ELSEVIER

ANNALS
of Tourism Research

Media framing of Copenhagen tourism: A new approach to public opinion about tourists

Check for updates

Torben Hansen

Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School, Solbjerg Plads 3, 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark,

A B S T R A C T

This study provides the first analysis of how relationships between tourist-related frames appear in the media. Media framing plays an important role in the public perception of tourism issues. Focusing on the Lonely Planet appointment of Copenhagen as the top city to visit in 2019, this study examines how Danish newspapers framed Copenhagen tourism from 2017 to 2019. Through a new quantitative approach to content analysis that includes optimal scaling and path analysis, we investigate 225 newspaper stories and find several relationships between frame contents and frame implications. The findings suggest that particular frames trigger demands for specific actions (e.g., restricting tourism) and therefore are highly relevant for tourism managers and policymakers aiming to develop, position, and communicate tourism-related issues.

Introduction

The travel guide publisher Lonely Planet appointed Copenhagen as the top city to travel to in 2019, which attracted wide attention in the Danish media. Similar to many other European cities (Hospers, 2019; Seraphin, Sheeran, & Pilato, 2018), Copenhagen has witnessed a remarkable surge in the number of tourist nights in the past decade, rising from 4.7 million in 2010 to 7.5 million in 2018 (Danish Statistical Bureau, 2020), which is expected to almost double by 2030 (Horesta, 2018). At its worst, tourism can evolve into over-tourism, a situation in which locals feel that there are too many visitors and that tourists are negatively affecting their quality of life (Goodwin, 2017; Richardson, 2017). Feelings of over-tourism may, in turn, lead to anti-tourism movements (Seraphin et al., 2018). At its best, tourism may develop into responsible tourism, contributing to make places better to visit and live (Goodwin, 2017).

The media is one of the main actors shaping the public's perception of issues of public life (Geschke, Sassenberg, Ruhrmann, & Sommer, 2010). Media dependency theory proposes that dependency on media information resources is a ubiquitous condition in modern society and that an important form of dependency develops from the need to understand the social world (Shirley, Liao, & Rosenthal, 2015). According to media dependency theory, the role of the media is particularly significant in areas such as tourism, which not everyone necessarily faces in daily life (Dirikx & Gelders, 2010). For example, media is likely to play an important role in the public's perception of tourism by generalizing tourism issues and *framing* them in specific ways (Dirikx & Gelders, 2010; McComas & Shanahan, 1999). Frames are "conceptual tools which media and individuals rely on to convey, interpret and evaluate information" (Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992, p. 60). In this sense, frames implicitly or explicitly encompass selected attributes of complex issues, helping to facilitate how people determine why an issue is important and what the implications might be (Dirikx & Gelders, 2010; McCombs, Shaw, & Weaver, 1997). Therefore, a distinction should be made between frame contents and frame implications. Frame contents represent a selection of some aspects of perceived reality to enhance their salience, whereas frame implications are the

particular treatment recommendations promoted (Entman, 1993). More specifically, frame contents are central ideas or story lines that organize reality and provide meaning to complex issues, such as tourism (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Scheufele, 1999). Frame implications emphasize actionable aspects of complex issues, making it possible for the public to determine their consequences (McCombs et al., 1997).

To date, the literature has identified several often-debated tourist-related frame contents, including social conflict frame (e.g., Clavé, 2019; Croes, Rivera, Semrad, & Khalizadeh, 2017), environment/climate frame (e.g., Seraphin et al., 2018; Yazdi & Khanalizadeh, 2017), and commercial/economic frame (e.g., Estol & Font, 2016). Frame implications may include restrictions on the number of tourists (e.g., European Parliament, 2018), efforts to attract more tourists (e.g., Kamburugamuwa, 2014; Oh & Zhong, 2016), and efforts to educate tourists (e.g., Lee, Jan, & Yang, 2013; Paige, 2009; Pennington-Gray, Reisinger, Kim, & Thapa, 2005).

Although previous research suggests a range of both frame contents and frame implications, little, if any, research has provided an analysis on how relationships between tourist-related frames and frame implications may appear in the media. This is surprising because improved insights into such relationships may contribute to the understanding of how public opinion about tourists develops. The framing of a media story (its selection of content and organization) may give rise to particular thoughts that may have profound effects on how people perceive issues and problems and how best to deal with them (Price, Tewksbury, & Powers, 1997; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate how Danish newspapers framed tourism in Copenhagen during 2017–2019. In a quantitative content analysis of 225 newspaper stories, we examine potential relationships between frame contents and frame implications and explore whether the Lonely Planet 2019 appointment may have led to differences between these relationships as compared with 2017–2018.

Newspaper stories are part of a complex relationship among communication, language, and the social world (Gee, 1999). As such, written text constitutes one of the mechanisms human beings use to create and renegotiate shared beliefs and opinions on various topics (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter, 2002). Multiple factors may lead the media to frame topics in a particular way. According to Paveglio, Norton, and Carroll (2011), citizen action and existing public discourse surrounding a given topic may influence the way article authors and editors choose to construct and frame their stories. Other potential influencing factors include reporter bias (e.g., the aims, motivations, and intentions of article authors), source or quote selection, sponsors, and special interest groups (Entman, 2004; Paveglio et al., 2011; Scheufele, 1999).

While most newspaper stories are written by journalists or editors, a substantial number of pieces are posts from readers (e.g., letters to the editor or online user-generated content in comment sections). In this sense, both journalists/editors and readers serve as social actors who contribute to the framing of media. Letters to the editor are often reflexive and subjective; referring to discussions that have previously appeared in newspaper stories (da Silva, 2012). As such, they define the salience of issues for readers and do not necessarily represent a full spectrum of positions (Hessing, 2003). In addition, da Silva (2012) notes that readers who write letters to the editor are most likely heavy readers who may maintain rather fixed beliefs while aiming to guide public opinion. Conversely, journalists and editors often claim to describe issues and events in an objectively and unbiased way (Geschke et al., 2010). As evidenced in prior research (e.g., Reinhart, 2007), such differences can create variations in frame contents and implications between types of authorship. Building on such reasoning and because posts from readers may play an important role in the public's perception of tourism, we also investigate whether article authorship (i.e., professional journalist/editors vs. post from reader) influences relationships between frame contents and frame implications.

The findings of this study should be highly important for tourism managers, tourism policymakers, and others aiming to better understand and even influence the public's perception of and opinion about tourism issues.

The framing of tourism

The premise of framing theory is that an issue can be viewed from different perspectives and construed as having multiple implications (Chong & Druckman, 2007). In contemporary society, people often form perceptions of and opinions about public issues surrounded by messages that may present opposing views about aspects of the issues and their potential implications (Aklin & Urpelainen, 2013; Dixon & Clarke, 2013). In this sense, frames can help readers "locate, perceive, identify, and label the flow of information around them" (Goffman, 1974, p. 21). Framing may have a profound impact on public opinion. For example, when asked their opinions about a hate group holding a political rally, 45% of respondents were in favor when the question was prefaced with the phrase "given the risk of violence", whereas 85% answered in favor when the question was prefaced with the phrase "given the importance of free speech" (Sniderman & Theriault, 2004). Politicians also often adopt communication frames used by the media or other politicians when attempting to influence public opinion (e.g., Chong & Druckman, 2007; Druckman, Jacobs, & Ostermeier, 2004). Moreover, frames in the media may reflect public perception and opinion. Newspapers are forums for debate, and readers often contribute to newspapers with posts or comments (Weber, 2014). In addition, most newspapers are commercial companies, which may target specific segments in the population, as some newspaper readers may identify with the ideological identity of the newspaper (Bulunmaz, 2012).

In the digital age, most citizens use a mix of traditional (e.g., newspapers, magazines, radio, television) and social (e.g., Twitter, Facebook) media to understand and form opinions about various topics. As traditional media have been complemented with social media, a gain in power and a sense of community among citizens have developed (Shaw, Mousa, Vargo, Minooie, & Cole, 2016). Also, the lines between traditional and digital media have become increasingly blurred in the current and emerging media landscape. Traditional media now also offer digital environments for audience connection, engagement, and consumption (Souleles, 2018). Thus, as Shaw et al. (2016) note, newspapers, television, radio, and other traditional media still perform a vital role in developed societies. Blevins and Ragozzino (2018) even argue that the rise of social media may in some cases strengthen the impact of

traditional media. This is because some people may be overwhelmed by the 'noise' of social media and find refuge in a 'clearer portrayal' of traditional media.

Frames may highly differ across various topics and therefore should be considered in relation to a specific issue, event, or actor (Entman, 2004). Prior research has conducted a number of studies on framing and tourism. For example, Huang, Cheng, Chuang, and Kuo (2016) explore tourists' environmental behavior intentions in terms of the way environmental action is framed during traveling. They find that tourists with lower environmental concerns behave more environmentally conservatively with a pro-environmental framing message than with no framing message. By combining critical discourse analysis with stakeholder interviews, White, Morgan, Pritchard, and Heimtun (2019) scrutinize an influential television travel documentary as an instrument of cultural pedagogy that recycles, re-creates, and re-enacts the tourism imagery. They show the multiple means through which travel journalism enthralls tourists through imagined portrayals of people and place. In a study of the holiday system reform process in China, Wu, Xue, Morrison, and Leung (2012) identify six frames based on online news stories from 2005 to 2009. They find that welfare and rights and economic issues were the two foremost frames in China's tourism policymaking process.

