TOURISMOS: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF TOURISM
Volume 8, Number 1, Spring 2013, pp. 53-91
UDC: 338.48+640(050)

THE COMPARISON OF SECONDARY AND PRIMARY TOURISM DESTINATION IMAGE: SERVING AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN EXPECTATION AND EXPERIENCE AND GUIDING EFFECTIVE MARKETING AND MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Ourania Vitouladiti
Technological Educational Institute of Athens

The importance of destination image in tourism is undeniable. Both aspects of destination image, secondary and primary, are very important in shaping the overall image. A comparison between them would bridge the tourists' expectations with experience by revealing the exact deviations from the original perception. According to the scientific literature there are scant researches that compare, directly, these two dimensions of the image, using a representative sample from first time visitors. Such a comparison would enrich the limited empirical research on this specific issue. This paper presents the direct comparison, based on empirical research and on representative sample of British first time visitors to the island of Corfu. The members of the sample where given two questionnaires,(total 752 questionnaires) one at the arrival and the other just before the departure. Both questionnaires were completed by the same person and this is an additional value of the study. The research revealed the pragmatic dimensions, indicated the priorities for marketing and management actions and suggested through this comparison a new kind of image.

Keywords: *Tourism destination image, secondary or naïve image, primary or reevaluated image, empirical research, marketing and management regional strategies*

JEL classification codes: M31, M37, R11

INTRODUCTION

Destination image has become a very important issue in the marketing research in the tourism industry, since many countries use promotion and global marketing to support their image and to compete with other destinations (Lin and Huang, 2008, in Kamenidou et al, 2009).

It is considered as a multidimensional concept (Ahmed, 1996, Chen and Tsai, 2007, Echtner and Ritchie, 1993, Gartner and Hunt, 1987, Gunn, 1972) which is related with several disciplines (Draper and Minca, 1997, Gunn, 1972, Meethan, 1996, Sternberg, 1997). Since, the importance of tourism destination image is widely acknowledged a lot of approaches have been presented during the past decades.

Numerous researchers have concentrated on image in relation to tourism marketing functions and aspects. Specifically, some of them relate destination image importance to its effect on demand-side aspects, such us tourism consumer behavior, destination choice and decision making, while others attribute destination image importance to its effect on supply-side aspects, namely, positioning and promotion. Also several researchers have studied tourism destination image as an independent variable and others as a dependent variable (Tasci and Gartner, 2007).

Actually, the majority of researchers focused on the impact on consumer buying behavior (Alhemoud and Armstrong, 1996, Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997, Chen and Hsu, 2000, Chen and Kerstetter, 1999, Crompton, 1979, Dadgostar and Isotalo, 1992, Dann, 1996, Fakeye and Crompton, 1991, Gartner, 1993, Goodrich, 1978, Hunt, 1975, MacKay and Fesenmaier, 1997, Mayo, 1973, Mayo and Jarvis, 1981, Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000, Walmsley and Young, 1998). By comparison, few researchers have underlined its impact on positioning and promotion (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997, Baloglu and McCleary, 1999, Calantone et al, 1989, Chen and Kerstetter, 1999, Govers and Kumar, 2007, Walmsley and Young, 1998).

And can be concluded that, independently of the approach, image is considered as a vital marketing concept in the tourism industry and it is linked to the success of a tourism destination. Tourism literature, in general, indicates that what a prospective traveler believes or thinks about the natural environment, climate, people, infrastructure, quality of a place, may shape perceptions or images which will contribute, or not, to the selection of this place by the traveler (Vitouladiti, 2003).

Trying to define the term a lot of definitions can be used. Some of the most common definitions are:

Hunt, 1971: Impressions that a person or persons hold about a state in which they do not reside

Crompton, 1979: An image may be defined as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination

Embacher & Buttle, 1989: Image is comprised of the ideas or conceptions held individually or collectively of the destination under investigation. Image may comprise both cognitive and evaluative components

Kotler & al, 1994: The image of a place is the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person holds of it

Gartner, 1993, 1996: Destination images are developed by three hierarchically interrelated components: cognitive, affective and conative

Parenteau, 1995: Is a favorable or unfavorable prejudice that the audience and distributors have of the product or destination

Moreover, certain studies (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997, Baloglu and McCleary, 1999a, Baloglu and McCleary, 1999b, Gartner, 1993, Walmsley and Young, 1998) support that image incorporates two interrelated components, cognitive elements, referring to the individual's own knowledge and beliefs about the object and affective elements relating to an individuals feelings towards the object.

SECONDARY OR NAÏVE IMAGE – PRIMARY OR REEVALUATED IMAGE

There are also many typologies concerning the formation of the image. Gartner's (1993) typology is one of the most important and supports that the image is formed by organic, induced and autonomous sources of information. This is basically the image perceived before experiencing a destination, which is called secondary or naïve image (Phelps, 1986). In contrast, the primary or reevaluated image is formed by actually visiting the destination. It is believed that actual visitation creates an image more realistic than that existing prior to visitation (Tasci and Gartner, 2007).

The secondary sources of information play a vital role in forming images (naïve) of the alternative destinations to be considered in the decision making process. Specifically, Mansfeld (1992) underlines that there is a theoretical consensus that the secondary sources fulfill three basic functions in destination choice: minimize the risk of the decision, create the destination's image and serve as a mechanism for later justification of the decision.

At the same time this aspect of the image represents its static element, since it is already formed because is based on information sources. The primary image, in contrast, meaning the experience itself, is considered the most dynamic aspect of the image.

Also, Selby and Morgan (1996) have noted that the possibility of separating naïve from reevaluated images, allows integrated image studies to indicate the priorities for action to a tourism authority and has implications for destination marketing.

The degree of consumer satisfaction will depend on the assessment of the perceived overall experience of the destination versus anticipated expectations and perceptions.

In order to achieve that, a comparison between secondary and primary image must be attempted, which will offer the possibility of measurable deviations from the expectations (secondary image). A fact that will result in revealing the existence and the characteristics of the primary image.

Knowing the content and characteristics of the resulting primary image, leads to effective strategies for tourism destination marketing.

The content and characteristics of the primary image are the elements that:

- Integrate the study of the image
- Determine the action priorities for a tourism marketing and development organization, because they define the competitive advantage, the destination positioning in relation to competition
- Determine the target market's wants and needs concerning the improvement of the tourism supply and the benefits expected from their vacation
- Define the priorities concerning investments and subsidies
- Lead to more effective and successful promotional strategies, since these strategies will incorporate the suggestions and the impressions of the target market
- Feed the information sources of the perspective visitors, meaning the secondary image, with realistic, objective and differentiated pictures. Therefore, they contribute to the image formation circle in the most reliable way. Simultaneously, the secondary image, in this way, becomes much less static.

According to Chon (1991 in Stylidis et al, 2008) the construction of primary images is based on 'push' and 'pull' factors associated with the destination. More precisely, Chon (1989, in Stylidis et al, 2008) relates Maslow's hierarchy of needs with 'push' factors, while 'pull' factors are

described as the attractiveness of a region and its various elements. The 'pull factors' fall into three categories: 1) static factors, which include the natural landscape, the climate, historical and cultural attractions; 2) the dynamic factors, which include accommodation, catering, entertainment, access, political conditions and trends in tourism; and 3) current decision factors, which include the marketing of the region and prices in the destination, as well as in the country of the origin (Witt and Moutinho, 1995, in Stylidis et al, 2008)

From an extensive literature review, results that there are no empirical findings that focus on the results of such a comparison, which define primary image's characteristics and demonstrate possible differences and modifications from the secondary.

