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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

\textbf{Purpose:} The goal of this study is to look at tourist plans to return to mountain places by integrating their previous experience and satisfaction with the risks that exist as part of the decision-making process.

\textbf{Design/Methodology/Approach:} The questionnaire data was disseminated through online media to residents of Bandung, West Java, who had visited mountain tourist locations at random. There is a total of 328 possible responses. Only 318 were utilized to process data. AMOS 22.0 and SPSS 23.0 were used to analyze the data using structural equation modeling (SEM). After doing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the measurement model, the structural linkages were investigated and the hypotheses were assessed. A bootstrap method was also used to test indirect effects.

\textbf{Findings:} Physical and performance concerns have a significant impact on the visitor experience than financial risks. Despite the lack of significance, the perception of financial risk has a significantly different impact on tourist satisfaction than physical risk and performance. Tourist satisfaction has a significant impact on return intention, but tourist experience has a little impact. Tourist experience moderates a significant relationship between physical risk and performance, as well as revisit intention and intention to return, but not financial risk. The relationship between perceived financial risk and the likelihood of returning can be mediated by visitor satisfaction. This suggests that the financial risk will have a substantial impact on customer satisfaction and will play a role in tourists' decision to return. The perception of performance risk might have an indirect effect on the decision to return based on previous experience and satisfaction.

\textbf{Practical implications:} The conclusions of this study provide guidance to government officials, tourism managers, marketing managers, and community members on how to better manage tourist attractions in mountain areas.

\textbf{Original/Value:} There are currently just a few studies linking perceived danger, experience, and satisfaction to revisit intentions, therefore this research significantly adds to the body of knowledge. The research gaps identified in this study can be filled by developing the construct into a model, which will also advance related concepts.
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INTENCIÓN DE REVISITAR O DESTINO DE MONTANHA COM BASE NA PERCEPÇÃO DE RISCO ATRAVÉS DA EXPERIÊNCIA E SATISFAÇÃO TURÍSTICA

RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo deste estudo é analisar os planos turísticos de retorno a locais de montanha, integrando sua experiência anterior e satisfação com os riscos que existem como parte do processo de tomada de decisão.

Design/Metodologia/Abordagem: Os dados do questionário foram divulgados através de meios de comunicação online para residentes de Bandung, Java Ocidental, que haviam visitado localidades turísticas de montanha aleatoriamente. Há um total de 328 respostas possíveis. Apenas 318 foram utilizados para processar dados. O AMOS 22.0 e o SPSS 23.0 foram utilizados para analisar os dados utilizando a modelagem de equações estruturais (SEM). Depois de fazer a análise fatorial confirmatória (CFA) no modelo de medição, foram investigadas as ligações estruturais e avaliadas as hipóteses. Um método de bootstrap também foi usado para testar efeitos indiretos.

Conclusões: Preocupações físicas e de desempenho têm um impacto significativo na experiência do visitante, e não em riscos financeiros. Apesar da falta de importância, a percepção do risco financeiro tem um impacto significativamente diferente na satisfação turística do que o risco físico e o desempenho. A satisfação turística tem um impacto significativo na intenção de retorno, mas a experiência turística tem um pequeno impacto. A experiência turística modera uma relação significativa entre o risco físico e o desempenho, bem como a intenção de revisitante e a intenção de regressar, mas não o risco financeiro. A relação entre o risco financeiro percebido e a probabilidade de retorno pode ser mediada pela satisfação do visitante. Isto sugere que o risco financeiro terá um impacto substancial na satisfação dos clientes e desempenhará um papel na decisão de regressar dos turistas. A percepção do risco de desempenho pode ter um efeito indireto na decisão de regresso com base na experiência e satisfação anteriores.

Implicações práticas: As conclusões deste estudo fornecem orientação aos funcionários do governo, gerentes de turismo, gerentes de marketing e membros da comunidade sobre como gerenciar melhor as atrações turísticas em áreas de montanha.

Original/Valor: Atualmente, existem apenas alguns estudos que ligam o perigo percebido, a experiência e a satisfação para revisitante as intenções, portanto, esta pesquisa adiciona significativamente ao corpo do conhecimento. As lacunas de pesquisa identificadas neste estudo podem ser preenchidas desenvolvendo o constructo em um modelo, que também promoverá conceitos relacionados.

Palavra-chave: Percepção de Risco, Experiência, Satisfação, Intenção de Revisitar, Turista.

