www.ejthr.com

European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation
Vol. 6, Issue 1, pp. 57-74, 2015

Printed in Portugal

CAPITAL CITIES TOURISM IMAGE: IS IT FRAGMENTED?

Raquel Camprubí
University of Girona, Spain

ABSTRACT: Tourism destination image is increasingly viewed as a strategic issue that can contribute to the competitiveness of tourism destinations. On the one hand, academic literature recognizes the intersubjective character of tourism image, and the possibility that various agents coming from the same place could simultaneously project different images. In this sense, there is little research that tries to analyze image fragmentation. On the other hand, in recent years, the Internet has been gradually becoming a powerful information source that can influence tourists' perceptions of places. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to analyze image fragmentation of capital cities on the Internet. In order to achieve this aim, it has been carried out a comparative case study of two capital cities: Paris and New York. Findings suggest that image fragmentation behaves differently in these two cases, although some similarities have been detected, especially depending on the role played by the local DMO. **Keywords**: projected image, image fragmentation, capital cities, Internet.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism destination image is commonly recognized as an important aspect in successful destination marketing (Tasci and Gartner, 2007), which contributes to influence tourists' decision-making (Bigné et al., 2009; Crompton, 1979; Etchner and Ritchie, 1991; Hong et al., 2006; Jenkins, 1999; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Larsen and George, 2004; Mayo, 1973; Tasci and Gartner, 2007; Telisman-Kosuta, 1989), as well as the level of satisfaction of the tourist's experience (Chon, 1992; Jenkins, 1999). Other authors emphasize the relevance of tourism destination image as an issue that conditions the competitiveness of the destination (Govers and Go, 2004; Hsu et al., 2004; Konecnik, 2002; Ritchie and Crouch, 2003; Runyan, 2006), influencing aspects of the overall marketing strategies of the tourism destination, such as the product offered, communication mix, positioning, and segmentation strategies.

Consequently, the strategic character of tourism destination image and the complexity of tourism destinations–configured by numerous tourism agents (public and private) in mutual interaction (Bhat and

Raquel Camprubí is Associate Professor at Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona. She concluded her PhD in 2009, focusing on tourism image formation and relational networks. She is a member of the research group Organizational Networks and Innovation in Tourism (ONIT). Author's email address: raquel.camprubi@udg.edu

Milne, 2008; Dredge, 2006; Tinsley and Lynch, 2001; Jackson and Murphy, 2002; Novelli et al., 2006; Scott, Cooper and Baggio, 2008; Sorensen, 2002; Camprubí et al., 2008)–favour the generation of various and even diverse tourism destination images (Selby, cited by Morgan and Pritchard, 1998), an outcome increased by the intersubjectivity of agents in the system (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998) and, sometimes, their lack of common agreement (Camprubí et al., 2008).

Although this phenomenon is identified in academic literature as image fragmentation, few empirical studies try to analyze it. In this sense, previous research conducted by Camprubí et al. (2012) showed that image fragmentation in medium-sized cities can have four profiles based on: heritage, regional context, tourist services, and tourist activities. As demonstrated in this research, image fragmentation is not a problem if this phenomenon is well managed and controlled by the Destination Marketing Organization (DMO) or the Local Tourism Board (LTB), and tourism images projected by other agents are complementary, giving a holistic view of the destination. Problems appear when images with significant differences coexist, with fragmented images not reflecting the reality of the tourism destination, and there is a lack of control and coordination by the DMO or the LTB in charge of marketing the destination.

Additionally, academic literature states multiple ways to project a tourism destination image (i.e. brochures, tourist guides, official and unofficial websites, postcards, publicity, movies, literature, recommendations, personal experience, etc.), taking into consideration the differences between organic information sources (literature, newspapers, movies…) and induced information sources (brochures, tourist guides, publicity…) (Gunn, 1972). Numerous authors have observed that contrasting information sources have different effects on cognitive and affective image components (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Bigné et al., 2009; Gartner, 1993), and thus on the perception of the overall image. In this scenario, the Internet has been positioned as one of the main media to disseminate tourism destination images, and its use continues to grow as an important source for travellers (Heung, 2003). Tourists use this channel to collect relevant information for their trips, as well as to prepare them. In summary, the Internet is currently a significant means to directly influence destination image perceptions by creating a virtual experience for the consumer (Doolin et al., 2002), as well as affecting the decision-making process.