The statements expressed in the relative literature are, mostly, theoretical, concerning opinions and thoughts. Fakeye and Crompton, (1991) underline that there is no agreement among the researchers for the impact of the visit to the secondary image. Also, they supported that there must be some disconnect between what the destination projects in its promotional and marketing efforts and the actual delivery of products and services. This implies the importance of finding any measurable deviations from secondary in order to avoid in the long run unrealistic expectations and disappointment.

Additionally, Baloglu and McClearly, (1999) support that the primary image could differ from the secondary. Moreover, other authors (Gartner and Hunt, 1987, Pearce, 1982, Phelps, 1986) support that the primary image tends to be different from the secondary. But, Echtner and Ritchie (2003), are among those who support that the visit will affect and modify the secondary image through the "first hand" information and acquired experience.

Also, Beerli and Martin (2004) underline that despite the fact that there is no empirical evidence to demonstrate directly that the acquired experience affects the perceived image, this variable (experience) presents, till now, an extensive and growing research interest, since is considered a very good index of the tourist needs, motivation, satisfaction and tourism market segmentation.

A comparative study between the secondary and primary image's variables, by carrying out empirical research is the only way to test the existence of the primary image and to prove the benefits for tourism development and marketing.

However, the existence of a primary and modified image has a prerequisite, the impact of the visit and the experience over the already

formed secondary image. Specifically, the visit should be able to change and modify any preexisting image, already formed through promotional activities and without the interference of the actual visit.

The authorities responsible for tourism development should know the difference between those two images and must use marketing tools to "shape" the image which will have a positive effect on the purchasing behavior of the potential tourists (Vitouladiti, 2000).

PREVIOUS RESEARCH APPROACHES AND POSSIBILITIES FOR ADDITIONAL PERSPECTIVES

The previous studies, concerning tourism destination image, that have been presented in various journals are actually incorporated and listed in the very detailed study by Gallarza, Saura and Garcia (2002). From this study results that the existing approaches and the topics covered by various authors, include:

Conceptualization and dimensions, destination image formation process, assessment and measurement of destination image, influence of distance on destination image, destination image change over time, active and passive role of residents in image study, destination image management policies (positioning, promotion).

Later studies have covered additional approaches concerning tourism destination image as perceived by distribution channels, tour operators and travel agents, (Baloglu and Mangaloglu, 2001) and tourism destination image in relation to the buying behavior (Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000, Hyounggon and Richardson, 2003, Lee, Lee and Lee, 2005, Chi and Qu, 2007, Chen and Chai, 2007).

Through the extensive literature review results that researches which could give the primary image's characteristics and demonstrate possible modifications in relation to the secondary image, based on representative sample are very scarce. Specifically, there are no researches where the respondent who evaluates the secondary and the primary image is the same person. This points to insufficient research concerning the incorporation and the comparison of the two kinds of image. There are limited empirical findings showing if and where exist modifications and differences between the two kinds of image, or useful information for tourism supply improvements or guidance for tourism policy planning.

Therefore, the following research questions are raised:

- What are the characteristics of the primary image?
- Differ from those of the secondary? If yes where do these differ?

- If there are differences which attributes do these concern?
- Which attributes/variables are modified and in what way?
- Are these potential modifications significant?
- Which elements of the image are mostly modified? The cognitive or the affective ones?
- Which are modified positively or negatively?

Objectives of the research paper

Consequently, the objectives of the paper are to compare the two images, on the basis of several sets of variables, by capturing firstly, the naïve and secondly, the primary image, as perceived by the first time visitor, who is the same person that evaluates the two images. To correlate directly these two aspects through statistical analysis and study the results. Finally, to propose marketing and management implications.

Development of Hypotheses A, A1, A2, A3, B, B4, B5, B6, C, C7, C8, C9

In order to cover this lack in the field of image research the development and test of certain hypotheses is necessary. Based on the above the following hypotheses are set:

The visitors of the destinations are the several target markets with their demographic characteristics. The target markets are the people whose characteristics filter the information from the organic and induced sources (secondary image) and also, interpret the experience acquired in the destination (primary image). Therefore, their characteristics, such us gender, age, income and education level are taken into account (Tasci and Gartner, 2007). Nevertheless, Litvin and Kar (2003) discount the value of demographics. Additionally, Hunt (1975) supports the possible systematic exclusion of certain subgroups when selecting research sample populations. Dunn (1996), says that no two people see a destination in exactly the same way.

Therefore, in this study the analysis will be presented firstly, by taking into account the total sample size and secondly, the sub segments of the sample divided by their age, education and income level criteria.

So, the general statement of the hypothesis to test is: "The visit modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image regarding the total supply of the destination. The demographic characteristics of the

target market contribute to the modification of this image." Analytically, the research hypotheses to test are presented below.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design and survey sites

In order to achieve the targets of the study, it was necessary to carry out primary quantitative research. The complexity of the issue, the lack of integrated previous research, the comparison of the secondary image variables with the ones of the primary image, demanded the quantitative approach. The implementation of the research and the collection of the primary data was decided to take place in the tourism destination of Corfu island. This destination could be considered as a miniature of Greek tourism. Also, it is a traditional destination for the British target market. So, the nationality of the sampling population was decided to be British, since they represent one of the two basic target markets of Corfu and Greece in general.

Sampling and data collection

The study needed a representative sample from the population of its main tourism generating country. Therefore, it was essential that the sample should not be chosen by convenience.

The main subject of the research, namely the study of the primary image in relation to the secondary, demanded one prerequisite from the sampling population: that of the first time visit in the island. Therefore, all the members of the sample are first time visitors.

The sample was decided to be stratified, because is probability sample and more representative. The island is divided into three areas, North, Central and South. Each area has all categories of hotels and accommodation. Since the boundaries of the areas were known, they were defined as strata. In everyone of these strata, accommodation of every category was chosen by random sampling. The members of the sample (British first time visitors) were also chosen by random sampling in all the selected hotels and accommodation types.

Each member of the sample was given a questionnaire upon arrival in order to be completed at the first day of their stay, and at the same member of the sample was given a second questionnaire to be completed at the day of their departure. Therefore, both questionnaires were completed by the same member of the sample. The naïve or secondary

image was recorded through the first questionnaire, while the primary or reevaluated image was captured by the second questionnaire. Therefore, the comparison of the two images and the variables analysis could offer the answers to the questions, objectives and hypotheses of the research.

Sample size

The final sample size obtained was 376 British tourists/first time visitors. This sample size (n=376) gives a statistical error (e≈5%).

Level of significance α=0,05

Level of confidence 95%

This sample size and statistical error could permit the generalisation of the results.

Since the members of the sample completed two questionnaires from these respondents resulted 752 questionnaires (questionnaire A and questionnaire B with the same serial number) completed by the same person.

Questionnaire design and content

The questionnaires were structured and self administrated. Their content was decided after studying the most common attributes used in destination image research as displayed in detail by Gallarza, Saura and Garcia (2002). Through a careful observation of the most common attributes results that the most common variables are these which are related with the receptiveness of the local population, cultural and natural attractions, entertainment, landscape, prices, cuisine, accommodation, nature, climate, access, safety, transportation, various activities, social interaction and service quality.

