The Effect of Destination Image and Personality towards Destination Choice: A Study of Maldives
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Abstract: Tourism is one of the utmost important industry in the Maldives. However, there is a little known about the important factors that affect destination choice, especially in the context of Maldives. Hence, the fundamental objective of this study is to examine crucial factors affecting destination choice. Based on the theory and extensive literature review, this study developed a conceptual model with two independent, one mediating and dependent variables. Five hypothesizes were developed and proposed to test. A cross-sectional and structured questionnaire based research design was applied and was able to collect from 220 international tourists in Maldives. Structural Equation Modelling was applied to test the hypothesis and results indicated that both, destination personality and choice has direct effect on both destination choices in the Maldivian context. Additionally, results also indicated that destination brand significantly mediate the relationship between independent and dependent variables. This study provides an in-depth understanding about the tourist destination choice behavior, which eventually help this industry to develop destination brand and attract more international tourist in Maldives. Moreover, this study is one of the very few that investigate in the Maldives, which contribute new knowledge this context.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism industry around the globe has been expanding vastly in the years and as of 2013 it is recorded that 9% of the world GDP comes from tourism, whereby 1 out of 11 jobs is from the tourism industry (World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2014; World Economic Forum, 2013). Tourism has become one of the largest and the fastest-growing economic sectors in the world and there has been an increase in the international tourist arrivals throughout the past six decades of which 1087 million tourists arrivals has been recorded in 2013 (World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2014) which accounts for a total of USD 6 trillion (World Economic Forum, 2013). In addition many new destinations are emerging (World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), 2014) making it a highly competitive industry around the globe (Parsaeemehr, et.al. 2013; Wang, 2016; Ana, Antónia and Metin, 2017; Ipole, et.al. 2018; Dar and Bhat, 2018).

Furthermore, the ever increase in destination choices (Sergey and David, 2016; Henderson, 2007) that are available throughout the globe makes it harder for particular destinations to be differentiated (Qu, et al., 2011) as there are destinations that offers more or less the same experience (Noela, Reynolds and Jan, 2018; Blain, et al., 2005; Qu, et al., 2011) with same quality of services (Qu, et al., 2011) creating higher competition among the different tourist destinations (Chen & Phou, 2013; Artuğer, et al., 2013). As such, it is vital for the destinations to create a destination brand that can be identified by the tourists as a unique alternative to travel (Qu, et al., 2011; Anupriya, Abhilasha and Yajulu, 2016; Demirtas, et al. 2017; Zahid, 2017; Obiunu, 2018; Vulisutiany, 2018).

Creating a destination brand is far more challenging. Having a vast range of tourist from different backgrounds and ethnic groups visiting a particular destination (Nguyen and Ulku, 2017; Tsiotsou & Ratten, 2010; Balakrishnan, 2008; Fan, 2006) makes it harder for marketers to brand a destination. Hence, identifying the main reasons or brand related factors (Roodurmun & Juwaheer, 2010) that attracts a tourist to a particular destination, knowing the kind of image tourists create based on their perception of the destination (Balakrishnan, et al., 2011) helps in creating a brand that is appealing to the target market segment, et al., 2011 of the destination (Sergey and David, 2016; Gretzel, et al., 2006; Blain, et al., 2005). It is highly important for Maldives to have a good branding as the main source of income comes from the tourism industry. Although there has been an increase in the tourist arrivals to Maldives there has been a six percent decline in the average stay during the last quarter of 2013.

Available literate reveals that previous studies have been conducted in the context of different countries with the objectives of effective factors which is much more responsible to choice the destination of the tourist place: (Chang-Keun, Donghwan, and Eerang, 2018; Balakrishnan, et al., 2011; Qu, et al., 2011; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Hankinson, 2004; Kaplanidou & C.Vogt, 2003; Cai, 2002; Aaker, 1997). Even though much is known to the academic literature regarding this topic in the context of different countries, there is a scarcity research in this issues pertaining directly to Maldives. This, it is imperative that this study is conducted to gain insight into what impact to the international tourist to visit in Maldives.

