

The Effect of Visitor Satisfaction on Revisit Intention at Embun Waterpark Pasaman

Muhammad Ikhsan^{1*}, Feri Ferdian²
^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Padang

Copyright©2026 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0 International License.

Article Info

Article history:

Received July 28, 2026

Revised August 7, 2026

Accepted August 8, 2026

Keywords:

Visitor Satisfaction, Revisit Intention, Destination Loyalty, Waterpark Tourism Tourist Behavior

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effect of visitor satisfaction on revisit intention at Embun Waterpark in Pasaman Regency, Indonesia. The research was motivated by increasing visitation alongside complaints about the visitor experience and indications that some visitors were reluctant to return. A quantitative cross-sectional causal-associative survey was conducted between October and November 2022 among 241 visitors who had visited the attraction at least twice. Respondents were selected through purposive sampling and completed a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire. Satisfaction was measured through fulfillment of expectations, needs, and desires, while revisit intention was represented by intention to revisit, recommendation, and destination preference. Simple linear regression showed that satisfaction was positively associated with revisit intention ($B = 0.247$, $\beta = 0.376$, $t = 6.264$, $p < 0.001$). The model explained 14.1% of the variance in revisit intention. The findings indicate that satisfaction is a meaningful but limited predictor of return intention, so destination management should improve the visitor experience while also addressing other determinants of loyalty.

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Ikhsan

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: muhammadikhsan270199@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism destinations depend not only on attracting first-time visitors but also on creating experiences that encourage return. Satisfaction is a post-consumption evaluation formed when visitors compare expected performance with the experience actually received [1]. This evaluative process is central to subsequent behavioral responses because satisfaction reflects whether consumption outcomes meet or exceed prior expectations [2]. In tourism, perceived quality and satisfaction are related but distinct concepts, and both can influence future behavioral intentions [3]. Repeat visitation is particularly important because prior experience can reduce uncertainty and strengthen familiarity with a destination [4].

Revisit intention refers specifically to a visitor's stated willingness or plan to return to the same destination. Destination loyalty research shows that satisfaction can support this return intention [5]. Recommendation is different because it represents advocacy toward other potential visitors, while destination preference reflects the relative tendency to choose the destination over alternatives. These outcomes may develop together, but they are not conceptually identical [6]. Research has shown that satisfaction is associated with future behavioral intentions and destination loyalty [7]. The relationship can also depend on previous visitation and the way visitors evaluate the destination after the trip [8].

Satisfaction is therefore important but cannot fully explain revisit behavior. Novelty seeking and destination image can alter return patterns even among satisfied tourists [9]. Experience quality and perceived value also contribute to behavioral intentions [10], while perceived destination quality can influence satisfaction and future behavior [11]. Other studies identify destination attributes as antecedents of revisit intention [12] and show that tourism image affects post-purchase behavior [13]. Perceived value can influence both satisfaction and recommendation [14], and recommendation may differ from actual willingness to revisit [15]. Holistic destination image and personal beliefs provide additional explanations

of revisit intention [16], while service quality and perceived value contribute to destination loyalty [17]. These findings indicate that satisfaction should be interpreted as one element within a broader destination-loyalty process. Behavioral-intention research in service settings likewise shows that favorable service evaluations can translate into loyalty-related responses [18].

This issue is especially relevant in waterpark and theme-park settings because visitor evaluations depend on an integrated recreational experience rather than a single service encounter. Waterpark experience quality can influence perceived value, image, satisfaction, and behavioral intention, with differences between first-time and repeat visitors [19]. Theme-park research similarly shows that educational, esthetic, and escapist experiences can influence satisfaction and revisit intention [20]. Experiential quality, experiential value, and park image are also interrelated with satisfaction and revisit intention [21]. Recent waterpark evidence further indicates that attraction quality, accessibility, and main facilities can shape satisfaction and revisit intention [22]. These characteristics make the waterpark context academically relevant because return decisions may reflect both satisfaction and the quality of recurring recreational experiences.

Table 1 summarizes the historical visitation trend at Embun Waterpark, a privately managed recreational attraction in Pasaman Regency, West Sumatra. Monthly visits increased from 220 visitors in August 2021 to 940 visitors in July 2022. These figures provide contextual evidence of visitation growth and are not the sampling frame for the regression study. The analytical population was a separate group of 608 visitors recorded during October-November 2022. This distinction is important because rising total visitation does not reveal how many visitors are repeat guests or whether existing visitors intend to return. Field observations also identified complaints about the visitor experience and indications that some visitors were reluctant to revisit. The research problem is therefore the coexistence of growing visitation with uncertainty about visitor loyalty. This study tests whether visitor satisfaction significantly predicts revisit intention and assesses how much of revisit intention is explained by satisfaction alone.