Considering the relevance of capital cities as tourism destinations, and the global character of the Internet as an information source, the previous working hypothesis is that capital cities image is fragmented on the Internet. This fragmentation will vary according to the nature and number of agents that are emitting tourism destination images

and the capacity of the DMOs to manage and control this situation through a complete image of the destination.

Paris and New York are taken as case studies to carry out this research, considering their character of capital cities and their relevance as tourism destinations. The research method used is based on previous research (Camprubí et al., 2012), using a content analysis of pictures to identify the characteristics of the projected image of these destinations through websites; and a cluster analysis to identify the existence of image fragmentation and the patterns of this fragmentation, if it exists. Findings show some differences and similarities in image fragmentation of both destinations. Finally, some conclusions, limitations of the study, and future research directions are reported.

THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF IMAGE FRAGMENTATION

Since the 1970s, a great number of authors have conceptualized and analyzed the tourism image phenomenon. In general, authors agree that a tourism image is a visual representation of a place (Crompton, 1978; Dichter, 1985; Reynolds, 1965; Santos Arrebola, 1994), this being the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has about the place (Crompton, 1979; Kotler et al., 1993).

Academic literature points out the difference between perceived and projected place images. In particular, Bramwell and Rawding (1996: 202) mention that "projected place images reach the consumer by an image transmission or diffusion process through various channels of communication", while "received [or perceived] place images are formed from the interaction between these projected messages and the consumer's own needs, motivations, prior knowledge, experience, preferences, and other personal characteristics". In this context, "the transmission and development of destination image can be understood as being a continuous process from projection of images to reception of these images by the intended target travellers" (McCartney, Butler and Bennett, 2008: 183). The complexity of this process is assumed by Tasci and Gartner (2007), who generate a conceptual model which includes supply-side and demand-side aspects, as well as consequences of the image formation process in tourist behaviour.

Focusing on supply-side aspects, Camprubí et al. (2008) propose a model that explains factors that intervene in the formation process of the projected tourism image, by assuming that a tourism destination is configured as a relational network, where a wide range of tourist agents interact (hotels, restaurants, transportation, local institutions, tourist activities, etc.) in order to supply a satisfactory tourist product.

The benefits that come from the relational network (social capital and absorptive capacity) allow the generation of an induced tourism image. However, the formation process of the induced image is not always perfect, as dysfunctions influenced by the coordination and structure of the relational network can appear.

Generally, tourism destinations have a natural tendency to project more than one single image. It must be taken into account that the agents of a tourism destination (some more than others) cast out induced images from various perspectives and interpretations of reality. In this context, Selby (cited by Morgan and Pritchard, 1998) recognizes the intersubjectivity of tourism images as a factor that can influence the existence of various induced images of a single destination. This is particularly palpable if we consider that each agent (tourists, locals, tourism industry, local institutions, etc.) has its own image of the destination. Thus, this fact can contribute to more than one image being emitted simultaneously and with substantial differences.

Frequently, these substantial differences among the various induced images are a way of presenting the reality of the destination partially or in fragments, only emphasising some particular aspects of the destinations, and omitting other elements that could contribute to give a more global image of them.

Dysfunction of the induced image also occurs when tourism images, apart from being fragmented or partial, are incoherent among themselves. The origin of these incoherencies can be in tourism agents having different interpretations of a specific reality, particularly when they try to adapt the tourism image of the destination to specific tourism products or needs, avoiding other aspects of the destination reality.

It should also be pointed out that, the existence of various induced images reflecting a certain tourism destination is not always a negative phenomenon. On one hand, academic literature accepts the existence of multi-image as a usual trend and easily occurring; and, in addition, Pike (2004) mentions that DMOs have the role of coordinating the tourism sector as well as enhancing destination image. On the other hand, it seems logical that each tourism agent, particularly those of the private sector (hotels, restaurants, leisure, etc.), projects the tourism image of the destination from the point of view of its product. In this context, the DMOs action is needed to correctly manage and control image fragmentation, in order to avoid the negative effects of this phenomenon. In addition, when the induced images being generated are directed at the suitable segments of prospective tourists, this image dysfunction will not be a problem. Therefore, image dysfunction will be negative when multi-image is manifested through fragmented and/or incoherent images that do not show the reality of the destination, and are not controlled or managed by any tourism agent.