INTENCIÓN DE REVISAR EL DESTINO DE LA MONTAÑA BASADA EN LA PERCEPCIÓN DEL RIESGO MEDIANTE LA EXPERIENCIA Y SATISFACCIÓN TURÍSTICA

RESUMEN

Objetivo: El objetivo de este estudio es analizar los planes turísticos para regresar a las zonas montañosas, integrando su experiencia y satisfacción previas con los riesgos que existen como parte del proceso de toma de decisiones.

Diseño/Metodología/Enfoque: Los datos del cuestionario se publicaron a través de los medios en línea para los residentes de Bandung, Java Occidental, que habían visitado lugares turísticos de montaña al azar. Hay un total de 328 respuestas posibles. Sólo se utilizaron 318 para procesar datos. AMOS 22.0 y SPSS 23.0 se utilizaron para analizar datos mediante el modelado de ecuaciones estructurales (SEM). Después de realizar el análisis factorial confirmatorio (CFA) en el modelo de mediación, se investigaron los vínculos estructurales y se evaluaron las hipótesis. También se utilizó un método de arranque para probar los efectos indirectos.

Conclusiones: Las preocupaciones físicas y de rendimiento tienen un impacto significativo en la experiencia del visitante, no en los riesgos financieros. A pesar de la falta de importancia, la percepción del riesgo financiero tiene un impacto significativamente diferente en la satisfacción del turista que el riesgo físico y el desempeño. La satisfacción turística tiene un impacto significativo en la intención de regresar, pero la experiencia turística tiene un impacto pequeño. La experiencia turística tiene una relación significativa entre el riesgo físico y el rendimiento, así como la intención de volver a estudiar y la intención de regresar, pero no el riesgo financiero. La relación entre el riesgo financiero percibido y la probabilidad de retorno puede estar mediada por la satisfacción del visitante. Esto sugiere que el riesgo financiero tendrá un impacto substancial en la satisfacción del cliente y desempeñará un papel en la decisión de volver a los turistas. La percepción del riesgo de rendimiento puede tener un efecto indirecto en la decisión de retorno sobre la base de la experiencia y satisfacción previas.

Consecuencias prácticas: Los resultados de este estudio proporcionan orientación a funcionarios gubernamentales, gerentes de turismo, directores de marketing y miembros de la comunidad sobre cómo gestionar mejor las atracciones turísticas en las zonas montañosas.
INTRODUCTION

Mountain tourism is one of the most popular tourist destinations in the world because it provides visitors with natural beauty and pure air. Visitors also have the opportunity to exercise while enjoying the beauty of the flora and animals. Beautiful vistas are in high demand these days because they are part of engaging material that may be shared on social media. Tourism activities in the mountains are particularly appealing to tourists; yet, this activity has a significant danger because the climbing path includes a variety of characteristics that might lead to tourist mishaps. Every year, there is an increase in the number of accidents in Indonesia. In 2015, there were 12 cases, 15 cases in 2016 and 2017, 23 cases in 2018, and there were accidents at the start of 2019 (Puspita, 2019). The possibility of an accident will undoubtedly deter tourists from visiting alpine destinations. There are numerous more concerns that visitors consider when traveling, such as the pandemic that struck the entire world when the Covid-19 Virus was discovered at the end of December 2019. Within a few weeks, it had evolved into a global threat. (Shen et al., 2020). The World Health Organization (WHO) declared Corona virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) a pandemic in March 2020, causing disruptions in daily life such as the closure of businesses and schools and the restriction of social gatherings to prevent the virus from spreading (World Health Organization, 2020). To prevent COVID-19 from spreading, many countries and cities have implemented complete lockdowns (A. K. F. Wong et al., 2021). The tourism industry is undoubtedly impacted, particularly because a tourist attraction is one of the sites that is purposefully meant to attract visitors looking for a holiday.

