emotional thoughts an individual or group might have of a particular place.” Nowadays, it is widely accepted that destination image refers to the tourist-based rather than the marketer-based image (Li and Vogelsong 2006).

Although there is no consensus in the literature on how to define destination image, researchers tend to agree that it has three distinctly different but hierarchically interrelated components, namely, cognitive, affective, and conative (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Gartner 1993; Lin, Morais, Kerstetter and Hou 2007; Pike and Ryan 2004). The cognitive image component refers to the individual’s knowledge, beliefs, and evaluation of the perceived destination attributes. The affective image component is concerned with how individuals feel about the destination (Boo and Busser 2005; Govers, Go, and Kumar 2007). The conative component indicates the behavioral intentions in relation to the destination (i.e. intention to visit) (Boo and Busser 2005; Pike and Ryan 2004). Many factors can potentially influence the formation of a destination image in the mind of the potential/actual tourist. Gartner (1993) proposed eight image formation agents, which range from induced sources (e.g., traditional forms of advertising) and autonomous sources (e.g., independently produced reports, movies, and documentaries) to organic sources (e.g., information acquired from word-of-mouth communication and/or previous travel to the destination).

As this study set out to examine and contrast the images of a tourist destination as held by distinct stakeholder groups, stakeholder theory seemed the most suitable framework for understanding potential differences between stakeholders. Stakeholder theory suggests that there are several (and diverse) stakeholder groups within a community with different stakes at issue (Easterling 2005). In line with Freeman (1984, p. 46), “a stakeholder in an organization is any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives.” Stakeholder theory is founded on the democratic principles of community participation and public involvement (Fiorino 1990). When applied to tourism, it asserts that attention should be paid to the interests of all those who may affect or may be affected by its development (Shani and Pizam 2012). The stakeholders involved in tourism are usually the residents, tourists, tourism sector, and local government officials (Goeldner and Ritchie 2009; Kotler, Haider, and Rein 1993). Stakeholder theory has been widely applied in the tourism literature, in the context of such issues as collaboration in local tourism policy making and planning (e.g., d’Angella and Go 2009), residents’ attitudes toward tourism (e.g., Byrd, Bosley, and Dronberger 2009; Easterling 2005), and management of stakeholder groups (e.g., Sautter and Leisen 1999).

Within the tourism marketing literature, most of the research dealing with stakeholders and destination image has been preoccupied with the image held by individual stakeholder groups, including tourists (e.g., Hallmann, Zehrer, and Muller 2014; Martin and del Bosque 2008; Stepchenkova and Li 2013), residents (e.g., Hudson and Ritchie 2002; do Valle, Mendes, and Guerreiro 2012; Schroeder 1996), or tourism entrepreneurs/employees (e.g., Sternquist-Witter 1985). Nevertheless, the great bulk of these destination image studies focuses exclusively on the destination images of the tourists, considered to be a key factor in determining the competitiveness of tourism destinations. Destination image, in particular, has been shown to be a pivotal factor not only in destination selection and in determining tourists’ intention to visit (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Gallarza, Saura, and Garcia 2002) but also in shaping their experience and level of satisfaction during the actual visit (e.g., Chi and Qu 2008; Lee 2009). Post travel, destination image influences future behavioral intentions, such as intention to revisit and willingness to recommend the destination to others (e.g., Chen and Tsai 2007; Ramkissoon, Uysal, and Brown 2011).

The images of other stakeholder groups, such as local residents, have received less attention, the assumption being that their perceptions are less significant for marketing and managing tourism destinations. Furthermore, as noted earlier, in contradistinction to the plethora of destination image studies examining individual stakeholder groups (chiefly tourists), only a limited number of studies compare the images held by the different stakeholder groups. Nonetheless it would appear that different stakeholders—residents versus tourists (e.g., Henkel et al. 2006; Jutla 2000), local tourism entrepreneurs versus tourists (e.g., Sternquist-Witter, 1985)—perceive the same destination differently. In one of the earliest studies devoted to the perceptions of multiple stakeholder groups, Sternquist-Witter (1985) measured the image that tourists and local retailers formed of Traverse City, Michigan, and found that local retailers assessed their place more favorably than visitors in regard to 6 out of 10 attributes. Similarly, in a study conducted in Kuwait, Alhemound and Armstrong (1996) compared samples of Kuwaiti students and English-speaking foreigners. Their findings suggest that foreigners were more impressed with cultural attractions while local residents preferred manufactured attractions. Henkel et al. (2006) also found a significant difference between Thai residents and international tourists’ images of Thailand as a tourist destination.

As these studies indicate, tourism stakeholders do not necessarily share the same images of a destination. Divergences in perceptions can lead to conflict between the various stakeholder groups, that is, between local residents and tourists (Byrd, Bosley, and Dronberger 2009; Henkel et al. 2006), and, in turn, to lack of harmony and cohesiveness, both of which are essential for a successful destination image and brand (Csaba 2005). To effectively reduce such conflicts, it is necessary to identify, understand, and integrate all

stakeholders' images and perceptions (Haugland et al. 2011; Merrilees, Miller, and Herington 2012; Reid, Mair, and George 2004). This process is deemed vital for planning and developing a marketing model for a sustainable tourism product (Henkel et al. 2006). Thus, application of stakeholder theory to destination marketing calls for the examination of the central stakeholder groups' images, especially tourists, residents, and the tourism sector. This study advances current research by exploring and comparing the images that residents, the tourism sector, and tourists hold of Eilat as a tourist destination. Such understanding has become particularly important in today's world, where competition between destinations has intensified because of globalization of the world economy and the concomitant increase in the spatial mobility of capital and people (Bramwell and Rawding 1996).

Study Methods

Study Setting

The city of Eilat in Israel was selected as the setting of this study for several reasons. First, limited research has been conducted on the image of tourist destinations located in the Middle East, and Eilat is a key destination in the region. Second, as the number of jobs directly generated by tourism in Eilat is large (7,700), encompassing a significant proportion of the local population, it is important to elucidate the image that the tourism sector holds of the city. Third, Eilat enjoys a high rate of repeat visits by Israeli tourists; an in-depth understanding of tourists' images is important for ensuring that such repeat visitations will continue. Fourth, while tourism is a major contributor to the local economy, accounting for 50% of local GDP, the city is facing intense competition from the nearby resorts of Aqaba in Jordan and Taba in Egypt; it has therefore become urgent to investigate Eilat's image and plan its positioning accordingly. Finally, the planned relocation of the Eilat airport is expected to double the number of passengers arriving by air in the next 25 years, and, importantly, will free up a large area in the center of the city for residential and hotel development (Ergas and Felsenstein 2012); so the results of this study should also benefit the planning of tourism to Eilat, a city that is undergoing a process of gradual expansion. All in all, from the point of view of the researcher seeking to understand the images of a tourist destination held by multiple stakeholders, Eilat represents a valuable case study.

Eilat (population 47,500), Israel's southernmost city, is situated at the northern end of the Red Sea on the Gulf of Eilat/Aqaba. It is a prominent tourism destination in the Red Sea region and is Israel's most highly developed sea, sun, and sand resort. The city offers a warm climate, a unique desert landscape, the underwater tropical flora and fauna of the Red Sea, as well as extensive tourism and hospitality facilities. International tourists spent 1,084,000 nights and

domestic tourists 5,671,000 nights in Eilat (50% of all Israeli nights domestically) in 2011. This makes Eilat the most popular destination for domestic tourism in Israel. Currently, the city offers 10,956 hotel rooms, almost one-quarter (24.6%) of all the hotel room supply in Israel (Israeli Ministry of Tourism 2012). There were about 7,700 jobs per month in Eilat (in 2011), which amount to 28% of the monthly average for the entire hotel industry in Israel (Belhassen and Shani 2012).