While prior research has strongly emphasized the importance of tourist-related frames in understanding the public's beliefs and behavior, the current study is the first to provide an analysis on (a) how relationships between tourist-related frames and frame implications may appear in the media and (b) how media reporting around a certain event may affect how tourism is framed. Analyzing relationships between frame contents and implications offers greater insight into how public opinion about tourism develops and thus may assist tourist managers, politicians, and public authorities in better developing, positioning, and communicating issues related to tourism.

We took a deductive approach to develop the frame contents and frame implications used in this study (Dirikx & Gelders, 2010; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000). First, an extensive review of both the research literature and popular press related to viewpoints on tourism suggests multiple frame contents and implications (Table 1). Second, a pilot study involving 50 randomly selected newspaper articles (2017–2019) on tourism in Copenhagen confirmed the media presence of both frame contents and frame implications as suggested by prior research. The pilot study did not indicate any frame contents/implications that were not also suggested in the literature review. In the pilot study, we coded the newspaper articles according to the same procedure as in the main study (see Methodology section).

Specifically, we investigated seven content frames and six implication frames, all of which came from tourism-related studies, reports, and articles (see Table 1). We developed three research questions. As the first aim of this study is to investigate possible relationships between frame contents and frame implications, we explore the following:

RQ1. What are the relationships between frame contents and frame implications?

While relationships between frame contents and implications may be affected by editorial criteria such as perceived relevance and

Table 1
Tourist frames.

Frame type	Frame contents and implications	Literature examples
Frame contents		
Responsibility	This frame attributes responsibility for a tourism-related problem or issue to the government, the community, a defined group of people, or an individual.	Lalicic (2019); Estol & Font, 2016; Airey, 1983
Social conflict	This frame emphasizes conflicts, or potential conflicts, between locals and tourists.	Croes et al., 2017; Clavé, 2019; Cheung & Li, 2019; Lalicic, 2019; Oklevik et al., 2019
Social enrichment	This frame focuses on how tourism may enrich locals' lives.	Higgins-Desbiolles, 2003; Sinclair-Maragh, Gursoy, & Vieregge, 2015
Environment/climate	This frame emphasizes how tourism may be related to environmental or climate issues.	Seraphin et al., 2018; Yazdi & Khanalizadeh, 2017; Oklevik et al., 2019; Buckley, 2012
Human interest factors	This frame brings a human face or an emotional angle to the presentation of a tourist-related problem or issue.	Clavé, 2019; Seraphin et al., 2018; Albrecht, 2010; Mostafanezhad & Norum, 2018
Commercial/economic	This frame reports how tourism is related to the economy of individuals, groups, institutions, companies, regions, or countries.	Estol & Font, 2016; European Parliament, 2018; Zuo & Huang, 2018
Destination branding	This frame reports how tourism is related to the branding of Copenhagen.	Barnes, Mattsson, & Sørensen, 2014; Park & Petrick, 2006; Ooi, 2002
Frame implications		
Spreading tourists	Suggests that tourists should be encouraged to visit other areas of Copenhagen or Denmark.	Mhanna, Blake, & Jones, 2019; Christensen & Beckmann, 1998
Educate tourists	Suggests that tourists should be educated on how to behave or need to be better informed about local traditions and culture.	Pennington-Gray et al. (2005); Paige, 2009; Lee et al., 2013
Restrictions on number of tourists	Suggests that restrictions should be put on the number of tourists.	European Parliament, 2018
Attract more tourists	Suggests that there is still room for more tourists or that more tourists be attracted.	Oh & Zhong, 2016; Kamburugamuwa, 2014
Behavioral restrictions	Suggests that behavioral restrictions should be imposed (e.g., music in public place, eating in public places).	Turen, 2012; Hospers, 2019
Fewer tourist activities	*Suggests a reduction in the number of tourist activities or that some holiday makers be banned/reduced in numbers.*	Hospers, 2019; Clausing, 2019

importance, they may also be influenced by external 'events' such as the appointment of Copenhagen as the top city to visit in 2019, an appointment that attracted wide attention in the Danish media. External events or appointments may lead to feelings of 'proudness' or 'greatness' and a desire to showcase the city to the world (Knott, Fyall, & Jones, 2015), which in turn may influence perceptions of tourism issues and spark related discussions. While other events also took place in Copenhagen in 2019, no other major events in or around Copenhagen received nearly the same amount of media coverage as the Lonely Planet appointment. In 2019, the Lonely Planet appointment had 590 stories in Danish media, whereas other major tourist-related events such as Tomorrow's Urban Travel 2019 (tourism conference), the introduction of the Copenhagen Card (experience card), and the appointment of Wonderful Copenhagen as the world's first Green Tourism Organization (Wonderful Copenhagen, 2020) had from 5 to 85 media stories (Infomedia, 2020). Thus, we also aim to answer the following:

RQ2. To what extent does the publication date (between 2017 and 2018 versus after 2019) moderate the relationships between frame contents and implications?

Our choice of segmentation (i.e., 2017–2018 vs. 2019) reflects our wish to explore whether the Lonely Planet 2019 appointment led to differences in relationships between frame contents and implications. However, this segmentation is also notable from a conceptual and tourism debate perspective. While many studies have contributed to the classic debate about the impact of tourism, some have challenged the tourism growth premise with the introduction of terms such as 'over-tourism', 'tourismphobia', and 'tourism overcrowding' (Dredge, 2017; Goodwin, 2017; Milano, Novelli, & Cheer, 2019). Thus, while some scholars argue that there is no over-tourism, only badly managed tourism (e.g., Buhalis, 2020), over-tourism and the quality of life and well-being of local residents have in the last years become increasingly central in the tourism debate (Milano et al., 2019; Seraphin et al., 2018).

Different communities or groups of people may react differently to the same news or issues (Balasubramanyan, Cohen, Pierce, & Redlawsk, 2012), and as such, newspaper articles are supposed to be accurate and unbiased; journalists often claim to describe issues and events in such a way, though the media has also been accused of being biased by stereotypes, among other criticisms (Geschke et al., 2010). Despite the scarce research, evidence indicates that posts from readers tend to be focused on just a few issues and emotionally laden (AIU, 2020), which may potentially influence relationships between frame contents and implications. For example, Reinhart (2007) finds that while both risks and benefits are commonly reported, letters to the editors are more likely to offer radical framing implications and to express subjectivist solutions to perceived problems than editorials. Thus, letters to the editor are subjected to a selection, editing, and framing process and therefore may be shaped by journalistic/professional routines (da Silva, 2012). Overall, posts from readers are an indispensable form of public debate (Richardson & Franklin, 2004), enabling the exchange of beliefs and opinions between different groups of people (da Silva, 2012), which may contribute to shape public perception of tourist. Therefore, we aim to answer the following:

RQ3. To what extent does whether the articles are authored by journalists/editors versus readers moderate the relationships between frame contents and frame implications?

Methodology

Frame measures

We identified 279 unique newspaper stories using the Danish database Infomedia. Infomedia is a news media company that monitors nearly all Danish national, regional, and local newspapers, as well as other sources such as magazines and popular journals. The search terms were 'tourists' and 'Copenhagen', and the search period was 2017–2019. Of the 279 unique stories, 54 stories were excluded from further analysis because these stories were mainly statistical summaries of tourist numbers, hotel nights, and the like. Of the final sample (225), 108 stories related to 2017–2018 and 117 to 2019. In addition, 150 stories were written by journalists/ editors, and 75 stories were posts (i.e., letters to the editor) from readers. The average word count of the stories was 599 words, ranging from 80 to 2739 words. Newspaper articles are good sources of communication on 'tourists' because they usually give more elaborate information than other media outlets (Dirikx & Gelders, 2010; Sparks, 1992). To measure the extent to which certain frames appear in stories that mention 'tourists' and 'Copenhagen', we developed a series of 38 questions [to which the coders answered *yes* (1) or *no* (0)] in line with previous research (e.g., Dirikx & Gelders, 2010; Kline, Karel, & Chatterjee, 2006; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000) (see Appendix A). Each question was designed to contribute to the measurement of one of the seven frame contents (responsibility, social conflict, social enrichment, environment/climate, human interest factors, commercial economic, and destination branding) or one of the six frame implications (spreading tourists, educate tourists, restriction on number of tourists, attract more tourists, behavioral restrictions, and fewer tourist activities). Sample questions were 'Does the story suggest that an individual (or group of people in society) is responsible for identified issues-problems?' (responsibility), 'Does the story suggest that interactions between locals and tourists may create positive experiences?' (social enrichment), 'Does the story suggest that restrictions should be put on the number of tourists?' (restrictions on number of tourists), and 'Does the story suggest that more tourists should be attracted' (attract more tourists). Two coders (one tourism research expert who was the main coder and one non-expert skilled in societal issues) content-analyzed the articles. The intercoder reliability was 91%, and the reliability on two sub-samples of 40 randomly chosen articles was 90% and 93%, respectively, indicating satisfactory robustness of the codings. The results are based on the main coder's content analysis.

Grouping procedures

We wanted to estimate whether the frame questions would group together in such a way as to reflect the underlying frame dimensions. However, as the study variables are categorical, standard factor analysis techniques such as principal component analysis (PCA), least-squares estimation, and principal axis factoring are less suitable for estimating underlying dimensions. This is because these methods are most often based on the analysis of the matrix of Pearson product–moment correlations, which can be considered critical when dealing with binary items because their bivariate relationship may give rise to spurious factors (Debelak & Tran, 2013). Instead, we assessed the dimensionality of the binary data using two alternative methods: PCA with smoothed tetrachoric correlations and categorical PCA (CATPCA), respectively. Use of the two methods gives an indication of the robustness of the estimated dimensions.