The Indonesian government's policy at the time demanded that all tourism objects handled by the government and private sector, including mountain tourism destinations, be closed until the disease spread no further. People were becoming bored of being forced to stay at home during the lockdown at the time. When the pandemic subsided around the end of 2021, tourist sites began to fill up. Tourist places, both public and private, have undertaken preparations in order to attract visitors. Mountain destinations are one of the tourist destinations with a low level of spread because the tourist attraction is located on a large and open piece of land, preventing the formation of a tourist crowd. In the midst of a pandemic, this is one of the
draws for travelers to travel to mountain destinations. Due to the high interest of tourists visiting mountain destinations at the time, many tourist managers created interesting places such as selfie spots that were purposefully placed in beautiful areas, unique places to stay with nature themes, camping along the riverbanks, and other forms of tourist attraction. In the beginning of 2022, a new variant of Covid-19, dubbed Omicron, was discovered, with a high spread rate but a lower effect than the prior type. Tourists will be hesitant to visit mountain destinations because of the risk of catching Omicron. When tourists desire to travel abroad, the health risk is given more consideration, and this has since become a crucial factor to take into account in tourist behavior (Hisamuddin et al., 2023). Aside from the risk of contracting, there are other concerns to consider in addition to the benefits they receive. In order to reduce these worries, consumers normally adopt strategies that help boost their confidence before making a decision, such as searching for information (Lu, 2021). The happy and comfortable experiences they've had in the past will be weighed against the risks they'll face in the future. When people decide to travel and look for information to help them choose a destination, they frequently recall previous experiences (Zhang et al., 2018). Tourist experiences are created through a process of visiting, learning and enjoying activities in an environment away from home (Mainolfi & Marino, 2020). If the perceptions of potential travel risks can not be alleviated, people may decide to change destinations or even cancel trips (Law, 2006). Tourist contentment is shaped by their previous experiences, whether it's the risks they've taken that have reduced their level of satisfaction or the pleasant things that have compelled them to return to tourist attractions. Tourism managers must grasp this in order to deliver appealing service items while also giving guests with a sense of security. Understanding visitor satisfaction is critical for effective destination marketing because it drives destination selection, product and service consumption, and tourist intent to return (Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

Research on revisit intention in the tourism sector has been carried out by previous researchers (such as, Jian et al., 2021; Hassan & Soliman. 2021; Bahja & Hancer, 2021; Cheng & Fountain, 2021; Kumar et al., 2021). Risk is linked to the intention to return, according to research. (Lu, 2021; Rather, 2021; Hu & Xu, 2021; Yu et al., 2021). Zhang et al. (2018) dan Meng & Cui (2020), do study to see if there's a correlation between previous experiences and the desire to return. While the research that connects satisfaction and revisit intention, was previously studied by (Liang et al. 2018; Mainolfi & Marino, 2020; Meng & Han, 2018; Vassiliadis et al., 2021; Whitehead & Wicker, 2020). Previous studies that related the characteristics of experience, contentment, and intention to return had been carried out by
There are presently few studies linking risk perception, experience, and satisfaction to revisit intention. As a result, by creating a model that incorporates these variables, we can address research gaps and contribute to related ideas.

The research was carried out with the following design goals in mind: (1) Developing a decision-making model for tourists to return to mountain places by integrating their previous experience and satisfaction with the risks that exist as part of the decision-making process, (2) examining the relationship between the variables in the model in the context of the proposed theory, and (3) providing practical guidance for mountain destination managers when developing tourist attractions, government agencies as policy material, and marketing managers when creating tourism promotional content for mountain destinations.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

**Risk Perception**

Risks associated with travel are primarily defined as the undesirable repercussions that may arise while travel (Hasan et al., 2017). Consumer perceptions of the likelihood that an action would expose them to danger, which might impact travel decisions if the perceived danger is regarded to be above an acceptable level, are defined as perceived risk (Chew & Jahari, 2014). Another element that influences travel decisions is risk perception (Khan et al., 2017). Scholars now define risk perception as a consumer's impression of uncertainty as well as the size of the potential negative outcomes (Sohn et al., 2016). The consumer's subjectively determined anticipation of potential losses is referred to as perceived risk, and each possible outcome is assigned a probability (Taylor, 2007). When obtaining desirable results from a product or service, perceived risk can be described as the subjective belief that a loss may occur (Tseng & Wang, 2016). Consumers' perceptions of risk have long been seen to be a crucial element in their decision-making and behavior (Han et al., 2019). There are several different types of risk that are associated with risky behavior (Bran & Vaidis, 2020). Tourists from quiet areas see risk differently; they sense less risk and are more likely to take chances (Desivilya et al., 2015). Performance, financial, convenience, psychological, and physical risks are all examples of perceived risk (Quintal et al., 2010).
Tourist Experience

