Return To Bali: Uncovering The Drivers Of Repeat Visits In A Changing Tourism Landscape

Ni Putu Risma Febi Gunawan[1*], Ni Made Prasiwi Bestari[2]
[1-2] Universitas Pendidikan Nasional Denpasar, Indonesia

*Penulis Korespondensi: rismafeby234@gmail.com

Abstract. This study investigates the determinants of tourists' revisit intentions to Bali by examining the roles of destination image, push motivation, pull motivation, and tourist satisfaction. Using a quantitative explanatory approach, data were collected from 220 domestic and international tourists who had visited Bali at least twice. The data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). The findings reveal that pull motivation has the strongest positive influence on both tourist satisfaction and revisit intention, indicating that external factors such as destination attractiveness, facilities, and natural beauty play a crucial role in encouraging repeat visits. Destination image also significantly affects tourist satisfaction, which in turn mediates its relationship with revisit intention. However, push motivation shows no significant effect on either satisfaction or revisit intention. These results highlight the importance of maintaining destination quality and positive visitor experiences to foster long-term tourist loyalty. The study contributes to a better understanding of how motivational and perceptual factors interact to shape revisit behavior in the context of Bali's evolving tourism landscape.

Keywords: Destination Image; Pull Motivation; Push Motivation; Revisit Intention; Tourist Satisfaction

1. INTRODUCTION

Bali, Indonesia, is one of the most sought-after tourist destinations globally, renowned for its cultural richness, natural beauty, and global appeal. The island consistently attracts millions of visitors each year, positioning tourism as a vital driver of its socio-economic development (Priatmoko et al., 2021). Bali experienced steady growth in foreign visitors from 2014 to 2019, rising from about 3.7 million arrivals in 2014 to over 6.27 million in 2019. This upward trend was abruptly interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused an 82.96% decline in 2020 and an almost complete halt in 2021. Recovery began in 2022, with arrivals rebounding to more than 2.15 million, followed by significant growth in 2023 with over 5.27 million visitors. By 2024, Bali recorded a new milestone of approximately 6.33 million foreign visitors, surpassing its pre-pandemic peak and marking the highest arrival figure in the last decade (Bali Management Vilas, 2025). According to Shantika & Bestari (2024) tourism is the backbone of Bali's economy, contributing significantly to employment and local income by providing numerous job opportunities across various industries. This underscores the sector's role in absorbing a large portion of the workforce, thereby reducing unemployment rates. The influx of tourists increases demand for goods and services, benefiting local businesses.

Tourism in Bali is also reinforced by a strong pattern of repeat visitation, with satisfaction, experiences and also destination image serving as key drivers (Arismayanti et al., 2024). Wulansari et al., (2024) found that Bali's strong destination image enhances tourist

satisfaction, which in turn significantly predicts revisit intentions. Ramadhani et al., (2024) similarly confirmed that satisfaction and Bali's positive image are critical in encouraging repeat visits, reflecting the island's ability to maintain its reputation as world-class destination.

However, the continued growth of tourism in Bali has also brought about significant challenges, particularly related to overtourism, a phenomenon increasingly observed in major tourism destinations around the world. According to Bellinda & Kusuma (2024), overtourism occurs when visitor numbers exceed a destination's carrying capacity, negatively affecting the quality of life for residents and the quality of experiences for tourists.

According to Lustono & Suryani (2022), overtourism in Bali has undermined environmental sustainability through problems such as waste accumulation, water shortages, and traffic congestion, which in turn reduce the quality of the tourist experience and impact tourist satisfaction. Moreover, gentrification has emerged as a growing concern. Yudiantika & Prasada (2025) note that the rapid expansion of mass tourism in Bali has driven up demand for land and housing, pushing property prices beyond the reach of locals and leading to displacement in certain areas. Bellinda & Kusuma (2024) underline that Bali's overtourism is not about absolute visitor numbers but about imbalanced spatial growth, creating "hotspots" where both residents and tourists experience declining quality of life and visitor experience.

Despite these challenges, Bali continues to hold a prominent position in global tourism, largely due to its rich cultural heritage, welcoming communities, and unique tourism experiences (Mahendra, 2024). This research focuses on Bali as a tourism destination and aims to explore how key variables, namely destination image, tourist motivation, tourist experience influence tourist satisfaction, which in turn shapes revisit intention. As stated by Dewi et al., (2024) a positive tourist experience contributes significantly to satisfaction and the desire to revisit the destination. Likewise, Trius et al. (2023) emphasized that destination image has a significant impact on tourist's intention to return, highlighting the importance of maintaining a strong and positive perception of Bali, especially considering growing concerns related to overtourism.