METHODOLOGY

Study sites

This paper presents a comparative case study of two capital cities, Paris and New York, in order to determine if the induced tourism image of these destinations is fragmented on the Internet, and which are the patterns of this fragmentation, considering their relevance as tourism destinations for millions of tourists every year. According to the Euromonitor International's Top City Destination Ranking (Bremner, 2010), New York City is the world's second urban destination with almost 11 million arrivals in 2008; and Paris is ranked in the sixth position with around 8.5 million arrivals in the same year. These data show a high increase of arrivals in New York City (23% in 2008), mainly due to US dollar depreciation; and a decrease of arrivals in Paris (4.4% in 2008), comparable to other European cities. Following the reasons described by Bremner (2010), the maturity of European cities as destinations loses share in favour of emerging cities in developing countries which have increased their marketing efforts and improved their infrastructures.

In any case, both destinations are important as tourist centres of attraction, not only for international visitors, but also for domestic visitors. In fact, considering international and domestic arrivals, New York has received 45.6 million people in 2009 (NYC & Company, 2010), and Paris 27 million in 2009 (Office de Tourisme et Congrès de Paris, 2010).

The attractiveness of New York is primarily in its spectacular architecture formed by its huge skyscrapers, its natural lung: Central Park, and its intense night life in Broadway. In the case of Paris, its attractiveness is concentrated in a number of heritage sights from different periods of history, an intense cultural life thanks to its numerous and specialized museums (Louvre Museum, Pompidou Centre, etc.), and in being a centre of shopping, fashion, and MICE.

Data collection

Data collection was carried out during January and February 2010, and a total of 21 websites were detected: 11 websites in the case of Paris and 10 websites in the case of New York. Google was the search engine used to detect the analyzed websites, due to its extended popularity among surfers. The keywords used to detect the websites were "Paris tourism" and "New York tourism". In order to select the appropriate websites, two criteria were used: the selected websites (a) should belong to inductive agents and (b) should be placed in the first three pages of Google, since only few surfers have the habit to look at more than three pages (Sherman, 2004). As shown in Table 1, in both cases,

most of the websites belong to private agents such as virtual tourist guides or hoteliers associations, and local or national DMOs have little representation (3 in the case of Paris and 1 in the case of New York).

Table 1: Analyzed websites

Paris	**Type of agent**
http://es.parisinfo.com/	Local DMO
http://www.paris-tourism.com	Private
http://www.paris-tourisme.com	Private
http://www.francetourism.com	National DMO
http://www.paris.org	Private
http://www.parisdigest.com	Private
http://travel.yahoo.com/p-travelguide-191501740-paris_vacations-i	Private
http://travel.aol.com/travel-guide/Europe/France/Paris	Private
http://www.new-paris-ile-de-france.co.uk/	Local DMO
http://www.planetware.com/france/paris-f-p-paris.htm	Private
http://goparis.about.com/od/sightsattractions/tp/ParisTopTen.htm	Private

New York	**Type of agent**
http://www.iloveny.com	Local DMO
http://www.nyctourist.com	Private
http://www.easynewyorkcity.com	Private
http://www.usatourist.com/ESPANOL/PLACES/newyork/index.html	Private
http://www.nyctourism.com	Private
http://gonyc.about.com/od/bestofnewyorkcity/tp/topattractions.htm	Private
http://www.nycgo.com/	Private
http://www.mustseenewyork.com/	Private
http://www.nyisbeautiful.com/	Private
http://travel.aol.com/travel-guide/United-States/New-York/New-York	Private

In order to collect data related to tourism image which was spread across the selected websites, a content analysis of pictures was carried out, taking previous studies as a starting point (Dilley, 1986; Galí and Donaire, 2005; Pritchard and Morgan, 1995, 1996). According to the literature review, five categories were created (heritage, culture, nature, tourist activities, and tourist services) to classify the pictures. In order to classify every picture in the right category, "eye catchers" were considered. Morgan and Pritchard (1995: 28) define "eye-catchers" "as an illustration where 50 per cent or more of the image is occupied by an eye-catching device designed to grab attention". Additionally, it was also taken into account whether people appeared in pictures or not.

Previous research demonstrates that promotional pictures generally search to convey the essence of sights by portraying them devoid of any life, leaving aside aspects of a particular sight such as people visiting it or passing by (Galí, 2005; Camprubí et al., 2009). On the basis of the content analysis of pictures, a total of 1,608 pictures were detected in the case of Paris, and 1,451 in the case of New York. These pictures were classified on a database, which identified the website where they were found.