The tourist experience has received a lot of attention in the tourism literature (Albayrak et al., 2018). The meaning of a tourist experience is related with different interpretations from social, environmental, and activity components of the total experience, which is a socially constructed concept (Tussyadiah & Fesenmaier, 2009). The term "travel experience" refers to a person's past visit to a location, which includes participation in various tourism activities as well as responses to various challenges encountered in a tourism setting (Dodd et al., 2005). Tourists will have a positive experience if the destination attribute meets their needs and wants (T. H. Lee, 2009). Tourists' recollections of previous travel experiences are important for future decisions and behavior, which is why reinforcing their memories of previous travel experiences is beneficial (J.-H. Kim, 2014). Tourists base their decisions on previous experiences and memories while planning future visits (Lehto et al., 2004). The services available at a destination, such as entertainment, lodging, transportation, gaming, dining facilities, tour sites, environment, and sanitation, all influence the tourist experience (I. A. Wong & Li, 2015). The pull factors that attract tourists to a destination, such as people, beach attractions, services and facilities, as well as safety and sanitation, encapsulate the travel experience (Sangpikul, 2018). Physical features, destination image, social connections, cultural exchanges, rewards, and meanings are among the six aspects that shape travel experience (Morgan & Xu, 2009). Because the model they provide focuses the destination's characteristics, the current study employs their model approach.

Tourist Satisfaction

Customer satisfaction is described as an emotional, cognitive reaction that develops in the wake of a single or extended series of service interactions (Loan, 2023). Tourist satisfaction is a reaction or decision made by tourists in response to an emotion or a thought (Bigné et al., 2001). Gap aspects such as social and psychological elements of individual visitors such as expression, behavior, and wants, as well as external circumstances such as weather conditions and social group interactions, determine satisfaction (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Overall satisfaction is described as the degree of overall pleasure experienced by tourists as a result of the tour's capacity to meet their desires, expectations, and needs (Chen & Tsai, 2007). Tourist satisfaction is also a significant problem for tourism destination managers since it influences travelers' destination choices (Cole & Crompton, 2003). Bigné et al., (2001) reveals that visitor satisfaction influences their readiness to promote the destination they visited to others, such as
friends and relatives, but not the other post-visit behavior, such as the want to revisit. In general, the quality of the accommodations, proximity to the location, beauty of the scenery, weather or climate, and neatness are regarded to be the most important aspects for tourist satisfaction (Vinh, 2013). After a mental comparison of the service and quality that a consumer expects to receive from a transaction after purchase, satisfaction is regarded as an attitude (Kim, 2012).

Revisit Intention

The topic of revisit intents has received a lot of attention in the tourism literature, and it refers to the prospect of tourists returning to the same location in the future (Sadat & Chang, 2016). Retaining consumers, or encouraging customers to return, is becoming increasingly vital, especially in today's highly competitive world (Yu et al., 2021). Jones et al., (2000) stated that in terms of cost and time spent, maintaining existing customers or increasing customer revisit rates is more effective than obtaining new consumers. One of the behavioral intention components is revisit intention, which relates to a customer's desire to revisit the same tourist site or product (Zhang et al., 2018). One of the behavioral intention components is revisit intention, which relates to a person's desire to re-experience the same tourism product or destination (Tosun et al., 2015). In the tourism and hospitality literature, revisit intention is a common research topic in relation to destination (Hassan & Soliman, 2021). Another key outcome variable is revisit intention, which reflects how likely customers are to return for additional purchases (Stylos et al., 2017). Prior research has suggested that revisit intentions are linked to satisfaction from the first experience (Park et al., 2020).

Hypotheses Development

A consumer's attitude toward a purchase is strongly influenced by their assessment of the product's risk (Yang et al., 2016). The detrimental impact of perceived risk on purchasers' final purchase intentions has been proven in numerous studies (Chiu et al., 2014). Johnson et al., (2008) confirmed the significant negative link between risk indicators such as performance, financial and time risk, and satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is negatively impacted by perceived risk variables such as information risk, performance risk, and functional risk, while other elements such as brand prestige and trust have a favorable impact (Jin et al., 2016). Customers will have negative attitudes regarding a purchase if they believe there is a large risk of loss linked with it (Quintal et al., 2010). According Chang et al., (2005), risk factors linked with the product and service have a negative impact on consumers' attitudes and purchasing
intentions. Perceived risk was divided into four categories: functional/performance, physical, psychological, and financial risks (Han et al., 2019). Yu et al., (2021) Using the same elements of perceived risk, such as physical, psychological, financial, and performance risks. The risks that may occur in mountain destination tourism are divided into three categories in the current study: physical, performance, and financial risks. In relation to mountain destination tourism, this study suggests that risk perception has a negative impact on tourist experience, satisfaction, and intent to return, leading to the following hypothesis:

