CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Twenty first century heralds a new form of competition in the market place. The traditional battle for the customers’ wallets among the business entities got amplified and geographies started competing among each other for trades, investments and businesses. Today nations and regions are competing for tourists (domestic and international), investments (FDIs and domestic), students and exports (refer to Table 1). This kind of rivalry among regional entities has resulted in gradual development of a new stream of marketing in the form of place branding (Anholt, 2005, 2010; Dinnie, 2004). Place branding tries to incorporate the traditional and nontraditional approaches of the marketing discipline with particular focus on branding strategies for promotion, development and enhancement of saleability of a particular place or region towards its prospective customers that include tourists, investors including foreign direct investments (FDIs), students and exports. Table 1 suggests that countries that are considered as powerful place brands tend to enjoy increased inflow of FDIs, tourists and students. This in turn makes a place a desired location for prospective investment as the returns can be high.

As of now the term ‘place branding’ is yet to get a well defined meaning (Anholt, 2005). Anholt (2003) opines that nation branding is citizen driven exercise(s) who are both the sender and the receiver of nation branding messages. “Country branding occurs when public speaks to public; when a substantial proportion of the population of the country – not just civil servants and paid figureheads – gets behind the strategy and lives it out in their everyday dealings with the outside world” (p. 123). Zanker and Braun (2010) define place brand as “a network of associations in the consumers’ mind based on the visual, verbal, and behavioral expression of a place, which is
embodied through the aims, communication, values, and the general culture of the place’s stakeholders and the overall place design.” (p.4). Rainisto (2003) mentions place branding and marketing as the process of creating place identity. From the above mentioned definitions a conclusion can be drawn that place branding involves, associations (image) and behavior from the customer’s perspective based on the values and culture that the place offers. These in the branding context, can be alluded to customer based brand equity (CBBE) (Keller, 1993; Aaker, 1996a) that results in higher premium for the product or service (Pope, 1993; Wood, 2000) and/or loyalty from the customer (Lassar et al., 1995). Therefore, it can be deduced that like a product or service a place can be considered a brand and thus, customer based brand equity concepts can be applied to places. It is here, that the research is trying to address the gap of measurement of customer based brand equity for a place. Subsequently, the affects of determinants of place brand equity on the dimensions of brand equity of the place would also be addressed.

Over the years, marketers and scholars have observed that certain places (cities, regions and nations) have affected customer’s imageries (positively or negatively) because of opportunities, resources and products they offer and thus they command a price premium and loyalty from customers for their specific offerings. For example, cities like Venice or regions like Tuscany (Italy) and Santorini (Greece) command a price premium from the tourists especially honeymooners (www.usnews.com), French perfumes, Swiss chocolates and Japanese electronic goods not only command price premium but also have very strong brand loyalties. Places thus, act as brands themselves and contextually, have developed brand equity for themselves that distinguishes them from the rest of the world. In this context, the opinion put forward by Kotler and Gertner (2002, 2004) that places help in information processing and heuristics by the
customers regarding products and services offered, can be attributed to the a place brand equity of a particular city, region or nation.

Balmer and Gray (2003), opine that “corporate level brands can also be applied to countries, regions and cities”. However, as Warnaby (2009) points out that the context specificity of places cannot be accommodated by the traditional branding theory and therefore, a serious limitation exists in this fledgling area of nontraditional branding strategies. This opinion testifies to a great extent why nation branding perspective is at present the most popular approach of theorists and practitioners to consider place branding strategies.