Eilat is significantly remote from other major cities, the distance to Beersheba, the nearest large center, being 241 kilometers (150 miles). The city is artificially divided by the local airport into two zones: a residential quarter, and a tourist area located along the shoreline. Historically Eilat has had a rather transient population, with about 70% of the population living in Eilat for less than 10 years (Eilat Info). The municipality of Eilat estimates that, apart from the legal residents, there are approximately 7,000 African refugees and asylum seekers in the city (Belhassen and Shani, 2012). Consequently, most residents do not feel a strong bond to the city and are not highly concerned with the many issues related to quality of life; as a result, the residential area tends to be ill maintained (Mansfeld 1992).

Sampling

In view of the differences between the three stakeholder groups, independent samples were collected (Andriotis 2005) to ensure that all perspectives would be represented in the study (Goeldner and Ritchie 2009). Numerous studies on destination image have used a nonprobability method for sampling tourists (e.g., Chen and Tsai 2007; Lee, Lee, and Lee 2014; Stepchenkova and Li 2013), mainly because of lack of accurate data regarding the size of the tourist population and the absence of a sampling frame (Prayag and Ryan 2012; Stepchenkova and Li 2013). A similar problem exists in the case of tourism business owners/employees, as Belhassen and Shani (2012) recently discussed in their study of Eilat. Heterogeneous purposive sampling (Finn, Elliot-White, and Walton 2000) was therefore utilized, with the aim of ensuring heterogeneity and variance among the local stakeholders (residents and tourism entrepreneurs/employees) participating in the study, albeit without applying random sampling methods because of the lack of a sampling frame.

Following Chen, Lin, and Petrick (2013), the questionnaire was personally administered to the three stakeholder groups, who were approached mainly in the streets, at their place of work, or at home, on/at a random day/time. In the data collection process, the interviewers were required to exercise their judgment in performing a number of tasks: ensuring that the sample included all three types of stakeholders (Hankinson 2005); purposively selecting an equal number of respondents from each neighborhood in the case of residents; approaching a representative number of

accommodation establishments, catering units (restaurants and bars), travel agencies/car rentals, and tourist shops, in the case of tourism business owners/employees; and interviewing tourists from various ethnic backgrounds. The primary purpose was to include all opinions or views so as to enable a detailed exploration and understanding of the stakeholders' image (Ritchie, Lewis, and Elam 2003).

The first sample consisted of adults (over the age of 18) who are permanent residents of Eilat. A screening question in the survey was used in order to differentiate between those who own/run a tourism business (tourism business owners) or work in the tourism industry (tourism employees) from the rest of the local residents. Tourism business owners/employees were treated as a distinct category in view of their special interests and strong stake in tourism (Byrd, Bosley, and Dronberger 2009). Residents and tourism sector employees were approached in their own neighborhoods or at work and asked to participate in the study. Members of the same household often hold similar views, so to avoid introducing a bias in the results, only one person out of each household approached was allowed to participate (Andriotis 2005).

Using the same sampling method as adopted for local residents and the tourism sector, tourists (the second sample) were approached in the tourist zone, where the vast majority of Eilat hotels, shops, and restaurants are located. A randomized day, time, and site methodology was used to obtain information (Bonn, Joseph, and Dai 2005). While this sampling procedure is helpful in achieving a balanced composition of respondents, it may limit the generalizability of the findings to other destinations, as is further discussed in the final section, Limitations and Future Research Directions. The data were collected between November 2012 and March 2013 using self-administered questionnaires, which were distributed by four trained research assistants. The process was closely supervised and monitored by one of the authors. Of the 900 stakeholders approached, 620 agreed to participate in the study. After discarding 12 incomplete responses, the final sample consisted of 608 usable questionnaires (240 tourists, 200 residents of Eilat, and 168 tourism business owners/employees in Eilat), resulting in an average response rate of 67.5%.

Study Instrument

A single questionnaire composed of three sections was developed in order to investigate the image that the three stakeholders had of Eilat as a tourist destination. Most of the questions were applicable to all the groups and were used to examine differences and similarities between them. The questionnaire also contained some items applicable exclusively to residents and tourism entrepreneurs/employees, or else to tourists (only the common questions are presented in the findings section).

In accordance with previous destination image research, a multi-item measure of destination image was utilized. With

this technique, a place is evaluated by the population under study for each of the attributes included in the measure, and the results are then combined into a profile depicting the image of the place studied. The multi-item scale was preferred to a single measurement for two main reasons. First, a plethora of studies (e.g., Beerli and Martin 2004; Bonn, Joseph, and Dai 2005; Lin et al. 2007) have delineated a number of destination image dimensions and argued that destination image is a complex and multifaceted concept. Second, a multi-item measure enables a better understanding of the construct under study, given that several image attributes are specified and incorporated into a standardized instrument (Lin et al. 2007; Martin and del Bosque 2008).

The questionnaire was prepared following a review of the existing literature on destination image (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Beerli and Martin 2004; Echtner and Ritchie 1991; Prayag 2009; Tasci and Holecek 2007). In the first stage of design, a list of place attributes, both functional and psychological (Echtner and Ritchie 1991), was generated on the basis of previous studies. The most frequently measured attributes of the cognitive component of destination image are scenery, natural attractions, climate, friendliness of the locals, nightlife-entertainment, appealing cuisine-food, shopping and accommodation facilities, safety, tourist activities, and local infrastructure. A group of 20 local residents, tourism entrepreneurs/employees, and tourists in Eilat were enlisted for an item selection exercise, and the 26 items most frequently mentioned and most relevant to Eilat items were retained. As in past research on destination image, a 7-point Likert-type scale was used, with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (e.g., Chi and Qu 2008; Lee 2009). The affective component of image was evaluated using four affective image attributes on a 7-point semantic differential scale. The four affective attributes drawn from previous research are: distressing-relaxing, unpleasant-pleasant, boring-exciting, and sleepy-lively (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Martin and del Bosque 2008).

Apart from the image-attribute questions, the stakeholders were asked to evaluate the overall image of Eilat, first as a tourist destination and then as a place to live, on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (very unfavorable) to 7 (very favorable) (e.g., Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Beerli and Martin 2004). They were also asked to express their intention to recommend Eilat to others as a tourist destination and as a place to live on a scale from 1 (very unlikely) to 7 (very likely) (e.g., Chi and Qu 2008; Prayag 2009). The third section of the questionnaire contained questions about the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including gender, age, educational level, marital status, and income (the second section is not presented here since it included questions not relevant to this study).

Prior to main data collection, a pilot test was conducted among 30 residents of Eilat in order to ensure the clarity, relevancy, and suitability of the research instrument. A few wording problems were corrected, but no other substantial

changes were required. Thus the pilot study enhanced both the instrument's face validity and the intelligibility of the questions. The questionnaire, originally written in English, was translated into Hebrew by a professional translator for the benefit of the residents and Hebrew-speaking tourists, then reviewed by a language editor to ensure the reliability of the translated version. To further verify the accuracy of the translation, the back-translation technique was used (e.g., Henkel et al. 2006). Finally, the use of surveyors with a command of both Hebrew and English minimized the risk of response problems due to language barriers (Bonn, Joseph, and Dai 2005).

A reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha) was performed for the cognitive and affective image scales. The Cronbach's alpha value of the cognitive image scale (26 items) was 0.89 for residents ($n = 200$), 0.86 for the tourism sector ($n = 168$), and 0.87 for tourists ($n = 240$). The relevant alpha value for the affective image scale (4 items) was 0.69 for residents, 0.67 for the tourism sector, and 0.57 for tourists. All cases were above the cut-off criterion of 0.6 (Peterson 1994), apart from the affective image scale for tourists, which was still over the cut-off of 0.50 suggested by Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991). Thus, the results indicated that the reliability of the scales was acceptable for measuring stakeholders' cognitive and affective images.

