

Exploring the Relationship of Perceived Risks on Revisit Intentions: A Study of Accommodations Repurposed as Quarantine Facilities during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Gail R. Lagadia¹, Patricia Nicole O. Baldos¹, Xena Mae R. Oclarit¹, Heslie Ree P. Pontillo¹,
Valerie Anne Rose Q. Pontillo¹

¹College of Business Administration and Accountancy, Mindanao State University at Naawan,
Naawan, Misamis Oriental, 9023, Philippines

Abstract - The hospitality industry and tourism sectors have been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, leading to the transformation of accommodation facilities into quarantine facilities. While crucial for public health, these have raised concerns about cleanliness, safety, and potential future infection among prospective guests. These concerns are likely to influence tourists' risk perceptions and the guests' willingness to return to these accommodations. This study aims to explore the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intentions of these repurposed accommodations, which is essential for the industry's recovery and future resilience. This study addresses a gap in the literature by specifically examining how tourists' perceptions of risk influence their revisit intentions towards accommodations repurposed as quarantine facilities, a topic that has not been extensively studied in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed, with data collected from 300 respondents who had experienced staying in accommodation facilities for leisure or personal reasons. Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intentions. The study found a highly significant and inverse relationship between perceived risks and revisit intentions, indicating that lower perceived risks are associated with higher revisit intentions. Physical and financial risks showed a weak negative relationship, while psychological and performance risks exhibited a moderate negative relationship with revisit intentions. The findings signify the importance of implementing effective risk mitigation strategies and transparent communication to enhance tourists' comfort and safety perceptions. This research provides valuable insights for the hospitality industry to develop strategies that mitigate perceived risks and boost customer confidence in the post-pandemic era.

Keywords: tourism, hospitality management, perceived risks, revisit intention, pandemic

I. INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has profoundly impacted the global tourism and hospitality industry, with accommodations playing a crucial role in controlling the spread of the virus. Amid the crisis, many accommodation facilities transitioned into quarantine facilities to support public health efforts. This shift not only altered the primary function of these accommodations but also influenced tourists' perceptions and behaviors towards them. Understanding the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention of these transformed accommodations is essential for the recovery and future resilience of the hospitality sector.

Perceived risk is a critical factor influencing consumer behavior, and refers to the uncertainty and potential negative outcomes associated with a product or service (Moutinho, 1987). In the context of tourism, perceived risk encompasses various dimensions, including health, financial, and psychological risks, all of which have been magnified by the pandemic (Floyd et al., 2004). The concept of perceived risk has been extensively studied in tourism literature, revealing its significant impact on travel decisions and destination choice (Quintal et al., 2010).

In the pandemic era, reality pushes people to accept the pandemic conditions that affect the whole world (Novitasari et al., 2020). During COVID-19, health-related risks became particularly salient, reshaping tourists' attitudes toward travel and accommodation choices.

The conversion of accommodations into quarantine facilities was a strategic response to the pandemic, aimed at isolating suspected or confirmed COVID-19 cases and containing the virus's spread (Gössling et al., 2020). Quarantine reduces the contamination of people but has negative effects on the economy and social life (Nafti, 2021). While this measure was critical for public health, it also posed a unique challenge for the hospitality industry. The association of accommodations with quarantine and disease raised concerns about cleanliness, safety, and the potential for future infection among prospective guests (Hao et al., 2020). These quarantine facilities should have post-recovery plans processes, and monitoring mechanisms (Saguran, 2023), to promote sustainable tourism development and improve the well-being of the tourists and communities (Bozdaglar, 2023). These concerns are likely to influence tourists' risk perceptions and their willingness to return to these accommodations once they resume normal operations.

Revisit intention, a crucial indicator of customer loyalty and satisfaction reflects a tourist's likelihood to return to a previously visited destination or accommodation (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Factors influencing revisit intention include past experiences, satisfaction, and perceived value, which are now overshadowed by the heightened awareness of health risks (Jin et al., 2019). The pandemic has added a new layer of complexity to this dynamic, as tourists weigh the benefits of returning to familiar accommodations against the perceived risks of potential health hazards.