H1. Physical risk has a negative effect on tourist experience.
H2. Physical risk has a negative effect on tourist satisfaction.
H3. Financial risk has a negative effect on tourist experience.
H4. Financial risk has a negative effect on tourist satisfaction.
H5. Performance risk has a negative effect on tourist experience.
H6. Performance risk has a negative effect on tourist satisfaction.

Various aspects of customer experience have been shown to contribute to pleasant recollections, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions in the literature (Hemmington, 2007; Hosany & Witham, 2010). Tung & Ritchie, (2011) showing a positive relation between memorable experiences, satisfaction, and the decision to return. When a traveler has positive memories of a particular travel experience in a destination, they are more likely to return and suggest it (Ali et al., 2016). A traveler's decision to revisit specific tourist attractions can be influenced by memories of previous travel experiences (Lehto et al., 2004). The quality of the tourist experience on the tourist site has a favorable association with overall tourist satisfaction (T. H. Lee, 2007). As a result, travel experience and destination image are important factors in determining destination satisfaction (Wu, 2016). To gain customer recommendations, grow consumer revisit intention, and achieve a lucrative organization, service managers are continually seeking to satisfy a customer (Yeoman et al., 2012). High-satisfaction visitors are more likely to have a positive attitude toward the experience, as well as higher intentions of returning to a place or purchasing tourism-related products (J. Lee & Beeler, 2009). Other research backs up the link between customer satisfaction and loyalty to a destination or repeat visits (Chi & Qu, 2008). Several criteria, including satisfaction with the event and/or place, were found to be strongly and positively associated with intention to return (e.g. Eusébio & Vieira, 2013; S.-H. Kim et al., 2013). A substantial corpus of tourism research shows a positive link between tourist satisfaction and a desire to return. (e.g. Jang & Feng, 2007; Shonk & Chelladurai, 2008). The current study focuses on tourists' experiences when visiting mountain
tourism locations, which has a favorable impact on tourist satisfaction and inclination to return. Furthermore, tourist satisfaction with mountain tourism sites has a positive effect on return intentions. As a result, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H7. Tourist experience is positively associated with tourist satisfaction
H8. Tourist experience is positively associated with intention to revisit.
H9. Tourist satisfaction is positively associated with intention to revisit.
H10. The relationship between risk perception and revisit intention is mediated by tourist experience.
H11. The relationship between risk perception and revisit intention is mediated by tourist satisfaction.
H12. The relationship between risk perception and tourist satisfaction is mediated by tourist experience.
H13. The relationship between tourist experience and revisit intention is mediated by tourist satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

Measures

Six variables are included in the research model provided in this study. Tourism risk perception is represented by three variables: financial risk, physical risk, and performance risk, as well as three other variables: tourist experience, tourist satisfaction, and intention to return. Previous investigations, such as looking at studies (Han et al., 2019) and (Yu et al., 2021) were used to adjust risk perception. The tourist experience components are modified from research (Nazir et al., 2021) and (Su et al., 2021), tourist satisfaction from (Meng & Han, 2018) and (Mainolfi & Marino, 2020), and intention to return adapted from (Bahja & Hancer, 2021) and (Meng & Cui, 2020). All traits were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disapproving (1) to strongly agreeing (5).

Data Collection

Data from the questionnaire is shared via Google Forms on the internet. Because of their ability to deliver speedy findings and minimal cost, online surveys have become popular in research, especially when using a large panel (Wright, 2005). This medium was chosen since the epidemic situation in Indonesia has not improved. Furthermore, this method was adopted in order to reach a larger audience. Residents in Bandung, West Java, were randomly selected
as potential responders by providing questionnaire fill links. Respondents must have visited mountainous tourism destinations. On the 6th and 8th of May, 2022, the questionnaire was distributed. The total number of responses that can be collected is 328. Only 318 of these are used in data processing. Due to missing or patterned responses, 7 data points were discarded.