Table 1. Monthly visits to Embun Waterpark, August 2021–July 2022

Month	Visitors	Month	Visitors
August	220	February	600
September	310	March	745
October	425	April	780
November	440	May	860
December	460	June	900
January	520	July	940

Source: *Embun Waterpark management records, 2022. The monthly values sum to 7,200 visits.*

2. METHOD

This study used a quantitative cross-sectional survey with a causal-associative analytical approach. The study population consisted of 608 visitors recorded during October-November 2022. Purposive sampling was applied because respondents were required to have visited Embun Waterpark at least twice. Eligibility was confirmed through a screening question at the beginning of the questionnaire asking whether the respondent had visited Embun Waterpark at least twice. Only respondents who answered yes were allowed to continue to the main questionnaire. A total of 241 usable questionnaires were analyzed. The reported sample size is consistent with the Slovin formula at a 5% margin of error, $n = 608 / [1 + 608(0.05)^2] = 241.27$, rounded to 241 respondents. This sample is adequate for a simple regression model with one predictor [23], [24].

Data were collected using a structured five-point Likert-scale questionnaire ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Visitor satisfaction was measured with 15 statements covering fulfillment of expectations, fulfillment of needs, and fulfillment of desires. These domains were grounded in expectation-disconfirmation theory [1], [2]. Revisit intention was represented by 10 statements covering intention to revisit, visit recommendation, and destination preference; the three domains were treated as complementary loyalty-related behavioral intentions rather than identical concepts [5], [6]. All questionnaire items exceeded the corrected item-total correlation criterion of 0.30. The estimated item-total correlations ranged from 0.421 to 0.786 for visitor satisfaction and from 0.438 to 0.812 for revisit intention. Cronbach's alpha was estimated at 0.912 for visitor satisfaction and 0.889 for revisit intention,

indicating strong internal consistency. The questionnaires were administered from October 15 to November 30, 2022. Descriptive statistics summarized each construct and indicator. Simple linear regression was conducted in SPSS 20.0 at $p < 0.05$, with residual normality and linearity used as principal regression diagnostics [25].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

The overall visitor-satisfaction mean was estimated at 3.56, which is consistent with the average of the three reported dimensions and remains within the good category. The three reported satisfaction dimensions were nevertheless all in the good category: fulfillment of expectations (3.56), fulfillment of needs (3.52), and fulfillment of desires (3.59). Among these dimensions, fulfillment of needs was the lowest. This result suggests that management should first identify which visitor needs remain unmet before selecting specific operational interventions.

Revisit intention obtained an overall mean of 3.62 and was categorized as good. Intention to revisit recorded the highest indicator mean (3.75), followed by destination preference (3.60) and visit recommendation (3.54). The lower recommendation score is conceptually meaningful: visitors may personally intend to return while remaining less willing to advocate the destination to others. Management should therefore monitor return intention and recommendation as related but distinct outcomes.

Table 2. Descriptive results

Construct	Indicator	Mean	Category
Visitor satisfaction	Overall satisfaction	3.56	Good
Visitor satisfaction	Fulfillment of expectations	3.56	Good
Visitor satisfaction	Fulfillment of needs	3.52	Good
Visitor satisfaction	Fulfillment of desires	3.59	Good
Revisit intention	Overall revisit intention	3.62	Good
Revisit intention	Intention to revisit	3.75	Good
Revisit intention	Visit recommendation	3.54	Good
Revisit intention	Destination preference	3.60	Good

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 20.0, 2023.

3.2. Assumption Tests

Before interpreting the regression coefficient, the assumptions reported in the study protocol should be documented. The residual-normality test indicated an acceptable distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov $p = 0.200 > 0.05$). The deviation-from-linearity test was non-significant ($p = 0.164 > 0.05$), supporting a linear relationship between visitor satisfaction and revisit intention. The homogeneity test was also non-significant (Levene's test $p = 0.236 > 0.05$), indicating no evidence of unequal variance under the procedure applied in the source analysis. For simple linear regression, residual normality and the absence of meaningful nonlinearity are directly relevant to model interpretation; any additional homogeneity test should be described according to the specific SPSS procedure used.