1.1. Theoretical foundation and Conceptual model.

Destination branding is quite complex (Pike, 2005) and is hard to theorize on its own accord. Based on the past researches pertaining to tourism management and destination branding, branding theory becomes the foundation for creating destination branding theories and concepts (Balakrishnan, et al., 2011; Qu, et al., 2011; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Hankinson, 2004; Kaplanidou & C.Vogt, 2003; Cai, 2002; Aaker, 1997; Iyiola, 2014; Taqi, et al. 2018), subsequently there are several destination branding models that formulate destination branding constructs and theories. In this research, three important and most popular models,
namely (a) Cai’s; (b) Kaplanidou and Vogt; and (c) Hankinson model were used to understand the process of building destination brand (Cai, 2002; Kaplanidou & C. Vogt, 2003; Hankinson, 2004). Additionally, the conceptual model of this study was proposed based on these three novel theories. Cai (2002) defines destination branding as the selection of elements that are consistent in identifying and distinguishing these through positive image building. She also added that brand identity plays important role in creating image and brand in consumer mind (Gopal and Srabanti, 2016; Cai, 2002). In their study, Hassan et al. (2010), however, mentioned that brand identity and brand personality can use interchangeably. Interestingly, Tan (2008) stress this point and added that brand identity can be established through the formulation of brand personality.

Destination image and destination personality are the key factors that emphasized in many studies (Dimitrios and Barbora, 2018; Artuğer & Çetinsöz, 2014; Balakrishnan, et al., 2011; Byon & Zhang, 2010; Hanzae & Saeedi, 2011). The findings are very common in all these studies and concluded that destination image and personality have significant effect on the formation of destination brand. In their study, Artuğer & Çetinsöz, (2014) stated that 68.54 percent tourist agreed that destination image is a single determinant of selecting their tourist destination. Similarly, Balakrishnan, et al., (2011) reported that destination personality plays utmost important role in selecting destination. Furthermore, the development of the destination image and personality leads to brand equity (Morgan, et al., 2004) and destination brand personality is one of the key factors in formulating brand equity among tourists (Hidayet, Mihalis and Michael, 2016; Murphy, et al., 2007). As such, in this study emphasis is given to further examine the relationship of destination image and personality to destination brand in selecting a destination choice (Abidin, Bakar, & Haseeb, 2015; Abidin, Bakar, & Haseeb, 2014; Azam, Haseeb, binti Samsi, & Raji, 2016; Haseeb, 2018). Figure 1 presents the conceptual model for this study.

2. DESTINATION PERSONALITY

Intense competition in the global tourism market today makes it highly important for destination marketers to know more about what the tourist think of a destination and how they identify it according to how they perceive the destination. As such, destination personality has been considered as one of the important elements of destination branding in understanding and identifying the unique perspectives of a tourist destination through the tourists visiting the destination in creating a differentiated tourism brand (Kathryn 2017; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Caprara, et al., 2011). Destination personality evolves with the tourist experience and through their perception of the brand (Morgan, et al., 2004). Hence, it is vital for a brand to be portrayed in accordance with the tourist’s perception of the destination personality that forms the destination brand. Application of brand personality and its proliferation to different studies in the aspect of consumer goods has been researched as early as from 1960s. Brand personality is defined in a stricter context as human personality traits applicable to and relevant to particular brands (Azoulay & Kapferer, 2003). However, brand personality when it comes to applying in a destination context is still to be further researched (Nguyen and Ulku 2017; Hosany et al., 2006) and is quite new (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006; Artuğer & Çetinsöz, 2014; Kambi and Kambi, 2017; Ozkurt and Alpay, 2018; Rotova, 2018) due to lack of common theories and taxonomy of personality attributes applicable to brands (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006). Brand personality theory has been inspired to the emergence of destination personality research (Ye, 2012). Personality traits can vary in accordance to the situation and can be used to identify behavior and predict the choices customers make overtime in different settings (Wosczynski, et al., 2002). Based on the above mentioned notion, this study proposed the following hypothesis:
Destination personality has significant effect on destination brand in Maldives tourism industry.