Previous research underscores the critical role of perceived risks in shaping consumer behavior, particularly in the context of travel and tourism. Perceived risk is known to negatively impact tourists' destination choices and revisit intentions (Floyd et al., 2004; Fuchs & Reichel, 2011). In the aftermath of the pandemic, health-related risks have become a predominant concern, significantly affecting tourists' trust and confidence in accommodations previously used for quarantine purposes (Hao et al., 2020). Previous research has established a negative relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention, suggesting that higher perceived risks deter tourists from returning to a destination or accommodation (Fuchs & Reichel, 2011). In the context of COVID-19, this relationship is particularly pronounced, as studies have shown that tourists' perceptions of health and safety significantly influence their travel decisions and their willingness to revisit accommodations that were previously used as quarantine facilities. Addressing these concerns through enhanced hygiene practices, transparent communication, and safety protocols is crucial for rebuilding trust and encouraging revisit intention.

Despite the growing body of literature on perceived risk and tourism behavior, there is a paucity of research specifically addressing how these perceptions influence revisit intentions towards accommodations that have been repurposed as quarantine facilities. This gap in the literature is particularly salient as the industry seeks to recover and restore customer confidence in the post-pandemic era. Understanding this relationship is vital for developing effective strategies to mitigate perceived risks and enhance the attractiveness of these accommodations to potential guests.

This study aims to explore the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention of accommodations that have been repurposed as quarantine facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic. By examining tourists' perceptions and behavioral intentions, this research seeks to provide valuable insights for the hospitality industry to devise strategies that mitigate perceived risks and enhance customer confidence in the post-pandemic era.

II. METHODS

Research Design

This study made use of a descriptive-correlational research design. Descriptive research design aims to systematically obtain information to describe a phenomenon, situation, or population. Correlational research design examines relationships between variables which reflects the strength and direction of the relationship.

Sampling

The respondents of this study were individuals who had experienced checking in to an accommodation facility for leisure or personal reasons. The researchers covered three hundred (300) respondents for the study. A

purposive sampling method was used in gathering the data in which the researchers posted the questionnaire via Google form through online platforms with a qualification that respondents experience checking in to accommodation. The research study relies on respondents who are qualified and readily available to participate in the study and respond to the survey questionnaire.

Statistical Tool

This study utilized Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficient to explore the relationship between the research variables. Kendall's tau-b correlation coefficient is a nonparametric measure of the strength and direction of association that exists between two variables measured on an ordinal scale. It can discuss the correlation and influence between the dimensions. This tool was used to determine the relationships of the variables, namely, Perceived Risks, the independent variable, and Revisit Intention, the dependent variable.

Data Collection

This study used a survey questionnaire to collect data from the respondents. The instrument consisted of two parts: Perceived Risks (PR), and revisit intention (RI).

The perceived risks (PR) questionnaire was adopted and modified from Bhukya and Singh (2015) which was based on the Risk Perception theory. The instrument measured the four dimensions such as physical risk, psychological risk, financial risk, and performance risk. There were twenty (20) items on the scale; each dimension of perceived risks has five (5) items with a five-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree applies, 3 = neither, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree).

The revisit intention (RI) questionnaire was adopted and modified from Harun et al. (2018) which was based on the Theory of Planned Behavior. The revisit intention comprised ten (10) items utilizing a standard five-point response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree applies, 3 = neither, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree).

To ensure the reliability and validity of the measurement instruments, they were refined through verification by a university hospitality management professor. Moreover, a pilot study was conducted to identify and address any weaknesses in construct measurement and research design. All variables exhibited satisfactory Cronbach's alpha reliability scores exceeding 0.7, indicating their suitability for the study without requiring modification.

Table 1. Cronbach's alphas test of reliability.

Constructs	N of items	Cronbach's alpha	Internal Consistency
Perceived risks	20	0.79	Acceptable
Revisit intention	10	0.93	Excellent

Measures

Perceived Risks: PR is defined as the consumers' perceptions of uncertainty and the magnitude of the possible adverse consequences (Sohn et al., 2016). Perceived Risks is an individual's perception of uncertainty and potential negative consequences when buying a product or service (George, 2010). Quintal and Polczynski (2010) expanded on this by including financial, social, psychological, and physical risks, particularly for tourists. According to Bhukya and Singh (2015), there are four dimensions of perceived risk, namely perceived functional risk, perceived financial risk, perceived physical risk, and perceived psychological risk. Harun et al. (2018) noted that perceived risk involves guests' perceptions of potential losses, which significantly influence behavior or decision-making processes (Brug et al., 2004; Sjöberg, 2000; Çetinsöz & Ege, 2013; Chew & Jahari, 2013). As indicated by various previous experts, Perceived Risks encompasses the customers' assessment of uncertainty and possible negative outcomes associated with purchasing decisions, influenced by various dimensions such as financial, social, psychological, and physical risks, particularly impacting decision-making in contexts like tourism. In this study, Perceived risks were evaluated with four dimensions which are physical risk, psychological risk, financial risk, and performance risk. Perceived risks have been measured using a set of twenty questions. Perceived risks have an alpha reliability of 0.79 which has an acceptable internal consistency.

