

Facilities and Service Quality as Predictors of Visitor Satisfaction at Belibis Island Tourism Attraction, Solok City

Jodi Perdana Putra^{1*}, Hijriyantomi Suyuthie²

^{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 31, 2026

Revised August 7, 2026

Accepted August 8, 2026

Keywords:

Destination Management,
Tourism Experience,
Servicescape, Visitor
Evaluation, Recreational
Attraction

ABSTRACT

This study examines facilities and service quality as predictors of visitor satisfaction at Belibis Island Tourism Attraction in Solok City. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted with 264 visitors selected through purposive screening after a Slovin-based sample target was established. Eligible respondents had direct experience with the attraction's facilities and visitor services. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed with descriptive statistics, regression diagnostics, and multiple linear regression in SPSS 20. Facilities (mean = 2.34), service quality (mean = 2.25), and visitor satisfaction (mean = 2.27) were all classified as poor. The overall model was significant ($F = 756.355$, $p < 0.001$) and explained 85.3% of the variance in visitor satisfaction. Facilities were a positive predictor ($B = 0.546$, $\beta = 0.356$, $p < 0.001$), while service quality showed the stronger relative coefficient ($B = 0.723$, $\beta = 0.585$, $p < 0.001$). The high R^2 should be interpreted cautiously because all constructs were measured in the same cross-sectional questionnaire. The findings support short-term priorities in safety-critical facility repair, staffing, and basic service standards, followed by preventive maintenance and continuous visitor-feedback monitoring.

Corresponding Author:

Jodi Perdana Putra

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: joedhi0303@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism attractions contribute to regional development through visitor expenditure, employment, and opportunities for local enterprise [1]. Yet destination sustainability depends on the quality of the experience delivered after visitors arrive. Satisfaction is a post-consumption evaluation of whether an offering provides the expected value [2]. Expectancy-disconfirmation theory explains this evaluation as a comparison between prior expectations and experienced performance [3]. A broader satisfaction perspective also recognizes cognitive and affective judgments that emerge across the consumption experience [4].

Service quality and the physical environment are two central components of that experience. The service-quality gap model explains how perceived performance is evaluated against expectations [5]. SERVQUAL operationalizes service quality through reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles [6]. The servicescape framework shows that physical surroundings can shape customer responses before and during service encounters [7]. In tourism, perceived quality is closely linked with satisfaction and subsequent behavioral intentions [8]. Destination image also interacts with satisfaction in shaping loyalty [9]. Experience quality and perceived value provide additional mechanisms connecting destination attributes with satisfaction [10]. Motivation and satisfaction are likewise related to destination loyalty [11], while dissatisfaction research shows that specific destination failures can meaningfully weaken the visitor experience [12]. At the destination level, perceived quality remains an important antecedent of satisfaction and behavioral intentions [13].

The measurement of service performance also requires careful distinction between service quality, value, and satisfaction. Performance-based service-quality research demonstrates that perceived performance can be analyzed without treating expectations as the only benchmark [14]. Broader service

models show that quality, value, and satisfaction jointly shape behavioral intentions [15]. A hierarchical view further treats service quality as a multidimensional evaluation rather than a single operational cue [16]. In tourism, destination image and evaluative factors influence future behavioral intentions [17], while repeat-visitor research indicates that post-visit responses differ according to prior destination experience [18]. More recent evidence shows that service quality can improve destination satisfaction through positive emotional experience [19]. Negative tourism experiences are also associated with safety, infrastructure, accessibility, service quality, information, and visitor-management problems [20]. Destination attributes can therefore shape loyalty through the quality of the service experience [21]. In hospitality settings, facilities and service attributes also contribute to satisfaction, trust, and loyalty evaluations [22].

Belibis Island Tourism Attraction in Solok City offers fishing ponds, a swimming pool, water bicycles, gazebos, toilets, prayer facilities, signage, and other recreational amenities. Preliminary observation identified damaged, unavailable, or poorly maintained facilities, while the attraction employed 19 staff members, including only three security personnel. Visitor records declined from 5,671 visits during July to December 2021 to 4,631 during the corresponding months of 2022, a reduction of 1,040 visits. The visitor-count data were obtained from the official visitor records maintained by the management of Belibis Island Tourism Attraction and cross-checked with records available from the Solok City Tourism Office. The decline is used here as contextual evidence of a management problem, not as proof that facilities or service quality caused the reduction in visits. Recent studies published in the *Journal of Multidimensional Management* (JoMM) provide complementary local evidence. Facility development affects the usability and attractiveness of tourism spaces [23]. Perceived safety can shape tourists' decisions to visit [24]. Facilities can also contribute to visitors' emotional value [25]. In hospitality settings, facilities and service quality have been associated with guest satisfaction [26], and another Padang hotel study similarly links service quality and facilities with satisfaction [27]. The present study extends this evidence by testing facilities and service quality simultaneously at a recreational attraction where physical deterioration and staffing constraints occur together. This joint model allows management to compare the relative contribution of the physical environment and service delivery within the same visitor experience.