Data analysis

First of all, with the purpose to determine patterns of tourism image of both destinations, a descriptive statistics related to classification of pictures was done. Secondly, with the purpose of determining the degree of image fragmentation, a cluster analysis was used, consisting in a multivariate technique of classification that aims at grouping data in a reduced number of clusters and groups that have to be mutually exclusive (Baggio and Klobas, 2011). In order to generate the cluster analysis, a new database was created. This database summarized the profile of each website using the percentage of pictures of each category as a basis. The chosen algorithm of classification was Ward's method. The benefits of this method of classification are in its capacity to optimize the minimal intra-group variance (Cea, 2004), and its tendency to constitute clusters with a hyperspherical shape and with a similar number of objects (Aldenderfer and Blashfield, 1984; Cea, 2004; Hair, et al., 1998). Additionally, Euclidean distance was used, since Cea (2004) states it as the most appropriate measurement when the Ward method is used. Moreover, it is relevant to mention that variables have been standardized according to Z score automatically using SPSS, in order to avoid the possible influence of the Square Euclidean Distance in the resulting clusters. Finally, four groups were selected as the most suitable and coherent solution, according to the analysis of the variance (ANOVA). Taking into account the significance of each variable, the final model included five variables in each case study (Table 2).

Table 2: Variables included in the model for each case study

Variables	Paris	New York
% of pictures depicting Heritage	✓	✓
% of pictures depicting Culture	✓	✓
% of pictures depicting Nature	✓	✓
% of pictures depicting Tourist Services	-	✓
% of pictures depicting Tourist Activities	✓	-
% of pictures depicting People	✓	✓

RESULTS

As reported from the content analysis results, a total of 1,608 pictures were detected in the case of Paris and 1,451 in the case of New York. In Table 3, we can see that both destinations are mainly depicted in pictures as heritage destinations, although in the case of New York, this item is less significant. For this reason we can highlight that New York is presented as a diversified destination, with a relevant number of pictures depicting elements such as nature (11.94%), tourist activities (11.39%) or tourist services (9.32%).

Table 3: Classification of pictures by destination

Pictures Classification	Paris	New York
% of pictures depicting Heritage	85.08	66.32
% of pictures depicting Culture	0.37	1.04
% of pictures depicting Tourist Services	2.62	9.32
% of pictures depicting Nature	7.55	11.94
% of pictures depicting Tourist Activities	4.37	11.39
Total	100.00	100.00

Considering the relevance of heritage pictures in both destinations, it has also been analyzed which are the items depicted by these kind of pictures. As can be seen in Table 4, monuments are the element most depicted in pictures of both destinations. However, some differences can be observed in other portrayed items. For example, for Paris the tendency is to focus on images depicting museums (31.72); but for New York the focus is on the city's streets and squares (22.48%).

Table 4: Classification of heritage pictures by destination

Heritage subcategories	Paris	New York
% of pictures depicting Monument	44.42	41.62
% of pictures depicting Museum	31.72	13.42
% of pictures depicting Heritage set	5.51	9.78
% of pictures depicting Heritage fragment	3.67	3.33
% of pictures depicting Museum pieces	7.78	9.37
% of pictures depicting Streets and squares	6.90	22.48
Total	100.00	100.00

Finally, another interesting issue is the level of humanization of pictures, determined by whether they depict people or not. According to several authors, most tourism destinations create their tourism images basing them on a romantic view of time and space (Donaire, 1995;

Galí, 2005; Poutet, 1995), where "the urban landscape is presented as a scenario for the individual consumption" (Galí, 2005: 279).

We can actually see this romanticizing tendency in both cases. In general, monuments, museums, and other sights appear in pictures on their own, without people, trying to represent the essence of the place. Paris is the paradigm of this, with more than 80% of pictures not depicting people. Conversely, New York is represented as a lively city, with a significant number of pictures (35.70%) showing people around photographed sights.

These previous results clearly show the general patterns of projected image in websites. However, as we mentioned above, image fragmentation is analyzed through a cluster analysis. In both cases, cluster analysis results have been examined by two, three, and four groups, concluding that working with four groups is the most coherent option according to the reality of each case study. Hair et al. (1998) mention that a standard process for determining the most suitable number of clusters does not exist. It is for this reason that these authors recommend complementing the empirical judgement with any other theoretical conceptualization that may suggest a natural number of clusters. In this context, calculating different cluster solutions in order to decide the most suitable solution, considering previous criteria, practical judgments, common sense, and theoretical foundations is highlighted as positive. Therefore, by analyzing the average of each variable in comparison to other clusters, and the global average, we were able to determine the appropriateness of the four groups' solution.

In Table 5, we can observe that in the case of Paris, group 1 accumulates the 63.64% of the sample, while the other groups are smaller; but in the case of New York, groups are more balanced.

