

## **Satisfaction and Loyalty in Cultural Heritage Tourism: Analysis of Destination Brand Experience Dimensions at Taman Mini Indonesia Indah**

**Adam Faisal Faliti, Andreo Wahyudi Atmoko**

Universitas Indonesia

Email: adam.faisal@ui.ac.id, wahyudiatmoko@yahoo.com

### **Abstract**

This study investigates a counterintuitive phenomenon in the context of cultural heritage tourism, where the Destination Brand Experience (DBE) dimensions that drive visitor satisfaction differ from those that influence tourist loyalty. The research is conducted at *Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (TMII)*, analyzing data from 200 respondents who visited the destination after the revitalization process during the 2022–2025 period. Utilizing a Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach, the analysis reveals that sensory, affective, and behavioral experiences significantly influence visitor satisfaction levels ( $\beta = 0.201; 0.301; 0.384; p < 0.05$ ). However, only intellectual experience is shown to have a direct impact on revisit intention ( $\beta = 0.177; p < 0.01$ ). This finding challenges the fundamental assumption in tourism literature that satisfaction automatically leads to loyalty. The study contributes to the advancement of destination branding theory by demonstrating that satisfaction and loyalty do not always originate from the same experiences, but instead follow different psychological pathways as explained in Experience Economy Theory. The implication is that cultural heritage destination managers must design strategies that not only aim for short-term satisfaction through entertainment but also foster long-term visitor loyalty by providing transformative educational experiences.

**Keywords:** Destination Brand Experience; cultural heritage tourism; satisfaction-loyalty paradox; tourist behavior; Indonesia.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The relationship between tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty has long been regarded as a fundamental pillar in tourism studies (Hidayat et al., 2025; Ramesh & Jaunky, 2021). Most previous research has assumed a linear progression from positive experiences to satisfaction, which subsequently leads to loyal behaviors such as repeat visits and recommendations (Oliver, 1997; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Chen & Chen, 2010). However, recent findings suggest that this relationship is not always straightforward or direct, particularly within the context of cultural heritage-based tourism, where educational aspects and entertainment elements interact and influence visitor perceptions in complex ways (Pine & Gilmore, 1998; McKercher & du Cros, 2002; Timothy & Boyd, 2003).

Recent developments in destination branding theory have introduced the concept of Destination Brand Experience (DBE), which encompasses multidimensional tourist interactions with destinations through sensory, affective, behavioral, and intellectual dimensions (Brakus et al., 2009; Barnes et al., 2014; Agapito et al., 2017). Although research on DBE has advanced significantly in recent years (Zhang et al., 2024; Guleria et al., 2023; Stavrianea & Kamenidou, 2022), studies remain limited on heritage cultural parks in developing countries, especially those undergoing significant post-pandemic revitalization efforts.

The post-COVID-19 tourism landscape has fundamentally altered tourist expectations and behaviors, with a growing emphasis on meaningful and transformative experiences rather than passive consumption (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015; Gössling et al., 2021). This shift holds important implications for cultural heritage destinations, which must balance the authenticity of preservation with contemporary tourist demands for engaging and technology-enhanced experiences (Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Poria et al., 2003; Chen & Rahman, 2018).

Indonesia's tourism sector has experienced substantial growth, making significant contributions to national economic development, with cultural tourism playing an increasingly

vital role in the national tourism strategy (Sujai, 2016; Pitana & Diarta, 2009). *Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (TMII)*, Indonesia's primary heritage cultural park, offers a unique case study following comprehensive revitalization since 2021 under new corporate management by *PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur, Prambanan & Ratu Boko (PT TWC)*.

Previous research has established that Destination Brand Experience significantly influences tourist satisfaction, but findings are inconsistent across various tourism contexts (Martins et al., 2021; Moraga & Barra, 2023; Jiménez-Barreto et al., 2020). Studies in nature tourism destinations emphasize sensory and affective dimensions (Lv et al., 2020; Agapito et al., 2017), while urban tourism research highlights a more dominant role for the behavioral dimension (Kim et al., 2018; Stylos et al., 2021). Cultural heritage contexts present unique challenges, as educational value often competes with entertainment appeal (Poria et al., 2003; Chen & Chen, 2010).