Results and Discussion

Sociodemographic Characteristics

The research was based on a sample of 608 persons, including tourists ($n = 240$), residents of Eilat ($n = 200$), and tourism business owners/employees in Eilat ($n = 168$). As can be seen in Table 1, of the 608 stakeholders who participated in the study, 54% were female and 46% male. Most were single (53%) and reported university studies as the highest educational level they had attained (45%). The majority of respondents were currently employed, either full-time (56%) or part-time (15%). In terms of respondents' age, the largest groups in the sample were the 25–34-year-olds (41%) and the 18–24-year-olds (28%), whereas respondents aged over 55 years were in the minority (7%). With regard to income, the majority of the stakeholders reported earning much less or less (57%) than the national average (8,000 new Israeli shekels [NIS]/month; approximately US\$2,100), with only 21% earning more than the national standard.

Within the local residents' sample ($n = 200$), women accounted for 59% and men for 41% of the respondents. The majority of the local residents were single (57%), less than 34 years old (67%), employed full-time (45%), and holders of an academic degree (45%). Finally, 41% of the residents stated that they had lived in Eilat for more than 10 years, whereas 12% were considered newcomers (<1 year of residence). Regarding the sample of residents working in the tourism sector ($n = 168$), most were single (62%), female

(54%), and less than 34 years old (73%). In comparison with the rest of the residents, most had lower educational qualifications (GED) (40%). They were mainly working full-time (66%) and had been living in Eilat for more than 10 years (46%). Finally, in the tourists' sample ($n = 240$), males and females were almost equally represented (51% and 49%, respectively). In contrast with the two other stakeholder groups, most tourists were married (48%). Half of the tourists had an academic degree (53%) and were employed full-time (59%). The vast majority of the tourists had visited Eilat in the past (68%).

Overall, based on the gender and age profile of Eilat residents (Eilat Census 2003), it appears that the sample of residents was generally representative of the city's population. Additionally, the sample of the tourism sector featured similar sociodemographic characteristics to those described in a recent study in Eilat (see Belhassen and Shani 2012).

Descriptive Statistics (Total Sample)

Three tourism stakeholder groups were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with a battery of attributes used to describe Eilat as a tourist destination (see Table 2). Most respondents held a rather favorable (mean score over 5) image of Eilat on a number of aspects, including scenery, quality of the hotels, climate, restaurants, water-sports and beaches, shopping and sport facilities, safety and security, and friendliness of the locals. Respondents also tended to agree that Eilat offers well known attractions, good nightlife, value for money, excellent quality of services, cleanliness, accessibility and political stability. On the other hand, most expressed slight disagreement with the notion that Eilat offers a good transportation system and local infrastructure, a variety of flora-fauna and interesting historic sites. In terms of the affective component of image, stakeholders evaluated Eilat as pleasant, relaxing, lively, and to a lesser extent exciting (Table 3). The overall image of Eilat as a tourist destination was favorable, and respondents rated Eilat more favorably as a tourist destination ($M = 5.44$) than as a place to live ($M = 4.57$) (see Table 4). Finally, most stakeholders noted that they would recommend Eilat to others as a tourist destination ($M = 5.74$) but appeared less inclined to recommend it as a place to live ($M = 4.34$).

The Stakeholder Groups Compared: Is a Congruent Tale Possible?

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) followed by post hoc test (Tukey) was conducted to identify potential differences between the three groups. The overall MANOVA test was significant (Wilks's Lambda = 0.631, $F = 4.249$, $df = 60$, $P < .001$). The results presented in Tables 2 and 3 indicate that there were statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) between the three stakeholder groups for 27 out of the 30 attributes used to measure Eilat's cognitive and

Table I. Respondents' Profile.

Variable	All Stakeholders (<i>n</i> = 608)		Residents (<i>n</i> = 200)		Tourism Sector (<i>n</i> = 168)		Tourists (<i>n</i> = 240)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender								
Male	280	46.4	82	41.2	77	45.8	121	51.3
Female	323	53.6	117	58.8	91	54.2	115	48.7
Marital status								
Single	313	53.0	108	56.5	101	61.6	104	44.1
Married	232	39.3	71	37.2	48	29.3	113	47.9
Other	46	7.7	12	6.3	15	9.1	19	8.0
Age								
18–24	169	27.9	56	28.1	50	29.7	63	26.5
25–34	248	41.0	77	38.7	72	42.9	99	41.5
35–44	93	15.4	36	18.1	24	14.3	33	13.9
45–54	52	8.6	17	8.5	9	5.4	26	10.9
≥55	43	7.1	13	6.6	13	7.7	17	7.2
Level of education								
High school	48	8.0	13	6.7	17	10.2	18	7.6
GED or other	190	31.9	67	34.5	67	40.1	56	23.7
Professional diploma	91	15.2	26	13.4	29	17.4	36	15.3
Academic degree	268	44.9	88	45.4	54	32.3	126	53.4
Occupation								
Full-time employee	338	56.2	89	45.4	110	65.5	139	58.6
Part time employee	87	14.5	24	12.1	35	20.8	30	12.6
Soldier	23	3.8	7	3.6	–	–	14	5.9
Self-employed	37	6.2	8	4.1	10	6.0	21	8.9
Unemployed	26	4.3	11	5.6	–	–	13	5.5
Retired	12	2.0	5	2.6	–	–	7	3.0
Student	64	10.7	47	24.0	12	7.1	5	2.1
Other	14	2.3	5	2.6	1	0.6	8	3.4
Years lived in Eilat								
≤1	39	10.9	23	11.7	16	10.0		
1–4	111	31.1	63	32.0	48	30.0		
5–10	53	14.8	31	15.7	22	13.8		
≥10	154	43.2	80	40.6	74	46.2		
Income (8,000 NIS)								
Much lower	174	29.2	71	37.2	55	33.1	48	20.2
Lower	168	28.2	64	33.5	56	33.7	48	20.2
Equal to	127	21.4	31	16.2	39	23.5	57	23.9
Higher	82	13.8	16	8.4	14	8.5	52	21.8
Much higher	44	7.4	9	4.7	2	1.2	33	13.9
Visits								
First time							76	32.5
Repeat visit							158	67.5

Note: GED = General Educational Development test; NIS = new Israeli shekels.

affective image. These findings support the notion that there are fundamental incongruities in the perceptions and images of tourist destinations between stakeholder groups.

A Tukey post hoc test was conducted to determine where the differences resided between the three groups (Bonn, Joseph, and Dai 2005). Tables 2 and 3 show the results of the MANOVA and Tukey tests. Except for three attributes (scenery, flora, relaxing), tourists and local residents had

different images of Eilat. In all 27 cognitive and affective evaluations, tourists (*n* = 240) were found to be more positive than local residents (*n* = 200). Local residents also differed from local tourism entrepreneurs/employees (*n* = 168) in respect to 15 items, with the latter group being more positive in all attributes where a significant difference was found. On the other hand, residents and the tourism sector held similar images of Eilat regarding its natural attractions (scenery,

Table 2. Stakeholders' Cognitive Images of Eilat.