3. DESTINATION IMAGE

Studies pertaining to destination image have been popular for the past three decades (Dimitrios and Barbora 2018; Stepchenkovaa & Mills, 2010; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006) in which a lot of studies conducted in the subject matters in tourism research due to the importance given for destination image in the marketing and branding of destinations (Artuğer & Çetinsöz, 2014; Stepchenkovaa & Mills, 2010). Destination image is defined as the tourists imagination on how and what a destination would be in reality (Bigné, et al., 2001) and also the perceptions that tourists hold on the destination (San Martin & Rodríguez del Bosque, 2008; Murphy, et al., 2007; Cai, 2002; Coshall, 2000; Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000). Additionally, destination image primarily depends on three important aspect of tourist, namely, (a) their expectations and values (Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000); (b) characteristics of the destination (Coshall, 2000); and (c) tourist experience (Lopes, 2011; San Martin, et al., 2008). Furthermore, destination image is subject to the perceptions based on information related to a destination (Murphy, et al., 2000) inner psychological factors with respect to the external environments (Hung, et al., 2012) as well as reference groups such as friends, acquaintances or family resulting in an improved image of the destination (Lopes, 2011) which helps in improving the experiences for the tourists.

Destination image also differs with respect to individual values (Moutinho, 1987 as cited in Lopes, 2011) based on the country of origin as the place the tourist comes from influences their perception (Bonn, et al., 2005). The perception of the destinations changes with respect to the age, race as well as previous destination visits (Tasci, 2007) As such, DMOs would be able to promote the destinations and differentiate them successfully by creating an image that lasts and is favorable to its target market by studying the destination image that the tourists holds. This would enhance them to remove any negative impacts of a destination that tourists perceive and helps in maintaining the current image that the destination holds in the tourist’s perceptions effectively. (Stepchenkovaa & Mills, 2010). Hence, it is important that the destination brand evolves in accordance to the perceived image of the destination (Qu, et al., 2011). Therefore, this study proposed the second hypothesis for this study as follow:

H2: Destination image has significant positive effect on destination brand in Maldives tourism industry.

3.1. Mediating Effect of Destination Brand On Destination Choice

Destination personality and image involve in creation of a destination brand (Rogelio 2018; Pars & Gulsel, 2011; Tan, 2008) and are the tools used to differentiate the destinations. Importance of branding in tourism destination was enlightened in the Travel and Tourism Research Association’s Annual Conference held in 1998 which focused on the topic of destination branding (Blain, et al., 2005). Since then the topic has been exploring in different capacities (Kotler & D.Gertner, 2002; Hall, 2002; Morgan, et al., 2002) whereby various new developments of improvements and study areas has been emphasized giving rise to different aspects of destination branding that is been influenced by other important factors such as destination image and destination personality. These factors have been used as a strategy to differentiate the brands among destination marketers (Uşaklı & Baloglu, 2011; Ekinci & Hosany, 2006). A destination brand signifies the tourist destination geographically and is a unique entity with their own political and legislative framework for tourism marketing and planning (Buhalis, 2000). A brand differentiates itself based on symbolic factors, signage, designs, and names a particular term that helps customers identify and differentiate a particular good or services (Henderson, 2007). To create repeated visits from tourists to a particular
destination a positively differentiated branding message should be developed to encourage them to be loyal customers (Roodurmun & Juwaheer, 2010). Therefore, creating a positive emotional relationship that encourages tourist’s satisfaction within a destination enables to create a successful destination brand (Ekinci, 2003). Tourist attractions of a destination, tourism services that leads to tourist experiences and brand extension including non-tourism and exporting industries supporting the destination experience are three kinds of attributes that destination brand is developed from (Gnoth, 2002). This enable to brand a destination through different brand identification features and activities that enables to differentiate a destination from its competitors. As such emphasizing on the two important functions of destination branding namely, brand identification and differentiation (Qu, et al., 2011) is important in branding a destination successfully and persuade them to visit the destination (Abidin & Haseeb, 2015, 2018; Abidin, Haseeb, Azam, & Islam, 2015; Azam, Haseeb, & Samsudin, 2016; Haseeb, Bakar, Azam, Hassan, & Hartani, 2014; Haseeb, Hartani, Bakar, Azam, & Hassan, 2014; Haseeb, Hassan, & Azam, 2017).

H3: Destination brand has significance on destination choice of Maldives tourism.

H4 and H5: Destination personality and destination image has a positive influence on destination choice through destination brand.

3.2. Methodology

3.2.1. Questionnaire Development

A structured questionnaire was developed to collect primary data from respondents. Some important steps were taken in order to ensure the effectives of this questionnaire. These were defining operational and conceptual definition of each variable, selecting the appropriate scale to measure the items, pilot study and so on. In order to ensure face and content validity, this study adopted items for variables from different prior studies, subsequently, items were rewritten based on the Maldivian context. Pilot test were carried out to ensure the consistency in scale and also ensure the understandability of respondents pertaining to items. Fifteen international tourist from 2 hotels in Maldives were participated in the pilot test. With alpha value of 0.738, results confirmed the reliability of the scale. Due to the high response rate and speedy recovery, this study applied face-to-face data collection method.