Table 5: Number of websites by cluster and case

Clusters	Paris		New York	
	Nº websites	%	Nº websites	%
Group 1	7	63.64	1	10.00
Group 2	1	9.09	3	30.00
Group 3	1	9.09	3	30.00
Group 4	2	18.18	3	30.00
Total	11	100.00	10	100.00

Regarding the results from variance analysis (Table 6), we can observe that all variables included in the final model have a p-value < 0.05, indicating significant differences. Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc test suggests that there are significant statistical differences among each pair of clusters.

It is worth remembering that in previous models, some of the variables have been excluded due to non-significant p-values (Table 2).

Table 6: ANOVA by case

Paris	F	Degrees of freedom	Sig.
% of pictures depicting heritage * Ward Method	35.811	3	0.000
% of pictures depicting culture * Ward Method	31.418	3	0.000
% of pictures depicting nature * Ward Method	6.872	3	0.017
% of pictures depicting tourist activities * Ward Method	47.508	3	0.000
% of pictures depicting people * Ward Method	7.360	3	0.014

New York	F	Degree of freedom	Sig.
% of pictures depicting heritage * Ward Method	32.682	3	0.000
% of pictures depicting culture * Ward Method	25.343	3	0.001
% of pictures depicting services * Ward Method	15.666	3	0.003
% of pictures depicting nature * Ward Method	7.997	3	0.016
% of pictures depicting people * Ward Method	13.397	3	0.005

If we focus on association measures (Table 7), classical eta-squared values typically range from 0.01 to 0.09 in the social sciences (Cohen, 1988). Since the minimum eta-square value is 0.747, all values obtained suggest a large size effect. It is interesting to note that "% of pictures depicting heritage" (Paris: 0.939; NY: 0.942) and "% of pictures depicting culture" (Paris: 0.931; NY: 0.927) are dominating variables in both cases, with similar values of Eta Square. Additionally, in the case of Paris, the variable "% of pictures depicting tourist activities" also contributes strongly to the final configuration of clusters (0.953).

Table 7: Association measures by case

Association measures of Paris	Eta	Eta Square
% of pictures depicting heritage * Ward Method	0.969	0.939
% of pictures depicting culture * Ward Method	0.965	0.931
% of pictures depicting nature * Ward Method	0.864	0.747
% of pictures depicting tourist activities * Ward Method	0.976	0.953
% of pictures depicting people * Ward Method	0.871	0.759

Association measures of New York	Eta	Eta Square
% of pictures depicting heritage * Ward Method	0.971	0.942
% of pictures depicting culture * Ward Method	0.963	0.927
% of pictures depicting services * Ward Method	0.942	0.887
% of pictures depicting nature * Ward Method	0.894	0.800
% of pictures depicting people * Ward Method	0.933	0.870

Finally, in order to properly interpret the characteristics of each cluster, an analysis of the average of each variable in comparison to other clusters and the global average has been done (Tables 8 and 9). Findings in this stage will be presented separately in order to improve the understanding of the results.

In the case of Paris (Table 8), firstly, we can observe that group 1, called "Heritage city", is characterized by a large number of pictures depicting the heritage of the city. Indeed, the average of this variable in group 1 is higher than the global average; and other variables of the model are less represented in this group. It is also interesting to point out that this group concentrates around 64% of the analyzed websites, which means that this is the generalized tourism destination image of Paris that is projected by the Internet. In addition, we can highlight that this image is shared among the local DMO of Paris and the majority of the private sector.

Secondly, group 2 is also characterized by a large number of pictures depicting heritage, although it is lower than the global average. The dominating variables, however, are "% of pictures depicting tourist activities" and "% of pictures depicting people". It is interesting to remark that the website classified in this cluster is the national DMO, giving a very particular image of Paris, one that focuses more on people and activities that tourists can do during their stay in the city. According to these results, we called this group "Heritage city of activities".

Thirdly, although the tourism image of Paris presents it as a "heritage city", items like culture, nature, and tourist activities are more present, giving a different view of the city and the way to consume it. In fact, this is not a generalized projected image of Paris, because only one website from the private sector has been included in this group. From these results we call this group "City of active tourism".

Finally, the fourth group in the case of Paris is again characterized by a high concentration of pictures depicting heritage. However, the dominating variable is "% of pictures depicting people", which allows to project a more lively image of Paris as a tourism destination, thus partly counterbalancing the usual solitude of monuments and tourist sights. This portrayal of Paris is shared by two websites; one belonging to the LTB of Île-de-France, and the other to a tourism agent from the private sector. Considering these results, we named this group "Lively heritage city".