Variable	All Groups (n = 608)	Residents (n = 200)	Tourism Sector (n = 178)	Tourists (n = 240)	F Ratio	Significance
Cognitive image	4.72	4.35 ^c	4.68 ^b	5.06 ^a	55.550	<.001
Scenic beauty	6.24	6.28	6.20	6.22	.617	.540
Pleasant weather	5.67	5.39 ^b	5.79 ^a	5.82 ^a	6.855	.001
Variety of flora and fauna	3.70	3.60	3.69	3.79	1.573	.208
Nice beaches	5.37	5.13 ^b	5.23 ^b	5.66 ^a	9.818	<.001
Quality hotels	5.67	5.29 ^c	5.60 ^b	6.03 ^a	20.282	<.001
Appealing restaurants	5.58	5.16 ^c	5.62 ^b	5.92 ^a	21.727	<.001
Excellent service quality	4.89	4.36 ^b	4.71 ^b	5.45 ^a	28.692	<.001
Variety of shops	5.13	4.66 ^b	5.24 ^a	5.44 ^a	13.813	<.001
Good nightlife	4.42	4.09 ^b	4.65 ^a	4.53 ^a	7.192	.001
Opportunities for sports	5.21	4.87 ^b	5.13 ^b	5.54 ^a	15.371	<.001
Unique water sports	5.52	5.19 ^c	5.50 ^b	5.80 ^a	11.645	<.001
Interesting festivals	3.96	3.73 ^b	4.01 ^{ab}	4.13 ^a	3.619	.027
Well-known attractions	4.56	4.08 ^c	4.57 ^b	4.94 ^a	16.086	<.001
Variety of tourist activities	4.80	4.39 ^b	4.76 ^b	5.18 ^a	13.746	<.001
Interesting historic sites	2.95	2.52 ^c	2.99 ^b	3.27 ^a	13.619	<.001
Convenient transportation	3.77	3.12 ^c	3.86 ^b	4.25 ^a	25.075	<.001
Developed infrastructure	3.80	3.17 ^b	3.47 ^b	4.56 ^a	51.091	<.001
Ease of access	4.34	4.07 ^b	4.39 ^{ab}	4.53 ^a	5.125	.006
Personal safety and security	5.10	4.80 ^b	5.16 ^a	5.32 ^a	8.315	<.001
Political stability	4.26	4.02 ^b	4.31 ^a	4.41 ^a	5.831	.003
Friendly local people	5.11	4.79 ^b	5.11 ^b	5.38 ^a	9.710	<.001
Exotic atmosphere	4.46	4.00 ^c	4.44 ^b	4.87 ^a	17.456	<.001
Good name and reputation	4.46	3.78 ^c	4.37 ^b	5.11 ^a	41.368	<.001
Good value for money	4.36	3.95 ^b	4.03 ^b	4.93 ^a	20.522	<.001
A clean environment	4.58	3.92 ^c	4.29 ^b	5.33 ^a	47.241	<.001
Crowded places	4.79	4.60 ^b	4.62 ^b	5.06 ^a	7.860	<.001

Note: *F* and significance level are presented for the multivariate analysis of variance. Significant differences in the means between pairs of the three stakeholder groups (tourists, local residents, and tourism sector) based on the Tukey test are indicated by the letters a, b, and c. Pairs of means that do not have the same letter are significantly different whereas those pairs of means that have the same superscript are not significantly different.

Table 3. Stakeholders' Affective Images of Eilat.

Variable	All Groups (n = 608)	Residents (n = 200)	Tourism Sector (n = 178)	Tourists (n = 240)	F Ratio	Significance
Affective Image	5.18	4.92 ^c	5.15 ^b	5.42 ^a	16.609	<.001
Distressing – Relaxing	5.32	5.36	5.44	5.21	1.297	.274
Unpleasant - Pleasant	5.63	5.42 ^b	5.44 ^b	5.92 ^a	10.278	<.001
Boring - Exciting	4.52	4.14 ^c	4.47 ^b	4.86 ^a	15.252	<.001
Sleepy - Lively	5.22	4.72 ^b	5.09 ^b	5.74 ^a	24.379	<.001

Note: *F* and significance level are presented for the multivariate analysis of variance. Significant differences in the means between pairs of the three stakeholder groups (tourists, local residents, and tourism sector) based on the Tukey test are indicated by the letters a, b, and c. Pairs of means that do not have the same letter are significantly different whereas those pairs of means that have the same superscript are not significantly different.

flora and fauna, nice beaches), infrastructure (infrastructure, accessibility, sports) and some less tangible characteristics, such as relaxing, pleasant, crowded, and value for money. Lastly, tourists differed from local tourism entrepreneurs/employees on 20 attributes, the tourists expressing the most positive perception regarding each of those items. Tourists and local tourism entrepreneurs/employees shared some

common images of Eilat as regards its natural attractions (scenery, weather, flora and fauna), tourist amenities (shopping, nightlife, festivals), and the less tangible aspects of safety, stability, and relaxing. Overall, tourists harbored a more positive perception than the other two stakeholder groups for all image attributes apart from three (scenery, nightlife, relaxing), while local residents had the least

Table 4. Stakeholders' Overall Images of Eilat and Their Intention to Recommend It.

Overall Image	All Groups (<i>n</i> = 608)	Residents (<i>n</i> = 200)	Tourism Sector (<i>n</i> = 178)	Tourists (<i>n</i> = 240)	<i>F</i> Ratio	Significance
Overall TDI	5.44	5.16 ^b	5.21 ^b	5.84 ^a	20.814	<.001
Overall PLI	4.57	4.65 ^a	4.88 ^a	4.28 ^b	7.990	<.001
Recommend as TD	5.74	5.36 ^b	5.60 ^b	6.15 ^a	18.607	<.001
Recommend as PL	4.34	4.51 ^a	4.79 ^a	3.88 ^b	13.885	<.001

Note: *F* and significant level are presented for the multivariate analysis of variance. Significant differences in the means between pairs of the three stakeholder groups (tourists, local residents, and tourism sector) based on the Tukey test are indicated by the letters a, b, and c. Pairs of means that do not have the same letter are significantly different whereas those pairs of means that have the same superscript are not significantly different.

positive image of Eilat. Tourism entrepreneurs/employees scored half-way between the two other groups in all cases (Tables 2 and 3).

In terms of the overall image of Eilat as a tourist destination and as a place to live, as well as stakeholders' intention to recommend it to others, statistically significant differences were recorded between the three groups (Table 4). Tourists harbored a more favorable perception of Eilat as a tourist destination and were more likely to recommend it to others, as compared with the tourism sector and residents. On the other hand, tourism entrepreneurs/employees perceived Eilat more favorably as a place to live and were more likely to recommend it to others as compared with residents and tourists, who ranked second and third, respectively.

In sum, the results indicate that there were significant divergences in the images held by the three stakeholder groups. This finding is in line with previous research reporting differences between residents and tourists (e.g., Henkel et al. 2006; Jutla 2000) and between tourists and local entrepreneurs (Sternquist-Witter 1985). In a study conducted in Simla (India), Jutla (2000) found that there were two distinct images of the destination, namely one held by local residents and another by tourists. Sternquist-Witter (1985) reported that local entrepreneurs had a more positive image of the Traverse City than the tourists. The present study, on the other hand, found that it was the tourists, rather than the local residents or the tourism sector, who evaluated Eilat more favorably.

The image differences noted among the stakeholders of Eilat does not seem to be attributable to differences in level of familiarity with the destination. The vast majority of the tourists (68%) have visited Eilat previously, and past research suggests that tourists' images tend to be more realistic and complex after they had visited a destination (e.g., Hsu, Wolfe, and Kang 2004). A more likely explanation may lie in the particular lens through which each group perceives the destination. A study by Merrilees, Miller, and Herington (2012) revealed that each stakeholder group uses its own filter or lens when it perceives and interprets the image of a city. The factors that may have shaped these filters and lens are discussed next.

The first tale: The tourists' image of Eilat. Of the three stakeholders examined here, tourists (*n* = 240) were the group that

harbored the most positive image of Eilat (overall cognitive image mean: 5.06; overall affective image mean: 5.42). Tourists reported more favorable perceptions of the fine climate and beaches, as well as of the amenities—hotels, restaurants, and shops. Indeed, Eilat offers dessert landscapes, a rich underwater life, high temperatures, and beaches accessible the year round (Sugarman, 2000). All of these increase the attractiveness of Eilat in the tourists' eyes. The image of Eilat as an exceptional experience, a unique, exotic, and prominent tourist destination, is hardly new—it has been cultivated by the Israeli tourist industry since the 1950s (Azaryahu 2005). This mainly positive image reinforces the competitiveness of Eilat as a tourist destination (e.g., Avraham 2004; Baloglu and McCleary 1999).