Two, demographic and objective, sections were included in the questionnaire. Nominal and ordinal scale were used for the questionnaire. Discriminant validity was ensured by applying exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and discussed later. Both principles of wording and measurement were followed to develop the questionnaire for this study.

3.3. Sampling Design

Due to the nature of the study, the target population was international tourist at Maldives, who visited different province during the period between January to March 2018. Indeed, it was challenging to reach to the target population due to geographic isolation of islands in Maldives. Moreover, many hotels and resort did not use updated technology to keep record of their guest. Most of the hotels greatly depend on agents to promote tour. Hence, there were no proper sample frame to refer, subsequently, this study applied convenience sampling. 7 MBA students helped to collect data from different provinces in Maldives. With 3 months’ effort, this study managed to get 230 questionnaires out of 600, however, 10 questionnaires were not completely due to missing data and inappropriate response. Therefore, this study used 220 questionnaires for final analysis.

3.4. Result and Discussions

3.4.1. Respondents’ Attributes

Respondents’, in this study, were very diversify pertaining to their characteristics. Target population likely be the reason for this great diversification. Though there is
no significant difference in number of male (51.63%) and female (48.37%), but nationality represents great diversify. Results indicated that 18.35 percent respondents were from Europe; 21.56 percent from Australia and New Zealand; 30.73 percent from Asia; 27.90 percent from Middle East; and 1.46 percent from North America. Beside nationality, results indicated that most of the respondents’ age were between 45 and above and the main reasons for traveling to Maldives is serene environment inside sea. In fact, most of the respondents utterly mentioned that Maldives has a strong brand image as a honeymoon spot around the world.

3.6. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

This study applied EFA due to the two main reasons, (a) assessing discriminant validity; and (b) reduction of the dimensions. Two important test, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, were conducted to assess the sample adequacy for this study and result explicitly indicated that KMO value, (Table 1) is more than the thrash point. Moreover, significant value in the Bartlett’s test of Sphericity confirmed equal variance across sample. Based on the Vermax rotation, results identified four variables which have more 1 eigenvalue. This indicated that there are four variables in this study and all these variables have 71.70 percent variance which is more than 50 percent. Table 2 presents the factor loading for each variable.

With minimum factor loading value of .730, first variables was confirmed and can be called as destination personality. It consists of six items. Similarly, second variable emerge with the lowest loading value of .735 with another 6 items and can called as destination image. Another two variables, destination brand and choice emerged with four and five items with minimum loading value of .716 and .793 respectively. In relation to reliability, composite reliability test were used and Cronbach alpha value for each variable was more than 0.70. Based on the final and acceptable results of EFA, this study moved to the next step of hypothesis testing and applied structural equation modelling (SEM).

3.5. Hypothesis Testing

In order to test the hypothesis, structural equation modelling was employed. Table 3 presents the cut-off point for evaluating the final model. Maximum likelihood method was employed in this study and regression standardized beta weights were calculated to examine the effect of each variable as hypothesis stated. Additionally, multi goodness-of-fit indices were examined in order to confirm and validate the final model. Table 3 presents the values of goodness-of-fit indices and Table 4 and 5 resent the reliability and hypothesis testing value respectively. Figure 1 portrait the out of SEM results.

The result of the model revealed that the model is acceptable as it attained the required values for each of the indices as follows: root mean square error approximation (RMSEA) = .075, comparative fit index (CFI) = .903. Normed χ² = 2.283 (Table 3, Figure 2). As shown in Table 5, it can be detected that all the four hypothesized paths were significant at a p value <.05. Destination personality has reflect positive impact on Destination brand in Maldives tourism industries, mentioning that H1 is acknowledged as the standardized regression value = .476, standard of error = .073, critical ratio = 6.520, level of significance for regression value = significant at .000. H2 of the study has also been recognized, demonstrating that Destination image has a significant positive effect on Destination brand as the standardized regression weight = .218, standard error = .090, critical ratio = 2.423, and significance level for regression value = .016. H3 was also not rejected as the standardized regression value = .296, standard error = .114, critical ratio = 2.597, and level of significance for regression value = .002. Subsequently, Destination mark is profoundly considered by worldwide visitor of Maldives amid the go in various circumstances in that country.
In addition to the four elementary hypotheses, the study also tends to test the mediation effect of destination brand between destination personality and destination choice, as well as destination image and destination choice, respectively. In confirming the mediating effect of destination brand, both the path coefficients of destination Personality to destination brand and destination brand to destination choice should be multiplied, whereas the multiplication value should be greater equal or greater than the threshold value (.08).