All these variables, analyzed and adapted to the specific destination, were the basis for the analytical formation of the hypotheses, as well as, the construction of the questionnaire. Great efforts were made to formulate a survey instrument which would help to eliminate any possible bias resulting from the wording, the layout, the sequence of questions or the intervention of the interviewer.

The questionnaires comprise closed-end and open-end questions. The closed-end questions had a five-point rating scale. All the rating scales were labeled. It was thought that in the interest of the questionnaires length and understanding the five-point label scales would be the appropriate choice. For the statistical analysis and the interpretation of the

results the five-point scale of the questions was coded from 5 to 1, considering 5 the best and 1 the worse rating, meaning the higher the better (5=very good, 4=good, 3=neither good nor bad, 2= poor, 1=very poor).

Questionnaire A, contains the introductory part that is about the name and the category of the accommodation, the filter question which checks that the respondent is a first time visitor, the duration of stay, frequency of travel during the last five years.

Also, contains the main part which incorporates all the variables that, through the extensive literature review, were indicated as the most common in measuring the tourism destination image, so it contains questions about variables dealing with local population receptiveness, impressiveness of landscape, physical and historical environment and recreational attractions. Moreover, a list of variables (19) were used in order to assess the perceived degree of their possession by the specific destination. These variables concern almost all the attributes which are listed in the relative studies.

The final part was designed to obtain demographic data from the respondents in order to be used in the interpretation of the results and provide background information on these respondents.

The questionnaire B comprises two parts. Since it is completed by the same respondent does not contain again the introductory part nor the demographic questions. Therefore, it incorporates the main part with the identical questions, in order to be used for the comparison between secondary and primary image.

This paper apart from the introductory and the demographic questions focuses on the identical parts of both questionnaires in order to present, in the following section, the comparison and the test for the hypotheses.

Profile and description of the sample

Female respondents represented 57%, or 216 persons, male respondents represented 43%, or 160 persons out of a total of 376.

Concerning age categories, 44% of the sample is between the ages of 35 and 54 years. These ages have increased opportunities for tourist mobility and therefore increased travel experience. The other age categories have a balanced representation with 27% for the 18 - 34 age group and 29% for the 55+ group.

The income brackets “>£20.000” and “£20.000 - £40.000” represent 36% and 41% respectively. Their percentages are elevated compared to

the income bracket of "£40.000+". This reassures the reliability of the sampling method, since it is known that the British visitors to Corfu belong to the average incomes.

The duration of stay for the 50, 5% of the sample is at least one week. While the duration of stay for the 39, 4% is two weeks. This is a positive element in relation to the subject of the study, because it proves that the sample population had considerable experience of the destination.

The 62, 2% of the respondents have traveled from 5 to 10 times during the last 5 years. This element indicates that the sample consists of experienced tourists that can recognize and judge the characteristics of a destination. Another positive element in relation to the subject of this research paper.

Research Hypotheses A, A1, A2, A3, B, B4, B5, B6, C, C7, C8, C9. Analytical statistical test

For the test of the following hypotheses the study focused on the comparison of the means, t-test, p-value, CI 95% (Confidence Interval), 2-tailed test.

A. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the attractions of the tourism destination.

The image of the attractions consists of 9 variables, therefore the above hypothesis is divided at an equal number of partial hypotheses. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_i} = 0 \quad vs \quad H_1: \ \mu_{D_i} \neq 0 \qquad ,where \qquad \mu_{Di} = \mu_{iS} - \mu_{iP} \quad i=1,..,9 \ attractions$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

Statistically important modification of at least one of the 9 variables means statistically important modification of the secondary image for the attractions.

A1. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the attractions of the tourism destination. The age contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every age category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP}$$
$$vs \qquad ,where \quad i=1,..,9 \ attractions$$
$$H_1: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0 \qquad j=1: under\ 34,\ 2:\ 35-54$$
$$3:\ 55+$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

A2. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the attractions of the tourism destination. The income contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every income category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP}$$
$$vs \qquad ,where \quad i=1,..,9 \ attractions$$
$$H_1: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0 \qquad j=1: under\ 20.000\ GBP,$$
$$2:\ 20.000 - 40.000GBP,$$
$$3:\ 40.001 + \ GBP$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

A3. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the attractions of the tourism destination. The education level contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every income category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP}$$
$$vs \qquad ,where \quad i=1,..,9 \ attractions$$

$$H_1: \quad \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0$$

j=1:Secondary/Technical,
2:Higher technical
3: University

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

B. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the local population of the tourism destination.

The image for the local population consists of one variable. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypothesis is as follows:

$$H_0: \quad \mu_{D_i} = 0 \qquad \mu_D = \mu_S - \mu_P$$
vs *,where*
$$H_1: \quad \mu_{D_i} \neq 0$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

B4. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the local population of the tourism destination. The age contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every age category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_j} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dj} = \mu_{jS} - \mu_{jP}$$
vs *,where* *j=1: under 34, 2: 35 - 54, 3: 55+*
$$H_1: \quad \mu_{D_j} \neq 0$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

B5. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the local population of the tourism destination. The income contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every income category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_j} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dj} = \mu_{jS} - \mu_{jP}$$

vs *,where*

$$H_1: \ \mu_{D_j} \neq 0$$

j=1: under 20.000 GBP,
2: 20.000- 40.000 GBP,
3: 40.001 + GBP

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

B6. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the local population of the tourism destination. The education level contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every education level category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_j} = 0 \qquad \mu_{Dj} = \mu_{jS} - \mu_{jP}$$

vs *,where* *j=1:Secondary/Technical,*
2:Higher technical
3: University

$$H_1: \ \mu_{D_j} \neq 0$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

C. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the infrastructure and superstructure, facilities and total supply of the tourism destination.

The image for the infrastructure and superstructure, facilities and total supply consists of 19 variables. Therefore the above hypothesis is divided to equal number of partial hypotheses. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences and the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_i} = 0 \quad vs \quad H_1: \ \mu_{D_i} \neq 0 \qquad \mu_{Di} = \mu_{iS} - \mu_{iP} \quad ,where \quad i=1,..,19 \ infrastructure\text{-}superstructure$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

C7. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the infrastructure and superstructure, facilities and total supply of the tourism destination. The age contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every age category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0 \quad vs \quad H_1: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0 \qquad \mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP} \quad ,where \quad i=1,..,19 \ infrastructure - superstructure$$

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

C8. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the infrastructure and superstructure, facilities and total supply of the tourism destination. The income contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every income category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$$H_0: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0 \quad vs \quad H_1: \ \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0 \qquad \mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP} \quad ,where \quad i=1,..,19 \ infrastructure - superstructure$$

$H_1: \quad \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0$ *j=1: under 20.000 GBP,*
2: 20.000- 40.000 GBP,
3: 40.001 + GBP

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

C9. The visit for the first time visitors modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the infrastructure and superstructure, facilities and total supply of the tourism destination. The education level contributes to the modification of this image.