While tourists held the most favorable cognitive, affective, and overall image of Eilat as a tourist destination, they held the least favorable overall image of Eilat as a place to live. Thus, Eilat's reputation as a "paradise" appears to break down outside of the context of tourism. Tourism images developed by marketers and reproduced by tourists arguably pay less attention to the characteristics of the destination as a place to live (Britton 1979; Echtner and Prasad 2003).

The second tale: The tourism sector's image of Eilat. In this study the local tourism sector (*n* = 168) manifested a more favorable perception of Eilat than the local residents, but a less favorable one than the tourists. It would seem that the "proud parent syndrome" (Sternquist-Witter, 1985, p. 19) influences tourism employees' perceptions of the city. Similarly, looking at the retail literature, Pathak, Crissy, and Sweitzer (1974) found that retail store managers consistently overrated their stores regarding all attributes as compared with other residents. A tenable explanation for the statistically significant difference found between the tourism sector's image of Eilat and that of the residents may be that the former is dependent economically on tourism. Previous studies have shown that residents whose livelihood depends on this industry tend to demonstrate more positive perceptions and attitudes toward tourism than other residents (e.g., Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; McGehee and Andereck 2004). In a study conducted in Eilat, Mansfeld (1992) noted that locals employed in the tourism sector had more positive perceptions of tourism impacts than other residents. In particular, residents who did not economically benefit from

tourism pointed to disruptions in local services stemming from diversion of public funds for development of the tourist area. Widespread hosting of friends and relatives (the VFR phenomenon) is also cited as disrupting the quality of life of local residents (Shani and Uriely 2012).

Another source of divergence between the two local stakeholders could be differing lifestyles. Because of its sociospatial marginality and other unique characteristics, Eilat has long had a liminal image. Numerous young people who find themselves in a period of transition between military service and the return to civilian life are attracted by Eilat's liminality. They flock to this remote resort town for what they envision as a temporary sojourn and obtain work in the hospitality industry, in a phenomenon that Belhassen (2012, p. 674) has termed the "Eilat syndrome." As their primary interest is to finance their vacation in the city, they can be regarded as "non-institutionalised working tourists" (Uriely 2001), a fact that might explain why they rated Eilat as a tourist destination more favorably than the rest of the residents but less favorably than the "real" tourists.

The third tale: Residents' image of Eilat. The group that appeared to harbor the least positive image of Eilat as a destination was its local residents ($n = 200$) (overall cognitive image mean: 4.35; overall affective image mean: 4.92). May (1973) suggests that when a brand is evaluated by two groups of people, the group that is more closely involved with the brand tends to be more critical. Indeed in the present study, it was the residents who ticked the lowest scores for a whole range of image attributes—historic attractions and festivals, transportation, infrastructure and cleanliness, the city's reputation, and value for money. In their evaluation of these attributes, most of which affected their everyday life in the city, the residents diverged significantly from the tourists. This may reflect the incongruity between the "front" presented by the city and its "backstage." Eilat, as previously mentioned, is divided into two zones, a tourist and a residential one, with the front-stage constituting a "tourist ghetto" (Mansfeld 1992). Frister (1988, B3) characterized Eilat as a hybrid, "a strange combination of Las Vegas and Yeroham" (Yeroham, a small isolated town in the Negev, represents the scruffy side of the city). Indeed during the off-season the local council shows little concern for the city's appearance (Noy 2007). It is reasonable to suppose that the negative image evoked by everyday life in Eilat has influenced the way its residents perceive it as a tourist destination. This negative image is probably further exacerbated by Eilat's liminal role in Israeli culture, as expressed in a verse by Nathan Zach, a well-known Israeli poet: "we met outside our lives; in Eilat." As a result, residents often see their city as a "foreign, unfamiliar and perhaps deserted space" (Noy 2007, p. 146).

Conclusions and Implications

The present study, which examines and compares the images of Eilat as a tourist destination held by tourists, residents, and

the tourism sector, improves our understanding of how each stakeholder group perceives the same tourist destination and how divergent images arise. It contributes to the destination image literature, responding to the call of Shani and Wang (2011) for research on the destination images of multiple stakeholders. Indeed, failure to take into account the destination images held by multiple stakeholders can have serious negative implications for the sustainable development of tourist destinations. In addition, the findings have strategic implications for marketing as well as for the formulation and implementation of policies designed to improve the urban environment and the destination image.

First of all, the findings suggest that stakeholders' images and stakes are complex and often contradictory. In some cases, in the perceptions of residents, negative images may even be associated with the presence of the tourists (e.g., Jutla 2000). Concu and Atzeni (2012) reported in their study that stakeholders express conflicting preferences regarding tourism. Although developing a congruent image of the destination may be complicated by power struggles between stakeholders (Bandyopadhyay and Morraais 2005), it is nonetheless considered vital to do so, as multiple perspectives can result in image incongruity (Virgo and de Chernatony 2006). Community involvement in tourism planning offers the possibility of reconciling differences, minimizing conflicts, and increasing both residents' and tourists' well-being (Concu and Atzeni 2012). This process entails different stages and levels of involvement (Wang 2008). In the case of Eilat, where mainly the tourism businesses dominate the development scene (Reichel and Uriely 2002), the need for community involvement in tourism planning, development, and marketing is clearly apparent.

The findings also raise questions about current marketing practices. For decades, the Destination Management Organizations, including local authorities in Eilat, have mostly been concerned with developing an attractive destination image aimed at the tourist. Such a marketing strategy "neglects the intangible component of the tourism product, which is the overall experience for all stakeholders, not just the tourists" (Byrd, Bosley, and Dronberger 2009, p. 698). In a highly competitive market, destination marketers must acknowledge and understand the various images held by the multiple stakeholders if they wish to enhance the attractiveness of the destination (Hankinson 2004). The contribution of this study to destination marketing practice resides in its findings about the images that the multiple stakeholder groups hold of Eilat as a tourist destination, findings that are valuable for understanding the decision making and behavioral intentions of the stakeholders (Bigne, Sanchez, and Sanz 2005; Martin and del Bosque 2008). With the aid of such insights, correcting actions can be implemented to address any negative aspects, aiding a destination's successful development, management and marketing from the perspectives of both residents and tourists. Creating a positive image and a brand name are vital, as people usually select places with more favorable or stronger images to visit or to

settle in (Ahmed 1991; Bandyopadhyay and Morrais 2005; Henkel et al. 2006). By adopting a suitable marketing plan, Eilat can position itself according to its unique characteristics, which can offer added value to its tourism product.

In terms of target marketing and destination positioning, this study suggests that insights regarding the perceptions of each stakeholder may be valuable in ensuring a competitive advantage for the given destination and optimizing place promotion and advertising (Calantone and Mazanec 1991). When designing destination positioning strategies, special attention should be paid to those components that are variously perceived by the different groups (Ahmed 1991). Eilat should (1) implement a strategic image management program that will allow frequent assessment of its image among the target groups, (2) deal with negative images, and (3) adjust its communication efforts to the needs of each stakeholder (e.g., Avraham 2004; Kotler, Haider, and Rein 1993; Merrilees, Miller, and Herington 2012). It should be noted that while it is important to ascertain the destination images of each stakeholder, it is no less crucial to strive for congruency among stakeholders in order to build a cohesive destination image (Haugland et al. 2011). Above all, the study emphasizes the need for destination marketers to acknowledge the fact that the same destination may mean different things to different stakeholders.

Another key result of this study is the finding that, of the three groups studied, it is the local population that perceived Eilat as a tourist destination in the least favorable manner. This lack of congruence in stakeholders' image could reflect Eilat's history as a city that was developed over the years with an eye to tourism while neglecting the residential areas. This lack of congruence poses a threat to the long-term viability of the tourism industry, insofar as residents imbued with a negative image of the city may opt to leave it. Accordingly, the study findings underline the need to improve certain features relating to the quality of life, such as local transportation, infrastructure, and cleanliness, attributes to which Eilat residents assigned relatively low scores. Proposed tourism development is more likely to gain local support if it is accompanied by improvement of these attributes.