Figure 1. Observed physical conditions at Belibis Island Tourism Attraction.

Table 1. Summary of facility conditions

Facility	Type	Total	Good	Poor
Fishing ponds	Main	2	1	1
Swimming pool	Main	1	0	1
Water bicycles	Main	6	4	2
Prayer room	Supporting	1	1	0
Pavilions	Supporting	2	2	0
Gazebos	Supporting	16	13	3
Toilets	Supporting	4	2	2
Waste bins	Supporting	23	20	3
Maps, gates, signs, and billboards	Supplementary	12	7	5

Facility	Type	Total	Good	Poor
Total	-	67	50	17

2. METHOD

A quantitative cross-sectional causal-associative survey design was used [28]. The study was conducted at Belibis Island Tourism Attraction, Kampung Jawa, Tanjung Harapan District, Solok City. The sampling frame used an average of 771 visitors recorded during July and August 2022. Applying the Slovin formula with approximately 5% precision generated a target of 264 respondents. Slovin was used only to establish the target sample size; purposive screening was subsequently used to recruit visitors capable of evaluating both facilities and service quality. The survey was administered from September to October 2022. The July-August 2022 average of 771 visitors was used because it represented the most recent complete visitor record available before questionnaire distribution. Respondents were required to be at least 18 years old, to have visited Belibis Island Tourism Attraction during the current or a recent visit period, to have directly used or observed the attraction facilities, and to have experienced interaction with visitor-service personnel. Eligibility was confirmed through screening questions before respondents completed the main questionnaire. Recruitment continued until 264 valid questionnaires were obtained.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire distributed directly at the attraction and through Google Forms. All items used a five-point Likert scale. Facilities were measured with nine statements covering main, supporting, and supplementary facilities. The facility domains were aligned with destination-management and servicescape concepts [1], [7]. Service quality was measured with eleven statements representing tangibles, empathy, responsiveness, reliability, and assurance, consistent with SERVQUAL [5], [6]. Visitor satisfaction was measured with thirteen statements covering product and service evaluation, emotional response, revisit-oriented response, and recommendation. Because revisit intention and recommendation are often modeled as outcomes after satisfaction, these items are interpreted here as broader post-visit responses retained from the original questionnaire rather than as defining satisfaction conceptually. All questionnaire items exceeded the corrected item-total correlation criterion of 0.30. The estimated coefficients ranged from 0.418 to 0.783 for facilities, from 0.432 to 0.821 for service quality, and from 0.405 to 0.806 for visitor satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha was estimated at 0.884 for facilities, 0.912 for service quality, and 0.906 for visitor satisfaction, indicating satisfactory internal consistency.

Descriptive analysis summarized means and score categories. Equal-width interpretation on the five-point scale was used: 1.00 to 1.80 = very poor, 1.81 to 2.60 = poor, 2.61 to 3.40 = fair, 3.41 to 4.20 = good, and 4.21 to 5.00 = very good. Regression diagnostics included Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual normality, the Glejser test for heteroscedasticity, and tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) values for multicollinearity [29]. Regression interpretation followed standard SPSS diagnostic guidance [30] and multivariate-analysis principles [31]. Multiple linear regression estimated the partial and simultaneous relationships of facilities and service quality with visitor satisfaction at $p < 0.05$. Because the survey is cross-sectional, the coefficients are interpreted as predictive associations within the sample rather than definitive temporal causation.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

Table 2. Descriptive assessment of the research variables

Variable	Mean	Category	Highest-scoring item	Lowest-scoring item
Facilities	2.34	Poor	Water bicycles were usable (2.58)	A souvenir shop was available (2.09)
Service quality	2.25	Poor	Employees were willing to serve visitors (2.39)	Understanding, accuracy, and consistency of service (2.11)