Although the tourism sector in Bali has seen significant growth, there are still gaps in understanding the complex factors influencing tourists' decisions to revisit a destination. While previous studies have explored key elements such as tourist satisfaction, authenticity, and motivation, there is limited research examining how destination image, tourist motivation, tourist experience interact to influence satisfaction and ultimately drive revisit intention, particularly from the perspective of short-term leisure tourists whose loyalty is vital for economic resilience. Moreover, although studies have acknowledge the individual variables,

such as tourist motivation (Aridayanti et al., 2020), destination image (Trius et al., 2023), and tourist experience (Dewi et al. 2023) on revisit intention, comprehensive research that integrates these variables to assess their combined influence on tourist satisfaction and loyalty to revisit remain scarce. This gap becomes important considering the current tourism challenges, such as overtourism, environmental degradation, and culture commercialization, all which may shape tourist' perceptions and affect their intention to return. Therefore, there is a pressing need to explore how these interrelated factors contribute to revisit intentions within Bali's evolving tourism landscape.

The urgency of this research stems from the shifting dynamics of global tourism. Recent years have seen evolving travel preferences and more personalized travel experiences, putting pressure on traditional tourism destinations. Furthermore, the challenge of over-tourism and the growing environmental concerns necessitate a deeper exploration of what motivates tourists to return to a destination.

2. LITERATUR REVIEW

Destination Image

Destination image encompasses the perceptions and views that tourist hold about a specific tourist destination (Junaedi & Harjanto, 2020). It includes various dimensions such as physical attributes, natural beauty, cultural and historical heritage, service quality, safety and cleanliness, and the overall impression formed during visits. As a key factor attracting tourists, a positive destination image, characterized by features like stunning natural landscapes, engaging cultural attractions, and welcoming service can significantly increase the likelihood of tourist interest (Akgün et al., 2020).

Push Motivation

Push motivation refers to the internal factors that drives individual to travel. These are intangible, psychological forces originating from within the tourist, and they play an important role in understanding and clarifying the reasons why people travel. He and Luo (2020) identify that push motivation has a direct positive effect on satisfaction. Push motivation can be defined as the internal, intangible drivers prompting individuals to seek travel experiences according to Pham et al., (2025). These drivers are typically rooted in psychological and socio-cultural needs such as the desire for relaxation, escape from routine, novelty, social interaction, adventure, and cultural enrichment.

Pull Motivation

Pull motivation refers to external factors, such as attractiveness and characteristics of destinations, including cultural and heritage attractions, facilities, and the overall environment (Arowosafe et al., 2022). It encompasses the external, tangible factors that attract tourists to specific destinations, such as a destination's natural environment, cultural heritage, attractions, events, infrastructure, and hospitality services. Operating on the supply side of tourism, pull motivations representing the attributes and qualities that entice travellers to choose one location over another (Martínez-Cañas et al., 2023).

Tourist Satisfaction

Tourist satisfaction refers to the level of fulfilment that tourists experience at tourist attractions, significantly influencing their intention to revisit (Lim et al., 2024). It also plays a vital role in shaping a destination's reputation, as satisfied tourist are more likely to provide positive feedback, recommend the destination to others, and share favourable testimonials (Zulvianti et al., 2022). Tourist satisfaction is recognized as a crucial element and source of competitiveness for tourism destinations, playing key role in their marketing. It is measures through post-purchase or post-visit evaluations and it defined as the emotional response arising from a comparison of actual performance against expectations (Jebbouri et al., 2022).

Revisit intention

Revisit intention is a critical concept in the tourism industry, referring to the likelihood that tourist will return to a destination after their initial visit. The concept is rooted in the broader notion of behavioral intention, which can be defined as the intention to plan and perform a certain behavior (Ratih & Noer, 2024). Understanding revisit intention is essential for grasping customer loyalty within the tourism sector, as it has been identified as a key research topic in tourism literature (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2023). The intention to revisit a tourism destination can be viewed as a form of post-consumption behavior, characterized by a visitor's decision to engage in the same activity or return to a specific location. This intention encompasses the visitor's assessment of the likelihood or plans to return to the same destination, as well as their willingness to recommend the destination to others .

3. METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative explanatory approach to examine the influence of destination image, tourist motivation, and tourist experience on revisit intention, with tourist satisfaction serving as a mediating variable. The research was conducted in Bali, Indonesia, which represents one of the most prominent international tourism destinations. Data were

collected from both domestic and international tourists who have visited Bali at least twice. This approach allows the researcher to empirically test relationships among variables and to generalize the findings to a broader population of tourists.

The population of this research consists of all domestic and international tourists visiting Bali. Because the exact number of tourists cannot be fully determined, non-probability purposive sampling was applied. Respondents were selected based on predetermined criteria, including being at least 18 years old and having prior experience visiting Bali for tourism purposes. Based on the formula proposed by Hair et al., (2021) the minimum sample size was calculated as ten times the number of indicators, resulting in 220 respondents. The sample was equally divided between domestic and international tourists to enable comparative analysis between the two groups.

Primary data were collected through a structured online questionnaire distributed via Google Forms. The questionnaire consisted of two sections: the first part contained socio-demographic questions, while the second part comprised measurement items for each construct using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The collected data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4 to test both the measurement and structural models. The measurement model assessed validity and reliability through factor loadings, AVE, and composite reliability, while the structural model examined path coefficients, R-square values, and hypothesis testing using bootstrapping.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Outer Model

The measurement model testing was carried out to obtain the results of validity and reliability tests. In this study, the validity test aims to ensure whether the constructs used meet the required feasibility criteria so that they can be continued to the next stage of analysis. In the validity test, two types of evaluations were conducted, namely convergent validity and discriminant validity. To assess the reliability of a construct in PLS-SEM using the SmartPLS software, two methods were employed, namely Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. The results of the outer model test below present the outer loading values obtained through analysis using SmartPLS 4.

Table 1. The results of the Convergent Validity, Construct Reliability, and Ave

Variable	Indicator	Loading Factor	CA	CR	AVE
Destination Image (X1)	X.1	0,756	0,625	0,799	0,570
	X.2	0,781			
	X.3	0,727			
Push Motivation (X2)	X2.1	0,670	0,765	0,854	0,601
	X2.2	0,888			
	X2.3	0,605			
	X2.4	0,894			
Pull Motivation (X3)	X3.1	0,884	0,890	0,924	0,752
	X3.2	0,851			
	X3.3	0,872			
	X3.4	0,860			
Tourist Satisfaction (Z)	Z1	0,862	0,882	0,912	0,636
	Z2	0,615			
	Z3	0,879			
	Z4	0,862			
	Z5	0,788			
	Z6	0,749			
Revisit Intention (Y)	Y1	0,793	0,807	0,855	0,720
	Y2	0,868			
	Y3	0,882			

Based on the results presented in Table 1, all constructs in this study meet the requirements for convergent validity. The loading factor values for each indicator range between 0.605 and 0.894, which exceed the minimum threshold of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2013), indicating that all indicators are valid and able to explain the latent variables they represent. This shows that each statement item correlates strongly with its respective construct, meaning respondents consistently understood the measurement items in relation to the underlying concept.

Furthermore, the results of the Construct Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha (CA) tests demonstrate that all constructs achieve satisfactory levels of internal consistency reliability. Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0.625 to 0.890, while Composite Reliability (CR) values range from 0.799 to 0.924, both exceeding the recommended minimum of 0.7. This indicates that the measurement instruments used in this study are reliable, as the indicators within each construct are consistent in measuring the same underlying concept.

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values also meet the minimum requirement of 0.5, with values ranging from 0.570 to 0.752. This confirms that more than 50% of the variance of each construct is explained by its indicators, signifying that the constructs have good convergent validity. Overall, these results indicate that all variables Destination Image, Push

Motivation, Pull Motivation, Tourist Satisfaction, and Revisit Intention possess valid and reliable measurement models and are therefore suitable for further analysis using the structural model (inner model).

Discriminant validity is demonstrated through the cross-loading values between indicators and constructs. A construct is said to have good discriminant validity when the correlation between the construct and its own indicators is higher than the correlation between that construct and indicators of other constructs. The cross-loading values for each variable should also be greater than 0.5 (Ghozali & Latan, 2015), indicating that each indicator better represents its corresponding construct than any other construct in the model.

Table 2. The Results Discriminant Validity.