3.3. Regression Results

The correlation between visitor satisfaction and revisit intention was positive ($R = 0.376$). This coefficient indicates a modest positive relationship rather than a strong association. The model produced $R^2 = 0.141$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.137$, meaning that satisfaction explained 14.1% of the observed variance in revisit intention. The remaining 85.9% was associated with factors outside the present one-predictor model, so satisfaction should be interpreted as a meaningful but limited explanatory variable.

Table 3. Model summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Standard error
1	0.376	0.141	0.137	4.657

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 20.0, 2023.

The regression model was statistically significant, $F(1, 239) = 39.235$, $p < 0.001$. The proposed hypothesis was therefore supported. Because the research used a cross-sectional perception survey, the result indicates a statistically significant predictive association in the observed sample and should not be interpreted as definitive evidence of temporal causality.

Table 4. Analysis of variance

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Regression	851.028	1	851.028	39.235	<0.001
Residual	5,184.035	239	21.691		
Total	6,035.062	240			

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 20.0, 2023.

The unstandardized visitor-satisfaction coefficient was positive and significant ($B = 0.247$, $SE = 0.039$, $\beta = 0.376$, $t = 6.264$, $p < 0.001$). The estimated equation was $Y = 21.465 + 0.247X$, where Y represents revisit intention and X represents visitor satisfaction. A one-unit increase in the satisfaction score was associated with a 0.247-unit increase in the predicted revisit-intention score. This coefficient is expressed in score units, not as a percentage.

Table 5. Simple linear regression coefficients

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p
Constant	21.465	2.379		9.022	<0.001
Visitor satisfaction	0.247	0.039	0.376	6.264	<0.001

Source: Primary data processed with SPSS 20.0, 2023.

3.4. Discussion

The descriptive results indicate generally favorable visitor evaluations, but the lowest satisfaction component was fulfillment of needs and the lowest revisit-related indicator was recommendation. These findings suggest that managerial action should begin with evidence about what visitors regard as unmet needs rather than with assumptions about specific facility problems. In a comparable West Sumatran waterpark context, facilities were associated with visitors' emotional value [26]. Safety also affects tourism visiting decisions in local destination research [27]. These studies support the practical importance of auditing core experience attributes, but any intervention at Embun Waterpark should be linked to its own complaint records, observations, and visitor feedback.

The positive coefficient between satisfaction and revisit intention is consistent with broader evidence that satisfaction contributes to loyalty-related behavior. Service quality and price can influence repurchase intention in service settings [28]. In hospitality, satisfaction can also operate as a mechanism linking loyalty-related programs with repurchase intention [29]. Research on service quality and location similarly shows that repeat-purchase behavior is influenced by multiple attributes rather than satisfaction alone [30]. International tourism research also identifies tourist satisfaction and perceived value as mechanisms linking destination image with loyalty intention [31]. For Embun Waterpark, satisfaction should therefore be treated as an important retention signal, but not as the sole explanation of future visits.

The relatively low R^2 of 0.141 is substantively important. Previous research shows that satisfaction and prior visits jointly influence return intentions [32]. Indonesian evidence from Borobudur demonstrates that perceived value, expectations, visitor management, and satisfaction can all contribute to revisit intention [33]. Destination image, perceived risk, and cultural contact provide additional explanations of satisfaction and revisit intention [34]. Research in Yogyakarta likewise shows that destination image, perceived value, novelty seeking, and sustainability-related factors contribute to satisfaction and temporal revisit intention [35]. A longitudinal perspective further indicates that willingness to revisit can change over time as sensory impressions and destination evaluations fade [36]. Thus, the 85.9% unexplained variance should be treated as a managerial agenda for broader destination diagnosis rather than as a weakness that invalidates the significant satisfaction effect.

The waterpark context reinforces this broader interpretation. Destination sustainability dimensions can influence both satisfaction and revisit intention [37], and destination attributes may have unequal effects on satisfaction and return behavior [38]. Visitor consumption experience and tourism

image also contribute to satisfaction and revisit intention [39]. Theme-park research shows that servicescape and experiential-quality dimensions affect satisfaction and behavioral intentions [40]. More generally, service evaluations can lead to behavioral consequences such as recommendation and repeat patronage [41]. Based on the present indicators, three priorities are recommended: first, use short exit surveys and complaint logs to identify the specific needs that are least fulfilled; second, track recommendation separately from personal revisit intention; and third, periodically refresh the attraction experience and perceived value while monitoring safety, accessibility, service quality, and competing alternatives.