PCA with smoothed tetrachoric correlations

Tetrachoric correlations are specifically intended for binary variables (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2012; Pearson, 1900). Estimation of tetrachoric correlations assumes that the two dichotomies are actually obtained by dichotomizing truly continuous variables that are not observed, which naturally excludes some variables (e.g., gender) from inclusion in the analysis. Thus, the tetrachoric correlation estimates the product–moment correlation that would have been obtained with the underlying continuous variables if its joint distribution was bivariate normal (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2012). However, tetrachoric correlation matrices can be indefinite (Lord, 1980), which makes the application of PCA impossible (Tran & Formann, 2009). Thus, to apply factor analytical methods with tetrachoric correlations, research suggests several smoothing procedures, including Higham's (2002) algorithm, which searches for the symmetric positive semidefinite matrix X with unit diagonal that is nearest to a given matrix A, and the procedure suggested by Knol and ten Berge (1989), which allows defining rows and columns of the correlation matrix that should not be altered by the smoothing algorithm. Prior research indicates that smoothing procedures provide viable results. Indeed, simulation studies conducted by Debelak and Tran (2013) suggest that applying PCA analysis to tetrachoric correlations "seems to assess the dimensionality of a multidimensional item set correctly if the correlations between the dimensions are low to medium and when a smoothing procedure is applied" (p. 74). In this study, we developed the tetrachoric correlation matrix using the FACTOR freeware program developed by the Rovira i Virgili University (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2019; version 10.10.01). Also using FACTOR, we applied the PCA procedure based on the tetrachoric correlation matrix with associated 'sweet smoothing', which is a non-linear smoothing algorithm that focuses only on the problematic variables while maintaining as much variance as possible in the process (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2019).

CATPCA

CATPCA uses optimal scaling to generalize PCA so that it can accommodate binary variables, among other variable types. The procedure does not assume that the relationships between variables are linear (Meulman & Heiser, 2001). As in standard PCA, the CATPCA algorithm allows the definition of new composite and standardized variables (i.e., dimensions), which maximizes the association between input variables while simultaneously reducing the multi-dimensionality of the initial data matrix (Aragão e Pina, Passos, Carvalho, & Travis Maynard, 2019; Popescu, Nicolae, State, Pavel, & Dinu, 2017; Saukani & Ismail, 2019). CATPCA is still not widely used in behavioral and economics studies, though some studies have applied this method to data grouping (e.g., Aragão e Pina et al., 2019; Comim & Amaral, 2013; Sabatini, Modena, & Tortia, 2012; Saukani & Ismail, 2019). In this study, we applied the SPSS 26 CATPCA procedure.

Path analysis

The dimensions developed from the grouping procedure were used to estimate possible relationships between frame contents and frame implications. Use of the developed dimensions in subsequent analyses relies on the fulfilled assumption that these adequately represent the pre-described frames, see further below. We used SPSS AMOS 25 and path analysis to estimate relationships between frame contents and frame implications.

Results

CATPCA

A comparison of the dimensions produced by PCA with smoothed tetrachoric correlations and CATPCA with optimal scaling showed practically identical results with an equal number of viable dimensions and an equal distribution of main loadings across dimensions. Therefore, in the following we report the results from the CATPCA, as this procedure may be more easily specified and handled by future research.

Using the eigenvalue > 1 criterion complemented by scree tests, we developed and rotated a 13-dimension solution using the non-orthogonal rotation method Oblimin (with Kaiser normalization, to prevent relatively large loadings from dominating the rotation). Only items with factor loadings higher than 0.50 were assigned to the interpretation of the frame dimensions, a threshold commonly used by researchers (Pedhazur & Pedhazur-Schmelkin, 1991; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000) (Table 2). The 13-dimension factor solution accounts for 77.7% of the variance, which is above the recommended 60% threshold (e.g., Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014). In addition, all items meet the 0.50 threshold, and no items load ≥0.50 on more than one dimension. An inspection

Table 2

CATPCA dimensions structure matrix.

	Dimension												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
R1 (Responsibility)	,245	,254	−,136	−,197	,098	−,080	,097	**,976**	,217	,309	−,204	−,059	,287
R2 -	,145	,236	−,155	−,153	,058	−,068	,093	**,978**	,190	,276	−,215	−,117	,319
R3 -	−,022	,298	,196	−,086	,439	,063	,147	**,854**	,299	,207	−,128	−,265	,026
R4 -	,236	,273	−,134	−,167	,275	−,045	−,029	**,953**	,037	,125	−,269	−,145	,406
C1 (Social conflict)	**,960**	−,095	−,265	−,113	,077	−,036	,192	,191	,303	,368	−,379	,135	,182
C2 -	**,963**	−,068	−,308	−,125	,077	−,049	,170	,201	,327	,314	−,385	,160	,143
C3 -	**,970**	,014	−,229	−,089	,296	−,081	,230	,196	,225	,231	−,286	,028	,047
C4 -	**,861**	−,264	−,272	−,164	,307	−,151	,126	,226	,232	,139	−,386	−,238	−,071
SE1 (Social enrichment)	−,033	−,077	,038	**,973**	,059	,184	−,030	−,124	−,113	−,147	,092	,038	−,238
SE2 -	−,070	−,020	,114	**,985**	−,040	,153	,039	−,094	−,071	−,110	,013	,135	−,104
SE3 -	−,115	−,057	−,168	**,953**	−,080	,233	,041	−,165	−,145	−,070	−,110	−,083	,042
SE4 -	−,138	−,105	,057	**,986**	−,089	,067	,087	−,177	−,083	−,118	,054	−,016	−,061
EM1 (Environment/climate)	,032	**,981**	−,106	−,035	,026	−,052	−,081	,268	,008	,025	−,198	−,048	,185
EM2 -	−,028	**,985**	−,060	−,072	,008	−,094	−,081	,258	,007	,058	−,188	−,037	,239
EM3 -	−,276	**,939**	−,074	−,165	,109	−,128	,005	,231	−,062	−,007	−,238	−,290	,077
EM4 -	−,131	**,983**	−,055	−,059	,123	−,131	,011	,261	−,042	,018	−,270	−,104	,043
HI1 (Human interest factors)	,140	,020	−,032	−,119	,052	,213	,068	,207	,289	**,984**	−,045	,015	,049
HI2 -	,181	,002	−,042	−,137	−,045	,023	,093	,278	,409	**,972**	−,213	−,054	,137
HI3 -	,342	,017	−,026	−,103	,050	,106	,106	,259	,290	**,982**	−,196	−,012	,031
HI4 -	,259	,045	−,015	−,108	,073	−,024	,227	,193	,256	**,982**	−,103	−,043	,010
Com1 (Commercial/economic)	−,276	−,033	**,982**	,014	,018	,048	−,140	−,127	−,121	,043	,416	,032	−,055
Com2 -	−,219	−,107	**,989**	,037	,048	,034	−,081	−,055	−,078	−,021	,469	,032	−,061
Com3 -	−,236	−,066	**,989**	,022	,031	,088	−,005	−,096	−,062	−,098	,291	,087	−,029
DB1 (Destination branding)	−,049	−,088	−,007	,188	−,048	**,991**	,007	−,052	,023	−,001	,022	−,136	−,088
DB2 -	−,042	−,088	,058	,129	,023	**,996**	−,049	−,017	,056	,106	,052	−,131	−,029
DB3 -	−,109	−,114	,143	,153	,117	**,979**	−,033	−,045	,024	,145	,043	−,035	−,151
ST1 (Spreading tourists)	,247	−,151	−,074	,042	,080	−,055	,032	−,003	−,091	−,014	−,194	**,946**	,003
ST2 -	−,156	−,070	,209	−,031	,189	−,260	−,103	−,316	−,054	−,077	,273	**,892**	−,139
ET1 (Educating tourists)	,150	−,075	−,078	,006	,084	−,037	**,995**	,071	−,038	,126	−,134	−,069	,037
ET2 -	,168	−,052	−,058	,068	,109	−,012	**,997**	,052	,027	,103	−,132	,010	,002
RT1 (Restrictions on number of tourists)	,222	−,045	−,083	−,103	,104	,033	,015	,159	**,998**	,299	−,182	−,048	,096
RT2 -	,249	−,026	−,112	−,100	,117	,041	−,022	,166	**,995**	,298	−,179	−,093	,063
AM1 (Attracting tourists)	−,283	−,222	,391	,012	−,095	,038	−,124	−,189	−,155	−,135	**,997**	−,002	−,162
AM2 -	−,309	−,217	,366	,015	−,091	,044	−,143	−,178	−,191	−,129	**,996**	−,007	−,149
BR1 (Behavioral restrictions)	,314	−,035	−,065	−,046	**,972**	,016	,096	,216	,149	,071	−,142	,106	,098
BR2 -	,108	,146	,106	−,036	**,965**	,053	,155	,217	,145	,035	−,142	,107	,277
FTA1 (Fewer tourist activities)	−,014	,224	−,088	−,138	,247	−,135	,036	,279	,093	,128	−,208	−,048	**,961**
FTA2 -	,309	,148	,058	−,155	,201	−,091	,082	,549	,203	−,005	−,201	−,127	**,882**
Variance accounted for; each dimension (%)	16.93	9.87	8.18	7.18	5.90	5.26	4.75	4.49	3.76	3.34	3.15	2.70	2.21
Cumulative variance (%)	16.93	26.80	34.98	42.16	48.06	53.32	58.07	62.56	66.32	69.66	72.81	75.51	77.72

of the matrix shown in Table 2 indicates that the 38 coding items adequately represent the 13 frames when assigned to the CATPCA procedure.