Variable	Mean	Category	Highest-scoring item	Lowest-scoring item
Visitor satisfaction	2.27	Poor	Security-related service expectation (2.61)*	Employees applied the 5S service behavior (1.89)

All three constructs were rated poorly. Facilities recorded a mean of 2.34, indicating weaknesses in both core attractions and supporting amenities. Of 67 observed facility units, 17 were recorded in poor condition, including the swimming pool, two water bicycles, two toilets, three gazebos, three waste bins, and five maps, gates, signs, or billboards. Service quality had the lowest construct mean (2.25), with problems involving accuracy, consistency, responsiveness, communication, and assurance. Visitor satisfaction averaged 2.27. The security-related statement with a score of 2.61 is interpreted as a diagnostic service expectation rather than a pure satisfaction item, while the lowest satisfaction-related item concerned employees' application of 5S service behavior (1.89). This measurement overlap is acknowledged as a limitation of the original questionnaire.

3.2. Regression Assumption Tests

Table 3. Regression assumption tests

Test	Indicator	Result	Interpretation
Normality	Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual	$p = 0.124$	Normally distributed
Heteroscedasticity	Facilities	$p = 0.066$	No heteroscedasticity
Heteroscedasticity	Service quality	$p = 0.125$	No heteroscedasticity
Multicollinearity	Tolerance	0.204	Above 0.10
Multicollinearity	VIF	4.898	Below 5.00, but close to threshold

The residual normality result exceeded 0.05, and the Glejser significance values for facilities and service quality were also above 0.05. Tolerance was 0.204 and VIF was 4.898. The VIF value is below the more conservative threshold of 5.00, but it is close enough to that threshold to warrant caution when comparing the independent contributions of the two predictors. The diagnostics do not indicate an unacceptable regression-assumption violation, yet the relatively strong relationship between facilities and service quality should remain part of the interpretation.

3.3. Hypothesis Testing

Table 4. Multiple linear regression results

Predictor	B	Std. error	Beta	t	p	Decision
Constant	1.417	0.856	-	1.655	0.099	-
Facilities	0.546	0.092	0.356	5.913	<0.001	Supported
Service quality	0.723	0.074	0.585	9.716	<0.001	Supported

Table 5. Model summary and simultaneous test

R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	p	Std. error
0.923	0.853	0.852	756.355	<0.001	4.329

The estimated equation was $Y = 1.417 + 0.546X_1 + 0.723X_2$, where Y represents visitor satisfaction, X1 facilities, and X2 service quality. The overall model was significant ($F = 756.355$, $p < 0.001$). Facilities were a positive predictor ($B = 0.546$, $\beta = 0.356$, $p < 0.001$), and service quality also showed a positive coefficient ($B = 0.723$, $\beta = 0.585$, $p < 0.001$). R² was 0.853 and adjusted R² was 0.852. Thus, the two predictors explained 85.3% of the observed variance in visitor satisfaction in this sample. This is unusually high for a behavioral field model and should not be interpreted as evidence that facilities and service quality are the only determinants of satisfaction. All constructs came from the same questionnaire, facilities and service quality were strongly related, and common-source measurement may contribute to the high explained variance.

3.4. Facilities and Visitor Satisfaction

Facilities were positively associated with visitor satisfaction ($B = 0.546$, $\beta = 0.356$, $p < 0.001$). This finding is consistent with marine-tourism evidence showing that facilities and service quality both contribute to tourist satisfaction [32]. Recent beach-destination research also reports that facilities and accessibility can improve visitor satisfaction [33]. Indonesian destination research further indicates that destination facilities work together with service quality and destination image in shaping satisfaction and loyalty [34]. In the Belibis Island context, the descriptive evidence gives the statistical relationship a clear operational meaning: the swimming pool was not in good condition, several water bicycles required attention, toilets and signage were incomplete, and a souvenir outlet was unavailable.

Management should therefore prioritize physical resources according to safety, frequency of visitor contact, and effect on the visitor journey. Earlier evidence from a recreational attraction also found that tourism facilities and service quality influence visitor satisfaction [35]. A short-term maintenance list should begin with the swimming pool, water bicycles, fishing-pond safety, toilets, entrance and directional signs, and waste-management points. A medium-term preventive-maintenance system should assign inspection frequency, responsible staff, repair status, and replacement dates. The servicescape perspective suggests that such improvements can influence comfort and behavioral responses beyond the functional use of the facilities themselves [37].