The finding that residents assessed Eilat less favorably suggests another threat to its success and sustainability as a tourist destination: it is known that, due to the formal/informal contacts between the two parties, the image harbored by local residents affects tourists' decision making and behavior (e.g., DiPietro, Wang, Rompf and Severt 2007). Given that tourism marketers can do little to change an organic image (Ahmed 1991), residents can play a crucial role. Word-of-mouth communications (an organic information agent) or what Rompf and Ricci (2005) term "gratuitous referrals" are recognized to be a type of promotion that can amplify destination marketing efforts (Hanlan and Kelly 2005; Pike 2008). In fact, the tourism literature suggests that positive images motivate residents to act as ambassadors of their region (e.g., Schroeder 1996; Tilson and Stacks 1997).

Additionally, because tourists believe that residents and hospitality employees are "more likely to be familiar with what the local area has to offer" (Gitelson and Kerstetter 1994, p. 66), the latter serve as a primary source of information during the tourists' stay. As regards visits to friends and relatives (the VFR market), residents also serve as an important source of information for their guests (Backer 2008;). In fact, residents often recommend places located outside of the tourist areas, contributing to the wider distribution of tourist spending in the local economy (Bischoff and Koenig-Lewis 2007). Studies suggest that friends and relatives living in the destination constitute the primary motivation for about one-third of tourists' visits (e.g., Hsu, Wolfe, and Kang 2004). The VFR phenomenon is exceptionally widespread in the case of Eilat (Shani and Uriely 2012), which makes it all the more important to nurture a positive destination image among local residents.

The results of this study also imply that residents may negatively affect the organic image held by nonresidents, and they also seem less motivated to promote the city as a tourist destination. A negative image often leads to lack of local pride and indifference regarding community issues. The findings of this study could be used to shape internal marketing campaigns aimed at cultivating and enhancing the image that residents hold of Eilat as a tourist destination, motivating them to promote the city to others and to invite friends and relatives, as well as to become active information providers to guests (e.g., Avraham 2004; Bigne, Sanchez, and Sanz 2005; Shani and Uriely 2012). Such campaigns could, for example, remind residents that "tourism is our business," broadcast personal stories of residents who earn their living from tourism, introduce and teach tourism concepts at schools, and train tourism employees in appropriate behaviors and attitudes (e.g., Crick 2003). Overall, internal marketing campaigns can help local people derive pleasure from living in the tourist destination, encouraging them to understand their locality and to identify with it (Clifford and King 1993), as well as enhancing their sense of pride and commitment (Bramwell and Rawding 1996). The challenge for place marketers is to "teach" the residents to enjoy the destination and appreciate its characteristics.

Internal campaigns and education programs should also target owners of tourism businesses and their employees, as they too act as ambassadors and are usually the primary people that tourists meet. Residents of Eilat should take part in the process of polishing its image as a tourist destination and become involved, for example, in choosing a new logo for the city, as in the case of Syracuse in the United States (e.g., Short, Benton, Luce and Walton 1993). In the era of social media, residents can play a crucial role as information providers, given that the internet serves as a communication channel for travelers seeking tourist information (Frias, Rodrigues, and Castaneda 2008). Utilizing organic image formation agents is particularly useful for destinations that, like Eilat, dispose of limited financial resources for tourism marketing and promotion (Hsu, Wolfe, and Kang 2004).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Certain limitations of this study should be mentioned. First, considering the sampling technique employed (heterogeneous purposive sampling) and the fact that the study was conducted on a single tourist destination, namely Eilat, caution should be exercised in generalizing the results to other destinations, that is, the external validity of the study will have to be established. Second, this study examined different stakeholders' images of the place as a tourist destination; however, not all stakeholders consider the latter to be their paramount concern. It would therefore be interesting to further investigate the images held by each different stakeholder group regarding the target most relevant to themselves in place marketing (i.e., tourist destination for tourists, place to live for residents, or place to work or do business for tourism entrepreneurs and employees). Additionally, although three stakeholder groups have been included in the survey, local government officials were not; future research will need to address the images held by this last group as well.

Third, the study was conducted during a rather low season for Eilat tourism, possibly affecting stakeholders' images; further research is required during other tourism seasons. Additionally, in the light of destination image studies suggesting that people harbor both attribute-based evaluations and overall evaluations of a specific destination, it would be instructive to examine how each image attribute or dimension affects the overall destination image and future behavioral intentions. Finally, in view of the fact that existing destination image models tend to be based solely on tourists' images (e.g., Hallmann, Zehrer, and Muller 2014; Prayag and Ryan 2012), it would be interesting to explore the validity/applicability of such models to the image held by other stakeholders, such as the local residents.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Ahmed, Z. U. (1991). "Marketing Your Community: Correcting a Negative Image." *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 31 (4): 24-27.
- Alhemound, A. M., and E. G. Armstrong. (1996). "Image of Tourism Attractions in Kuwait." *Journal of Travel Research*, 34 (4): 76-80.
- Andrades-Caldito, L., M. Sánchez-Rivero, and J. Pulido-Fernández. (2013). "Differentiating Competitiveness through Tourism Image Assessment: An Application to Andalusia." *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (1): 68-81.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). "Community Groups' Perceptions of and Preferences for Tourism Development: Evidence from Crete." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29 (1): 67-90.
- Ashworth, G. J., and H. Voogd. (1990). *Selling the City: Marketing Approaches in Public Sector Urban Planning*. London: Belhaven.
- Assaker, G., and R. Hallak. (2013). "Moderating Effects of Tourists' Novelty-Seeking Tendencies on Destination Image, Visitor Satisfaction, and Short- and Long- Term Revisit Intentions." *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (5): 600-13.
- Avraham, E. (2004). "Media Strategies for Improving an Unfavourable City Image." *Cities*, 21 (6): 471-79.
- Azaryahu, M. (2005). "The Beach at the End of the World: Eilat in Israel Popular Culture." *Social and Cultural Geography*, 6 (1): 117-33.
- Backer, E. (2008). "VFR Travellers: Visiting the Destination or Visiting the Hosts?" *Asian Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2 (1): 60-70.
- Baloglu, S., and K. W. McCleary. (1999). "U.S. International Pleasure Traveller's Images of Four Mediterranean Destinations: A Comparison of Visitors and Non-visitors." *Journal of Travel Research*, 38 (2): 144-152.
- Bandyopadhyay, R., and D. Morrais. (2005). "Representative Dissonance: India's Self and Western Image." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (4): 1006-21.
- Beerli, A., and J. Martin. (2004). "Tourists' Characteristics and the Perceived Image of Tourist Destinations: A Quantitative Analysis— A Case Study of Lanzarote, Spain." *Tourism Management*, 25 (5): 623-36.
- Belhassen, Y. (2012). "Eilat Syndrome: Deviant Behavior among Temporary Hotel Workers." *Tourism Analysis*, 17:673-77.
- Belhassen, Y., and A. Shani. (2012). "Hotel Workers' Substance Use and Abuse." *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31:1292-302.
- Bigne, E. A., I. G. Sanchez, and S. B. Sanz. (2005). "Relationships among Residents' Image, Evaluation of the Stay and Post-purchase Behaviour." *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11 (4): 291-302.
- Bischoff, E. E., and N. Koenig-Lewis. (2007). "VFR Tourism: The Importance of University Students as Hosts." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9 (6): 465-84.
- Bonn, M. A., S. M. Joseph, and M. Dai. (2005). "International versus Domestic Visitors: An Examination of Destination Image Perceptions." *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (3): 294-301.
- Boo, S. Y., and J. A. Busser. (2005). "The Hierarchical Influence of Visitor Characteristics on Tourism Destination Images." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 19 (4): 55-67.
- Boulding, K. (1956). *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bramwell, B., and L. Rawding. (1996). "Tourism Marketing Images of Industrial Cities." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1): 201-21.
- Britton, R. A. (1979). "The Image of the Third World in Tourism Marketing." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6 (3): 318-29.
- Byrd, E. T., H. E. Bosley, and M. G. Dronberger. (2009). "Comparisons of Stakeholder Perceptions of Tourism Impacts in Rural Eastern North Carolina." *Tourism Management*, 30 (5): 693-703.
- Calantone, R., and J. A. Mazanec. (1991). "Marketing Management and Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18 (1): 101-19.