Path analyses

The correlation matrix of the CATPCA dimensions (Table 3) suggests a substantial number of significant correlations between frame contents and frame implications, which indicates that estimating path relationships between these dimensions is a viable approach. The use of CATPCA dimensions renders nonnormality, which violates the distributional assumptions of the standard maximum likelihood (ML) estimator and can lead to under-estimation of standard errors (Kaplan, 2009). Thus, we initially estimated the path model estimations using the bootstrapping resampling procedure (5000 samples; Efron & Tibshirani, 1993) to produce distributionally appropriate standard errors and chi-square statistics. Next, we re-estimated the models using ML. A comparison of the parameter estimates produced by bootstrapping and ML showed similar significance levels for all estimated structural equation modeling paths. In the following, we report the results based on ML estimates (Table 4).

Results pertaining to RQ1

The path model provides a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 12.85$ (df = 15, $p = 0.61$); NFI = 0.94; AGFI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.024). Several significant relationships between frame contents and frame implications were identified (Table 4). The frame content 're-sponsibility' was positively related to the implication 'fewer tourist activities' ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) and (marginally) positively

Table 3

Descriptive statistics and correlations between CATPCA dimensions.

Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Social conflict	63.2												
2 Environment/climate	−0.117	37.2											
3 Commercial/ economic	−0.221[a]	−0.044	70.0										
4 Social enrichment	−0.082	−0.063	0.016	21.3									
5 Behavioral restrictions	0.131	0.058	0.063	−0.041	12.0								
6 Place branding	−0.056	−0.084	0.048	0.158[b]	0.010	46.3							
7 Educate tourists	0.133[b]	−0.039	−0.050	0.035	0.095	−0.027	29.5						
8 Responsibility	0.167[b]	.226[a]	−0.050	−0.133	0.178[b]	−0.025	0.068	52.0					
9 Restr. on tourist numbers	0.199[a]	−0.022	−0.051	−0.096	0.108	0.028	0.011	0.162[b]	37.0				
10 Human int. factors	0.190[a]	0.022	−0.026	−0.107	0.019	0.076	0.111	0.194[a]	0.282[a]	23.8			
11 Attract more tourists	−0.280[a]	−0.179[a]	0.352[a]	0.015	−0.089	0.026	−0.133[b]	−0.189[a]	−0.149[b]	−0.113	59.5		
12 Spreading tourists	0.053	−0.082	0.043	0.026	0.043	−0.087	−0.034	−0.140	−0.056	−0.009	0.031	57.5	
13 Fewer tourist activities	0.070	0.128[b]	−0.046	−0.086	0.075	−0.065	0.019	0.247[a]	0.069	0.043	−0.142[b]	−0.015	22.0

Numbers on the diagonal represent the number of times (averaged across items) a particular frame was coded 1 in the content analysis. Numbers below the diagonal represent correlations among CATPCA dimensions. $N = 225$.

[a] Significant at the 1% level.

[b] Significant at the 5% level.

related to 'behavioral restrictions' ($β = 0.12$, $p = 0.08$); conversely, the frames 'social conflict' ($β = −0.20$, $p < 0.01$) and 'environment/climate' ($β = −0.17$, $p < 0.01$) were both negatively related to 'attract more tourists'. The frames 'social conflict' ($β = 0.13$, $p = 0.05$) and 'human interest factors' ($β = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$) were both positively related to 'restrictions on tourist numbers', and the frame 'commercial/economic' ($β = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$) was positively related to 'attract more tourists'. In addition, 'social conflict' was (marginally) positively related to 'behavioral restrictions' ($β = 0.12$, $p = 0.08$).

The results suggest that two frames ('social conflict' and 'human interest factors') were both positively related to 'restrictions on tourist numbers'. To test the difference between coefficients, we estimated their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI). If the confidence intervals overlap with $< 50\%$, the coefficients can be considered significantly different from each other ($p < 0.05$) (Cumming, 2009). This criterion suggests that the relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'restrictions on tourist numbers' (95% CI [0.11, 0.38]) was not significantly different from the relationship between 'social conflict' and 'restrictions on tourists numbers' (95% CI [0.01, 0.26]). In addition, the frames 'social conflict' and 'environment/climate' were both negatively related to 'attract more tourists'. Calculations of CI show that their corresponding coefficients were not significantly different (social conflict: 95% CI [−0.33, −0.07]; environment/climate: 95% CI [−0.30, −0.04]).

Results pertaining to RQ2 and RQ3

We investigated the moderating effects pertaining to year (2017–2018 vs. 2019) and authorship (journalist vs. reader) using multiple-group path analysis with chi-square difference tests (Table 4). Several significant moderating effects were detected.

Year (2017–2018 vs. 2019)

The relationship between 'responsibility' and 'restrictions on tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 ($β = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$) and non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.08$, $p = 0.39$). A chi-square difference test showed that the difference between coefficients was significant ($Δχ^2 = 5.39$, $Δdf = 1$, $p = 0.02$). For the 2017–2018 period, the results indicated a negative relationship between 'responsibility' and 'attract more tourists' ($β = −0.19$, $p = 0.02$), while this relationship was non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.06$, $p = 0.53$; $Δχ^2 = 5.82$, $Δdf = 1$, $p = 0.02$).

Moreover, the frame 'social conflict' was differently related to several implications across year (i.e., 2017–2018 vs. 2019). The relationship between 'social conflict' and 'spreading tourists' was positive for 2019 ($β = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$) and non-significant for 2017–2018 ($β = −0.04$, $p = 0.68$; $Δχ^2 = 4.34$, $Δdf = 1$, $p = 0.04$). The results also showed that the relationship between 'social conflict' and 'educate tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 ($β = 0.25$, $p = 0.01$) and non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.06$, $p = 0.68$) and that the difference between coefficients was significant ($Δχ^2 = 4.34$, $Δdf = 1$, $p = 0.04$). Finally, the results indicate that 'social conflict' was negatively related to 'attract more tourists' for 2017–2018 ($β = −0.37$, $p < 0.01$) and non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.07$, $p = 0.50$; $Δχ^2 = 11.51$, $Δdf = 1$, $p < 0.01$).

The relationship between 'environment/climate' and 'attract more tourists' was negative for 2017–2018 ($β = −0.27$, $p < 0.01$) and non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.08$, $p = 0.39$; $Δχ^2 = 3.95$, $Δdf = 1$, $p = 0.05$). The results also showed a positive relationship between 'environment/climate' and 'fewer tourist activities' for 2017–2018 ($β = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), while this relationship was non-significant for 2019 ($β = −0.08$, $p = 0.39$; $Δχ^2 = 6.90$, $Δdf = 1$, $p < 0.01$).

The frame 'human interest factors' was differently related to both 'spreading tourists' and 'educate tourists' for 2017–2018 versus

Table 4
Estimated standardized coefficients.