There are hypotheses for every education level category. The statistical analysis is about paired samples t-test differences, the level of significance, a, is 0,05. The general form of hypotheses is as follows:

$H_0: \quad \mu_{D_{ij}} = 0$ $\mu_{Dij} = \mu_{ijS} - \mu_{ijP}$
vs *,where* *i=1,..,19 infrastructure – superstructure*
$H_1: \quad \mu_{D_{ij}} \neq 0$ *j=1: Secondary/Technical,*
2:Higher technical
3: University

S: Secondary image, P:Primary image

Hypotheses test A to C9. Application of statistical analysis

Table 1 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis A

	secondary	**primary**	**primary - secondary**	
	mean	**mean**	**Mean Diff**	***p-value***
Corfu town	3,78	4,03	0,24	0,00
Villages	3,73	3,81	0,08	0,05
Historical areas	3,69	3,79	0,10	0,02
Beaches	3,78	3,73	-0,05	0,23
Physical environment	3,84	3,87	0,03	0,47
The sea	4,25	4,35	0,10	0,01
Mountains and Hills	4,23	4,35	0,12	0,00
Corfu countryside	3,91	3,98	0,07	0,11
Fields	3,27	3,24	-0,02	0,55

Table 2 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis A1

			Corfu town	Villages	Historical areas	Beaches	Physical environment	The sea	Mountains and Hills	Corfu countryside	Fields
under 34	**secondary**	Mean	**3,77**	**3,63**	**3,51**	**3,79**	**3,93**	**4,25**	**4,27**	**3,85**	**3,37**
	primary	Mean	**4,02**	**3,75**	**3,64**	**3,74**	**4,03**	**4,29**	**4,37**	**3,94**	**3,19**
	diff	Mean	**0,26**	**0,11**	**0,13**	**-0,05**	**0,10**	**0,04**	**0,10**	**0,09**	**-0,18**
		p-value	0,00	0,12	0,12	0,54	0,21	0,55	0,21	0,34	0,02
35 - 54	**secondary**	Mean	**3,69**	**3,69**	**3,75**	**3,81**	**3,81**	**4,25**	**4,23**	**3,91**	**3,23**
	primary	Mean	**3,93**	**3,78**	**3,77**	**3,75**	**3,83**	**4,39**	**4,31**	**3,96**	**3,26**
	diff	Mean	**0,22**	**0,08**	**0,02**	**-0,06**	**0,02**	**0,14**	**0,07**	**0,05**	**0,03**
		p-value	0,00	0,24	0,77	0,42	0,81	0,02	0,23	0,41	0,61
55+	**secondary**	Mean	**3,93**	**3,87**	**3,78**	**3,73**	**3,81**	**4,25**	**4,19**	**3,97**	**3,23**
	primary	Mean	**4,19**	**3,90**	**3,96**	**3,68**	**3,80**	**4,33**	**4,41**	**4,05**	**3,25**
	diff	Mean	**0,28**	**0,06**	**0,20**	**-0,05**	**-0,01**	**0,07**	**0,22**	**0,07**	**0,04**
		p-value	0,00	0,46	0,01	0,54	0,90	0,28	0,00	0,28	0,64

Table 3 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis A2

			Corfu town	Villages	Historical areas	Beaches	Physical environment	The sea	Mountains and Hills	Corfu countryside	Fields
under 20000	**secondary**	Mean	**3,87**	**3,83**	**3,79**	**3,96**	**3,93**	**4,31**	**4,35**	**3,98**	**3,31**
	primary	Mean	**4,19**	**3,93**	**3,88**	**3,94**	**4,00**	**4,41**	**4,43**	**4,07**	**3,33**
	diff	Mean	**0,31**	**0,10**	**0,10**	**-0,02**	**0,07**	**0,10**	**0,08**	**0,09**	**0,01**
		p-value	0,00	0,15	0,17	0,74	0,29	0,08	0,21	0,21	0,82
20000–40000	**secondary**	Mean	**3,70**	**3,63**	**3,68**	**3,64**	**3,78**	**4,19**	**4,18**	**3,85**	**3,21**
	primary	Mean	**3,92**	**3,73**	**3,78**	**3,55**	**3,81**	**4,32**	**4,28**	**3,90**	**3,11**
	diff	Mean	**0,22**	**0,10**	**0,10**	**-0,09**	**0,03**	**0,13**	**0,10**	**0,05**	**-0,10**
		p-value	0,00	0,12	0,13	0,20	0,60	0,01	0,08	0,39	0,07
40000+	**secondary**	Mean	**3,78**	**3,76**	**3,55**	**3,73**	**3,81**	**4,28**	**4,13**	**3,92**	**3,29**
	primary	Mean	**3,96**	**3,73**	**3,67**	**3,70**	**3,78**	**4,29**	**4,37**	**3,98**	**3,34**
	diff	Mean	**0,18**	**0,01**	**0,12**	**-0,04**	**-0,02**	**0,01**	**0,24**	**0,06**	**0,06**
		p-value	0,08	0,89	0,21	0,74	0,85	0,91	0,01	0,56	0,56

Table 4 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis B

	secondary	**primary**	**primary - secondary**	
	mean	**mean**	**Mean Diff**	***p-value***
receptiveness	4,36	4,50	0,15	0,00

Table 5 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis B4

Receptiveness			
under 34	**secondary**	Mean	**4,29**
	primary	Mean	**4,51**
	diff	Mean	**0,21**
		p-value	0,01
35 - 54	**secondary**	Mean	**4,31**
	primary	Mean	**4,51**
	diff	Mean	**0,21**
		p-value	0,00
55+	**secondary**	Mean	**4,49**
	primary	Mean	**4,48**
	diff	Mean	**-0,01**
		p-value	0,91

Table 6 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis B5

Receptiveness			
under 20000	**secondary**	Mean	**4,35**
	primary	Mean	**4,53**
	diff	Mean	**0,18**
		p-value	0,01
20000-40000	**secondary**	Mean	**4,37**
	primary	Mean	**4,49**
	diff	Mean	**0,12**
		p-value	0,07
40000+	**secondary**	Mean	**4,35**
	primary	Mean	**4,49**
	diff	Mean	**0,14**
		p-value	0,12

Table 7 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis B6

Receptiveness			
Secondary/ Technical	**secondary**	Mean	**4,30**
	primary	Mean	**4,40**
	diff	Mean	**0,10**
		p-value	0,14
Higher technical/	**secondary**	Mean	**4,44**
	primary	Mean	**4,52**
	diff	Mean	**0,08**
		p-value	0,25
University	**secondary**	Mean	**4,33**
	primary	Mean	**4,61**
	diff	Mean	**0,28**
		p-value	0,00

Table 8 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis C

	secondary	primary	primary - secondary	
	mean	mean	Mean Diff	*p-value*
accommodation	4,27	4,22	-0,05	0,25
prestige	3,64	3,66	0,02	0,61
cuisine	4,22	4,22	0,01	0,89
friendships	3,48	3,77	0,28	0,00
personnel	4,30	4,31	0,00	0,95
cleanliness	4,34	4,01	-0,33	0,00
new/different	4,13	4,04	-0,09	0,03
sport facilities	3,70	3,78	0,08	0,08
entertainment	3,92	3,82	-0,11	0,03
safety	4,21	3,80	-0,41	0,00
unspoiled environment	4,06	3,88	-0,18	0,00
fun	3,82	3,72	-0,10	0,03
historical attractions	3,92	3,82	-0,10	0,01
natural beauty	4,26	4,27	0,02	0,70
relaxing	4,49	4,50	0,01	0,77
prices	4,24	4,02	-0,22	0,00
adventure	3,61	3,62	0,01	0,75
escape routine	4,49	4,51	0,02	0,56
sunbathing	4,22	4,35	0,13	0,00