3.5. Service Quality and Visitor Satisfaction

Service quality showed the stronger standardized coefficient ($\beta = 0.585$), but this should be interpreted as a stronger relative contribution within the sample, not as proof that service improvements will automatically produce faster gains. Hotel-service evidence similarly shows that service quality is closely connected with customer satisfaction [36]. The most important descriptive weakness at Belibis Island was not employee willingness to serve, which received the highest service-quality item score, but understanding, accuracy, and consistency of service (2.11). The low 5S service-behavior score (1.89) reinforces the same operational problem: basic service conduct was not being delivered consistently.

The immediate response should therefore focus on standardized behaviors that visitors can observe. Service-management guidance emphasizes consistent procedures, employee readiness, and customer-oriented delivery [41]. Tourism and hospitality operations also depend on clear service roles, supervision, and facility-service coordination [42]. Belibis Island should introduce staff identification, opening and closing service checklists, simple greeting and information scripts, queue and complaint procedures, safety-response protocols, and supervisor spot checks. Behavioral-intention research indicates that service quality can have consequences for recommendation and future patronage [38], while customer-satisfaction systems emphasize the need to monitor satisfaction repeatedly rather than relying on a single survey [39].

3.6. Managerial Implications

Managerial priorities should combine coefficient strength with the seriousness of observed operational failures. In the first 30 to 60 days, management should address safety-critical repairs, restore or restrict

unsafe attractions, increase visible security coverage, improve toilets and signage, and implement minimum service standards for greeting, information accuracy, responsiveness, and 5S behavior. In the following three to six months, management should establish preventive-maintenance records, staffing by operational zone, visitor-information standards, and monthly satisfaction monitoring. The physical environment can affect behavioral intentions in leisure-service settings [37], so the maintenance program should be treated as part of experience management rather than only asset repair.

The decline of 1,040 visits between the two six-month comparison periods cannot be attributed directly to facilities or service quality because the present study is cross-sectional and does not model visitor counts over time. The remaining 14.7% of satisfaction variance also indicates room for additional explanations. Perceived value is particularly relevant because visitors integrate quality and sacrifice when evaluating tourism experiences [40]. Future research should therefore focus on a limited set of context-relevant extensions, especially perceived value, safety perception, accessibility, and destination image, rather than adding a large undifferentiated set of variables.

4. CONCLUSION

Facilities and service quality were both positive predictors of visitor satisfaction at Belibis Island Tourism Attraction, Solok City. Facilities had $B = 0.546$ and $\beta = 0.356$, while service quality had $B = 0.723$ and $\beta = 0.585$. The overall model was significant ($F = 756.355$, $p < 0.001$) and explained 85.3% of the observed variance in satisfaction. The stronger service-quality coefficient should be understood as a relative result within this sample, while the high R^2 requires caution because the variables were measured simultaneously using the same questionnaire.

The operational priorities are clear. Management should first address safety-critical and nonoperational facilities, strengthen security coverage, improve sanitation and signage, and standardize basic service behaviors, particularly accuracy, consistency, responsiveness, and 5S conduct. Preventive maintenance, staff identification, simple service procedures, complaint handling, and regular visitor-feedback monitoring should follow. The study is limited to one attraction, a cross-sectional design, purposive field recruitment, and an original satisfaction scale that includes some post-visit and service-expectation items. Future research should compare multiple attractions and examine perceived value, safety, accessibility, and destination image using more clearly separated constructs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management of Belibis Island Tourism Attraction, the Solok City Tourism Office, and all visitors who participated in the survey. The authors also acknowledge the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Universitas Negeri Padang, for its academic support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Isdarmanto, *Dasar-Dasar Kepariwisata dan Pengelolaan Destinasi Pariwisata*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Ambarrukmo, 2017.
- [2] P. Kotler and K. L. Keller, *Marketing Management*, 15th ed. Harlow, U.K.: Pearson, 2016.
- [3] 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.
- [4] R. L. Oliver, *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1997.
- [5] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 41-50, 1985, doi: 10.1177/002224298504900403.
- [6] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 12-40, 1988.
- [7] M. J. Bitner, "Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 57-71, 1992, doi: 10.1177/002224299205600205.
- [8] 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.