Relationship	Model effects	Moderating effects			
		Article appearance		Article authorship	
		2017–2018	2019	Journalist	Reader
	β(SE) *t*-value	β(SE) *t*-value	β(SE) *t*-value	β(SE) *t*-value	β(SE) *t*-value
Responsibility→spreading tourists	−0.11(0.07)–1.52	−0.21(0.08)–2.07[b]	0.01(0.11) 0.01	−0.12(0.09)–1.43	−0.08(0.12)–0.55
Responsibility→educate tourists	0.05(0.08) 0.64	0.03(0.11) 0.31	0.05(0.11) 0.49	0.01(0.11) 0.01	0.17(0.12) 1.28
Responsibility→restrictions on tourist no.	0.09(0.08) 1.27	**0.26(0.10) 2.70**[a]	**−0.08(0.11)–0.87**	0.21(0.10) 2.44[b]	−0.02(0.14)–0.15
Responsibility→attract more tourists	−0.08(0.07) 1.23	**−0.19(0.09) 2.40**[b]	**−0.06(0.10)–0.63**	−0.08(0.09)–0.99	0.01(0.11) 0.02
Responsibility→behavioral restrictions	0.12(0.07) 1.76[c]	0.20(0.09) 2.03[b]	0.01(0.11) 0.06	0.01(0.09) 0.14	0.12(0.14) 0.92
Responsibility→fewer tourist activities	0.23(0.07) 3.35[a]	0.27(0.09) 2.83[a]	0.15(0.10) 1.60	**0.34(0.07) 4.04**[a]	**−0.02(0.14)–0.19**
Social conflict→spreading tourists	0.12(0.07) 1.77	**−0.04(0.08)–0.41**	**0.31(0.10) 3.20**[a]	0.23(0.08) 2.66[a]	−0.09(0.11)–0.77
Social conflict→educate tourists	0.10(0.08) 1.47	**0.25(0.12) 2.50**[b]	**−0.06(0.11)–0.62**	0.12(0.10) 1.34	0.09(0.11) 0.82
Social conflict→restrictions on tourist no.	0.13(0.08) 1.98[b]	0.18(0.11) 1.82[c]	0.11(0.11) 1.13	0.01(0.09) 0.05	0.32(0.13) 2.87[a]
Social conflict→attract more tourists	−0.20(0.07)–3.17[a]	**−0.37(0.09)–4.61**[a]	**−0.07(0.10)–0.68**	−0.18(0.09)–2.24[b]	−0.18(0.11)–1.80[c]
Social conflict→behavioral restrictions	0.12(0.07) 1.77[c]	0.12(0.10) 1.14	0.21(0.11) 2.05[b]	**0.23(0.09) 2.65**[a]	**−0.08(0.13)–0.69**
Social conflict→fewer tourist activities	0.04(0.07) 0.57	0.07(0.10) 0.77	0.04(0.09) 0.41	0.16(0.07) 1.89[c]	−0.16(0.13)–1.41
Social enrichment→spreading tourists	0.04(0.07) 0.61	−0.08(0.09)–0.82	0.08(0.09) 0.86	0.10(0.08) 1.20	−0.14(0.14)–1.17
Social enrichment→educate tourists	0.07(0.08) 0.96	0.10(0.12) 1.01	0.09(0.10) 1.00	0.07(0.10) 0.79	0.02(0.14) 0.22
Social enrichment→restric. on tourist no.	−0.05(−0.08)–0.75	−0.07(0.11)–0.76	−0.02(0.10)–0.23	−0.01(0.08)–0.18	−0.09(0.16)–0.82
Social enrichment→attract more tourists	−0.03(0.07)–0.54	−0.06(0.10)–0.77	−0.06(0.09)–0.61	−0.05(0.08)–0.67	0.04(0.13) 0.40
Social enrichment→behavioral restrictions	−0.02(0.07)–0.31	0.04(0.11) 0.35	−0.06(0.10)–0.67	−0.01(0.08)–0.06	−0.09(0.16)–0.79
Social enrichment→fewer tourist activities	−0.06(0.07)–0.85	−0.06(0.11)–0.66	−0.03(0.08)–0.36	−0.01(0.07)–0.17	−0.13(0.16)–1.18
Env./climate→spreading tourists	−0.04(0.07)–0.65	−0.06(0.08)–0.64	−0.08(0.09)–0.89	0.01(0.08) 0.06	−0.13(0.11)–0.97
Env./climate→educate tourists	−0.05(0.08)–0.70	−0.13(0.11)–1.34	0.06(0.09) 0.61	−0.02(0.10)–0.18	−0.17(0.12)–1.36
Env./climate→restrictions on tourist no.	−0.04(0.07)–0.56	−0.02(0.10)–0.17	−0.04(0.10)–0.42	−0.04(0.09)–0.44	−0.03(0.14)–0.25
Env./climate→attract more tourists	−0.17(0.07)–2.77[a]	**−0.27(0.09)–3.42**[a]	**−0.08(0.09)–0.85**	−0.14(0.08) 1.88	−0.24(0.11)–2.24[b]
Env./climate→behavioral restrictions	0.05(0.07) 0.67	0.09(0.09) 0.83	0.02(0.10) 0.25	0.05(0.08) 0.59	0.02(0.14) 0.12
Env./climate→fewer tourist activities	0.08(0.06) 1.25	**0.28(0.09) 2.90**[a]	**−0.08(0.09)–0.86**	0.01(0.07) 0.16	0.31(0.14) 2.48[b]
HI factors→spreading tourists	0.02(0.06) 0.22	**0.22(0.07) 2.27**[b]	**−0.15(0.11)–1.67**[c]	0.03(0.10) 0.31	−0.03(0.09)–0.24
HI factors→educate tourists	0.09(0.08) 1.29	**0.26(0.10) 2.75**[a]	**−0.13(0.11) 1.29**	0.04(0.12) 0.42	0.23(0.09) 2.03[b]
HI factors→restrictions on tourist no.	0.24(0.07) 3.57[a]	0.15(0.09) 1.60	0.29(0.12) 3.15[a]	0.17(0.11) 1.98[b]	0.26(0.11) 2.41[b]
HI factors→attract more tourists	−0.05(0.07)–0.84	−0.10(0.08)–1.25	−0.06(0.10)–0.61	0.01(0.10)–0.01	−0.10(0.08)–1.10
HI factors→behavioral restrictions	−0.04(0.07)–0.64	−0.02(0.08)–0.18	−0.11(0.12)–1.18	0.09(0.10) 1.06	−0.22(0.10) 1.95[c]
HI factors→fewer tourist activities	0.01(0.06) 0.01	−0.16(0.08)–1.71[c]	0.13(0.10) 1.41	**−0.22(0.08) 2.54**[b]	**0.12(0.10) 1.06**
Com./economic→spreading tourists	0.05(0.06) 0.70	−0.04(0.07)–0.44	0.16(0.10) 1.78[c]	0.13(0.08) 1.52	−0.14(0.10)–1.19
Com./economic→educate tourists	−0.03(0.07)–0.50	0.01(0.11) 0.05	−0.11(0.10)–1.14	−0.09(0.10)–1.12	0.16(0.11) 1.39
Com./economic→restrictions on tourist no.	−0.03(0.07)–0.44	−0.01(0.10)–0.02	−0.08(0.10)–0.89	−0.04(0.08)–0.45	0.02(0.13) 0.20
Com./economic→attract more tourists	0.30(0.07) 4.89[a]	**0.35(0.09) 4.61**[a]	**0.14(0.09) 1.52**	0.29(0.08) 3.77[a]	0.25(0.10) 2.54[b]
Com./economic→behavioral restrictions	0.10(0.07) 1.48	0.19(0.09) 1.94[c]	−0.01(0.10)–0.04	0.11(0.08) 1.36	0.04(0.12) 0.38
Com./economic→fewer tourist activities	−0.02(0.06)–0.27	0.08(0.09) 0.86	−0.12(0.09)-1.32	0.08(0.07) 1.06	−0.09(0.13)–0.82
Destination branding→spreading tourists	−0.09(0.06)–1.40	−0.09(0.07)–0.91	−0.09(0.10)–1.04	−0.10(0.08)–1.26	−0.07(0.11)–0.55
Dest. branding→educate tourists	−0.04(0.07)–0.60	−0.17(0.10)–1.77[c]	0.01(0.10) 0.06	0.03(0.10) 0.34	−0.20(0.11)–1.70[c]
Dest. branding→restrictions on tourist no.	0.03(0.07) 0.44	0.15(0.09) 1.64	−0.05(0.11)–0.60	0.02(0.09) 0.30	0.04(0.13) 0.37
Dest. branding→attract more tourists	−0.01(0.07)–0.04	−0.06(0.08)–0.77	0.02(0.09) 0.18	**−0.15(0.09) 1.96**[b]	**0.28(0.10) 2.85**[a]
Dest. branding→behavioral restrictions	0.03(0.07) 0.46	0.07(0.09) 0.75	−0.01(0.11)–0.08	0.11(0.08) 1.31	−0.17(0.13)–1.40
Dest. branding→fewer tourist activities	−0.04(0.06)–0.62	0.13(0.09) 1.44	−0.16(0.09)–1.82	0.01(0.07) 0.09	−0.09(0.13)–0.82

Model fit (direct model effects): χ^2 = 12.85 (df = 15, *p* = 0.61); NFI = 0.94; AGFI = 0.95; RMSEA = 0.024.
Coefficients in bold are statistically different (*p* ≤ 0.05); only differences in which at least one coefficient was significant were inspected.
Sample size n, groups: 2017–2018 = 108, 2019 = 117; journalist = 150, reader = 75. *N* = 225.
[a] Significant at the 1% level.
[b] Significant at the 5% level.
[c] Marginal significant at the 10% level.

2019. The relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'spreading tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 (β = 0.22, *p* = 0.02) and (marginally) negative for 2019 (β = −0.15, *p* = 0.10; $\Delta\chi^2$ = 4.49, Δdf = 1, *p* = 0.03). In addition, the results showed a positive relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'educate tourists' for 2017–2018 (β = 0.26, *p* < 0.01), while this relationship was non-significant for 2019 (β = −0.13, *p* = 0.20; $\Delta\chi^2$ = 9.89, Δdf = 1, *p* < 0.01).

The relationship between 'commercial/economic' and 'attract more tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 (β = 0.35, *p* < 0.01) and non-significant for 2019 (β = 0.14, *p* = 0.13; $\Delta\chi^2$ = 9.35, Δdf = 1, *p* < 0.01). The results showed no significant moderating effects between the frames 'social enrichment' and 'destination branding' or any of the implications.

Article authorship (journalist vs. reader)
The frame 'responsibility' was differently related to 'fewer tourist activities' for articles written by journalists versus readers. The

relationship was positive for 'journalist' ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$) and non-significant for 'reader' ($\beta = -0.02$, $p = 0.85$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 5.52$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p = 0.02$). The results also showed a positive relationship between 'social conflicts' and 'behavioral restrictions' for 'journalist' ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$), while this relationship was non-significant for 'reader' ($\beta = -0.08$, $p = 0.49$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 3.88$ $\Delta df = 1$, $p = 0.05$). The relationship between 'environment/climate' and 'fewer tourist activities' was non-significant for 'journalist' ($\beta = 0.01$, $p = 0.87$) and positive for 'reader' ($\beta = 0.31$, $p = 0.01$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 4.14$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p = 0.04$), while the relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'fewer tourist activities' was negative for 'journalist' ($\beta = -0.22$, $p = 0.01$) and non-significant for 'reader' ($\beta = 0.12$, $p = 0.29$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 4.09$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p = 0.04$). Finally, the results showed that 'destination branding' was positively related to 'attract more tourists' for 'reader' ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$) and negative for 'journalist' ($\beta = -0.15$, $p = 0.05$; $\Delta\chi^2 = 24.35$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p < 0.01$).