Revisit Intention: RI has been defined as a visitor repeating an activity or revisiting a destination (Baker & Crompton, 2000). The intention to revisit a tourism destination can be seen as a type of post-consumption behavior (Cole & Scott, 2004). Revisit intention also relates to the visitor's judgment about the likeliness or plans to revisit the same destination (Khasawneh & Alfandi, 2019; Stylos et al., 2016) or the willingness to

recommend the destination to others (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Khasawneh&Alfandi, 2019). Revisit intention is defined as an individual's behavior that is influenced by decisions toward revisiting in the future (Harun, 2018). Revisit intention is defined as a part of customer loyalty and the will to revisit the destination in the future (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Oppermann, 2000). Revisit intention is defined as customer loyalty as behavior including continued patronage and recommendations (Chen and Tsai, 2007), and relates to the visitor's judgment about the likelihood or plans to revisit (Khasawneh&Alfandi, 2019; Stylos et. al, 2016). Based on the definitions of the researchers, Revisit intention encompasses a visitor's likelihood or plans to repeat an activity or return, customer retention, customer loyalty, reflecting post-consumption behavior, and willingness to recommend to others. Revisit intention was evaluated and has been measured using a set of ten questions. RI has an alpha reliability of 0.93 which has an excellent internal consistency.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the correlation analysis using Kendall's tau-b (T_b) correlation coefficient as presented in Table 3, the results revealed that there is a highly significant and weak negative relationship between physical risk and revisit intention ($r = -0.273$, p -value < 0.001), which means that physical risk is indirectly associated with revisit intention. It is evident from this relationship that the lower an individual's physical risk, the higher their revisit intention will be. This shows that the lower level of physical risk of tourists will perceive a higher revisit intention of accommodations that have been repurposed as quarantine facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In examining the tourists' psychological risk, particularly its association with revisit intention, the analysis, as presented in Table 3, reveals a highly significant indirect relationship between psychological risk and revisit intention ($r = -0.460$, p -value < 0.001). This suggests that decreasing psychological risk corresponds with an increase in revisit intention. There is also a moderate negative relationship between these two variables. This means that the lower the levels of psychological risk of tourists, the greater the likelihood of intention to revisit the accommodations turn into quarantine facilities.

In evaluating the tourists' financial risk to revisit intention, the results imply that there is a highly significant inverse relationship between financial risk and revisit intention ($r = -0.228$, p -value < 0.001). There is also a weak negative correlation between financial risk and revisit intention. This means that as financial risk decreases, revisit intention increases. This suggests that tourists who have a lower level of financial risk perception to the accommodations turn to quarantine facilities during COVID-19, tourists are more willing to revisit the accommodations.

In analyzing the tourists' performance risk, particularly its relation with revisit intention, the analysis, reveals that there is a highly significant adverse relationship between performance risk and revisit intention ($r = -0.480$, p -value < 0.001). This indicates that decreasing performance risk corresponds with an increase in revisit intention. There is also a moderate inverse relationship between these two variables. This means that the lower the levels of performance risk of tourists, the greater the likelihood of intention to revisit the accommodations that turn into quarantine facilities.

Table 2. Level of perceived risks and revisit intention.

Variable	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
Physical risk	300	2.520	.8073	Low risk
Psychological risk	300	2.643	.7905	Moderate risk
Financial risk	300	3.167	.7075	Moderate risk
Performance risk	300	2.540	.6757	Low risk
Perceived Risks (PR)	300	2.573	.5937	Low risk
Revisit Intention (RI)	300	3.650	.8102	High Intent

Note: Perceived risks: 1.00-1.80 = very low risk, 1.81-2.60 = low risk, 2.61-3.40 = moderate risk, 3.41-4.20 = high risk, 4.21-5.00 = very high risk; Revisit intention: 1.00-1.80 = very low intent, 1.81-2.60 = low intent, 2.61-3.40 = moderate intent, 3.41-4.20 = high intent, 4.21-5.00 = very high intent

A correlation analysis was performed to assess the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention. The results revealed that the effect of perceived risks on revisit intention was highly significant ($r = -0.468$,

$p < 0.001$). There is a moderate inverse correlation between perceived risks and revisit intention. This implies that as perceived risks decrease, revisit intention increases. This represents that tourists who have a lower level of risk perception, tourists are more willing to revisit the accommodations that turn to quarantine facilities during COVID-19.