Table 9 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis C7

			Accomodation	Prestige	Cuisine	Friendships	Personnel	Cleanliness	New/different	Sport facilities	Entertainment	Safety	Unspoiled environment	Fun	Historical attractions	natural beauty	Relaxing	Prices	Adventure	Escape routine	Sunbathing
under 34	**secondary**	Mean	**4,20**	**3,59**	**4,26**	**3,55**	**4,23**	**4,34**	**4,09**	**3,84**	**4,23**	**4,26**	**4,11**	**4,07**	**3,86**	**4,22**	**4,49**	**4,24**	**3,76**	**4,48**	**4,40**
	primary	Mean	**4,28**	**3,64**	**4,34**	**3,76**	**4,32**	**3,94**	**3,98**	**3,84**	**4,06**	**3,90**	**3,97**	**3,95**	**3,74**	**4,19**	**4,48**	**4,12**	**3,69**	**4,58**	**4,59**
	diff	Mean	**0,08**	**0,05**	**0,08**	**0,21**	**0,09**	**-0,40**	**-0,11**	**0,00**	**-0,17**	**-0,36**	**-0,14**	**-0,12**	**-0,12**	**-0,03**	**-0,01**	**-0,12**	**-0,07**	**0,09**	**0,18**
		p-value	0,25	0,49	0,28	0,01	0,22	0,00	0,23	1,00	0,08	0,00	0,07	0,13	0,13	0,72	0,89	0,24	0,43	0,19	0,02
35 - 54	**secondary**	Mean	**4,25**	**3,68**	**4,25**	**3,43**	**4,32**	**4,36**	**4,10**	**3,66**	**3,86**	**4,20**	**4,02**	**3,81**	**3,86**	**4,21**	**4,46**	**4,23**	**3,63**	**4,51**	**4,20**
	primary	Mean	**4,20**	**3,75**	**4,17**	**3,80**	**4,28**	**4,07**	**4,05**	**3,78**	**3,78**	**3,90**	**3,85**	**3,74**	**3,83**	**4,24**	**4,53**	**3,97**	**3,64**	**4,53**	**4,36**
	diff	Mean	**-0,05**	**0,07**	**-0,07**	**0,37**	**-0,05**	**-0,29**	**-0,05**	**0,11**	**-0,08**	**-0,31**	**-0,17**	**-0,07**	**-0,03**	**0,03**	**0,07**	**-0,26**	**0,01**	**0,02**	**0,16**
		p-value	0,40	0,29	0,21	0,00	0,43	0,00	0,47	0,08	0,29	0,00	0,03	0,30	0,65	0,62	0,16	0,00	0,85	0,76	0,02
55+	**secondary**	Mean	**4,35**	**3,62**	**4,13**	**3,52**	**4,34**	**4,31**	**4,23**	**3,63**	**3,74**	**4,17**	**4,07**	**3,62**	**4,06**	**4,36**	**4,53**	**4,26**	**3,45**	**4,47**	**4,08**
	primary	Mean	**4,20**	**3,55**	**4,18**	**3,73**	**4,34**	**3,99**	**4,08**	**3,72**	**3,65**	**3,55**	**3,83**	**3,50**	**3,87**	**4,40**	**4,46**	**4,01**	**3,54**	**4,44**	**4,12**
	diff	Mean	**-0,15**	**-0,07**	**0,05**	**0,21**	**0,00**	**-0,32**	**-0,15**	**0,10**	**-0,09**	**-0,63**	**-0,25**	**-0,12**	**-0,19**	**0,04**	**-0,06**	**-0,25**	**0,09**	**-0,04**	**0,04**
		p-value	0,06	0,37	0,51	0,01	1,00	0,00	0,05	0,21	0,29	0,00	0,01	0,18	0,00	0,62	0,39	0,01	0,23	0,55	0,63

Table 10 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis C8

			accomodation	prestige	cuisine	friendships	personnel	cleanliness	new/different	sport facilities	entertainment	safety	unspoiled environment	fun	historical attractions	natural beauty	relaxing	prices	adventure	escape routine	sunbathing
under 20000	secondary	Mean	4,29	3,76	4,30	3,68	4,34	4,38	4,18	3,72	4,09	4,41	4,20	4,02	3,99	4,23	4,56	4,39	3,73	4,49	4,31
	primary	Mean	4,29	3,82	4,35	3,85	4,41	4,06	4,15	3,80	3,99	3,91	3,99	3,97	3,92	4,36	4,54	4,22	3,74	4,53	4,45
	diff	Mean	0,00	0,07	0,05	0,18	0,07	-0,32	-0,02	0,08	-0,10	-0,50	-0,21	-0,05	-0,07	0,12	-0,02	-0,17	0,01	0,04	0,14
		p-value	1,00	0,27	0,44	0,02	0,31	0,00	0,76	0,30	0,21	0,00	0,00	0,45	0,28	0,08	0,69	0,03	0,84	0,46	0,03
20000-40000	secondary	Mean	4,28	3,54	4,19	3,40	4,26	4,39	4,06	3,67	3,83	4,17	4,03	3,78	3,92	4,31	4,51	4,19	3,54	4,56	4,22
	primary	Mean	4,24	3,54	4,13	3,75	4,22	3,99	4,04	3,76	3,71	3,79	3,80	3,58	3,80	4,26	4,49	3,92	3,53	4,52	4,33
	diff	Mean	-0,03	-0,01	-0,06	0,35	-0,04	-0,40	-0,03	0,08	-0,13	-0,38	-0,23	-0,19	-0,12	-0,04	-0,02	-0,26	-0,01	-0,04	0,10
		p-value	0,62	0,93	0,37	0,00	0,56	0,00	0,67	0,22	0,10	0,00	0,00	0,01	0,05	0,45	0,74	0,00	0,84	0,42	0,15
40000+	secondary	Mean	4,22	3,61	4,13	3,33	4,31	4,18	4,19	3,72	3,81	3,95	3,87	3,58	3,80	4,20	4,33	4,11	3,53	4,36	4,07
	primary	Mean	4,07	3,61	4,18	3,65	4,29	3,99	3,86	3,79	3,73	3,60	3,82	3,58	3,69	4,16	4,45	3,88	3,59	4,47	4,23
	diff	Mean	-0,14	0,00	0,05	0,33	-0,02	-0,19	-0,34	0,07	-0,07	-0,35	-0,05	0,00	-0,11	-0,05	0,12	-0,23	0,06	0,11	0,16
		p-value	0,08	1,00	0,57	0,00	0,77	0,07	0,00	0,45	0,48	0,00	0,67	1,00	0,27	0,58	0,18	0,04	0,51	0,17	0,09