Results summary

The results suggest that the frame content 'responsibility' was positively related to the implication 'fewer tourist activities'. This relationship was moderated by 'article authorship', as the relationship was significant only for articles written by journalists. Furthermore, 'responsibility' was positively related to 'restrictions on tourist numbers' and negatively related to 'attract more tourists' for 2017–2018, while these effects were non-significant for 2019. The frames 'social conflict' and 'human interest factors' were both positively related to 'restrictions on tourist numbers'. In addition, the frames 'social conflict' and 'environment/climate' were both negatively related to 'attract more tourists'. These relationships were moderated by 'article appearance', as the relationships were negative for 2017–2018 and non-significant for 2019.

Several other moderating effects occurred. The relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'spreading tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 and (marginally) negative for 2019, and the relationship between 'human interest factors' and 'educate tourists' was positive for 2017–2018 but non-significant for 2019. The frame 'commercial/economic' was positively related to 'attract more tourists'. This effect was moderated by article appearance, as the relationship was positive for 2017–2018 but was non-significant for 2019. We found a significant, positive relationship between 'environment/climate' and 'fewer tourist activities' for articles written by readers, but this relationship was non-significant for articles written by journalists.

Discussion

Prior research suggests that varying how a problem or an issue is presented or framed can induce people to change their perceptions and focus on different implications (Majer, Trötschel, Galinsky, & Loschelder, 2019). Consistent with this suggestion, the purpose of this research was to investigate how frame contents are related to frame implications. Specifically, we analyzed the possible relationships between seven frame contents and six frame implications across 225 Danish newspaper stories published from 2017 to 2019. Retrieval of the 13 frames through PCA with smoothed tetrachoric correlations and CATPCA led to practically identical results. Frame contents most often reflected in the articles were 'social conflict' and 'commercial/economic', while 'attract more tourists' and 'spreading tourists' were most often reflected in frame implications (Table 3). Analyzing relationships between frame contents and implications helps increase understanding of how public opinion about tourism develops and may also assists tourist managers, politicians, and public authorities wanting to develop, position, and communicate issues related to tourism. The results uncover several significant relationships between frame contents and implications. In addition, they show that 'article appearance' or 'article authorship' moderate some of the relationships and that some moderating effects occur even when the corresponding pooled sample relationship is non-significant.

Protection motivation theory (Rogers, 1983) suggests that when people are confronted with threatening but potentially treatable issues, they are motivated to change their behavior and/or require behavioral change from others. We found that when a third party is assigned 'responsibility', this may be accompanied by a demand for action, such as reducing the number of tourist activities. This relationship was further defined by 'article authorship', as the relationship was significant only for articles written by journalists. Furthermore, the relationship between 'responsibility' and 'restrictions on tourist numbers' was positive for 2017–2018 but non-significant for 2019, while the relationship between 'responsibility' and 'attract more tourists' was negative for 2017–2018 but non-significant for 2019. When taken together, these results imply that the Lonely Planet appointment of Copenhagen as the top city to visit in 2019 might have reduced the demand for action implications from those considered responsible for the city's tourist situation. This is in line with prior research, which suggests that events may affect not only the brand of nations or cities (Knott et al., 2015) but also the political dialogue between local governments and residents (Eshuis, Klijn, & Braun, 2014). The results further suggest that articles written by journalists are more likely to demand action (i.e., 'fewer tourist activities') from those responsible than articles written by readers. A possible explanation is that journalists' often regard their roles as critical to authorities, which in turn may lead to a greater demand for action from these authorities.

People who are emotionally involved may care more about their near surroundings and try to protect them from perceived external threats (Pace et al., 2014; Pandve et al., 2011). This notion is reflected in our results. When tourism is more emotionally/personally framed (i.e., 'social conflict' and 'human interest factors') or framed as a potential threat to locals' daily lives (i.e., 'environment/climate'), the preferred implications are 'restrictions on tourist numbers' or a desire not to 'attract more tourists'. However, both 'article appearance' and 'article authorship' moderate these relationships. Framing tourism as 'social conflict' is negatively related to 'attract more tourists' for 2017–2018, while this relationship is non-significant for 2019, suggesting that after the Lonely Planet appointment, social conflicts were no longer proposed to be solved by attracting fewer tourists; instead, the solution was to spread tourists across the city. The Lonely Planet appointment may also have reduced the focus on tourism as a source of income, as

the framing content 'commercial/economic' was related to 'attract more tourists' for 2017–2018 but was non-significant for 2019.

The results also indicate that readers who are proud of the city (destination branding) are more inclined than journalists to propose that more tourists should be attracted. By contrast, readers seem more concerned than journalists about the local implications of tourists' influence on the environment/climate. Indeed, articles written by readers show a significant, positive relationship between 'environment/climate' and 'fewer tourist activities', while this relationship is non-significant in articles written by journalists.

The results of this research offer several implications to tourist managers, public authorities, and politicians. Tourism is a multifaceted issue. Depending on its framing contents, it may have different implications for the public. This insight is of pivotal importance to tourism managers and authorities, because communication of tourism issues may bring about unintended responses from citizens if it is based on counterproductive framing contents. For example, this study finds that external events (e.g., Lonely Planet recommendation) and article authorship (i.e., journalists vs. newspaper readers) may influence relationships between framing contents and framing implications. Thus, tourist managers and authorities might want to increase focus on positive tourist-related events, as this may reduce demand for fewer tourist activities and likely also feelings of over-tourism. This implication also ties in with the ongoing debate on over-tourism. For example, Buhalis (2020) argues that over-tourism is a simplistic term that media uses to describe overcrowding. Instead, he suggests that strategic tourism management and planning and smart methodologies should develop comprehensive strategies for co-creating value for tourists, residents, and companies. Moreover, the results encourage an increased focus on 'green tourism', as 'environment/climate' was negatively related to 'attract more tourists'. Furthermore, tourist managers and authorities should try to reduce social conflicts between citizens and tourists, as such efforts may lead to more positive attitudes toward tourists.

As with any research, this study has limitations that may guide and inspire further research. First, although the quantitative approach taken herein showed important results, a mixed methodology that also includes qualitative content analyses may shed further light on framing in relation to tourism issues and may elicit even more nuances in the background data. Second, our analysis focused on written content in the form of newspaper articles. Future research could also include television news and social media, which are also relevant for the framing and outcomes of tourism issues and may provide even more insights into this area. Third, among other aspects, this study compared two periods (2017–2018 vs. 2019) to understand the potential influence of the Lonely Planet appointment. While we cannot entirely disregard the possibility that other events or incidents may have influenced the framing of tourism issues during the two periods, no other tourist events seemed to receive the same degree of attention in the periods. In addition, the use of identical coding items for the two periods rules out the possibility that differences in the results are attributed to measurement variations between samples. Fourth, this study concentrated on analyzing newspaper articles from one society/culture. Although the investigated framing contents and implications are relevant for most societies and tourist destinations, the results may suffer from a lack of generalizability to other countries/cultures (Sebri & Zaccour, 2017).

Conclusions

The travel guide publisher Lonely Planet appointed Copenhagen as the top city to travel to in 2019, which attracted wide attention in the Danish media. This study analyzed the possible relationships between seven frame contents and six frame implications across 225 Danish newspaper stories published from 2017 to 2019. The framing of media stories may give rise to particular thoughts that have profound effects on how people perceive issues and problems and how best to deal with them. Taking a new quantitative approach to content analysis, which includes a combination of binary coding, optimal scaling, and path analysis, we provided the first analysis of relationships between frame contents and implications in tourism. Our results uncover several significant relationships between frame contents and implications and also suggest that 'article appearance' and 'article authorship' moderate some of the relationships. Among other implications, the results contribute to the ongoing debate about over-tourism (e.g., Buhalis, 2020; Goodwin, 2017; Milano et al., 2019; Richardson, 2017; Seraphin et al., 2018) by showing how positive tourist-related events may reduce demand for fewer tourists and tourist activities. Overall, the findings of the content analysis may be highly useful to those interested in public opinion about tourism issues. Consequently, further research on tourism could proceed along this avenue by using various forms of data, such as newspaper, social media, and/or television.

Appendix A

Frame contents

- Responsibility
  - o R1. Does the story suggest that some level of government has the ability to alleviate identified issues/problems?
  - o R2. Does the story suggest that some level of the government is responsible for identified issues/problems?
  - o R3. Does the story suggest that an individual (or group of people in society) is responsible for identified issues/problems?
  - o R4. Does the story suggest an issue that requires urgent action by someone?

- Social conflict
  - o Conflict1. Does the story provide an example of a social conflict?
  - o Conflict2. Does the story suggest that interactions between locals and tourists may create tension?
  - o Conflict3. Does the story mention any complaints/dissatisfaction regarding tourists' behavior?

o Conflict4. Does the story offer specific social prescriptions about how to avoid conflicts?