The study's findings are consistent with the results of Yu et. al. (2021), who reveal that perceived risks of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) have a negative impact on revisit intention. Correspondingly, Rather (2021), and Karagöz et. al. (2023) support the result which states that perceived risks have a negative effect on revisit intention. Additionally, this confirms previous findings by Pai et. al (2024) which reveal that there is a negative relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention. Moreover, Hasan et. al. (2017) share that if tourists find the tourism offers risky, and have a bad experience, then they would never plan to visit in the future, and even they would not refer it to others. Furthermore, Viet et. al. (2020) supported this study and confirmed the negative impact of perceived risk on the intention to return. In general, the findings emphasize that a well-supported body of research shows a clear and negative relationship between the perceived risks to the accommodations that turn to quarantine facilities during COVID-19 and individuals' willingness to revisit accommodations, confirming that higher perceived risks lead to lower revisit intentions.

Table 3. Relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention.

Predictor	Dependent: Revisit Intention (RI)			
	Kendall's tau-b r	p-value	Interpretation	Decision
Physical risk	-.273	< .001(**)	High significant relationship	Fail to reject H_0
Psychological risk	-.460	< .001(**)	High significant relationship	Fail to reject H_0
Financial risk	-.228	< .001(**)	High significant relationship	Fail to reject H_0
Performance risk	-.480	< .001(**)	High significant relationship	Fail to reject H_0
Perceived Risks (PR)	-.468	< .001(**)	High significant relationship	Fail to reject H_0

Note: *p-value < 0.05, **p-value < 0.01; r-value: 0.000-0.199=very weak, 0.200-0.399=weak, 0.400-0.599=moderate, 0.600-0.799=strong, 0.800-1.000=very strong

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In exploring the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention, the research concluded that this study demonstrates a highly significant and inverse moderate relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention. This indicates that perceived risks significantly predict the revisit intention of the tourists where the lower the level of perceived risks, the higher the intention to revisit the accommodations that are repurposed as quarantine facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In terms of the dimensions of perceived risks which are the physical risk, psychological risk, financial risk, and performance risk in association with revisit intention, the study concluded that physical risk and financial risk have a highly significant and weak negative relationship with revisit intention. In addition, psychological risk and performance risk have a highly significant and moderate indirect relationship with revisit intention. These reveal that tourists who have a lower level of risk perception to the accommodations turn to quarantine facilities during COVID-19, tourists are more willing to revisit the accommodations.

This study contributes to the existing literature on risk perception by providing empirical evidence that perceived risks, specifically physical, psychological, financial, and performance risks, significantly relate to tourists' revisit intentions. This aligns with the theoretical understanding that perceived risks can influence consumer behavior, particularly in the context of travel and tourism. Additionally, The findings support and extend consumer behavior models, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior, by highlighting how perceived risks play a crucial role in decision-making processes. The inverse relationship between perceived risks and revisit intention entails that reducing these risks can enhance positive behavioral intentions. Moreover, the research offers insights into the conceptual foundation of crisis management in tourism. It shows that perceived risks during crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, can alter tourist behavior. This underscores the need for robust risk management strategies to mitigate perceived risks and foster tourist confidence.

In real-world applications, for the accommodations repurposed as quarantine facilities, it is essential to implement and communicate effective risk mitigation strategies by addressing physical, psychological, financial, and performance risks. The establishments can enhance tourists' comfort and safety perceptions, thereby increasing the likelihood of revisits. The accommodation facility should provide clear and transparent communication about safety measures, health protocols, and financial guarantees can reduce perceived risks. Marketing efforts should focus on reassuring potential visitors about the low risk associated with staying at these accommodations. The establishment should also improve service quality to address performance risks which can also boost revisit intentions. Ensuring high standards of cleanliness, efficient service delivery, and overall customer satisfaction can mitigate performance-related concerns. Implementing robust customer feedback systems can help identify and address specific risk perceptions. Regularly collecting and analyzing feedback allows accommodations to continuously improve and adapt their services to meet tourist expectations and reduce perceived risks. By understanding and addressing the dimensions of perceived risks, accommodations can not only enhance their reputation and trustworthiness but also encourage higher revisit rates, which is crucial for recovery and growth in the post-pandemic tourism industry.