The domain of place branding in itself is very new and is still in nascent stage. Most of the literatures thus, deal with place branding and how it has affected one or many of the dimensions of brand equity of a particular place or nation as the place. Moreover, the context of brand equity for a place has predominantly been applied in the context of destination branding that deals with tourism marketing and Tourism Destination Image (TDI) and its antecedents and consequences thereof (Pike, 2007; 2009; Elliott et al., 2010; Gartner and Konecnik Ruzzier; 2010). It must be kept in mind that destination in place branding literature has tended to relate to tourism only (Hanna and Rowley, 2008). In addition, it must be mentioned that place branding has had been studied over a long period of time from the aspect of country of origin (COO) effects and Product Country Image (PCI). Therefore, place brand equity from the perspective of country image, product quality and product loyalty has its fare share of research endeavors (Parameswaran and Pisharodi, 1994; Agrawal and Kamakura, 1999; Pappu et al., 2007, Fetscherin and Toncar 2010; Prendergast et al., 2010).
Scholars of place branding opine that place branding can be studied and/or analyzed from the aspects of regional identity and public diplomacy. Fan (2010) in his study of nation branding mentions four sources that have contributed to nation branding. These sources are country of origin (COO) (Papadopulous and Heslop 1993; 2002), place and/or destination branding (Kotler et al. 1993a; Kotler and Gertner, 2002; 2004), national identity (Smith 1991; Bond et al., 2001) and public diplomacy (Ham 2001; Melissen 2005a; Fan 2008).

In this dissertation, the researcher cites literature that is not restricted to only particular place or region but nation branding as well as nation is largest sovereign the manifestation of a place or region. Even the researchers on place branding use nations as focal point of study on place branding strategies. In the following review of literature, the researcher starts off with nation branding (as an enlarged place branding study) and its antecedents. Subsequently, determinants of nation brands are analyzed. It must be mentioned that other than country of origin studies (COO) the other three facets, namely, destination branding (tourism), public diplomacy and national identity can be applied to a particular place or region as well. For example, research on destination branding that has been conducted on New Zealand can also be applied to one of the country’s provinces as the principles are similar. Similarly, for a country like Isle of Man, because of its low internal cultural differences, national identity can be applied to a particular place or institution. The researchers also review literature dealing with place branding for particular regions within a country to get an understanding of the variability that may exist between nation branding and region branding.

Investment attractiveness which is one of the critical dimensions that acts both as antecedent and consequence of place branding and thus place brand equity has been generally been overlooked. Scholars have considered investment (FDI and domestic) as just a consequence of place
branding. Investment attractiveness thus, generally cannot considered be an established dimension of place brand equity though there is voluminous research in that context in the domains of international business (Agarwal and Ramaswamy, 1992; Cheng and Kwan, 2000; Head and Mayer, 2004; Devereaux et al., 2007). To the best of researcher’s knowledge two distinct research that studies place brand equity from investment attractiveness are Jacobsen (2009) and Matlovicova (2010).

Table 1

Investments, tourists and students inflow data for countries with highest brand index ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Anholt-GfK Roper 2012</th>
<th>Future Brand 2012-13</th>
<th>FDI (US$ millions)</th>
<th>Tourist (US millions)</th>
<th>Student (Person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>339741</td>
<td>3931976</td>
<td>103,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1162196</td>
<td>1321352</td>
<td>32,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1053956</td>
<td>1094961</td>
<td>46,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>716704</td>
<td>716344</td>
<td>34,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>347163</td>
<td>376181</td>
<td>11,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>214880</td>
<td>205361</td>
<td>13,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>513451</td>
<td>610517</td>
<td>29,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>617703</td>
<td>665596</td>
<td>14,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>591873</td>
<td>636972</td>
<td>15,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>328058</td>
<td>356887</td>
<td>38,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data collected on June 2013 and hence incomplete


The chapter proceeds to explain the research objectives and their related research hypotheses. Subsequently, the required models are specified. The key outcomes are then discussed and their implications are expressed, limitations of the study are then specified.

The next chapter elucidates on explaining the constructs used in the study. After this, review of literature is made and the gap(s) pertaining to place brand equity is/ are identified. In Chapter 3, research scope arising from the gap(s) in the literature is discussed and research objective(s) and
research hypotheses are explained in detail. The third chapter leads to chapter explaining the research plan and research methodologies. In Chapter V the findings are discussed in details and inferences made are elaborated. The dissertation culminates in Chapter VI with discussions on the research made and specifications of future course of research.