- Social enrichment
  o SE1. Does the story provide an example of a social enrichment?
  o SE2. Does the story suggest that interactions between locals and tourists may create positive experiences?
  o SE3. Does the story mention any satisfaction or pleasantness with tourists' behavior?
  o SE4. Does the story offer specific social prescriptions about how to welcome tourists or make them feel at home?

- Environment/climate
  o EM1. Does the story contain any environmental message?
  o EM2. Does the story make reference to climate issues?
  o EM3. Does the story offer specific prescriptions about how to behave in an environmentally friendly way?
  o EM4. Does the story provide examples of environmental issues/problems?

- Human interest factors
  o HI1. Does the story provide a human example or 'human face' on the issue?
  o HI2. Does the story employ adjectives or personal vignettes that generate feelings of outrage, empathy/caring, sympathy, or compassion?
  o HI3. Does the story emphasize how individuals and groups are affected by the issue/problem?
  o HI4. Does the story go into the private or personal lives of the actors?

- Commercial/economic
  o COM1. Is there a mention of financial gains now or in the future?
  o COM2. Is there a mention of the degree of income involved?
  o COM3. Is there a reference to economic consequences of welcoming/not welcoming tourists?

- Destination branding
  o PB1. Does the story make reference to city–branding issues?
  o PB2. Is there a mention of local city/culture?
  o PB3. Does the story emphasize that locals should be delighted, proud, or encouraged to showcase their city?

Frame implications

- Spreading tourists
  o ST1. Does the story suggest that tourists should be urged to visit other areas of Copenhagen than the city center?
  o ST2. Does the story suggest that tourists should be urged to visit other areas of Denmark?

- Educate tourists
  o ET1. Does the story suggest that tourists should be 'educated' on how to behave?
  o ET2. Does the story suggest that tourists need to be better informed about local traditions, culture, and/or behavioral 'rules'?

- Restrictions on the number of tourists
  o RT1. Does the story suggest that restrictions should be put on the number of tourists?
  o RT2. Does the story suggest that there is no room for more tourists?

- Attract more tourists
  o AM1. Does the story suggest that more tourists should be attracted?
  o AM2. Does the story suggest that there is still room for more tourists?

- Behavioral restrictions
  o BR1. Does the story suggest that behavioral restrictions should be imposed (e.g., music in public places, beer-bikes, eating in public places, Airbnb restrictions, among others)?
  o BR2. Does the story suggest the creation of 'silent areas' or the like?

- Fewer tourist activities
  o FTA1. Does the story suggest a reduction in the number of tourist activities (e.g., sight-seeing buses, sight-seeing boats, exhibitions, etc.)?
  o FTA2. Does the story suggest that some holidaymakers should be banned?
  o FTA3. Does the story suggest that the establishment of new bars, restaurants, hotels, or the like, should be prohibited or reduced?

Moderators

- M1. Article appearance: before (i.e., 2017–2018) vs. during 2019
- M2. Journalist vs. reader written article

References

Airey, D. (1983). European government approaches to tourism. *Tourism Management, 4*(4), 234–244.

AIU (2020). Avisen i undervisningen. Berlingske Media. Retrieved January 3, 2020 from https://aiu.dk/mediehandbogen/medier/genrer/laeserbrev/.

Aklin, M., & Urpelainen, J. (2013). Debating clean energy: Frames, counter frames, and audiences. *Global Environmental Change, 23*(5), 1225–1232.

Albrecht, G. (2010). Solastalgia and the creation of new ways of living. In S. Pilgrim, & J. N. Pretty (Eds.). *Nature and culture: Rebuilding lost connections* (pp. 217–234). London: Earthscan.

Aragão e Pina, J., Passos, A. M., Carvalho, H., & Travis Maynard, M. (2019). To be or not to be an excellent football referee: Different experts' viewpoints. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 37*(6), 692–700.

Balasubramanyan, R., Cohen, W. W., Pierce, D., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2012). Modeling polarizing topics: When do different political communities respond differently to the same news? *Proceedings of the sixth international AAAI conference on weblogs and social media* (pp. 18–25). .

Barnes, S. J., Mattsson, J., & Sørensen, F. (2014). Destination brand experience and visitor behavior: Testing a scale in the tourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research, 48*, 121–139.

Blevins, D., & Ragozzino, R. (2018). On social media and the formation of organizational reputation: How social media are increasing cohesion between organizational reputation and traditional media for stakeholders. *Academy of Management Review, 44*, 219–222.

Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(2), 528–546.

Buhalis, D. (2020). *Karantzavelou V.: Dimitrios Buhalis (Bournemouth University) "There is no Overtourism - Only badly managed tourism".* Travel Daily News. February 17. Url: https://www.traveldailynews.com/post/dimitrios-buhalis-bournemouth-university-there-is-no-overtourism-only-badly-managed-tourism (accessed April 22, 2020) .

Bulunmaz, B. (2012). A difficult choice for newspapers: Advertisers or readers? *Global Media Journal: Turkish Edition, 2*(4), 1–20.

Cheung, K. S., & Li, L.-H. (2019). Understanding visitor–resident relations in overtourism: Developing resilience for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27*(8), 1197–1216.

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science, 10*, 103–126.

Christensen, A. M. G., & Beckmann, S. C. (1998). *Consumers' perspectives on tourism and the environment. Working paperno. 10.* Copenhagen Business School.

Clausing, J. (2019). As 2019 dawns, destinations' actions to curb overtourism grow in severity. *Travel Weekly, 78*(3), 1, 48.

Clavé, S. A. (2019). Urban tourism and walkability. In E. Fayos-Solà, & C. Cooper (Eds.). *The future of tourism* (pp. 195–211). Cambridge: Springer.

Comim, F., & Amaral, P. V. (2013). The human values index: Conceptual foundations and evidence from Brazil. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 37*(6), 1221–1241.

Croes, R., Rivera, M. A., Semrad, K., & Khalizadeh, J. (2017). Happiness and tourism: Evidence from Aruba, Institute for Tourism Studies. Retrieved November 18, 2019 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318492963_Happiness_and_Tourism_Evidence_from_Aruba.

Cumming, G. (2009). Inference by eye: Reading the overlap of independent confidence intervals. *Statistics in Medicine, 28*, 205–220.

da Silva, M. T. (2012). Newsroom practices and letters-to-the-editor. *Journalism Practice, 6*(2), 250–263.

Danish Statistical Bureau (2020). Hotel nights in Copenhagen. Retrieved January 13, 2020 from https://www.statistikbanken.dk/HOTEL1.

Debelak, R., & Tran, U. S. (2013). Principal component analysis of smoothed tetrachoric correlation matrices as a measure of dimensionality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 73*(1), 63–77.

Dirikx, A., & Gelders, D. (2010). To frame is to explain: A deductive frame-analysis of Dutch and French climate change coverage during the annual UN conferences of the parties. *Public Understanding of Science, 19*(6), 732–742.

Dixon, G. N., & Clarke, C. E. (2013). Heightening uncertaintyaround certain science: Media coverage, false balance, andthe autism-vaccine controversy. *Science Communication, 35*(3), 358–382.

Dredge, D. (2017). "Overtourism" old wine in new bottles? Retrieved April 22, 2020 from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/overtourism-old-wine-new-bottles-dianne-dredge.

Druckman, J. N., Jacobs, L. R., & Ostermeier, E. (2004). Candidate strategies to prime issues and image. *Journal of Politics, 66*, 1205–1227.

Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). *An introduction to the bootstrap.* London: Chapman & Hall.

Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58.

Entman, R. M. (2004). *Projects of power: Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eshuis, J., Klijn, E.-H., & Braun, E. (2014). Place marketing and citizen participation: Branding as strategy to address the emotional dimension of policy making? *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 80*(1), 151–171.

Estol, J., & Font, X. (2016). European tourism policy: Its evolution and structure. *Tourism Management, 52*(February), 230–241.

European Parliament (2018). Research for TRAN Committee - overtourism: Impact and possible policy responses. *Policy Department for Structural and Cohesion Policies Directorate-General for Internal Policies PE 629.184*.

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology, 95*, 1–37.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York: Routledge.

Geschke, D., Sassenberg, K., Ruhrmann, G., & Sommer, D. (2010). Effects of linguistic abstractness in the mass media: How newspaper articles shape readers' attitudes toward migrants. *Journal of Media Psychology, 22*, 99–104.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* New York: Harper & Row.

Goodwin, H. (2017). *The challenge of overtourism, responsible tourism partnership.* (Working paper).

Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hessing, M. (2003). Green mail: The social construction of environmental issues through letters to the editor. *Canadian Journal of Communication, 28*, 25–42.

Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2003). Reconciliation tourism: Tourism healing divided societies!. *Tourism Recreation Research, 28*(3), 35–44.

Higham, N. (2002). Computing the nearest correlation matrix: A problem from finance. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis, 22*, 329–343.

Horesta (2018). København forudser fordobling af antal turister. Retrieved November 20, 2019 from https://www.horesta.dk/presseklip/2018/oktober/koebenhavn-forudser-fordobling-af-antal-turister/.

Hospers, G.-J. (2019). Overtourism in European cities: From challenges to coping strategies. *CESifo forum. Vol. 20. CESifo forum* (pp. 20–24). Munich: ifo Institute-Leibniz Institute for Economic Research, University of Munich.

Huang, M. C.-J., Cheng, Y.-H., Chuang, S.-C., & Kuo, K.-S. (2016). Framing makes tourists more environmentally conservative. *Annals of Tourism Research, 61*(November), 242–244.