In light of the study's findings, it is strongly recommended that the administrators and staff prioritize enhancing faculty members' emotional intelligence skills and understanding. Investing in programs aimed at developing emotional intelligence among faculty members is crucial. This could involve workshops, training sessions, and other developmental activities. Additionally, regular team-building exercises and information drives should foster emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. Additionally, faculty members may focus on developing their emotional intelligence, which can lead to higher organizational commitment and job satisfaction, which may result in less stress and increased productivity at work.

Despite the careful implementation of precautionary measures, this study is subject to certain limitations. Firstly, data collection was restricted to Iligan City, Philippines, limiting the generalizability of the findings to other geographic regions. To enhance the external validity of future research, it is advisable to gather data from a more diverse range of geographic areas.

Moreover, while this study primarily employed quantitative data analysis, future researchers might consider integrating qualitative research methods. Qualitative approaches, such as interviews or focus groups, can provide deeper insights into experiences, perceptions, and attitudes, enriching the understanding of underlying mechanisms and potential limitations of perceived risks and revisit intentions. These qualitative insights can complement the quantitative findings, offering a more comprehensive perspective.

In this study, the exploration of the relationship between perceived risks and revisit intentions of accommodations repurposed as quarantine facilities during the COVID-19 pandemic was based solely on tourists who experienced these accommodations. It is recommended that future research also consider other tourism establishments, such as resorts, restaurants, and tourist destinations. This broader approach will enhance the comprehensiveness of research in this area, allowing for a more holistic understanding of perceived risks and revisit intention dynamics, ultimately facilitating more robust conclusions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to extend their heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Elnor C. Roa, Chancellor of Mindanao State University at Naawan, for her unwavering support, unparalleled encouragement, and significant inspiration throughout the process of this research publication. Her guidance and commitment have played a pivotal role in this publication journey. The authors also extend their sincere gratitude to their mentors for their invaluable guidance and perseverance throughout the research publication process. Their wisdom, insights, and dedication have been instrumental in the successful completion of this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Baker, D., & Crompton, J. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 785-804. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00108-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5).
- [2] Bhukya, R., & Singh, S. (2015). The effect of perceived risk dimensions on purchase intention: An empirical evidence from Indian private labels market. *American Journal of Business*, 30(4), 218-230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJB-10-2014-0055>.

DOI: [10.51386/25815946/ijms-v7i4p118](https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v7i4p118)