Table 11 Statistical Analysis – Hypothesis C9

			accommodation	prestige	cuisine	friendships	personnel	cleanliness	new/different	sport facilities	entertainment	safety	unspoiled environment	fun	historical attractions	natural beauty	relaxing	prices	adventure	escape routine	sunbathing
Secondary/ Technical	**secondary**	Mean	**4,31**	**3,78**	**4,18**	**3,61**	**4,33**	**4,36**	**4,07**	**3,62**	**3,88**	**4,38**	**4,14**	**3,84**	**3,87**	**4,17**	**4,50**	**4,31**	**3,55**	**4,48**	**4,17**
	primary	Mean	**4,25**	**3,72**	**4,18**	**3,92**	**4,31**	**3,96**	**4,02**	**3,78**	**3,87**	**3,86**	**3,93**	**3,77**	**3,89**	**4,29**	**4,49**	**4,09**	**3,69**	**4,47**	**4,28**
	diff	Mean	**-0,06**	**-0,06**	**0,00**	**0,31**	**-0,01**	**-0,40**	**-0,05**	**0,16**	**-0,01**	**-0,52**	**-0,21**	**-0,07**	**0,02**	**0,11**	**-0,01**	**-0,22**	**0,14**	**-0,01**	**0,11**
		p-value	0,38	0,36	1,00	0,00	0,83	0,00	0,47	0,03	0,93	0,00	0,01	0,36	0,73	0,08	0,88	0,01	0,05	0,90	0,16
Higher technical/	**secondary**	Mean	**4,20**	**3,60**	**4,24**	**3,43**	**4,29**	**4,28**	**4,16**	**3,70**	**3,96**	**4,17**	**3,98**	**3,78**	**3,93**	**4,21**	**4,48**	**4,27**	**3,65**	**4,48**	**4,29**
	primary	Mean	**4,10**	**3,63**	**4,17**	**3,79**	**4,23**	**3,98**	**3,98**	**3,74**	**3,77**	**3,70**	**3,75**	**3,65**	**3,78**	**4,20**	**4,45**	**3,90**	**3,56**	**4,46**	**4,38**
	diff	Mean	**-0,10**	**0,04**	**-0,07**	**0,37**	**-0,06**	**-0,30**	**-0,18**	**0,04**	**-0,19**	**-0,47**	**-0,22**	**-0,13**	**-0,15**	**-0,02**	**-0,02**	**-0,37**	**-0,10**	**-0,02**	**0,09**
		p-value	0,14	0,60	0,30	0,00	0,45	0,00	0,02	0,62	0,02	0,00	0,01	0,11	0,05	0,84	0,75	0,00	0,22	0,81	0,18
University	**secondary**	Mean	**4,30**	**3,51**	**4,24**	**3,39**	**4,29**	**4,38**	**4,18**	**3,80**	**3,94**	**4,05**	**4,05**	**3,85**	**3,97**	**4,42**	**4,48**	**4,13**	**3,64**	**4,53**	**4,20**
	primary	Mean	**4,34**	**3,61**	**4,34**	**3,54**	**4,38**	**4,12**	**4,13**	**3,83**	**3,80**	**3,83**	**3,95**	**3,75**	**3,77**	**4,35**	**4,55**	**4,08**	**3,62**	**4,63**	**4,40**
		Mean	*0,72*	*0,96*	*0,76*	*0,88*	*0,64*	*0,86*	*0,84*	*0,87*	*0,92*	*0,98*	*0,95*	*0,81*	*0,81*	*0,73*	*0,60*	*0,91*	*0,74*	*0,57*	*0,88*
	diff	Mean	**0,04**	**0,10**	**0,10**	**0,15**	**0,09**	**-0,26**	**-0,05**	**0,03**	**-0,14**	**-0,22**	**-0,10**	**-0,10**	**-0,20**	**-0,07**	**0,07**	**-0,05**	**-0,02**	**0,10**	**0,20**
		p-value	0,61	0,21	0,15	0,09	0,20	0,00	0,52	0,75	0,12	0,02	0,26	0,21	0,01	0,27	0,30	0,61	0,80	0,14	0,01

Remarks

A careful observation of the above tables reveals that there are modifications, without exception, in all variables of the image. The relative numbers in the tables display the difference of all the means between the secondary and the primary image. However, for research reliability purposes and accuracy of the findings we will analyse the statistically important modifications ($p<0,05$) of various variables. Important modification of at least one variable among all, means an important modification for the secondary overall image.
The above modifications, positive or negative, are presented in the following section.

Findings

Attractions

Table 12 Findings – Hypothesis A

Total size of sample	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
• Corfu Town • Villages • Historical areas • The sea • Mountains and Hills	

Table 13 Findings – Hypothesis A1

According to the demographic characteristic: age	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 34 • Corfu Town	• Fields
35 – 54 • Corfu Town • The sea	

55 + • Corfu Town • Historical areas • Mountains and Hills	

Table 14 Findings - Hypothesis A2

According to the demographic characteristic: income	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 20.000£ • Corfu Town	
20.000 – 40.000£ • Corfu Town • The sea	
40.000£ + • Corfu Town • Mountains and Hills	

Table 15 Findings - Hypothesis A3

According to the demographic characteristic: education level	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Secondary/Technical • Corfu Town	
Higher technical • Corfu Town • Villages • Historical areas • The sea • Mountains and Hills	
University • Corfu Town	

Support of hypotheses A, A1, A2, A3 - Conclusions

The analysis of the data proved that the visit, for the first time visitors, modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for the attractions. Important modifications are observed at the total size of the sample as well as at the categories of age, income and education.
Specifically, concerning the total size of the sample, important positive modification is observed in 5 attractions and not one negative modification. Regarding the modifications in the categories of age, income and education level the number of the variables which have important modifications varies. For example, more modifications are observed among higher age groups, while the most of the modifications are observed in the educational category "higher technical". Moreover, it is underlined that the majority of the variables presents several important modifications within the frame of the hypothesis A, A1, A2 and A3, while the physical environment and Corfu countryside remain unchanged. Finally, the visit affects positively several elements of the attractions image and negatively just one element.

Local population

Table 16 Findings - Hypothesis B

Total size of the sample	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
• Receptiveness	

Table 17 Findings - Hypothesis B4

According to the demographic characteristic: age	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 34 • Receptiveness	
35 – 54 • Receptiveness	
55 + No modification	

Table 18 Findings - Hypothesis B5

According to the demographic characteristic: income	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 20.000£ • Receptiveness	
20.000 – 40.000£ • Receptiveness	
40.000£ + No modification	

Table 19 Findings - Hypothesis B6

According to the demographic characteristic: education level	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Secondary/ Technical No modification	
Higher technical No modification	
University • Receptiveness	

Support of hypotheses B, B4, B5, B6 - Conclusions

The analysis of the data proved that the visit, for the first time visitors modifies significantly the variables of the secondary image concerning the receptiveness of the local population.

Significant modifications are observed at the total size of the sample as well as at the demographic categories of age, income and education. In all cases the modification is positive.