Table 1. Respondents’ demographical characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N=318</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family monthly income (Rp.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5.000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.000–9.999</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.000–14.999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.000–19.999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.000+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the author

Table 1 illustrates the gender breakdown, with 75 (23.6%) males and 243 (76.4%) women responding. Respondents under the age of 20 received 66 (20.7 %) data, 114 (35.8%) data at the age of 20–29 years, 83 (26.1 %) data at the age of 30–39 years, 43 (13.5 %) data at the age of 40–49 years, 10 (3.1 %) data at the age of 50–59 years, and 2 (0.6%) data at the age of 59 years and above. Most respondents 181 (56.9%) possessed bachelor's degrees, followed by 126 (39.6%) graduate schools, and high schools 11(3.5%). A total of 36 respondents (11.3%) have a monthly household income below 5 million Indonesian rupiah, 163 (51.3%) have an income between 5-10 million rupiah, 89 (27.9%) have an income between 10-15 million rupiah, 25 (7.9%) have an income of 15-20 million, and 5 (1.6%) have an income above 20 million.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS 22.0 and SPSS 23.0. The structural linkages were studied and hypotheses were evaluated after doing
confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on the measurement model. Indirect effects were also tested using a bootstrap technique. Figure 1. depicts the proposed research model.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION
Measurement Model

Physical risk (PR), financial risk (FR), performance risk (PER), tourist experience (EX), tourist satisfaction (SN), revisit intention (RI), desire (DE), and behavioral intention (BI) are the six factors determined by the assessment methodology. The reliability was assessed using the coefficient of Construct Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) with criteria of CR 0.60 or 0.70 and AVE value 0.50 (Hair et al., 2014). The validity was assessed using the coefficient (weighted factor) with criteria significant and standardized 0.50, ideally not less than 0.70. (Hair et al., 2014). The majority of fit indices, according to (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988), meet the criteria of over 0.9. The measurement model that resulted verified that the proposed model suited data well: ($\chi^2 = 306.137$, df = 349, $p < .001$, Cmin/df = 2.639, TLI = 0.955, AGFI = 0.902, CFI = 0.966, and RMSEA = 0.072). Table 2. shows that all indicators produce a very significant standardized loading estimate value ($p <0.001$) with a value more than 0.50, based on the findings of the standardized loading estimate significance test. This means that, once the model has been updated, all indicators are valid for measuring latent variables. All
Cronbach’s Alphas (α) showed satisfactory consistency, which was higher than the recommended threshold of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Furthermore, all CRs were higher than the suggested level of .70, ranging from .774 to .979 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Overall, the constructs’ validity and reliability were supported by the results in Table 2.

### Table 2. Reliability and confirmatory factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Risk (PR)</td>
<td>I’m concerned that if I go to the mountain tourism destination, the locals will conduct crimes against me.</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I go to West Java’s mountainous tourism location, the facilitator will commit crimes against me.</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My visit to West Java’s mountainous tourism spots may encourage criminal activity.</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Risk (FR)</td>
<td>If I go to West Java’s mountain tourism destination, the view will be disappointing in comparison to the cost of the trip.</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I remain in West Java’s hilly tourism area, I will be disappointed with the service provided in comparison to the travel fees I will incur.</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I visit West Java’s hilly tourist destinations, the meals will be disappointing in comparison to the money I pay.</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Risk (PER)</td>
<td>If I visit West Java’s mountainous tourist area, the splendor of the mountain scenery will disappoint me.</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I visit West Java’s mountainous tourist area, the available accommodations will disappoint me.</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If I visit West Java’s mountainous tourism area, the service from the touristic managers will disappoint me.</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Experience (EX)</td>
<td>Traveling to West Java’s mountainous tourism destination is the most enjoyable experience.</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A trip to West Java’s mountainous tourism spots gave me the most sense of being alive.</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I felt more emotionally immersed with the atmosphere when I visited the mountainous tourism destination of West Java.</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Satisfaction (SN)</td>
<td>I am pleased with the natural beauty of West Java’s mountain tourism destination.</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am pleased with the facilities in West Java’s mountain tourism destination.</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I’m conducting activities in West Java’s mountain tourism destination, I feel appropriate or integrated.</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit Intention (RI)</td>
<td>I intend to return to West Java’s mountainous tourist area.</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would love to visit West Java’s mountainous tourist area again.</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe I will return to West Java's mountainous tourist area in the near future.