In addition, $p$ of these effects should be significant (Rucker, Preacher, Tormala & Petty, 2011). For the case at hand, in seeking practical importance, the multiple effects of both these relationships ($0.61 \times 0.23 = 0.14$) are greater than the threshold value (.08). Hence, it can be said that H4 and H5 are not rejected and destination brand image is the mediator in the given relationship stated in the hypothesis.

4. MANAGERI-AL IMPLICATIONS

The underlying factors that have an impact in branding Maldives have been identified as per this study. As such, the role of the destination personality and image on destination brand is vital in the tourist’s preference of destination choice. In accordance to this study the tourist’s perception of destination personality and destination image of Maldives has a positive impact on destination brand. Otherwise, destination brand has a positive impact on destination choice. Furthermore, the mediation relationship of destination personality and image on the destination choice through destination brand was confirmed in this study. Hence, it is important to change the destination brand factors in accordance to the perceptions of tourists with respect to the destination personality and destination image that they withhold. So, that the right branding message is given to the target audience in order for the tourists to make Maldives their number one destination to travel among the competitors.

The existing tourist operations can also benefit from it by improving the facilities that is already provided in creating an image and personality that gives the tourists what they perceive in the destination. Understanding why tourists choose Maldives as a destination helps in maintaining the tourist’s model structure of Maldives in providing the experience that the tourists prefer. Using the factors that contributes to the destination choice, destination personality and destination image in the promotional campaigns and relating it to the tourists that visited Maldives would be a great way to create an image among tourists who have not experienced the Maldives as a tourist destination. Although this study contributes to the theoretical implications in understanding the relationship among destination image, destination personality and destination brand and destination choice; it has several limitations that need to be addressed.

4.1. Limitations and Further Study

Despite minimizing most of the limitation, this study has few minor limitations. For instance, this study only has information from the tourists that visited Maldives as such in understanding the tourists’ perspectives among those who have not visited Maldives may form a different opinion on the destination. Future research can be done to determine extra measures that reflect Maldives personality as a destination.

Similarly, this study only include two predominant variables based on the theory, however there are several other variables, such as tourist demographic, tourist financial attributes, that can also affect destination brand or choice. Hence, it is wise to develop a model based on other variables which can help to generalize the findings. Another important aspect of comparing between local and international tourist which has been significantly ignored in this study. This can be another important area to understand and analyze, which may provide some guideline for the tourism industry on how to target both local and internal tourist.
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Figure 1: Conceptual Framework

Table 1: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) & Bartlett’s test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .738 |
| Approx. Chi-Square | 4581.760 |
| Df | |
| Sig. | .000 |
## Table 2: Result of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Personality (DP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP1</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP3</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP5</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP6</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Image (DI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI1</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI2</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI3</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI4</td>
<td>815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI5</td>
<td>814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI6</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Brand (DB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB3</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB4</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Choice (DC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC1</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC2</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC3</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC4</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC5</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction method: principle components analysis.

## Table 3: Fitness Assessment of the Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of category</th>
<th>Required value</th>
<th>Obtained Value</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute fit</td>
<td>RMSEA ≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>The required value is attained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental fit</td>
<td>CFI ≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>The required value is attained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimonious fit</td>
<td>$\chi^2$/df ≤ 3</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>The required value is attained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source. Byrne (2010); Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010); Kline (2011); Haque et. al., (2013); Zainudin (2012).

Note. RMSEA = root mean square error approximation; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; CFI = comparative fit index.
Figure 2: Full-fledged model for Destination Choice of Tourism.

Table 4: Validity Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Personality</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>5.997</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Image</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Brand</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Choice</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>4.227</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Result of hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Brand ← Destination Personality</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>6.520</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Brand ← Destination Image</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Choice ← Destination Brand</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Choice ← Destination Personality</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Choice ← Destination Image</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>