- [9] C. G. Q. Chi and H. Qu, "Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty," *Tourism Management*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 624-636, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.007.
- [10] 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.
- [11] Y. Yoon and M. Uysal, "An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty," *Tourism Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 45-56, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016.
- [12] J. Alegre and J. Garau, "Tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 52-73, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2009.07.001.
- [13] 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.
- [14] J. J. Cronin Jr. and S. A. Taylor, "Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 55-68, 1992, doi: 10.1177/002224299205600304.
- [15] J. J. Cronin Jr., M. K. Brady, and G. T. M. Hult, "Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 193-218, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00028-2.
- [16] M. K. Brady and J. J. Cronin Jr., "Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 34-49, 2001, doi: 10.1509/jmkg.65.3.34.18334.
- [17] 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.
- [18] 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.
- [19] X. He, L. Su, and S. R. Swanson, "The service quality to subjective well-being of Chinese tourists connection: A model with replications," *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. 23, no. 16, pp. 2076-2092, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13683500.2020.1755240.
- [20] J.-H. Kim, Y. Wang, and H. Song, "Understanding the causes of negative tourism experiences," *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 304-320, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13683500.2020.1711711.
- [21] W. Schlesinger, A. Cervera-Taulet, and C. Perez-Cabanero, "Exploring the links between destination attributes, quality of service experience and loyalty in emerging Mediterranean destinations," *Tourism Management Perspectives*, vol. 35, Art. no. 100699, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100699.
- [22] Y. Jeaheng, A. Al-Ansi, and H. Han, "Impacts of Halal-friendly services, facilities, and food and beverages on Muslim travelers' perceptions of service quality attributes, perceived price, satisfaction, trust, and loyalty," *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 787-811, 2020, doi: 10.1080/19368623.2020.1715317.
- [23] S. R. Herman and T. Putra, "Design for the development of tourist attraction facilities Timbulun Waterfall in Pesisir Selatan," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 25-31, 2024, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v1i2.13.
- [24] 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.
- [25] 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.
- [26] M. Aurellia and Hermansyah, "The influence of hotel facilities and service quality on guest satisfaction at Fave Hotel Olo Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 73-77, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.20.

- [27] Al Hambra and A. Kahar, "The effect of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Hotel Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 133-139, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.36.
- [28] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2019.
- [29] I. Ghozali, *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS*, 8th ed. Semarang, Indonesia: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2016.
- [30] A. Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. London, U.K.: Sage, 2018.
- [31] J. F. Hair Jr., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed. Andover, U.K.: Cengage, 2019.
- [32] A. P. Meidina, H. Brahmantyo, and S. Mariati, "The effect of quality service and facilities on tourist satisfaction in marine tourism (Jatimalang Beach, Purworejo)," *TRJ Tourism Research Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 218-232, 2022, doi: 10.30647/trj.v6i2.161.
- [33] A. Nopriana, D. Valeriani, K. Kurniawan, and N. W. Sugeng, "The influence of attractions, facilities and accessibility on tourist satisfaction at Parai Tenggara Beach, Bangka Regency," *TRJ Tourism Research Journal*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 336-349, 2024, doi: 10.30647/trj.v8i2.202.
- [34] R. Ridoloh, M. Munizu, S. Alam, F. Umar, and O. M. T. Alkanan, "Influence of service quality, destination facilities, destination image, and satisfaction on tourist loyalty in Pasar Lama Chinatown, Tangerang City," *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, vol. 8, no. 13, Art. no. 9173, 2024, doi: 10.24294/jipd9173.
- [35] R. Rosita, S. Marhanah, and W. H. Wahadi, "Pengaruh fasilitas wisata dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pengunjung di Taman Margasatwa Ragunan Jakarta," *Jurnal Manajemen Resort dan Leisure*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 61-72, 2016.
- [36] K. Kasinem, "Pengaruh kepercayaan dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan konsumen pada Hotel Serelo Lahat," *Jurnal Media Wahana Ekonomika*, 2020.
- [37] K. L. Wakefield and J. G. Blodgett, "The effect of the servicescape on customers' behavioral intentions in leisure service settings," *Journal of Services Marketing*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 45-61, 1996, doi: 10.1108/08876049610148594.
- [38] 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.
- [39] C. Fornell, M. D. Johnson, E. W. Anderson, J. Cha, and B. E. Bryant, "The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, purpose, and findings," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 7-18, 1996, doi: 10.1177/002224299606000403.
- [40] P. Williams and G. N. Soutar, "Value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions in an adventure tourism context," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 413-438, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2009.02.002.
- [41] F. Tjiptono, *Strategi Pemasaran*, 4th ed. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Andi, 2015.
- [42] A. Sulastiyono, *Manajemen Penyelenggaraan Hotel*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2016.