Volume: 7 Issue: 4

July to August 2024

<https://www.ijmsjournal.org>

- [3] Bozdaglar, H., (2023). The effectiveness of community-based tourism initiatives in promoting sustainable tourism development and improving the well-being of local communities. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 6(1), 280-286. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v6i1p123>.
- [4] Brug, J., Aro, A. R., Oenema, A., De Zwart, O., Richardus, J. H., & Bishop, G. D. (2004). SARS risk perception, knowledge, precautions, and information sources, the Netherlands. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 10(8), 1486. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1008.040283>.
- [5] Caber, M., Gonz ó lez-Rodriguez, M., Albayrak, T., & Simonetti, B. (2020). Does perceived risk really matter in travel behaviour? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 26(3), 334-353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766720927762>.
- [6] Çetinsöz, B. C., & Ege, Z. (2013). Impacts of perceived risks on tourists' revisit intentions, Anatolia. *An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 24(2), 173-187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2012.743921>.
- [7] Chen, C. F., & Tsai, D. C. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115-1122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.07.007>.
- [8] Cheng, T., & Lu, C. (2013). Destination image, novelty, hedonics, perceived value, and revisiting behavioral intention for island tourism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(7), 766-783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2012.697906>.
- [9] Chew, E., & Jahari, S. (2014). Destination image as a mediator between perceived risks and revisit intention: A case of post-disaster Japan. *Tourism Management*, 40, 382-393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.07.008>.
- [10] Cohen, S., Prayag, G., & Moital, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 872-909. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.850064>.
- [11] Cole, S., & Scott, D. (2004). Examining the Mediating Role of Experience Quality in a Model of Tourist Experiences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 16(1), 79-90. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v16n01_08.
- [12] Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2011). An exploratory inquiry into destination risk perceptions and risk reduction strategies of first time vs. repeat visitors to a highly volatile destination. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 266-276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.tourman.2010.01.012>.
- [13] George, R. (2010). Visitor perceptions of crime-safety and attitudes towards risk: The case of Table Mountain National Park, Cape Town. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 31(6), 806-815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.011>.
- [14] Hao, F., Xiao, Q., & Chon, K. (2020). COVID-19 and China's Hotel Industry: Impacts, a Disaster Management Framework, and Post-Pandemic Agenda. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 90, 102636-102636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102636>.
- [15] Harun, A., Obong, A., Kassim, A., & Lily, J. (2018). The effects of destination image and perceived risk on revisit intention: a study in the south eastern coast of Sabah, Malaysia. *e-Review of Tourism Research*, 15(6), 540-559.
- [16] Hasan, K., Ismail, A. R., & Islam, F. (2017). Tourist risk perceptions and revisit intention: A critical review of literature. *Cogent Business & Management*, 4(1), 1412874. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2017.1412874>.
- [17] Kao, Y., Huang, L., & Wu, C. (2008). Effects of theatrical elements on experiential quality and loyalty intentions for theme parks. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 163-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941660802048480>.
- [18] Khasawneh, M. S., & Alfandi, A. M. (2019). Determining behaviour intentions from the overall destination image and risk perception. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 355-375. <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.25.2.6>.
- [19] Nafti, S., (2021). Covid 19, quarantine confronting economic growth, social challenges and health spending. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 4(5), 263-266. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v4i5p122>.
- [20] Novitasari, D., Sasono, I., & Asbari, M. (2020). Work-family conflict and worker's performance during covid-19 pandemic: What is the role of readiness to change mentality? *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 3(4), 122-134. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v3i4p112>.
- [21] Pai, C. K., Chen, H., & Wang, Y. (2024). The moderating effect of safety image on Guests' perceived risk and revisit intentions in luxury hotels. *PlosOne*, 19(1), e0296524. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2614>.
- [22] Quintal, V., & Polczynski, A. (2010). Factors influencing tourists' revisit intentions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 22(4), 554-578. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851011090565>.
- [23] Rather, R. (2021). Monitoring the impacts of tourism-based social media, risk perception and fear on tourist's attitude and revisiting behaviour in the wake of COVID-19 pandemic. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24(23), 3275-3283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1884666>.



DOI: [10.51386/25815946/ijms-v7i4p118](https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v7i4p118)

Volume: 7 Issue: 4

July to August 2024

<https://www.ijmsjournal.org>

-
- [24] Saguran, J., (2023). A phenomenological study of the experiences of front liner police officers infected with covid-19. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 6(4), 193-215. <https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v6i4p123>.
- [25] Seabra, C., & Bhatt, K. (2022). Tourism sustainability and COVID-19 Pandemic: Is there a positive side? *Sustainability*, 14(14), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148723>.
- [26] Sjöberg, L. (2000). Factors in risk perception. *Risk Analysis*, 20(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0272-4332.00001>.
- [27] Sohn, H. K., Lee, T. J., & Yoon, Y.-S. (2016). Relationship between perceived risk, evaluation, satisfaction, and behavioral intention: A case of local-festival visitors. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33(1), 28–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2015.1024912>.
- [28] Soliman, M. (2019). Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior to predict tourism destination revisit intention. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 22(5), 524-549. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2019.1692755>.
- [29] Stylos, N., Vassiliadis, C. A., Bellou, V., & Andronikidis, A. (2016). Destination images, holistic images and personal normative beliefs: Predictors of intention to revisit a destination. *Tourism Management*, 53, 40-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.09.006>.
- [30] Yu, J., Lee, K., & Hyun, S. S. (2021). Understanding the influence of the perceived risk of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) on the post-traumatic stress disorder and revisit intention of hotel guests. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 327-335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.01.010>.
- [31] Viet, B. N., Dang, H. P., & Nguyen, H. H. (2020). Revisit intention and satisfaction: The role of destination image, perceived risk, and cultural contact. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1796249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1796249>.