This study addresses gaps in destination branding literature by examining whether the conventional satisfaction–loyalty paradigm applies to all Destination Brand Experience dimensions in cultural heritage contexts. Specifically, this research investigates how sensory, affective, behavioral, and intellectual experiences influence tourist satisfaction and loyalty intentions, thereby contributing to theoretical understanding and practical destination management strategies for post-pandemic recovery and sustainable cultural tourism development.

The study aims to fill this gap by examining how different dimensions of DBE influence satisfaction and loyalty at *Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (TMII)*, a revitalized cultural heritage destination in Indonesia. The findings are expected to provide theoretical insights into the satisfaction–loyalty paradox in cultural tourism and offer practical strategies for destination managers to enhance short-term satisfaction and long-term loyalty through an integrated edutainment approach. Ultimately, this study contributes to the development of sustainable cultural tourism by balancing entertainment and educational values to meet the evolving expectations of post-pandemic tourists.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design to examine the relationships between Destination Brand Experience dimensions, tourist satisfaction, and both intention to revisit and intention to recommend. The research utilizes Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with the aid of SmartPLS 4.0 software, selected for its capability to manage complex models involving multiple relationships, accommodate smaller sample sizes, and its suitability for exploratory research with non-normal data distributions (Hair & Alamer, 2022; Hair et al., 2022).

The study population consists of TMII tourists aged 17 and above who visited the destination between 2022 and 2025, ensuring tourist experiences reflect the post-revitalization period. This timeframe captures tourist experiences after major improvements were implemented while avoiding confounding effects from the COVID-19 pandemic period. Using purposive sampling technique, 200 respondents were selected through online questionnaire distribution via social media platforms, tourism communities, and tourist networks.

Sample size determination follows Hair et al. (2022) guidelines requiring a minimum of 10 times the largest number of structural paths directed to any construct in the inner model. With the most complex construct receiving five paths, the required minimum was 50 respondents. However, to ensure model stability and statistical power, the sample target was set at 200 respondents, consistent with PLS-SEM best practices for complex models (Ringle et al., 2020).

Data collection used structured questionnaires adapted from established and validated scales in tourism contexts. Destination Brand Experience was measured using the Barnes et al. (2014) scale, which extends the original Brakus et al. (2009) brand experience scale to tourism destinations. The scale consists of four dimensions: sensory experience (5 items measuring visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, and tactile stimuli), affective experience (5 items measuring emotional responses and feelings), behavioral experience (5 items measuring physical activities and interactions), and intellectual experience (5 items measuring cognitive stimulation and learning).

Tourist Satisfaction was measured using Oliver's (1980) expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm adapted for tourism contexts by Chi & Qu (2008), consisting of three items measuring overall satisfaction, quality evaluation, and decision validation. Revisit Intention was measured using four items adapted from Nguyen Viet et al. (2020) and Lv et al. (2020), focusing on future visit plans and destination appeal. Recommendation Intention was measured using four items from Hosany & Prayag (2013) and Martins et al. (2021), examining word-of-mouth and recommendation behaviors.

All constructs were measured using five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), following established practices in tourism research (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Chen & Chen, 2010). The questionnaire underwent pre-testing with 30 respondents to ensure clarity, comprehension, and cultural appropriateness for Indonesian tourism contexts.

Data collection was conducted between April and May 2025 through online survey distribution using Google Forms platform. Questionnaires were distributed through multiple channels including tourism-focused social media groups, university networks, and personal contacts to ensure diverse respondent representation. Screening questions ensured respondents met inclusion criteria (age 17+, TMII visit 2022-2025) before accessing the main questionnaire.

Response quality was maintained through several measures: mandatory completion of all items, attention check questions, and response time monitoring to identify potentially erroneous responses. The final dataset consisted of 200 complete responses after removing 40 incomplete or invalid responses from 240 initial responses, representing an 83.3% completion rate.