Table 8: Average of each variable by groups (Paris)

Variables	Average				Global
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Average
% of pictures depicting heritage	91.71	75.00	53.25	82.38	85.00
% of pictures depicting culture	0.05	0.00	2.37	0.36	0.31
% of pictures depicting nature	4.40	0.00	17.75	12.68	6.72
% of pictures depicting tourist activities	1.92	25.00	23.08	2.77	6.10
% of pictures depicting people	12.20	25.00	14.29	39.31	18.48

Turning now to the results concerning New York (Table 9), the first group is characterized by a large number of pictures depicting culture, nature, tourist services, and people. In fact, the only website included in this group belongs to the local DMO and shows an image of the city mainly based on its natural resources (Central Park), people, and tourist services; including very few pictures related to its heritage, museums, or squares and streets. In this sense, we can point out that the local DMO understand and project a different image of New York in contrast to the image projected by the other agents included in the sample. According to these results, this group was named "Lively and natural city".

In the second group, New York is presented as a heritage city, but with the particularity that people are present in the every day of the city. Buildings, museums, and streets are full of people, showing a lively city. Hence, this group was named "Lively heritage city".

Thirdly, results in group 3 show that dominating variables are "% of pictures depicting heritage" and "% of pictures depicting nature". Websites included in this group, then, try to project an image based on these two elements: heritage and nature. But it is interesting to remark that the average of pictures depicting people is close to the global average situated around 21%. Considering these results, the name of this group is "City of heritage and nature".

Lastly, the fourth group is dominated by the variable "% of pictures depicting heritage". As can be observed in Table 9, the other variables included in the model have little significant weight. In this sense, the projected image of New York is fundamentally based on its monuments, museums, and squares, regardless of other elements such as its culture or services. Taking into account these results, this group was called "Heritage city".

Table 9: Average of each variable by groups (New York)

New York variables	Average				Global
	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Average
% of pictures depicting heritage	20.11	62.22	76.32	97.50	72.82
% of pictures depicting culture	3.80	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.61
% of pictures depicting services	15.22	12.75	2.16	0.42	6.12
% of pictures depicting nature	35.33	10.91	16.01	1.25	11.98
% of pictures depicting people	42.39	40.77	20.94	2.92	23.63

In view of the obtained results, we found some similarities and differences related to the groups obtained in the cluster analysis. In both cases, there are two common groups which present similarities in variables that distinguish one cluster from the others. These groups are: "Heritage city" and "Lively heritage city". As we mentioned above, these two groups emphasize the tourism image of both destinations as places where their heritage can be enjoyed, without giving too much importance to other resources. But the second group goes even further in stressing also the lively character of these destinations through a considerable amount of pictures depicting people. At the same time, the other two groups are characterizing different profiles of the image projected by each one of the analyzed destinations. On the one hand, the different groups in the case of Paris are "City of heritage and activities" and "City of active tourism". And on the other hand, in the case of New York, the distinctive groups are called "Lively and natural city" and "City of heritage and nature". In both cases, the differing groups offer a distinctive tourism image of these two destinations.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Academic literature assumes that tourism destinations have the tendency to project more than one and even differing images of a certain place, due to the great number of agents that form part of the tourism destination and intervene in the projected image formation process (Camprubí, 2008). Accepting this assumption, the present paper aimed to analyze image fragmentation of capital cities on the Internet, and two case studies have been presented to illustrate this phenomenon: Paris and New York.

Descriptive statistics showed that both cases are in general terms heritage cities, where monuments, museums, heritage settings, etc. are the main elements of their promotional image as destinations on the

Internet. At the same time, data revealed that the level of humanization of pictures is low, although higher in the case of New York.

In relation to factors contributing to image fragmentation, we found that capital cities follow different profiles (2 common profiles and 2 different profiles). This means that the specific conditions of each destination in terms of tourist resources, attractiveness, and relational networks can influence it.

In the case of Paris, we cannot consider a real fragmentation of its projected image on the Internet, because 7 of the 11 analysed websites are included in the same cluster. Thus, we can assert that there is a general tacit agreement about the patterns of tourism destination image that should be projected. This image is basically configured by heritage (monuments, museums, etc.). The participants in this common agreement are the majority of the analyzed tourism agents, including the local DMO and a wide range of agents from the private sector. While we can think that this is not an adequate image of this tourism destination because it centres all its potential in its heritage, the dominating position of the local DMO should be considered positive, since it somehow manages and controls the projection of the tourism image of Paris. The national DMO and the LTB Île-de-France are also present in the analyzed sample, but these two institutions have a different way to promote some of the relevant aspects of Paris. In this sense, there is a certain lack of coordination between the local DMO and these two institutions.