Infomedia (2020). www.Infomedia.dk.

Kamburugamuwa, A. (2014). *Sri Lanka to attract more tourists. Lanka business report, 2-2*.

Kaplan, D. (2009). *Structural equation modeling–foundations and extension, advance quantitative techniques in the social sciences series* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kline, S., Karel, A., & Chatterjee, K. (2006). Covering adoption: General depictions in broadcast news. *Family Relations, 55*(4), 487–498.

Knol, D. L., & ten Berge, J. M. (1989). Least-squares approximation of an improper correlation matrix by a proper one. *Psychometrika, 54*, 53–61.

Knott, B., Fyall, A., & Jones, I. (2015). The nation branding opportunities provided by a sport mega-event: South Africa and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 4*, 46–56.

Lalicic, L. (2019). Solastalgia: An application in the overtourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102766 press.

Lee, T. H., Jan, F. H., & Yang, C. C. (2013). Conceptualizing and measuring environmentally responsible behaviors from the perspective of community-based tourists. *Tourism Management, 36*(June), 454–468.

Lord, F. M. (1980). *Application of item response theory to practical testing problems.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lorenzo-Seva, U., & Ferrando, P. J. (2012). TETRA-COM: A comprehensive SPSS program for estimating the tetrachoric correlation. *Behavior Research Methods, 44*, 1191–1196.

Lorenzo-Seva, U., & Ferrando, P. J. (2019). *FACTOR.* Rovira i Virgili University. Retrieved November 2019 from http://psico.fcep.urv.es/utilitats/factor/Download.html.

Majer, J. M., Trötschel, R., Galinsky, A. D., & Loschelder, D. D. (2019). Open to offers, but resisting requests: How the framing of anchors affects motivation and negotiated outcomes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26*, 1–18.

McComas, K., & Shanahan, J. (1999). Telling stories about global climate change: Measuring the impact of narratives on issue cycles. *Communication Research, 26*(1), 30–57.

McCombs, M. E., Shaw, D. L., & Weaver, D. (1997). *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Meulman, J. J., & Heiser, W. J. (2001). *SPSS categories 11.0.* Chicago: SPSS.

Mhanna, R., Blake, A., & Jones, I. (2019). Spreading tourists around host countries of mega sport events: A strategy to overcome over tourism in host cities. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, 11*(5), 611–626.

Milano, C., Novelli, M., & Cheer, J. M. (2019). Overtourism and tourismphobia: A journey through four decades of tourism development, planning and local concerns. *Tourism Planning & Development, 16*(4), 353–357.

Mostafanezhad, M., & Norum, R. (2018). Tourism in the post-selfie era. *Annals of Tourism Research, 70*(May), 131–132.

Neuman, W. R., Just, M. R., & Crigler, A. N. (1992). *Common knowledge.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Oh, J., & Zhong, W. (2016). How to attract more tourists to Korea? Possible collaborations with China. *Asia Pacific Management Review, 21*(4), 239–243.

Oklevik, O., Gössling, S., Hall, M. C., Steen Jacobsen, J. K., Grøtte, I. P., & McCabe, S. (2019). Overtourism, optimisation, and destination performance indicators: A case study of activities in Fjord Norway. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27*(12), 1804–1824.

Ooi, C.-S. (2002). Contrasting strategies: Tourism in Denmark and Singapore. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(3), 689–706.

Pace, U., Zappulla, C., Guzzo, G., Di Maggio, R., Laudani, C., & Cacioppo, M. (2014). Internet addiction, temperament, and the moderator role of family emotional involvement. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 12*(1), 52–63.

Paige, R. C. (2009). Educational promotion strategies: Brokering culture between tourists and tourist destinations. *Journal of Promotion Management, 15*(1/2), 286–301.

Pandve, H. T., Chawla, P. S., Fernandez, K., Singru, S. A., Khismatrao, D., & Pawar, S. (2011). Assessment of awareness regarding climate change in an urban community. *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 15*(3), 109–112.

Park, S.-Y., & Petrick, J. F. (2006). Destinations' perspectives of branding. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(1), 262–265.

Paveglio, T., Norton, T., & Carroll, M. S. (2011). Fanning the flames? Media coverage during wildfire events and its relation to broader societal understandings of the hazard. *Human Ecology Review, 18*(1), 41–52.

Pearson, K. (1900). Mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution in the inheritance of characteristics not capable of exact quantitative measurement. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A, 195*, 79–150.

Pedhazur, E., & Pedhazur-Schmelkin, L. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integral approach.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pennington-Gray, L., Reisinger, Y., Kim, J. E., & Thapa, B. (2005). Do US tour operators' brochures educate thetourist on culturally responsible behaviours? A case study for Kenya. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 11*(3), 265–284.

Popescu, D., Nicolae, V., State, C., Pavel, I. M., & Dinu, A. (2017). Empirical study on identifying collaborative practices in local communities. *Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research, 4*(51), 73–90.

Price, V., Tewksbury, D., & Powers, E. (1997). Switching trains of thought: The impact of news frames on readers' cognitive responses. *Communication Research, 24*, 481–506.

Reinhart, H. C. (2007). Framing the biotechnology debate: A textual analysis of editorials and letters to the editor in the St. Louis post-dispatch. *Global Media Journal, 6*(10), 1–19.

Richardson, D. (2017). *Suffering the strain of tourism.* (Retrieved from TTG@wtm).

Richardson, J. E., & Franklin, B. (2004). Letters of intent: Election campaigning and orchestrated public debate in local newspapers' letters to the editor. *Political Communication, 21*(4), 459–478.

Rogers, R. W. (1983). Cognitive and psychological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: A revised theory of protection motivation. In J. T. Cacioppo, & R. E. Petty (Eds.). *Social psychophysiology: A sourcebook* (pp. 153–177). New York: Guilford.

Sabatini, F., Modena, F., & Tortia, E. (2012). Do cooperative enterprises create social trust? *Economics and econometrics research institute (EERI) research paper series no. 10/2012.*

Saukani, N., & Ismail, N. A. (2019). Identifying the components of social capital by categorical principal component analysis (CATPCA). *Social Indicators Research, 141*(2), 631–655.

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication, 49*(1), 103–122.

Sebri, M., & Zaccour, G. (2017). Cross-country differences in private-label success: An exploratory approach. *Journal of Business Research, 80*(November), 116–126.

Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication, 50*(2), 93–109.

Seraphin, H., Sheeran, P., & Pilato, M. (2018). Over-tourism and the fall of Venice as a destination. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 9*, 374–376.

Shaw, D. L., Mousa, I. S., Vargo, C. J., Minooie, M., & Cole, R. (2016). The agenda setting in the digital age: How we use media to monitor civic life and reframe community. *Jordan Journal of Social Sciences, 9*(1), 125–139.

Shirley, S. H., Liao, Y., & Rosenthal, S. (2015). Applying the theory of planned behavior and media dependency theory: Predictors of public pro-environmental behavioral intentions in Singapore. *Environmental Communication, 9*(1), 77–99.

Sinclair-Maragh, G., Gursoy, D., & Vieregge, M. (2015). Residents' perceptions toward tourism development: A factor-cluster approach. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 4*, 36–45.

Sniderman, P. M., & Theriault, S. M. (2004). The structure of political argument and the logic of issue framing. In W. E. Saris, & P. M. Sniderman (Eds.). *Studies in public opinion* (pp. 133–165). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Souleles, C. G. (2018). The role of traditional media in the digital age. *Executive Forums*. May. Retrieved April 23, 2020 from https://www.executiveforums.com/single-post/2018/04/30/The-role-of-traditional-media-in-the-digital-age.

Sparks, C. (1992). Popular journalism: Theories and practice. In P. Dahlgren, & C. Sparks (Eds.). *Journalism and popular culture* (pp. 24–44). London: SAGE.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2002). *Methods of text and discourse analysis.* London: Sage.

Tran, U. S., & Formann, A. K. (2009). Performance of parallel analysis in retrieving unidimensionality in the presence of binary data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*, 50–61.

Turen, R. (2012). Salami on the Spanish steps. *Travel Weekly, 71*(44), 85.

Weber, P. (2014). Discussions in the comments section: Factors influencing participation and interactivity in online newspapers' reader comments. *New Media & Society, 16*(6), 941–957.

White, P., Morgan, N., Pritchard, A., & Heimtun, B. (2019). Framing the land of the northern lights. *Annals of Tourism Research, 78*(September), 1–11.

Wonderful Copenhagen (2020). Press room. Url https://www.wonderfulcopenhagen.com/, Accessed date: 25 April 2020.

Wu, B., Xue, L., Morrison, A. M., & Leung, X. Y. (2012). Frame analysis on Golden Week policy reform in China. *Annals of Tourism Research, 39*(2), 842–862.

Yazdi, S. K., & Khanalizadeh, B. (2017). Tourism demand: A panel data approach. *Current Issues in Tourism, 20*(8), 787–800.

Zuo, B., & Huang, S. (2018). Revisiting the tourism-led economic growth hypothesis: The case of China. *Journal of Travel Research, 57*(2), 151–163.

Torben Hansen is a professor at the Department of Marketing, Copenhagen Business School (CBS). He is former chairman of the Danish Money and Pension Panel. His main fields of research are consumer behavior and marketing research methods. He has authored several academic articles and books. Also, he is co-authoring the European edition of Marketing Management and has worked as a consultant for many organizations.