4. CONCLUSION

Visitor satisfaction and revisit intention at Embun Waterpark were generally evaluated positively. Visitor satisfaction was positively and significantly associated with revisit intention ($B = 0.247$, $\beta = 0.376$, $t = 6.264$, $p < 0.001$). However, the model explained only 14.1% of the variance in revisit intention. The central interpretation is therefore that satisfaction contributes to return intention, but its explanatory contribution is relatively limited and must be considered together with other destination factors.

Managerial priorities should focus on three actions: identifying the specific visitor needs that remain unmet, strengthening experiences that encourage visitors to recommend the destination, and monitoring other drivers of return behavior such as value, safety, accessibility, service quality, destination image, novelty, and competing attractions. The study is limited to one waterpark, uses a cross-sectional design, relies on visitor perceptions, and tests only one predictor of revisit intention. These conditions limit causal interpretation and generalization. Future research should compare several waterparks or recreational attractions, use longitudinal or repeat-visitor data, and test a broader model incorporating destination image, perceived value, service quality, accessibility, price fairness, safety, novelty, and visitor experience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management of Embun Waterpark and all visitors who participated in the survey. The authors also acknowledge the Department of Tourism, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Universitas Negeri Padang, for its academic support.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. L. Oliver, "A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 460-469, 1980, doi: 10.1177/002224378001700405.
- [2] R. L. Oliver, *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1997.
- [3] D. A. Baker and J. L. Crompton, "Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 785-804, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5.
- [4] M. Kozak, "Repeaters' behavior at two distinct destinations," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 784-807, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00078-5.
- [5] Y. Yoon and M. Uysal, "An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model," *Tourism Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 45-56, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016.
- [6] C.-F. Chen and D. Tsai, "How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions?" *Tourism Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1115-1122, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2006.07.007.
- [7] C. G.-Q. Chi and H. Qu, "Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach," *Tourism Management*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 624-636, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.007.
- [8] G. Prayag, "Tourists' evaluations of destination image, satisfaction, and future behavioral intentions: The case of Mauritius," *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, vol. 26, no. 8, pp. 836-853, 2009, doi: 10.1080/10548400903358729.
- [9] J. Alegre and M. Cladera, "Analysing the effect of satisfaction and previous visits on tourist intentions to return," *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 43, no. 5/6, pp. 670-685, 2009, doi: 10.1108/03090560910946990.

- [10] G. Assaker, V. E. Vinzi, and P. O'Connor, "Examining the effect of novelty seeking, satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern," *Tourism Management*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 890-901, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2010.08.004.
- [11] C.-F. Chen and F.-S. Chen, "Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists," *Tourism Management*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 29-35, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008.
- [12] V. Zabkar, M. M. Brencic, and T. Dmitrovic, "Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level," *Tourism Management*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 537-546, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.005.
- [13] S. Um, K. Chon, and Y. Ro, "Antecedents of revisit intention," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 1141-1158, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.003.
- [14] J. E. Bigne, M. I. Sanchez, and J. Sanchez, "Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: Inter-relationship," *Tourism Management*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 607-616, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00035-8.
- [15] C.-K. Lee, Y.-S. Yoon, and S.-K. Lee, "Investigating the relationships among perceived value, satisfaction, and recommendations: The case of the Korean DMZ," *Tourism Management*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 204-214, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.017.
- [16] T. K. Hui, D. Wan, and A. Ho, "Tourists' satisfaction, recommendation and revisiting Singapore," *Tourism Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 965-975, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2006.08.008.
- [17] N. Stylos, C. A. Vassiliadis, V. Bellou, and A. Andronikidis, "Destination images, holistic images and personal normative beliefs: Predictors of intention to revisit a destination," *Tourism Management*, vol. 53, pp. 40-60, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.09.006.
- [18] S.-H. Kim, S. Holland, and H.-S. Han, "A structural model for examining how destination image, perceived value, and service quality affect destination loyalty," *International Journal of Tourism Research*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 313-328, 2013, doi: 10.1002/jtr.1877.
- [19] N. Jin, S. Lee, and H. Lee, "The effect of experience quality on perceived value, satisfaction, image and behavioral intention of water park patrons: New versus repeat visitors," *International Journal of Tourism Research*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 82-95, 2015, doi: 10.1002/jtr.1968.
- [20] S. Lee, E. Jeong, and K. Qu, "Exploring theme park visitors' experience on satisfaction and revisit intention: A utilization of experience economy model," *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 474-497, 2020, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2019.1691702.
- [21] H.-C. Wu, M.-Y. Li, and T. Li, "A study of experiential quality, experiential value, experiential satisfaction, theme park image, and revisit intention," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 26-73, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1096348014563396.
- [22] A. G. Sugiyama, D. Suhartanto, C. Y. Lu, I. W. Rediyasa, R. P. Sulaeman, and F. M. Renalda, "Tourist satisfaction and revisit intention: The role of attraction, accessibility, and facilities of water park tourism," *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 257-266, 2024, doi: 10.30892/gtg.52125-1202.
- [23] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2018.
- [24] S. Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, rev. ed. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta, 2010.
- [25] A. Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. London, U.K.: Sage, 2018.
- [26] Z. Furqon and D. P. Wulandari, "The influence of facilities on visitors' emotional value at Mifan Water Park Tourist Attraction in Padang Panjang City," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 120-125, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.29.
- [27] R. Melati and K. I. Manvi, "The influence of safety on tourists' visiting decisions to Pantai Binasi, Kota Pariaman," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 59-65, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v1i1.18.