Infrastructure-superstructure, facilities, tourism supply

Table 20 Findings – Hypothesis C

Total size of the sample	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
• Developing friendships • Sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • New place/different culture

	• Availability of entertainment • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Having fun being entertained • Historical and cultural attractions • Prices

Table 21 Findings – Hypothesis C7

According to the demographic characteristic: age	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 34 • Developing friendships • Sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety
35 – 54 • Developing friendships • Sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Prices
55 + • Developing friendships	• Accommodation • Cleanliness of sea and beaches • New place/different culture • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Historical and cultural attractions • Prices

Table 22 Findings – Hypothesis C8

According to the demographic characteristic: income	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Under 20.000£ • Developing friendships • Sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Prices
20.000 – 40.000£ • Developing friendships	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Having fun being entertained • Historical and cultural attractions
40.000£ + • Developing friendships	• New place/different culture • Safety • Prices

Table 23 Findings – Hypothesis C9

According to the demographic characteristic: education level	
POSITIVE MODIFICATIONS	NEGATIVE MODIFICATIONS
Secondary/Technical • Developing friendships • Availability of facilities for sports and activities • Being adventurous/being active	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety • Unspoiled physical environment • Prices
Higher technical • Developing friendships	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • New place/different culture • Availability of entertainment • Safety • Unspoiled physical

	environment • Historical and cultural attractions • Prices
University • Developing friendships • Sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing	• Cleanliness of sea and beaches • Safety • Historical and cultural attractions

CONCLUSIONS

Support of hypotheses C, C7, C8, C9 - Conclusions

The analysis of the data proved that the visit, for the first time visitors, modifies significantly the elements of the secondary image for infrastructure-superstructure, facilities, tourism supply.
Important modifications are observed at the total size of the sample as well as at the categories of age, income and education.
Specifically, concerning the total size of the sample important modifications are observed into 10 out of 19 variables. 2 of them have positive modification while 8 have negative modifications. Regarding the changes into the categories of age, income and education level there are differentiations among the variables that have significant modifications. In the categories of age changes are detected for 2 variables, but in the categories of income and education level, changes concern more variables. The most important remarks are:

- For every variable the changes in the partial categories are in accordance with the change in the total size of the sample. There are 2 exceptions, a) the variable "prices" has no significant modification in the education level "university" while at the other 2 educational levels the modification does exist and is negative, b) negative modification is observed for the variable "new place/different culture" concerning the higher level of income, while at the other income categories there is no significant modification.
- The modification for the variable "safety" is much more negative concerning the higher ages (55+) and the lower level of education. In general, this is the variable that demonstrates the

more intense negative modification. It must be commented that this is the only variable where the negative modification is significant for all the demographic categories, without exception. At this point it is important to underline that the variable safety in this particular research was associated with the roads' condition and the lack of pavements.

- The age category "under 34" displays the less negative modifications compared with higher ages. Similar observation is noted at the "university" education level (compared to lower education levels) as well as the higher income levels.
- The variable "developing friendships" has significant modifications in all demographic categories,
- Significant positive modification at the variable "sunbathing in the beach and doing nothing" is connected with ages under 55, university education level and low income (under 20.000*£)*

Conclusions, comments, marketing and management implications

From a scientific approach the findings of this research paper provided empirical evidence of the direct comparison between primary and secondary image and covered the lack of research in this specific issue. The comparison verifies the modification of the secondary image and reveals the strengths and weaknesses which arise from the impact of the visit.

As a result, the study findings offered substantial support, based on empirical research with probability sample, to the statements of several scholars (Gartner and Hunt, 1987, Pearce, 1982, Phelps, 1986, Fakeye and Crompton,1991, Baloglu and McClearly, 1999, Beerli and Martin, 2004) regarding the possible, but now verified, impact of the experience (visit) to the secondary image.

A careful observation of the findings reveals an important general ascertainment. The negative modifications are related, mostly, to cognitive elements of the image while the positive ones are related to the affective ones.

From a methodological perspective the design of this research (identical double questionnaires, the homogenous population, the comparison of the two images by the same respondent, the choice of a representative Mediterranean destination, the stratified sample and the possibility of

generalisation of results) was shown to be an effective method to contribute and enrich the empirical research on this issue.
From a practical perspective the study offered several implications, firstly for a series of actions which concern targeted investments in infrastructure, projects and policies that enhance the natural environment and the cultural resources. Secondly, the study offered guidelines for product differentiation, creation of identity and design of advertising campaigns focused on specific characteristics which are considered "strong elements" such as the attractions of the island, the uniqueness of Corfu city, the receptiveness of the local population and the opportunity for socialising and relaxation.
These strengths and affective elements can differentiate a destination, are difficult for competitors to replicate and may provide a significant competitive advantage (Kozak and Tasci, 2005) capable of creating customer loyalty. In particular the element which concerns the local residents and their friendliness and also the element concerning the opportunities the island offers for socializing, fall in the destination's opportunities to create emotional connection with customers. Customer's emotions have been proved to be a key determinant to turn a satisfied customer into a repeated one (Chatzigeorgiou et al, 2009).
Also the findings show the immediate target market for an advertising campaign, namely young people, with good educational level and higher incomes. A new target market which proved to be the "less strict" and has a future perspective and spending ability.
Finally, the findings offer the knowledge for the next promotional campaigns, which will incorporate the corrective actions indicated by the desired target markets.
Future studies could use additional segmentation criteria such us behavioural and psychographic in order to provide information beyond the traditional variables.
The concept and methodology of this study provided answers to questions about a comprehensive study of a tourism destination image. Also offered insights to the perception of several target markets. A knowledge that gives the privilege to emphasize the right attributes to the respected target group and by this way to generate repeat visitation.
The negative or positive measurable deviations from the expectations reveal both salient and inferior attributes and create a modified new image, the realistic one, resulting from the direct comparison of the two images, which could be named **"orientation and guidance image"**.

- An "orientation and guidance image" for the marketers which will help them to bridge the gap between expectations and experience and therefore to induce customer loyalty, to diminish the competition and to demand "more money for more value".
- An "orientation and guidance image" for the tourists which will help them choose, through the information sources, a destination that will incorporate the desired characteristics and offer the consumer "value for money".

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Z.U. (1996). The Need for the Identification of the Constituents of a Destination's Tourist Image a Promotional Segmentation Perspective. *Revue du Tourisme*, Vol. 51, No.2, pp.44-57.

Alhemoud, A. & Armstrong, E. (1996). Image of tourism attractions in Kuwait. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 34(Spring), pp.76-80.

Ashworth, Gr. & Goodall, B. (1990). *Marketing tourism places*. Routledge, Publishing.

Baloglu, S. & Brinberg, D. (1997). Affective images of tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 35 , No.4, pp.11-15.

Baloglu, S. & Mangaloglou, M. (2001). Tourism Destination Images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece and Italy as Perceived by US-based Tour Operators and Travel Agents. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, No.1, pp.1-9.

Baloglu, S. & McCleary, K.W. (1999). A Model of Destination Image Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 26, pp.868-897.

Baloglu, S. & McCleary, K.W. (1999). U.S. International Pleasure Travelers' Images of Four Mediterranean Destinations: A Comparison of Visitors and Nonvisitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 38(November), pp.114-129.

Beerli, A. & Martin, J. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 31, No.3, pp.657-681.

Bigne, E., Sanchez, M. & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, pp.607-616.

Calantone, R.J., Di Benedetto, C.A., Hakam, A. & Bojanic, D.C. (1989). Multiple Multinational Tourism Positioning Using Correspondence analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 28, No.2, pp.25-32.

Chatzigeorgiou, Ch., Christou, Ev., Kassianidis, P. & Sigala, M. (2009). Examining the Relationship between Emotions, Customer Satisfaction and Future Behavioural Intentions in Agrotourism. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 4, No.4, pp.145-161.

Chen, C. & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioural intentions? *Tourism Management*, Vol. 28, No.4, pp.1115-1122.

Chen, J.S. & Hsu, C.H.C. (2000).Measurement of Korean Tourists' Perceived Images of Overseas Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 38 (May), pp.411-416.

Chen, P.J. & Kerstetter, D.L. (1999). International Students' Image of Rural Pennsylvania as a Travel Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 37 (February), pp.256-266.

Chi, C. & Qu, H. (2007). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: an integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 29, pp.624-636.

Chon, K.S. (1992). Self-image/destination image congruity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 19, No.2, pp.360-363.