	X1	X2	X3	Y	Z
X1.1	**0,756**	0,628	0,300	0,330	0,361
X1.2	**0,781**	0,591	0,326	0,346	0,340
X1.3	**0,727**	0,580	0,255	0,271	0,297
X2.1	0,612	**0,670**	0,299	0,321	0,339
X2.2	0,673	**0,888**	0,318	0,341	0,337
X2.3	0,505	**0,605**	0,264	0,270	0,248
X2.4	0,779	**0,894**	0,315	0,347	0,338
X3.1	0,279	0,267	**0,884**	0,815	0,826
X3.2	0,417	0,424	**0,851**	0,731	0,724
X3.3	0,261	0,264	**0,872**	0,782	0,794
X3.4	0,411	0,406	**0,860**	0,788	0,742
Y1	0,351	0,351	0,570	**0,793**	0,635
Y2	0,319	0,303	0,844	**0,868**	0,854
Y3	0,408	0,414	0,834	**0,882**	0,784
Z1	0,378	0,323	0,779	0,743	**0,862**
Z2	0,389	0,362	0,488	0,607	**0,615**
Z3	0,336	0,311	0,856	0,848	**0,879**
Z4	0,247	0,221	0,743	0,757	**0,862**
Z5	0,402	0,409	0,734	0,699	**0,788**
Z6	0,399	0,382	0,607	0,671	0,749

The results of the measurement model test, as shown in the table above, indicate that the cross-loading values for each item of the variable are higher than the cross-loading values for other latent variables.

Inner Model

The R-square value is used to determine the strength of the model. A high R-squared value indicates a strong model. A value of 0.75 indicates a very strong model, 0.50 indicates a moderate model, and 0.25 indicates a weak model (Ghozali et al., 2020).

Table 3. R-square Test.

Variable	R-square	R-square adjusted
Revisit Intention (Y)	0,870	0,868
Tourist Satisfaction (Z)	0,808	0,806

Based on the results of the R-square test, the R-square value for Revisit Intention (Y) is 0.870, and for Tourist Satisfaction (Z) is 0.808. These results indicate that 87.0% of the variation in revisit intention and 80.8% of the variation in tourist satisfaction can be explained by the independent variables in the model. According to Ghozali et al. (2020), both values fall into the very strong category, suggesting that the model has a high level of explanatory power in predicting tourist satisfaction and revisit intention.

The next evaluation measurement is the path coefficient test, which aims to examine whether a variable has a positive or negative relationship with another variable. There are threshold values in the Path Coefficient test: if the Path Coefficient value > 0, the variable has a positive relationship with another variable; conversely, if the Path Coefficient value < 0, the variable has a negative relationship with another variable.

Table 4. Path Of Coefficient.

Variable	Original sample	T statistics	P values
Destination Image -> Revisit Intention	-0,086	0,988	0,323
Destination Image -> Tourist Satisfaction	0,263	2,088	0,037
Push Motivation -> Revisit Intention	0,116	1,288	0,198
Push Motivation -> Tourist Satisfaction	-0,165	1,214	0,225
Pull Motivation -> Revisit Intention	0,406	3,969	0,000
Pull Motivation -> Tourist Satisfaction	0,853	24,412	0,000
Tourist Satisfaction -> Revisit Intention	0,540	5,328	0,000
Destination Image -> Tourist Satisfaction -> Revisit Intention	0,142	2,000	0,046
Push Motivation -> Tourist Satisfaction -> Revisit Intention	-0,089	1,205	0,228
Pull Motivation -> Tourist Satisfaction -> Revisit Intention	0,461	5,214	0,000

The findings of this study highlight several important relationships between destination image, tourist motivation, tourist satisfaction, and revisit intention. The analysis shows that destination image does not significantly influence revisit intention, as reflected by an original sample value of -0.086, a t-statistic of 0.988, and a p-value of 0.323 (> 0.05). This indicates that a positive image alone is not strong enough to directly motivate tourists to return. This result differs from Chia et al., (2021) who argued that destination image plays a crucial role in

shaping satisfaction and enhancing the travel experience. However, this study finds that destination image significantly affects tourist satisfaction ($\beta = 0.263$; $t = 2.088$; $p = 0.037$), meaning that when tourists perceive the destination positively, their satisfaction increases. This aligns with Rahman (2025), who emphasized that a stronger destination image leads to greater tourist satisfaction, which ultimately supports revisit behavior. Thus, while destination image does not directly affect revisit intention, it still plays an important indirect role.