- Campelo, A., R. Aitken, M. Thyne, and J. Gnoth. (2014). "Sense of Place: The Importance of Destination Branding." *Journal of Travel Research*, 53 (2): 154-66.
- Chen, C. C., Y. H. Lin, and J. F. Petrick. (2013). "Social Biases of Destination Perceptions." *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (2): 240-52.
- Chen, C. F., and D. C. Tsai. (2007). "How Destination Image and Evaluative Factors Affect Behavioural Intentions?" *Tourism Management*, 28 (4): 1115-22.
- Chi, C. G. Q., and H. Qu. (2008). "Examining the Structural Relationships of Destination Image, Tourist Satisfaction and Destination Loyalty: An Integrated Approach." *Tourism Management*, 29 (4): 624-36.
- Clifford, S., and A. King. (1993). "Losing Your Place." In *Local Distinctiveness: Place, Particularity and Identity*, edited by S. Clifford and A. King. London: Common Ground, pp. 7-19.
- Concu, N., and G. Atzeni. (2012). "Conflicting Preferences among Tourists and Residents." *Tourism Management*, 33:1293-1300.
- Crick, A. (2003). "Internal Marketing of Attitudes in Caribbean Tourism." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15 (3): 161-66.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). "Motivations for Pleasure Vacation." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6 (4): 408-24.
- Csaba, F. (2005). "The Application of Branding to Non-profit Organizations and Places." In *Corporate Branding*, edited by M. Schultz, Y. Antorini, and F. Csaba. Kage: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- D'Angella, F., and F. M. Go (2009). "Tale of two cities' collaborative tourism marketing: Towards a theory of destination stakeholder assessment." *Tourism Management*, 30(3), 429-440
- DiPietro, R. B., Y. Wang, P. Rompf, and D. Severt. (2007). "At-Destination Visitor Information Search and Venue Decision Strategies." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9:175-88.
- do Valle, P. O., J. Mendes, and M. Guerreiro. (2012). "Residents' Participation in Events, Events Image, and Destination Image: A Correspondence Analysis." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 29 (7): 647-64.
- Easterling, D. (2005). "Residents and Tourism: What Is Really at Stake?" *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 18 (4): 49-64.
- Echtner, C. M., and J. R. B. Ritchie. (1991). "The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image." *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 2 (2): 2-12.
- Echtner, C. M., and P. Prasad. (2003). "The Context of Third World Tourism Marketing." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30 (3): 660-82.
- Eilat Census. (2003). <http://www.redseaeilat.com/about-eilat/the-city/eilat-info/> (accessed November 27, 2013).
- Eilat Info. (2012). <http://www.redseaeilat.com/about-eilat/the-city/eilat-info/> (accessed May 27, 2013).
- Ergas, Y., and D. Felsenstein. (2012). "Airport Relocation and Expansion and the Estimation of Derived Tourist Demand: The Case of Eilat, Israel." *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 24:54-61.
- Finn, M., M. Elliott-White, and M. Walton. (2000). *Tourism and Leisure Research Methods: Data Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Fiorino, D. J. (1990). "Citizen Participation and Environmental Risk: A Survey of Institutional Mechanisms." *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 15 (2): 226-43.
- Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Frias, D., M. A. Rodriguez, and J. A. Castaneda. (2008). "Internet vs. Travel Agencies on Pre-visit Destination Image Formation: An Information Processing View." *Tourism Management*, 29 (1): 163-79.
- Frister, R. (1988). "A Quarter of an Hour from Taba." *Ha'aretz*, October, B3 (Hebrew).
- Gallarza, M. G., L. G. Saura, and H. C. Garcia. (2002). "Destination Image: Towards a Conceptual Framework." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1): 56-78.
- Gartner, W. C. (1993). "Image Formation Process." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 2 (2/3): 191-215.
- Gitelson, R., and D. Kerstetter. (1994). "The Influence of Friends and Relatives in Travel Decision-Making." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 3 (3): 59-68.
- Goeldner, C. R., and J. R. B. Ritchie. (2009). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*, 11th edition. London: Wiley.
- Gold, J., and S. Ward. (1994). *The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Regions*. New York: John Wiley.
- Govers, R., F. M. Go, and K. Kumar. (2007). "Promoting Tourism Destination Image." *Journal of Travel Research*, 46:15-23.
- Gursoy, D., C. Jurowski, and M. Uysal. (2002). "Resident Attitudes: A Structural Modelling Approach." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1): 79-105.
- Hall, C.M. (2008). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*, 2nd edition. Essex: Pearson.
- Hallmann, K., A. Zehrer, and S. Muller. (2014). "Perceived Destination Image: An Image Model for a Winter Sports Destination and Its Effect on Intention to Revisit." *Journal of Travel Research*, doi:10.1177/0047287513513161.
- Hankinson, G. (2004). "The Brand Images of Tourism Destinations: A Study of the Saliency of Organic Images." *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 13 (1): 6-14.
- Hankinson, G. (2005). "Destination Brand Images: A Business Tourism Perspective." *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19 (1): 24-32.
- Hanlan, J., and S. Kelly. (2005). "Image Formation, Information Sources and an Iconic Australian Tourist Destination." *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11 (2): 163-77.
- Haralambopoulos, N., and A. Pizam. (1996). "Perceived Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Samos." *Annals of tourism Research*, 23 (3): 503-26.
- Haugland, S. A., H. Ness, B. Grønseth, and J. Aarstad. (2011). "Development of Tourism Destinations: An Integrated Multilevel Perspective." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38 (1): 268-90.
- Henkel, R., P. Henkel, W. Agrusa, J. Agrusa, and J. Tanner. (2006). "Thailand as a Tourist Destination: Perceptions of International Visitors and Thai Residents." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11 (3): 269-87.
- Hsu, C. H. C., K. Wolfe, and S. K. Kang. (2004). "Image Assessment for a Destination with Limited Comparative Advantages." *Tourism Management*, 25 (1): 121-26.
- Hudson, S., and J. B. R. Ritchie. (2002). "Understanding the Domestic Market Using Cluster Analysis: A Case Study of the Marketing Efforts of Travel Alberta." *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8 (3): 263-76.
- Hughes, H., and D. Allen. (2005). "Cultural Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: The Views of 'Induced Image Formation Agents.'" *Tourism Management*, 26 (2): 173-83.