Chon, K-S. (1992). The Role of Destination Image in Tourism: An Extension. *Revue du Tourisme*, Vol. 1, pp.2-8.

Chon, K-S. (1990). The Role of Destination Image in Tourism: A Review and Discussion. *Revue du Tourisme*, Vol. 2, pp.2-9.

Crompton, J.L. (1979). An Assessment of the Image of Mexico as a Vacation Destination and the Influence of Geographical Location upon the Image. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 18, No.4, pp.18-23.

Dadgostar, B. & Isotalo, R.M. (1995). Content of City Destination Image for Near-Home Tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, Vol. 3, No.2, pp.25-34.

Dann, G.M.S. (1996). Tourists Images of a Destination: An Alternative Analysis. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 5, No.1/2, pp.41-55.

Dichter, E. (1985). What is an Image. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 13, pp.455-472.

Draper, D. & Minca, C. (1997). Image and Destination: A Geographical Approach Applied to Banff National Park Canada. *Revue du Tourisme*, Vol. 2, pp.14-24.

Echtner, C.M. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (1991). The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol. 2, No.2, pp.2-12.

Echtner, C.M. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (2003). The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, Vol. 14, No.1, pp.37-48.

Echtner, C.M. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (1993). The Measurement of Destination Image: An Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 31, No.4, pp.3-13.

Embacher, J. & Buttle, F. (1989). A Repertory Grid Analysis of Austria's Image as a Summer Vacation Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 28, No.3, pp.3-23.

Fakeye, P.C. & Crompton, J.L. (1991). Image Differences Between Prospective, First-Time, and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 30, No.2, pp.10-16.

Gallarza, M., Saura, I. & Garcia, H. (2002). Destination Image. Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No.1, pp.56-78.

Gartner, W.C. (1993). Image Formation Process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 2, No.2/3, pp.191-215.

Gartner, W.C. (1996). *Tourism Development: Principles, Policies, and Policies*. New York, Van Nostram Reinhold.

Gartner, W.C. & Hunt, J.D. (1987). An Analysis of State Image Change over a Twelve-Year Period (1971–1983). *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 26, No.2, pp.15-19.

Goodrich, J.N. (1978). The Relationship Between Preferences for and Perceptions of Vacation Destinations: Application of a Choice Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 17, No.2, pp.8-13.

Goodrich, J.N. (1978). A New Approach to Image Analysis through Multidimensional Scaling. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 17, No.2, pp.2-7.

Govers, R., Go, F. & Kumar, K. (2007). Promoting Tourism Destination Image. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 46, pp.15-23.

Gunn, C. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing tourist regions*. Austin: Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas.

Hunt, J.D. (1971). Image: A Factor in Tourism. Cited in N. Telisman-Kosuta (1989) Tourism Destination Image. In S.F. Witt and L. Moutinho (Eds.) *Tourism Marketing and Management Handbook* (pp. 557-561), Cambridge: Prentice Hall.

Hunt, J.D. (1975). Image as a Factor in Tourism Development. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 13, No.3, pp.1-7.

Hyounggon, K. & Richardson, S.L. (2003). Motion Picture impacts on destination images. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 30, No.1, pp.216-237.

Jalil, S. (2010). Images of Egypt in United Kingdom Tour Operator's brochures. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 5, No.2, pp.179-191.

Kamenidou, I., Mamalis, S. & Priporas, C.V. (2009). Measuring Destination Image and Consumer Choice Criteria: the case of Mykonos island. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 4, No.3 (Spring), pp.67-79

Kotler, N., Haider, D.H. & Rein, I. (1994). *Mercadotecnia de Localidades*. Mexico, Diana.

Kozak M. & Tasci, A.D.A. (2005). Perceptions of foreign tourists by local service providers: the case of Fethiye, Turkey. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7, Issue.4-5, pp.261–277.

Lee, C., Lee Y. & Lee, B. (2005). Korea's destination image formed by the 2002 World Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32, No.4, pp.839-858

Litvin, S.W. & Kar, G.H. (2003). Individualism/Collectivism as a Moderating Factor to the Self-Image Congruity Concept. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 10, No.1, pp.23-32.

MacKay, K. & Fesenmaier, D. (1997). Pictorial Element of Destination in Image Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, pp.537–65.

Mansfeld, Y. (1992). From Motivation to Actual Travel. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 19, pp.399-419.

Mayo, E. & Jarvis, L. (1981). *The Psychology of Leisure Travel*. Boston, CBI.

Mayo, E. (1973). Regional Images and Regional Travel Behaviour, Research for Changing Travel Patterns: Interpretation and Utilisation. Proceedings of the Travel Research Association, fourth Annual Conference, Sun Valley, Idaho, pp.211-218.

Meethan, K. (1996). Place, Image and Power: Brighton as Resort. In T. Selwyn (Eds.) *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth Making in Tourism* (pp. 180-196), Chichester: Wiley.

Parenteau, A. (1995). *Marketing Practico del Turismo*. Madrid, Sıntesis S.A.

Pearce, P.L. (1982). Perceived Changes in Holiday Destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9, pp.145-164.

Phelps, A. (1986). Holiday Destination Image: The problem of Assessment. An example developed in Menorca. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 7, No.3, pp.168-180.

Selby, M. & Morgan, N.J. (1996). Reconstruing place image (a case study of its role in destination market research). *Tourism Management*, Vol. 17, No.4, pp.287-294.

Stabler, M.J. (1988). The Image of Destination Regions: Theoretical and Empirical Aspects. In B. Goodall and G. Ashworth (Eds.) *Marketing in the Tourism Industry: The Promotion of Destination Regions* (pp. 133-161), London: Croom Helm.

Sternberg, E. (1997). The Iconography of the Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, pp.951–969.

Stylidis, D., Terzidou, M. & Terzidis, K. (2008). Islands and Destination Image: the case of Ios. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 3, No.1, pp.180-199.

Tapachai, N. & Waryszak, R. (2000). An Examination of the Role of Beneficial Image in Tourist Destination Selection. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 39, No.1, pp.37-44.

Tasci, A.D. & Gartner, W.C. (2007). Destination Image and its Functional Relationships. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 45, No.4, pp.413-425.

Telisman-Kosuta, N. (1989). Tourist destination image. In S.F. Witt and L. Moutinho (Eds.) *Tourism Marketing and Management Handbook Hemel*, Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Vitouladiti, Ou. (2000). The necessity for comprehensive application of Marketing in insular regions and special destinations. In Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference: Tourism in insular regions and special destinations. Chios Island.

Vitouladiti, Ou. (2003). Sustainable tourism development and destination Marketing. In Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference: Sustainable Tourism Development and Environment. Chios Island

Walmsley, D.J. & Young, M. (1998). Evaluative Images and Tourism: The Use of Personal Constructs to Describe the Structure of Destination Images. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 36, No.3, pp.65-69.

Wang, Y. (2006). Strategic Employee Training and Development in Chinese Luxury Hotels. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, Vol. 1, No.1, pp.111-118.

SUBMITTED: APR 2012
REVISION SUBMITTED: AUG 2012
2nd REVISION SUBMITTED: DEC 2012
ACCEPTED: JAN 2013
REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

Ourania Vitouladiti (ranivito@hol.gr), is a Lecturer in Tourism Marketing at the Technological Educational Institute of Athens, Faculty of Management and Economics, Department of Tourism Enterprises.