New York findings reveal the existence of image fragmentation, especially between the local DMO and the private sector. While the local DMO projects a tourism image of New York as a place to do activities, enjoy tourist services, and nature; the private sector focuses on New York as a heritage destination, leaving aside the dynamic view of the city often promoted by the local DMO. In this case, the local DMO does not share its view of the city with any other agent promoting it on the Internet. This situation can have negative effects on the way tourists perceive the destination image, which can influence their decisions and expectations regarding the destination.

In any case, it is relevant that a solid tourism destination image reflecting the real characteristics of a tourism destination exists, since we consider it as a factor that contributes positively to the destination's competitiveness (Camprubí et al., 2008).

Although this paper increases the knowledge about the phenomenon of image fragmentation, showing how two capital cities react differently to this situation, further research is needed in order to see how other destinations behave in front of image fragmentation, considering both patterns of image fragmentation and type and variety of tourism agents. Other interesting phenomena to study in the future,

are a comparison of image fragmentation through different communication tools (brochures, TV documentaries, tourist guides, etc.), and the effects of image fragmentation in consumer behaviour.

REFERENCES

Aldenderfer, M.S. & Blashfield, R.L (1984). *Cluster Analysis*, Collection "Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences", Newbury Park: Sage.

Baggio, R. & Klobas, J. (2011). *Quantitative Methods in Tourism. A Handbook*, Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Baloglu, S. & McCleary, K. W. A. (1999). Model of Destination Image Formation, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 808-889.

Beerli, A. & Martín, J.D. (2004). Factors Influencing Destination Image, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 657-681.

Bhat, S.S. & Milne, S. (2008). Networks effects on cooperation in destination website development, *Tourism Management,* 29(6), 1131-1140.

Bigné, E., Sánchez, I. & Sanz, S. (2009). The functional-psychological continuum in the cognitive image of a Destination: A confirmatory analysis, *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 715-723.

Bramwell, B. & Rawding, L. (1996). Tourism marketing images of industrial cities, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1), 201-221.

Bremner, C. (2010). *Euromonitor International's Top City Destination Ranking*, <http://www.euromonitor.com/Euromonitor_Internationals_Top_City_Destination_Ranking>.

Camprubí, R., Guia, J. & Comas, J. (2008). Destination networks and induced tourism image, *Tourism Review*, 63(2), 47-58.

Camprubí, R., Guia, J. & Comas, J. (2009). Managing induced tourism image: Relational patterns and the life cycle, *Tourism. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 57(3), 241-258.

Camprubí, R., Guia, J. & Comas, J. (2012). Analysing image fragmentation in promotional brochures: A case study of two urban destinations, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, DOI: 10.1177/1096348012451451.

Cea, M.A. (2004). *Análisis multivariante. Teoría y práctica en la investigación social.* Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

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*, 17(4), 18-23.

Dichter, E. (1985). What is an Image, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 2(1), 75-21.

Dilley, R.S. (1986). Tourist brochures and tourist images, *Canadian Geographer*, 30 (1), 59-65.

Donaire, J.A. (1995). *El turismo a los ojos del postmodernismo. Una lectura desde la dialéctica socioespacial* [unpublished thesis].

Doolin, B., Burgess, L., & Cooper, J. (2002). Evaluating the Use of the web for tourism marketing: A case study from New Zealand, *Tourism Management*, 5, 557-561.

Dredge, D. (2006). Policy Networks and the Local Organization of Tourism, *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 269-280.

Echtner, C.M. & Ritchie, J.R.B. (1991). The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image, *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14(1), 37-48.

Galí, N. & Donaire, J.A. (2005). The Social Construction of the Image of Girona: A Methodological Approach, *Tourism Management*, 26, 777-785.

Galí, N. (2005). La humanización de las imágenes emitidas por la publicidad de los destinos turísticos monumentales: el caso de Girona, *Pasos, revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, 3(2), 273-281.

Gartner, W.C. (1993). Image Formation Process, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 2(2), 191-215.

Govers, R. & Go, F.M., (2004). Cultural Identities Constructed, Imagined and Experienced: A 3-gap Tourism Destination Image Model, *Tourism*, 52(2), 165-182.