Source: Prepared by the author

Hypothesis Test

The first step in the measurement process is to determine the model's appropriateness index. The following outcomes were achieved as a result of data processing: ($\chi^2=267.606$, df=117, $p < 0.001$, Cmin/df=2.287, RMSEA=0.064, CFI=0.973, GFI=0.915, TLI=0.964). The data fits the structural equation model, according to the results. To put it another way, the proposed structural model can be applied to the entire population. The results of the hypothesis calculation in table 3 demonstrate that the physical risk perception has a negative and substantial effect on the perception of the tourist experience ($\beta=-0.441$, $p<0.001$), indicating that the hypothesis is accepted. Meanwhile, financial risk perception has a positive and insignificant effect on tourist experience ($\beta=0.164$, $p=0.143$), which means that the hypothesis is rejected. The perception of performance risk has a negative and significant impact on the tourist experience ($\beta=-0.465$, $p=0.001$), demonstrating that the prediction is supported. Financial risk perception on tourist satisfaction had a negative and significant effect ($\beta=-0.148$, $p=0.01$), indicating the hypothesis was accepted as well as tourist experience on tourist satisfaction had a positive and significant effect ($\beta=0.859$, $p<0.001$). For the physical risk perception on tourist satisfaction had a positive and insignificant effect ($\beta=0.037$, $p=0.487$) and the perception of performance risk on tourist satisfaction had a negative and insignificant effect ($\beta=-0.044$, $p=0.551$), the hypothesis was rejected. The tourist satisfaction on revisit intention has a positive and significant effect ($\beta=0.922$, $p<0.001$), meaning that the hypothesis is accepted, in contrast to the tourist experience test on revisit intention that has a positive and insignificant effect ($\beta=0.029$, $p=0.847$), the hypothesis is rejected. The summary of the estimation results on the hypothesis, then for $H_1$, $H_4$, $H_5$, $H_7$, $H_9$, is accepted, while the hypothesis $H_2$, $H_3$, $H_6$, $H_8$, is rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Estimate RW</th>
<th>Estimate SRW</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>H test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR $\rightarrow$ EX</td>
<td>-0.874</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-3.972</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR $\rightarrow$ EX</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER $\rightarrow$ EX</td>
<td>-0.466</td>
<td>-0.465</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>-3.255</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model SN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR $\rightarrow$ SN</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR $\rightarrow$ SN</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-2.579</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER $\rightarrow$ SN</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-597</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX $\rightarrow$ SN</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>17.381</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Indirect and Total Effects

The bootstrap process is used to estimate model parameters. A 95 percent confidence interval (CI) and a number of bootstrap samples (typically 500 to 1,000 or 5,000) (Hair et al., 2014). Table 4 reveals that for physical, financial, and performance risk, the H10 hypothesis, namely that the relationship between risk perception and tourist pleasure is mediated by tourist experience, is rejected. For H11, tourist satisfaction mediates the association between risk perception and revisit intention; the hypothesis is accepted for financial risk perception and performance, but rejected for physical risk perception. For the perception of performance and physical risk, hypothesis H12, the relationship between risk perception and tourist pleasure is mediated by tourist experience, is accepted, whereas the perception of financial risk is rejected. The hypothesis H13, that tourist satisfaction mediates the association between tourist experience and revisit intention, is accepted. Table 4 reveals that there is a substantial association between performance risk perception and revisit intention as measured by visitor experience and satisfaction.

Tabel 4. Summary of indirect effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Path</th>
<th>Unstandardized Estimate</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PER → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.470</td>
<td>-0.835</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>-0.399*</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>-0.807</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.399*</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.881</td>
<td>-1.637</td>
<td>-0.404</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.379***</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.685</td>
<td>-1.454</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.379***</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.137*</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR → EX → SN → RI</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.792**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared by the author
DISCUSSION

The Covid-19 virus wreaked havoc on the global society. If it is not urgent, this condition leads people to reduce or even discontinue their activities outside the home. The regular process takes a long time; thus, individuals require a lot of fun in the form of recreation. Mountain tourism is a form of alternative activity that allows guests to stay safe from getting the virus because they can keep their distance. A likelihood alternative is not always risk-free. Furthermore, this site may or may not be able to meet the needs of guests. The current research examines the impact of risk perception, tourist experience, and contentment on tourist decisions to return to mountain tourist sites.