1.1 Research Objectives and Research Hypotheses

The primary objective of the study is to develop a theoretical framework of place brand equity from the perspectives of destination branding, public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness. Subsequently, the study empirically tests the model. For the purpose of developing the model of customer based place brand equity (CBPBE) the generic customer based brand equity (CBBE) model of Aaker (1996b) is considered and adapted to suit place branding context. Therefore, to suit ‘place’ as a brand the study approaches CBPBE from the dimensions of brand awareness, brand image, perceived quality and brand loyalty. Thus, the primary objective of the study is to check the inter-relationships of brand awareness, brand image, perceived quality and brand loyalty with brand equity of a place when considered from individual aspects of destination branding, public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness and when all of the four perspectives are taken as a whole.

Based on the primary objective, the following hypotheses are developed:

Hypotheses 1a: In case of destination branding, brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality are antecedents of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 1b: In case of destination branding, brand loyalty is consequence of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.
Hypothesis 2a: In case of public diplomacy, brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality are antecedents of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 2b: In case of public diplomacy, brand loyalty is consequence of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 3a: In case of regional identity, brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality are antecedents of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 3b: In case of regional identity, brand loyalty is consequence of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 4a: In case of investment attractiveness, brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality are antecedents of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 4b: In case of investment attractiveness, brand loyalty is consequence of brand equity and would have positive relation with brand equity.

Subsequently, the hypothesis for the final CBPBE model that considers all the four aspects of place branding is developed.

Hypothesis 5a: Brand awareness, brand image and perceived quality considered from the perspectives of destination branding, public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness would have positive relation with brand equity.

Hypothesis 5b: Brand loyalty considered from the perspectives of destination branding, public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness would have positive relation with brand equity.
To measure the dimensions of CBPBE, the study requires instruments that measure brand equity of place from the aforesaid perspectives. In this regard, an instrument to measure CBPBE exists for destination brands in the form of consumer based brand equity for tourism destination (CBBETD) scale (Gartner and Konecnik- Ruzzier, 2010). That instrument is adapted to suit the place (West Bengal) considered for the study. However, there is no instrument that measure brand equity of a place from the perspectives of public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness. These instruments are to be developed in the study. The adaption and development of instruments to measure CBPBE is the secondary objectives of the study.

The process of fulfilling these objectives would generate data about perceptions of West Bengal when considered from the four mentioned perspectives. These data can be used for understanding and analyzing the impact of the dimensions of brand equity on the overall brand equity of West Bengal. So this is an additional objective.

### 1.2 Findings

The study resulted in adaption of the CBBETD scale and creation of three other scales that measure CBPBE from the perspectives of public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness respectively. These three scales are observed to be internally consistent and structurally robust for measuring the phenomenon of place brand equity. The scales are then used to develop the model of CBPBE when the four above mentioned aspects are considered together. The model is subsequently tested and found to be robust. In addition, perceptions of West Bengal’s overall place brand equity are also discovered and the contributions of each dimensions of CBPBE on overall brand equity of the state are analyzed.
1.3 Construct Definition

1.3.1 Place branding

Skinner (2008) is one of the earliest researchers to highlight the difference between the concepts of place marketing and place branding which are often used interchangeably in academic literature. The researcher opines that ‘place marketing’ (p. 923) has a wider span and relates to issues regarding the place’s overall management and is in similar lines with the management of a corporation while considering all the stakeholders. On the other hand ‘place branding’ (p. 923) is the creation of brand identity and can be linked to promotional activities and therefore relates to the domain of marketing communication.

Hanna and Rowley (2011, 2013) developed a strategic place-brand management (SPBM) model. They conclude that strategic place brand management encompasses brand evaluation or the feedback about the brand image; stakeholder engagement and management; infrastructure; brand identity which is the brand essence; brand architecture; brand articulation or the process of expressing the brand; brand communication; brand experience during the consumer’s engagement(s) with the place brand; and Word of Mouth among consumers about the brand experience(s). Of these, infrastructure is the existence and accessibility of tangible (functional) and intangible (experiential) place attributes; brand architecture is designing and/or management of the place brand portfolios and the sub brands; and brand communications is the focus on the communication of the brand identity. Here, it must be mentioned that some of these attributes suggest being inter-related and are extensions of other mentioned attributes.