Analytical procedures followed the recommended two-stage approach for PLS-SEM: first, measurement model assessment through reliability and validity tests, followed by structural model evaluation for hypothesis testing (Hair et al., 2022; Ringle et al., 2020). Measurement model assessment included examination of indicator reliability (factor loadings  $> 0.70$ ), internal consistency reliability (composite reliability  $> 0.70$ , Cronbach's alpha  $> 0.70$ ), convergent validity (average variance extracted  $> 0.50$ ), and discriminant validity through Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratios ( $< 0.90$ ).

Structural model assessment evaluated collinearity (VIF  $< 5.0$ ), path coefficient significance, coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), effect size ( $f^2$ ), and predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ). Hypothesis testing used bootstrapping procedures with 5,000 resamples to determine path coefficient significance at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level. Mediation analysis followed Zhao et al. (2010) recommendations for PLS-SEM, examining indirect effects through satisfaction as mediating variable.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Sample Characteristics

The final sample consisted of 200 respondents with balanced demographic representation. Gender distribution showed 61% female and 39% male, consistent with tourism

research patterns where female participation rates are typically higher (Litvin et al., 2008). Age distribution revealed 54.5% aged 17-26 years, 33.5% aged 27-40 years, 9% aged 41-55 years, and 3% over 55 years, representing primarily Generation Z and millennials who are core markets for cultural heritage tourism (Richards, 2018).

Geographically, 45.5% lived in Jakarta, 39.5% in Greater Jakarta area (Bodetabek), and 15% from other regions throughout Indonesia, reflecting TMII's role as both local recreational destination and national cultural attraction. Educational backgrounds were diverse, with 48.5% students, 20% private sector employees, 14% government employees, 5.5% entrepreneurs, and 12% other occupations. Visit frequency during the study period showed 56.5% first-time visitors, 36.5% with 2-3 visits, and 7% with 4+ visits, indicating substantial new visitor attraction post-revitalization.

### Measurement Model Assessment

All constructs demonstrated valid reliability and validity. Composite reliability values ranged from 0.843 to 0.958, and Cronbach's alpha from 0.751 to 0.935, exceeding the recommended 0.70 threshold (Hair et al., 2022). Factor loadings for all indicators exceeded 0.70, ranging from 0.713 to 0.946, establishing individual indicator reliability.

Convergent validity was confirmed with average variance extracted (AVE) values above 0.50 for all constructs: Sensory (0.655), Affective (0.748), Behavioral (0.662), Intellectual (0.719), Satisfaction (0.884), Revisit Intention (0.573), and Recommendation Intention (0.600). These values indicate that constructs explain more than half the variance in their respective indicators.

Discriminant validity was established through several criteria. Cross-loadings showed all indicators loaded highest on their intended constructs. Fornell-Larcker criteria confirmed that the square root of AVE for each construct exceeded its correlations with other constructs. Most importantly, HTMT ratios remained below 0.90 for all construct pairs, with the highest value 0.897 between Satisfaction and Revisit Intention, confirming adequate discriminant validity (Henseler et al., 2015).

### Structural Model Results

The structural model demonstrated strong explanatory power, with R<sup>2</sup> values of 0.631 for tourist satisfaction, 0.611 for revisit intention, and 0.663 for recommendation intention. These values indicate that the model explains 63.1%, 61.1%, and 66.3% of variance in respective constructs, representing substantial explanatory power in social science research (Cohen, 1988).