The study's findings demonstrate how the hypothesis has the following implications: First, while financial risks have little impact on the visitor experience, physical and performance concerns do. This demonstrates that security and the supply of facilities are crucial considerations for mountain tourism sites in order to help people in enjoying tourist attractions and give a nice experience for them. When contrasted to the atmosphere and experience they have had, the money they spend is not an issue. Pandemic conditions can also make people make decisions based on the perceived financial risk versus the experience they would gain. Second, the impression of financial risk has a dramatically different impact on tourist satisfaction than physical risk and performance, despite the fact that the results are not significant. This indicates that when tourists visit mountain tourist destinations, they will weigh their level of enjoyment against the amount of money they will spend when they return. Physical dangers they may face and poor performance of tourist attractions are not taken into account when determining their contentment. Third, tourist experience has a considerable impact on tourist satisfaction, which means that the experience they will have will be one of the factors taken into account when determining tourist contentment. Fourth, whereas tourist satisfaction has a large impact on revisit intention, tourist experience has little effect. This explains why tourist satisfaction is more of a criterion for returning to mountain tourist locations. If the duration of the epidemic is linked to their previous experience visiting mountain tourism destinations, it may alter their judgment. While contentment will be their first factor, consumers will also examine whether returning is the appropriate move and in line with their expectations. Fifth, tourist experience moderates a strong association between physical risk and performance, as well as revisit intention, but not financial risk. This demonstrates that the physical and performance risks that tourists may encounter will create an experience for them, making it a powerful factor in influencing their decision to visit again, but not a financial risk.
Sixth, visitor pleasure has a role in mediating the relationship between perceived financial risk and the likelihood of returning. This indicates that the financial risk will have a significant impact on customer satisfaction and will become a factor in tourists' decision to return. Seventh, only when risk perception is linked to revisit intention via experience mediation and visitor satisfaction does it have a substantial influence. This suggests that the perception of performance risk can have an indirect impact on the decision to return by way of experience and satisfaction.

The findings of the current study have a number of managerial implications: First, the direct relationship indicates that tourist satisfaction influences tourists' decisions to return, thus in this situation, the mountain tourism management location must be able to provide excellent service to visitors. Second, mountain tourist management strategy is linked to the government since it involves land ownership, which is regulated by the government. How can you boost visitor satisfaction to become a target or reference in building mountain tourism attractions in order to be effectively managed? Third, visitors' perceptions of risk will have an indirect impact on their decisions, both in terms of their experience and satisfaction, therefore good risk management will aid in improving the performance of tourist attractions. Fourth, marketing managers can demonstrate their competence to handle potential hazards in mountain tourist objects by using content connected to visitor happiness and experience. Fifth, involving the community will aid in determining what the community's desired experience and satisfaction are. It will be easier to recognize any risks that may arise in mountain tourist sites with them.

**CONCLUSION**

This study emphasizes how experience, contentment, and perceived risk affect visitors' desire to return. In addition, it examines how satisfaction and experience are directly impacted by perceived risk. The examination of the literature demonstrates that there is direct evidence supporting the relationship between physical risk and performance risk, financial risk and experience, and satisfaction with intention to return. The direct relationship between financial risk, physical and performance risk, and intention to return has not yet been proven. The study was conducted in an area where the COVID-19 pandemic was still present in order to better understand how travelers perceive physical risk factors and performance that can ensure they are not exposed to the virus while visiting tourist attractions. At the time, experience was gained at the expense of financial risk. Tourists, however, may weigh financial risks over other risks more than they would with satisfaction. Only performance risk has an impact indirectly through
the mediation of experience and satisfaction. In addition, only performance risk and financial risk have an impact on the intention to return, which has an impact indirectly through the mediation of tourist satisfaction.

Because the pandemic situation is always changing, the research findings are based on the situation at the time the questionnaire is issued. The results of the study will be different if a pandemic is still ongoing, even though the spread has decreased, but there are still concerns about a new variant entering, then if the situation is the same during a pandemic where the spread is decreasing but there are no concerns about new variants entering. This study cannot be generalized due to the extent of the research area. There are several possibilities for future research, the first of which is to take the same technique as the previous study, namely to look at the wishes and intentions of students who will study offline during a pandemic, as studied using various scenarios that occurred during the epidemic. By presenting this proposal, it is hoped that it would gain a better understanding of public perceptions in the case of a pandemic. The second step is to include a new risk perception variable in the model, which will provide management with a more complete and clearer picture when making decisions and developing policies.
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