Recently, Aitken and Campelo (2011) have proposed four elements that sum up the overall experience of a place and therefore are the essence of place branding. They term them as the
‘four Rs of place branding’ (p. 913). These are: rights; roles; responsibilities; and relationships. Rights are those rights or claims that the stakeholders enjoy being a part of that place; the rights determine the roles to be played within the community by the stakeholders; the rights and roles directly affect the responsibilities to be carried out by the stakeholders as these rights determine their roles and makes it imperative for the stakeholders to fulfill their objectives; and finally the relationships are the ways the stakeholders connect to that place given their rights, roles and responsibilities. This approach suggests that the four Rs relate more to place branding from destination marketing perspective than any other approaches namely, country of origin effects, public diplomacy, regional identity and investment attractiveness.

1.3.2 Customer based brand equity

Customer based brand equity (CBBE) is defined as a set of all assets and liabilities that can attached to a brand (name and/or symbol) that gives additional value to the customer consuming the product or service (Aaker, 1996b). This ‘value added’ that the product or service provides results in price premium and/or customer loyalty towards the brand (Keller, 1993; Aaker, 1996b; Pitta and Katsanis, 1995). Aaker (1996a, 1996b) opines that CBBE has five components, which are: a) brand awareness – the customer’s knowledge of the presence of the brand and subsequently, his/her capacity to recall the brand; b) brand association – all the associations or cues that the customer can relate with the brand. In literature, brand image has often been used as a surrogate for brand associations; c) perceived quality – the perceptions about the quality of the branded product/service offered; d) brand loyalty- the loyalty of the customer towards the product. Generally, loyalty has been measured through re-purchase intentions and/or actions and positive/ negative word-of- mouth (Oliver, 1999); and e) proprietary assets like patents and trademarks.
Keller (1993) opines CBBE as “the differential effect of brand knowledge on consumer response to the marketing of the brand” (p.2) and is a process that occurs “when the consumer is familiar with the brand and holds some favorable, strong, and unique brand associations in memory” (Keller, 1993, p.2). The author posits that the primary associations include the perceived benefits and quality of the given brand. Thus, the approach to CBBE is similar to that of Aaker (1996a; 1996b) where the former mentions about differential effect in response by the consumer (brand loyalty) towards the product/service due to the brand.

It must be kept in mind that proprietary brand assets like trade mark or copyright gives the owner to sole right to use the brand and thus leverage from its equity. However, such rights need not be present for all brands. Most of the brand equity measurement scales that approach CBBE from Aaker (1996b) perspective measures brand equity on the basis of brand awareness, brand association (image), perceived quality and brand loyalty (Yoo and Donthu, 2001; Washburn and Plank, 2002; Netemeyer et al., 2004). In the context of place brand equity, handful of places like Darjeeling (India) for tea, Champagne (France) for champagne or Scotland for scotch whisky hold Geographical Indications (GIs) and can leverage on proprietary brand assets. Therefore, generally proprietary brand assets are not considered as a measure of brand equity when considering place brand equity (Gartner and Konecni-Kuzier, 2010).

1.3.3 Destination branding

Destination branding at its very basic level implies branding of a tourism destination or a place. Branding has been defined as “The process involved in creating a unique name and image for a product in the consumers’ mind, mainly through advertising campaigns with a consistent theme. Branding aims to establish a significant and differentiated presence in the market that
attracts and retains loyal customers” (www.businessdictionary.com). Now, destination branding serves the purpose of creating unique images that a potential tourist can associate with a particular place or tourism destination. Ekenci (2003) opines that destination branding involves creation of a strong emotional attachment between the prospective tourist and the destination or the place through the creation of those unique images. Successful destination branding involves establishment of a relationship between the tourist and the destination by satisfying the former’s emotional (example, picturesque and fun) and basic (example, eating and shopping) needs. Ritchie and Ritchie (1998, p: 17) define destination brand as “A Destination Brand is a name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic that both identifies and differentiates the destination; furthermore, it conveys the promise of a memorable travel experience that is uniquely associated with the destination; it also serves to consolidate and reinforce the recollection of pleasurable memories of the destination experience.” Thus, it can be said that destination branding involves creation of distinctive emotional associations and/or images between the place and the tourist through opportunities and experiences provided to the later by the place. Therefore, the essence of destination branding is the creation of destination image.