Predictive relevance was confirmed through blindfolding procedures, yielding Q<sup>2</sup> values of 0.549 for satisfaction, 0.338 for revisit intention, and 0.382 for recommendation intention, all substantially above zero indicating strong predictive capability. Model fit was adequate with SRMR values of 0.055 for saturated model and 0.056 for estimated model, both below the 0.08 threshold for good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Table 1. Hypothesis Testing Results**

Hypothesis	Path	Coefficient	t-value	P-Value	Result
H1a	Sensory Satisfaction	→ 0.201	4.142	0.000	Supported
H1b	Affective Satisfaction	→ 0.301	4.845	0.000	Supported
H1c	Behavioral Satisfaction	→ 0.384	7.618	0.000	Supported

Hypothesis	Path	Coefficient	t-value	P-Value	Result
H1d	Intellectual Satisfaction →	0.117	1.912	0.056	Not Supported
H2a	Sensory Intention → Revisit	0.106	1.734	0.083	Not Supported
H2b	Affective Intention → Revisit	0.081	1.137	0.256	Not Supported
H2c	Behavioral Intention → Revisit	0.043	0.687	0.492	Not Supported
H2d	Intellectual Intention → Revisit	0.177	2.906	0.004	Supported
H3a	Sensory Recommendation Intention →	0.120	2.264	0.024	Supported
H3b	Affective Recommendation Intention →	0.177	2.238	0.025	Supported
H3c	Behavioral Recommendation Intention →	0.061	1.065	0.287	Not Supported
H3d	Intellectual Recommendation Intention →	0.253	3.725	0.000	Supported
H4	Satisfaction → Revisit Intention	0.504	6.781	0.000	Supported
H5	Satisfaction → Recommendation Intention	0.369	5.787	0.000	Supported

### The Satisfaction-Loyalty Paradox

The study revealed a striking paradox that challenges conventional tourism literature: dimensions that strongly influence satisfaction (sensory, affective, behavioral) show limited direct impact on loyalty intentions, while intellectual experience, which has minimal effect on satisfaction, significantly drives revisit and recommendation intentions.

This finding can be theoretically explained through Pine and Gilmore's (1998) Experience Economy framework, which categorizes experiences into four realms based on participation level (active vs. passive) and connection type (absorption vs. immersion). Sensory, affective, and behavioral experiences align with the entertainment realm, characterized by passive absorption of destination stimuli that provide pleasure and satisfaction. According to Pine and Gilmore (1998), "entertainment experiences are those that customers absorb through their senses while customers remain essentially passive" (p. 101).

Entertainment-oriented experiences excel at generating visitor satisfaction through visual stimulation, emotional responses, and engagement in recreational activities. However, their effectiveness in building long-term loyalty is relatively limited. This is due to the tendency of entertainment experiences to be generic and easily found at other destinations, reducing destination uniqueness and competitiveness. Moreover, such experiences do not provide transformative value capable of changing perspectives or deeply enhancing visitors' cognitive capacity. The memories generated tend to be episodic and temporary, easily fading over time, while accompanying novelty sensations decrease after the first visit (Oh et al., 2007; Quadri-Felitti & Fiore, 2013).

Conversely, intellectual experiences operate in the educational realm, requiring active mental participation and cognitive engagement. While creating higher cognitive demands that may not provide immediate satisfaction, they generate lasting value through knowledge acquisition, perspective transformation, and cultural understanding. Pine and Gilmore (1998) emphasize that "educational experiences reveal skills or knowledge that participants can take with them when the experience ends" (p. 102), explaining their stronger influence on future behavioral intentions.

Unlike entertainment experiences, intellectual experiences are rooted in educational dimensions that demand active cognitive engagement and deeper mental participation. While not always producing instant satisfaction due to requiring greater cognitive effort, this type of experience provides long-term value through knowledge internalization processes, perspective changes, and deepening cultural understanding. Pine and Gilmore (1998) emphasize that educational experiences create skills or knowledge that remain attached and can be utilized after the experience ends, explaining their contribution to long-term behavioral intentions.

Differences in value creation timeframes further clarify this paradox. Entertainment experiences generally reach peak value during consumption but quickly diminish as memories fade and alternative destinations emerge. Conversely, educational experiences, while providing lower direct satisfaction levels, actually increase in value over time through reflection processes, integration into individual knowledge structures, and meaning-making of learning benefits (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Tulving, 1972).