Gunn, C.A. (1972). *Vacationscape. Designing Tourist Regions*, Washington DC, Taylor and Francis/University of Texas.

Hair, J.F. Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Heung, V.C.S. (2003). Internet Usage by International Travellers: Reasons and Barriers, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(7), 370-378.

Hong, S., Kim, J., Hochan, J. & Lee, S. (2006). The roles of categorization, affective image and constraints on destination choice: An application of the NMNL model, *Tourism Management*, 27, 750-761.

Hsu, C.H.C., Wolfe, K. & Kang, S.K. (2004). Image assessment for a destination with limited comparative advantages, *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 121-126.

Jackson, J. & Murphy, P. (2002). Tourism destinations as clusters: Analytical experiences from the World, *Tourism and Hospitality*, 4(1), 36-52.

Jenkins, O.H. (1999). Understanding and Measuring Tourist Destination Images, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 1, 1-15.

Kim, H. & Richardson, S.L. (2003). Motion picture impacts on destination images, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 216–237.

Konecnik, M. (2002). The image as a possible source of competitive advantage of the destination – The case of Slovenia, *Tourism Review*, 57(1), 6-12.

Kotler, P., Haider, D.H., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry and Tourism to Cities*, London: Belhaven.

Larsen, G. & George, V. (2004). The Social Construction of Destination Image – A New Zealand Film Example, *Working Paper No 04/01*. Bradford University, <http://www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/management/external/researchworkingpapers2004.php>.

Mayo, E.J. (1973). Regional Images and Regional Travel Bahavior. In *4th Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association. Research for Changing Travel Patterns: Interpretation and Utilisation*. August 12--15, 211-218

McCartney, G., Butler, R. & Bennett, M. (2008). A strategic use of the communication mix in the destination image-formation process, *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(2), 183-196.

Morgan, N. & Pritchard, A. (1998). *Tourism Promotion and Power: Creating Images, Creating Identities,* Chicester: John Wiley & Sons.

Novelli, M., Schmitz, B. & Spencer, T. (2006). Networks, clusters and innovation in tourism: A UK experience, *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1141-1152.

NYC & Company, «nyc statistics», <http://www.nycgo.com/?event=view.article&id= 78912>, 2010

Office de Tourisme et Palais de Congres de Paris (2010). *Le Tourisme à Paris Chiffres clés 2009*.

Pike, S. (2004). *Destination Marketing Organizations*, Oxford, Elsevier.

Poutet, H. (1995). *Images touristiques de l'Espagne: de la propaganda politique à la promotion touristique*. Paris: Harmattau.

Pritchard, A. & Morgan, N. (1995). Evaluating vacation destination brochure images: the case of local authorities in Wales, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2(1), 23-38.

Pritchard, A. & Morgan, N. (1996). Selling the Celtic Arc to the USA: a comparative analysis of the destination brochure image used in the marketing of Ireland, Scotland and Wales, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2(4), 346-365.

Reynolds, W.H. (1965). The Role of the Consumer in Image Building, *California Management Review*, 7(3), 69-8.

Ritchie, J.R.B. & Crouch, G.I. (2003). *The competitive destination: a Sustainable Tourism Perspective*. Oxon: CAB international.

Runyan, R.C. (2006). Tourist dependent small towns: Understanding competitive advantage, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(4), 329-343.

Santos Arrebol, J.L. (1994). La Imagen en Turismo, in AECIT, *1r Congreso de la Asociación Española de Expertos Científicos en Turismo*, Marbella, Instituto de Estudios Turísticos, 209-217.

Scott, N., Cooper, C. & Baggio, R. (2008). Destination networks: Four Australian cases, *Annals of Tourism Research,* 35(1), 169-188.

Sorensen, F. (2002). *Tourist Destination Networks – Networks of agglomeration as sub-optimal network configurations*, NOLD PhD-course, Mobility Culture and Tourism, 9-15 September, Iceland.

Tasci, A. & Gartner, W.C. (2007). Destination image and its functional relationship. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(4), 413-425.

Telisman-Kosuta, N. (1989). Tourism Destination Image, *in* Witt, S.F. et Moutinho, L. (eds.), *Tourism Marketing and Management Handbook*, Cambridge: Prentice Hall, 557-561.

Tinsley, R. & Lynch, P. (2001). Small Tourism Business Networks and Destination Development, *International Journal and Hospitality Management,* 20(4), 367-378.

Submitted: 12th June, 2014 *Accepted: 19th February, 2015*
Final version: 01st February, 2015 *Refereed anonymously*