Tourism destination image (TDI) or destination image has seen voluminous research conducted in the domain of tourism research and tourism marketing. Destination has been described as a location visited by a tourist that can be a country (Chon, 1991; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993), region (Ahmed, 1991, Fakeye and Crompton, 1991) or even a city (Dadgostar and Isotalo, 1995; Opermann, 1996). Therefore, destination image is the image(s) that an individual has about a particular destination given the beliefs, ideas he/she has about the destination. Baloglu and McCleary (1999, p: 870) defined destination image as “an attitudinal construct consisting of an individual’s mental representation of knowledge (beliefs), feelings, and global impression about
an object or destination”.

Similarly, TDI is defined as the effect of ideas, beliefs and impressions of an individual about a destination (Kotler et al., 1993b).

1.3.4 Public diplomacy

There is a paucity of a uniformly accepted definition of public diplomacy and thus the problem with developing a model of public diplomacy lies with the problem definition itself (Gilboa, 2008). Scholars and practitioners have been observed to come out with varied forms of incomplete and confusing definitions of the domain. Malone (1995, p: 199) defined the subject as “direct communication with foreign peoples, with the aim of affecting their thinking, and ultimately, that of their own governments.” However, the definition neither states the individual or body or machinery that control the communication, nor it speaks about the kind of information that is being passed. Subsequently, Tuch (1990) and Frederick (1993) add the communication source or controller of the communication and the information type respectively. Signitzer and Coombs (1992) opined Public relations (PR) and public diplomacy are very similar because of their similar objectives and usages of similar tools. They defined public diplomacy as “the way in which both government and private individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on another government’s foreign policy decisions” (p.138). This new approach to public diplomacy is crucial for the evolution of the subject as it removed the myopic idea that public diplomacy is only made by governments.

Gilboa (2008) opined that modern public diplomacy has been contributed a great deal from related social sciences and should therefore; incorporate their contributions in defining the domain. Experts have suggested that public diplomacy is about yielding ‘soft power’
(international relations) through communication (Nye, 2004; Melissen, 2005b). They have operationalized public diplomacy as official policy that translates soft power resources into actions. The second perspective to public diplomacy is the relation between the media and government to frame public opinion. The cascading activation model of Entman (2004) connects policy, media and public opinion. The modern trend in public diplomacy research is approaching the domain from public relations (PR) theories. Ham (2002, p: 268) commented that “PD and PR- marketing are merging”. Wang (2006b) suggested that managing national reputation is the focal point of public diplomacy. Scholars in the domain of foreign affairs identified nation branding as gaining prominence day by day and acts as connect between the two distinct domain of branding (marketing) and public diplomacy (Anholt, 2002; Olins, 2002; 2005). The concept of a ‘brand state’ (Ham, 2001) is developed and it refers to the international audiences’ thoughts and feelings about the state.

There is an evolving school of thought that considers the role of domestic audience in public diplomacy (Melissen, 2005a; Hujgh, 2011; Tyler et al., 2013). Melissen (2005a) has opined that over the years public diplomacy’s audience have been evolving and the boundaries between international and domestic public have subsequently blurred. It has resulted in the requirement for a new outlook and the traditional definition of public diplomacy being reviewed. In similar vein, Tyler et al. (2013) report that in the case of Australia in 2007 the Senate Standing Committee for Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade had found the lack of awareness of Australia’s public diplomacy efforts and programs among its citizens. Subsequently, the committee recommended public communication strategy and designing programs to inform Australian public about the public diplomacy of Australia. The committee went further to
recommend participation of non-state actors in Australia’s public diplomacy. This has given rise to a new concept of domestic public diplomacy.