## Mediation Analysis

**Table 2. Mediation Analysis Results**

Indirect Path	Coefficient	t-value	P-Value	Mediation Effect
Sensory → Satisfaction → Revisit	0.101	3.415	0.001	Significant
Affective → Satisfaction → Revisit	0.152	4.021	0.000	Significant
Behavioral → Satisfaction → Revisit	0.193	5.089	0.000	Significant
Intellectual → Satisfaction → Revisit	0.059	1.761	0.078	Not Significant
Sensory → Satisfaction → Recommend	0.074	3.180	0.001	Significant
Affective → Satisfaction → Recommend	0.111	3.719	0.000	Significant
Behavioral → Satisfaction → Recommend	0.142	4.353	0.000	Significant
Intellectual → Satisfaction → Recommend	0.043	1.802	0.072	Not Significant

Mediation analysis results show that tourist satisfaction significantly serves as a connecting path between entertainment-oriented experiences—namely sensory, affective, and behavioral dimensions—and final outcomes of revisit and recommendation intentions. However, this mediation effect was not found for the intellectual dimension. These findings indicate that entertainment experiences tend to work indirectly through increased satisfaction, while educational experiences influence loyalty directly through different psychological pathways.

This aligns with the transformative service research concept proposed by Anderson et al. (2013), which states that transformative experiences can generate impacts that transcend instant satisfaction and lead to deeper changes in individual well-being and behavior. In the TMII context, intellectual experiences appear to provide transformative value that influences loyalty directly without going through satisfaction stages as prerequisites.

From a theoretical perspective, these findings enrich destination branding literature by showing that satisfaction and loyalty do not always emerge sequentially as results of the same experiences. Conversely, the psychological mechanisms underlying both can differ, requiring different managerial approaches. These findings invalidate common assumptions in tourism

studies that increased satisfaction automatically generates loyalty (Oliver, 1997; Anderson & Sullivan, 1993).

This research also expands the application of Experience Economy Theory in cultural heritage tourism realms, affirming that each type of experience has different contributions in shaping tourist behavior. Entertainment experiences through sensations, emotions, and activities are more effective in creating short-term satisfaction due to their passive and entertaining nature. Conversely, educational experiences through cognitive and reflective stimulation are stronger in building long-term loyalty through learning processes.

### **Practical Implications for Destination Management**

These findings provide strategic direction for cultural heritage destination managers to design experiences capable of addressing two main objectives simultaneously: creating instant satisfaction and fostering long-term loyalty. For destinations like TMII, the balance between commercial success and cultural preservation missions becomes crucial.

**Strategies for Enhancing Short-term Satisfaction:** Strengthening sensory aspects through visual aesthetics and attractive spatial atmosphere, strengthening affective dimensions through emotional narratives and personal service interactions, and developing behavioral aspects through interactive, participatory, and direct experience-based activities.

**Strategies for Building Long-term Loyalty:** Educational approaches that are transformative in nature, such as through deeply curated cultural tours, workshops providing cultural insights, and reflective activities that encourage intellectual engagement and appreciation of cultural heritage values.

**Integrated Approach (Edutainment):** The most effective approach is combining entertainment and educational dimensions into a unified experience. This can be realized through innovations such as technology-based interactive museums (e.g., virtual reality), craft activities that are both enjoyable and educational, or cultural performances that not only entertain but also convey educational messages.

With this integrative strategy, cultural destinations like TMII can not only attract short-term visits but also build a visitor base that is loyal, reflective, and becomes cultural advocacy agents in the future.

### **Implications for Indonesian Cultural Tourism Development**

Findings in this research provide significant strategic impact for Indonesian cultural tourism development direction. With cultural diversity backgrounds covering 34 provinces and hundreds of ethnicities, Indonesian cultural tourism attractions need to be designed to have distinctive characteristics different from mere commercial entertainment venues. Emphasis on educational values and transformative experiences becomes key to creating authentic differentiation, without neglecting entertainment elements still needed by contemporary tourists.

The successful revitalization of Taman Mini Indonesia Indah (TMII) shows that cultural heritage destinations can achieve commercial success while still prioritizing educational functions. However, careful strategies are needed to maintain balance between inclusive entertainment accessibility aspects and authentic cultural value preservation. This approach becomes relevant considering diverse tourist segmentation, from casual visitors to cultural students seeking deeper meaning from their visits.