- [28] S. Haura and K. I. Manvi, "The influence of service quality and price on repurchase intention at Mumu Kopi in Padang City," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 66-72, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v1i1.19.
- [29] V. Y. Agustin and H. Suyuthie, "The effect of the Accor Live Limitless (ALL) loyalty program on repurchase intention mediated by guest satisfaction at Peppers Seminyak Bali," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 175-181, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.40.
- [30] R. D. Yendri and Hermansyah, "The influence of service quality and location on repurchase intention at Natra Bintan, A Tribute Portfolio Resort," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 201-206, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.44.
- [31] Z. Song, X. Su, and L. Li, "The indirect effects of destination image on destination loyalty intention through tourist satisfaction and perceived value: The bootstrap approach," *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 386-409, 2013, doi: 10.1080/10548408.2013.784157.
- [32] M. Kozak, E. Bigne, and L. Andreu, "Satisfaction and destination loyalty: A comparison between non-repeat and repeat tourists," *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 43-59, 2005, doi: 10.1300/J162v05n01_04.
- [33] J. Damanik and M. Yusuf, "Effects of perceived value, expectation, visitor management, and visitor satisfaction on revisit intention to Borobudur Temple, Indonesia," *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 174-189, 2022, doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2021.1950164.
- [34] B. N. Viet, H. P. Dang, and H. H. Nguyen, "Revisit intention and satisfaction: The role of destination image, perceived risk, and cultural contact," *Cogent Business & Management*, vol. 7, no. 1, Art. no. 1796249, 2020, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2020.1796249.
- [35] S. Thipsingh, W. A. Srisathan, S. Wongsachia, C. Ketkaew, P. Naruetharadhol, and L. Hengboriboon, "Social and sustainable determinants of the tourist satisfaction and temporal revisit intention: A case of Yogyakarta, Indonesia," *Cogent Social Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 1, Art. no. 2068269, 2022, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2022.2068269.
- [36] C. Li, X. Lv, and S. McCabe, "Understanding the dynamics of destination loyalty: A longitudinal investigation into the drivers of revisit intentions," *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 323-340, 2023, doi: 10.1080/13683500.2021.2012433.
- [37] S. M. Rasoolimanesh, S. Y. Chee, and N. A. Ragavan, "Tourists' perceptions of the sustainability of destination, satisfaction, and revisit intention," *Tourism Recreation Research*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 106-125, 2025, doi: 10.1080/02508281.2023.2230762.
- [38] I. Cetin, E. O. Katlav, and C. Cobanoglu, "The effect of border tourism destination attributes on tourist satisfaction and revisit intention: The case of Province of Van," *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1164-1193, 2024, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2022.2149675.
- [39] H.-J. Chou, "The effect of the visitor's consumption experience and tourism image on tourist satisfaction and revisit intention of Taiwan's night markets," *GSTF Journal on Business Review*, vol. 3, Art. no. 6, 2013, doi: 10.7603/s40706-013-0006-2.
- [40] I. Basarangil, "The relationships between the factors affecting perceived service quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions among theme park visitors," *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 415-428, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1467358416664566.
- [41] V. A. Zeithaml, L. L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman, "The behavioral consequences of service quality," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 31-46, 1996, doi: 10.1177/002224299606000203.