For this article, the researcher considers public diplomacy including domestic public diplomacy, to be all the activities undertaken by regional and national authorities based on the context of the place to form positive opinion about the place and is inclusive of international relations, public relations and any other process that influences public opinions and attitudes towards the particular place. In that contest people within a particular state or region and of other regions are considered as audience for the public diplomacy efforts.

1.3.5 Regional identity

Regional identity has been described as “the extent to which people identify themselves with the region as the whole of institutionalized practices, discourses and symbols” (Messely et al., 2009:3). One must understand that at the very basic level a region is nothing but a manifestation of a place. However, Paasi (2002) opined that regional identities are developed through multiple practices that generate and institutionalize hegemonic narratives. These practices are then reproduced or challenged by social actors within a spatial area. Therefore, it can be deduced that place identity comprise of cultural, physical and historical entities that distinguish one particular region from the other and these need not be institutionalized. Lagendijk (2007) developed a theory of construction of regional identities. The author opined that the process begins with the creation ‘windows of change’ by the social, economic and political driving forces. These windows are then used for policy-making and individual and organizational practices. At the final phase, these new ways of policy-making and practices get institutionalized in new forms of
regional governance. Therefore, once the regions get recognized and accepted institutionally, they develop regional identity.

Relating to the above construct development Houtum and Lagendijk (2001) had earlier expressed that the identity of a region consists of three dimensions, namely: a) strategic; b) cultural; and c) functional. They go on to mention that a region is supposed to have its own identity if “it is different from others in terms of its politically induced strategic plans”. Houtum and Lagendijk (2001, p. 751). Cultural identity of the particular place provides elements that create common images and perspectives. The measurement of regional identity has been a matter of complication owing to the fact that identity is not static and is dynamic in time. The cultural symbols of a particular region’s or nation’s identity may change over time, albeit slowly (Billiet et al, 2003; Kubakci and Skinner, 2006). In this regard, the popular approach for measuring regional identity is to use place attachment as a cue for regional identity (Shamai, 1991; Williams et al., 1995).

1.3.6 Investment attractiveness

‘Attractiveness’ has been defined as the host country’s ability to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) and the multi- nation enterprises’ (MNEs) willingness to invest abroad (Michalet, 1999; Fabry and Zeghny, 2002). However, this work is not restricted to the definition of ‘attractiveness’ as given by Michalet (1999), mentioned by Fabry and Zeghny (2002) and applied by Jacobsen (2009) in his study. In addition to FDI, the study also takes into account domestic inward investment while considering investment attractiveness of a place. This is crucial as the researcher is trying to find brand equity of a place and not necessarily a nation. Economists using sector wise data from countries have found that regional and national growth
is dependent on domestic investments as much as FDIs (Driffield, 2001; Gorg and Greenaway, 2003; Javorcik, 2004). Even Porter (1990; 1993; 1994) in his studies on competitive advantages of nations and later of cities (Porter, 1995) opined that domestic and region centric investment has to be encouraged for region(s) to prosper. Bhattacharya and Sakthivel (2004) had shown that in the Indian context the industrialized states have grown much faster than the then backward states in the context of industry, investment and income thus, suggesting that investment brings about further investment. The state of late has shown tremendous volumes of inward investments from both entities and domestic industries. Gujarat today is one of the fastest growing states in India industry, trade and investment wise.

In this context, the role inward investments to the growth of particular place or region should not be viewed from FDI and domestic contexts in separation. Economists have found that FDI complements domestic investments in catapulting growth in that region considering various economic parameters like availability of funds and transfer of technology (Tang et al., 2008; Mutenyo et al., 2010) and increasing competitiveness (Greenway et al., 2001). Therefore, for a region to grow inward FDI though important should not be the one and only focus for the concerned regional authority. In this context, Agosin and Machado (2005) have warned that FDI have been seen to bring about the negativities of crowding – out in regional economies and killing domestic investments. They opined that economic policies that foster growth of domestic investment have to be promoted. Thus, from place branding perspective investment attractiveness for a region has to consider both FDI and domestic investments.