In national tourism policy contexts, this study's results recommend repositioning cultural destinations as transformative learning spaces rather than merely entertainment locations. This approach potentially provides more sustainable competitive advantages in the long term. Educational tourism also aligns with global development directions increasingly demanding

meaningful, responsible travel experiences that provide real contributions to personal growth and cross-cultural understanding enhancement (Richards, 2018; UNWTO, 2019).

### Limitations

Several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional study design captures relationships at one time point, limiting causal inference. Longitudinal research tracking tourists over extended periods would provide stronger evidence for temporal dynamics of satisfaction versus loyalty formation.

Second, the study focuses on one destination, limiting generalizability to other cultural heritage contexts. Comparative studies across various types of cultural destinations (museums, historical sites, cultural districts) would enhance understanding of when and why satisfaction-loyalty paradoxes occur.

Third, the research relies on behavioral intentions rather than actual behavior. Future studies should examine actual revisit behavior and recommendation actions to validate intention-behavior relationships in cultural tourism contexts.

Fourth, variables of cultural background, tourism motivation, and learning styles may moderate the examined relationships. Future research should explore these moderating effects to identify different tourist segments.

### Recommendations for Future Research

Based on identified findings and limitations, several future research directions can be recommended:

1. **Longitudinal Studies:** Research tracking tourists over 6-12 months post-visit to examine how educational experience value develops over time and influences actual loyalty behavior.
2. **Cross-Destination Comparative Analysis:** Studies comparing findings across various types of Indonesian cultural heritage destinations (temples, museums, cultural tourism villages) to identify universal versus context-specific patterns.
3. **Mixed-Method Research:** Combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches to deeply understand psychological mechanisms behind satisfaction-loyalty paradoxes.
4. **Segmentation Analysis:** Research examining how demographic, psychographic, and behavioral tourist characteristics moderate relationships between experience dimensions and outcomes.
5. **Implementation Studies:** Action research examining integrated edutainment strategy implementation and its impact on destinations.

### CONCLUSION

This research uncovers a paradox in cultural heritage tourism, demonstrating that the Destination Brand Experience (DBE) dimensions which enhance tourist satisfaction—primarily sensory, affective, and behavioral (entertainment-oriented)—are distinct from those that foster destination loyalty, which are more strongly linked to the intellectual (educational) dimension. These findings challenge the conventional belief that satisfaction automatically leads to loyalty, suggesting that destination management should integrate immediate, engaging experiences with educational elements to build deeper, more sustainable visitor relationships. In the context of Indonesian cultural tourism development, positioning destinations as transformative learning environments is more relevant and sustainable than focusing solely on entertainment, aligning with global trends toward meaningful and responsible tourism. For future research, it is recommended to explore the impact of digital and technological

innovations in enhancing both educational and entertainment experiences, as well as to investigate these dynamics across diverse cultural heritage settings and visitor segments.

## REFERENCES

- Agapito, D., Valle, P. O., & Mendes, J. (2017). Tourists' memories, sensory impressions and loyalty: In loco and post-visit study. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(4), 471-481.
- Anderson, L., Ostrom, A. L., Corus, C., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., Giraldo, M., ... & Williams, J. D. (2013). Transformative service research: An agenda for the future. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), 1203-1210.
- Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. W. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Science*, 12(2), 125-143.
- 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.
- Brakus, J. J., Schmitt, B. H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: What is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52-68.
- Buhalis, D., & Amaranggana, A. (2015). Smart tourism destinations enhancing tourism experience through personalisation of services. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015* (pp. 377-389). Springer.
- Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29-35.
- Chen, N., & Rahman, I. (2018). Cultural tourism: An analysis of engagement, cultural contact, memorable tourism experience and destination loyalty. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 26, 153-163.
- Chi, C. G. Q., & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 624-636.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2000). Managing heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 682-708.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2021). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1-20.
- Guleria, A., Joshi, R., & Adil, M. (2023). The impact of memorable tourism experiences on customer-based destination brand equity: The mediating role of destination attachment and overall satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(2), 891-910.
- Hair, J. F., & Alamer, A. (2022). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in second language and education research: Guidelines using an applied example. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 1(3), 100027.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2022). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook*. Springer.
- Hidayat, A. R., Alifah, N., Astuti, A. W., Cahya, M. N., & Lutfia, L. (2025). Utilization of innovation in digital marketing: Qualitative study of SMEs in Indonesia. *Multidisciplinary Science Journal*, 7(10), 2025489.

- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115-135.
- Hosany, S., & Prayag, G. (2013). Patterns of tourists' emotional responses, satisfaction, and intention to recommend. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(6), 730-737.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
- Jiménez-Barreto, J., Rubio, N., Campo, S., & Molinillo, S. (2020). Linking the online destination brand experience and brand credibility with tourists' behavioral intentions toward a destination. *Tourism Management*, 79, 104101.
- Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. B., & McCormick, B. (2018). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12-25.
- Litvin, S. W., Goldsmith, R. E., & Pan, B. (2008). Electronic word-of-mouth in hospitality and tourism management. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 458-468.
- Lv, X., Li, C., & McCabe, S. (2020). Expanding theory of tourists' destination loyalty: The role of sensory impressions. *Tourism Management*, 77, 104026.
- Martins, C., Carvalho, P., & Almeida, N. (2021). Destination brand experience in nature-based cultural destinations: Evidence from Peneda-Gerês National Park. *Sustainability*, 13(20), 11569.
- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: The partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Moraga, E., & Barra, C. (2023). Does destination brand experience help build trust? Disentangling the effects of brand experience dimensions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 47, 100767.
- Nguyen Viet, B., Dang, H. P., & Nguyen, H. H. (2020). Revisiting the relationship between perceived value and intention to revisit: The role of satisfaction and regret. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 37(8-9), 1001-1017.
- Oh, H., Fiore, A. M., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: Tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 119-132.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460-469.
- Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(4), 97-105.
- Pitana, I. G., & Diarta, I. K. S. (2009). *Pengantar ilmu pariwisata*. Andi Publisher.
- Poria, Y., Butler, R., & Airey, D. (2003). The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 238-254.
- PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur, Prambanan & Ratu Boko. (2024). *Laporan tahunan 2023*. PT TWC.
- Quadri-Felitti, D., & Fiore, A. M. (2013). Destination loyalty: Effects of wine tourists' experiences, memories, and satisfaction on intentions. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 13(1), 47-62.
- Ramesh, V., & Jaunky, V. C. (2021). The tourist experience: Modelling the relationship between tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 37, 2284-2289.
- Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 12-21.

- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Mitchell, R., & Gudergan, S. P. (2020). Partial least squares structural equation modeling in HRM research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(12), 1617-1643.
- Stavrianea, A., & Kamenidou, I. (2022). Memorable tourism experiences, destination image, satisfaction, and loyalty: An empirical study of Santorini Island. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(1), 142-160.
- Stylos, N., Bellou, V., Andronikidis, A., & Vassiliadis, C. A. (2021). Linking the dots among destination images, place attachment, and revisit intentions: A study among British and Russian tourists. *Tourism Management*, 82, 104204.
- Sujai, M. (2016). Strategi pemerintah Indonesia dalam menarik kunjungan turis mancanegara. *Kajian Ekonomi & Keuangan*, 20(1), 61-75.
- Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). *Heritage tourism*. Prentice Hall.
- Tulving, E. (1972). Episodic and semantic memory. In E. Tulving & W. Donaldson (Eds.), *Organization of memory* (pp. 381-403). Academic Press.
- UNWTO. (2019). *International tourism highlights: 2019 edition*. World Tourism Organization.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56.
- Zhang, Y., Hu, L., & Wang, S. (2024). Tourist behaviour: The role of digital marketing and social media in destination choice. *Applied Geography*, 162, 103143.
- Zhao, X., Lynch Jr, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 197-206.