- Israeli Ministry of Tourism. (2012). *Annual Tourism Statistics Report*. Jerusalem.
- Jutla, R. (2000). "Visual Image of the City: Tourists' versus Residents' Perception of Simla, a Hill Station in Northern India." *Tourism Geographies*, 2 (4): 404-20.
- Kavaratzis, M., and G. Ashworth (2008). "Place marketing: how did we get here and where are we going?" *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(2), 150-165
- Kearsley, G.W. (1990). "Tourism development and users' perceptions of wilderness in Southern New Zealand." *Australian Geographer*, 21(2), 127-140
- Kokosalakis, C., G. Bagnall, M. Selby, and S. Burns. (2006). "Place Image and Urban Regeneration in Liverpool." *International Journal for Consumer Studies*, 30 (4): 389-97.
- Kotler, P., D. H. Haider, and I. Rein. (1993). *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States, and Nations*. New York: Free Press.
- Lawson, F., and M. Baud-Bovy. (1977). *Tourism and Recreational Development*. London: Architectural Press.
- Lee, T. H. (2009). "A Structural Model to Examine How Destination Image, Attitude, and Motivation Affect the Future Behaviour of Tourists." *Leisure Sciences*, 31 (3): 215-36.
- Lee, B. K., C. K. Lee, and J. Lee. (2014). "Dynamic Nature of Destination Image and Influence of Tourist Overall Satisfaction on Image Modification." *Journal of Travel Research*, 53 (2): 239-51.
- Leisen, B. (2001). "Image Segmentation: The Case of a Tourism Destination." *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15 (1): 49-66.
- Li, X., and H. Vogelson. (2006). "Comparing Methods of Measuring Image Change: A Case Study of a Small Scale Community Festival." *Tourism Analysis*, 10:349-60.
- Lin, C. H., D. B. Morais, D. L. Kerstetter, and J. S. Hou. (2007). "Examining the Role of Cognitive and Affective Image in Predicting Choice across Natural, Developed, and Theme-Park Destinations." *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (2): 183-94.
- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). "Group-Differentiated Perceptions of Social Impacts Related to Tourism Development." *Professional Geographer*, 44 (4): 377-92.
- Martin, H. S., and I. A. R. del Bosque. (2008). "Exploring the Cognitive—Affective Nature of Destination Image and the Role of Psychological Factors in Its Formation." *Tourism Management*, 29 (2): 263-77.
- May, E. (1973). *Management Applications of Retail Image Research*. Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- McGehee, N. G., and K. L. Andereck. (2004). "Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 43:131-40.
- Merrilees, B., D. Miller, and C. Herington. (2012). "Multiple Stakeholder and Multiple City Brand Meanings." *European Journal of Marketing*, 46 (7): 1032-47.
- Michaelidou, N., N. T. Siamagka, C. Moraes, and M. Micevski. (2013). "Do Marketers Use Visual Representations That Tourists Value? Comparing Visitors' Image of a Destination with Marketer-Control Images Online." *Journal of Travel Research*, 52 (6): 789-804.
- Noy, C. (2007). "The Poetics of Tourist Experience: An Autoethnography of a Family Trip to Eilat." *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 5 (3): 141-57.
- Papadimitriou, D., A. Apostolopoulou, and K. Kaplanidou. (2014). "Destination Personality, Affective Image, and Behavioral Intentions in Domestic Urban Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, doi:10.1177/0047287513516389.
- Pathak, D. S., W. J. E. Crissy, and R. W. Sweitzer. (1974-1975). "Customer Image versus the Retailers' Anticipated Image—A Study of Four Department Stores." *Journal of Retailing*, 50 (4): 21-28.
- Pedhazur, E. J., and L. P. Schmelkin. (1991). *Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Peterson, R. (1994). "A Meta-analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha." *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (2): 381-91.
- Pike, S. (2008). *Destination Marketing: An Integrated Marketing Communication Approach*. Burlington: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Pike, S., and C. Ryan. (2004). "Destination Positioning Analysis through a Comparison of Cognitive, Affective, and Conative Perceptions." *Journal of Travel Research*, 42:333-42.
- Prayag, G. (2009). "Tourists' Evaluation of Destination Image, Satisfaction and Future Behavioural Intentions—The Case of Mauritius." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 26 (8): 836-53.
- Prayag, G., and C. Ryan. (2012). "Antecedents of Tourists' Loyalty to Mauritius: The Role and Influence of Destination Image, Place Attachment, Personal Involvement, and Satisfaction." *Journal of Travel Research*, 51 (3): 342-56.
- Ramkissoon, H., M. Uysal, and K. Brown. (2011). "Relationship between Destination Image and Behavioural Intentions of Tourists to Consume Cultural Attractions." *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 20 (5): 575-95.
- Reichel, A., and N. Uriely. (2002). "Tourism Development in a Desert Frontier Town." In *Tourism in Frontier Areas*, edited by S. Krakover and Y. Gradus. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 195-203.
- Reid, D. G., H. Mair, and W. George. (2004). "Community Tourism Planning: A Self-Assessment Instrument." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (3): 623-39.
- Ritchie, J., J. Lewis, and G. Elam. (2003). "Designing and Selecting Samples." In *Qualitative Research Practice*, edited by J. Ritchie and J. Lewis. London: Sage, pp. 77-108.
- Rompf, P., and P. Ricci. (2005). "Gratuitous Referrals." *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 18 (2): 39-52.
- Sautter, E. T., and B. Leisen. (1999). "Managing Stakeholders: A Tourism Planning Model." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (2): 312-28.
- Schroeder, T. (1996). "The Relationship of Residents' Image of Their State as a Tourist Destination and Their Support for Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 34 (4): 71-73.
- Shani, A., and A. Pizam. (2012). "Community Participation in Tourism Planning and Development." In *Handbook of Tourism and Quality of Life Research: Enhancing the Lives of Tourists and Residents of Host Communities*, edited by M. Uysal, R. Perdue, and J. Sirgy. New York: Springer, pp. 547-64.
- Shani, A., and Y. Wang. (2011). "Destination Image Development and Communication." In *Destination Marketing and Management*, edited by Y. Wang and A. Pizam. Wallingford: CAB International, pp. 130-48.

- Shani, A., and N. Uriely. (2012). "VFR Tourism: The Host Experience." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39 (1): 421-40.
- Short, J. R., L. M. Benton, W. B. Luce, and J. Walton. (1993). "Reconstructing the Image of an Industrial City." *Annals of American Geographers*, 83:207-24.
- Stepchenkova, S., and X. Li. (2013). "Chinese Outbound Tourists' Destination Image of America: Part II." *Journal of Travel Research*, 51 (6): 687-703.
- Sternquist-Witter, B. S. (1985). "Attitudes about a Resort Area: A Comparison of Tourists and Local Retailers." *Journal of Travel Research*, 24 (1): 14-19.
- Stylidis, D., and M. Terzidou. (2014). "Tourism and the Economic Crisis in Kavala, Greece." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44:210-26.
- Sugarman, L. M. (2000). "Trouble in Paradise." *The Jerusalem Report*, April 10, 34-38.
- Sun, M., C. Ryan, and S. Pan. (Forthcoming). "Using Chinese Travel Blogs to Examine Perceived Destination Image: The Case of New Zealand." *Journal of Travel Research*.
- Tasci, A. D. A., and D. F. Holecek. (2007). "Assessment of Image Change over Time: The Case of Michigan." *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13 (4): 359-69.
- Tilson, D. J., and D. W. Stacks. (1997). "To know us is to love us: The public relations campaign to sell a 'business-tourist-friendly' Miami." *Public Relations Review*, 23, 95-115
- Uriely, N. (2001). "Travelling workers and working tourists: variations across the interaction between work and tourism." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 1-8
- Virgo, B., and L. de Chernatony. (2006). "Delphic Brand Visioning to Align Stakeholder Buy-in to the City of Birmingham Brand." *Journal of Brand Management*, 13 (6): 379-92.
- Walls, A., A. Shani, and P. D. Rompf. (2008). "The Nature of Gratuitous Referrals in Tourism; Local Residents' Perspective." *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20:647-63.
- Wang, Y. (2008). "Collaborative Destination Marketing: Understanding the Dynamic Process." *Journal of Travel Research*, 47:151-66.
- Ward, S. (1998). *Selling Places: The Marketing and Promotion of Towns and Cities 1850-2000*. London: Routledge.

Author Biographies

Dimitrios Stylidis, PhD is a Postdoc Researcher at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat Campus, Israel. His current research interests include place image, tourism impacts and residents' attitudes toward tourism development.

Yaniv Belhassen, PhD is faculty member in the Department of Hotel and Tourism Management at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. He conducts research in the fields of tourism, hospitality and leisure.

Amir Shani, PhD is faculty member in the Department of Hotel and Tourism Management at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Eilat Campus. He specializes in tourism and hospitality ethics.