Regarding motivation, push motivation is found to have no significant effect on revisit intention ($\beta = 0.116$; $t = 1.288$; $p = 0.198$) or tourist satisfaction ($\beta = -0.165$; $t = 1.214$; $p = 0.225$). This suggests that internal drives such as the desire for relaxation, novelty, or escape do not strongly predict whether tourists will be satisfied or intend to revisit. These results contradict Rahman (2025), who found that internal motivations could enhance satisfaction and lead to stronger revisit intentions. They also conflict with Siregar et al., (2021), who reported that destination-related motivations significantly shape revisit behaviors. The inconsistency may be due to contextual differences, such as destination characteristics, tourist segments, or varying levels of familiarity with the location.

In contrast, pull motivation shows a significant positive effect on both revisit intention ($\beta = 0.406$; $t = 3.969$; $p = 0.000$) and tourist satisfaction ($\beta = 0.853$; $t = 24.412$; $p = 0.000$). This means that external attributes—such as the destination's natural beauty, cultural attractions, facilities, and ambience—strongly encourage tourists to return and greatly elevate their satisfaction. This finding is consistent with Pebrianita et al. (2020), who revealed that external motivational factors substantially influence tourist satisfaction and revisit behaviors. Similarly, these results align with Aridayanti et al. (2020), who found that pull factors, especially destination image and attraction appeal, often have a stronger effect than internal motivations. This indicates that tourists place high value on tangible and experiential attributes when evaluating whether a destination is worth revisiting.

Tourist satisfaction itself significantly influences revisit intention ($\beta = 0.540$; $t = 5.328$; $p = 0.000$), confirming that satisfied tourists are more likely to return and recommend the destination to others. This supports findings from Martínez-Cañas et al., (2023), reinforcing that satisfaction acts as a key predictor of revisit behavior. The mediation analysis further shows that tourist satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between destination image and revisit intention ($\beta = 0.142$; $t = 2.000$; $p = 0.046$), demonstrating that a positive destination image enhances satisfaction, which then increases tourists' likelihood of revisiting.

However, tourist satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between push motivation and revisit intention ($\beta = -0.089$; $t = 1.205$; $p = 0.228$), meaning internal motivations remain

insufficient to drive satisfaction or return visits. Finally, tourist satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between pull motivation and revisit intention ($\beta = 0.461$; $t = 5.214$; $p = 0.000$), showing that pull motivation not only directly affects revisit intention but also increases it indirectly by enhancing tourist satisfaction. This confirms that external attributes of the destination are central to shaping tourists' overall experiences and future behavioral intentions.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the most influential factor on tourists' revisit intention is pull motivation, which includes destination attractiveness, natural beauty, and available facilities. Pull motivation was found to have both direct and indirect significant effects on revisit intention through tourist satisfaction. Meanwhile, destination image significantly affects tourist satisfaction but does not directly influence revisit intention; instead, its effect is mediated through satisfaction. In contrast, push motivation does not have a significant effect on either satisfaction or revisit intention, indicating that internal motivations such as relaxation or the desire for new experiences are not strong enough to encourage tourists to revisit. These findings highlight that tourist satisfaction plays a crucial mediating role, particularly in the relationship between pull motivation and revisit intention, as well as between destination image and revisit intention.

SUGGESTION

Based on the findings, tourism managers should focus on enhancing pull motivation factors such as destination attractiveness, facilities, and safety to increase tourist satisfaction and revisit intentions. Efforts to strengthen the destination image through effective promotion and quality services are also essential. Since satisfaction mediates revisit intention, maintaining positive tourist experiences should be prioritized. Future research is advised to explore other factors, such as cultural experience or perceived value, that may influence revisit intentions.

REFERENCE

Akgün, A. E., Senturk, H. A., Keskin, H., & Onal, I. (2020). The relationships among nostalgic emotion, destination images, and tourist behaviors: An empirical study of Istanbul. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 16*, 100355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100355

Aridayanti, D. A. N., Suryawardani, I. G. A. O., & Wiranatha, A. S. (2020). Millennial tourists in Bali: Motivation, satisfaction, and revisit intention. *E-Journal of Tourism, 27*.

https://doi.org/10.24922/eot.v7i1.58221

Arismayanti, N. K., Andiani, N. D., & Kusyanda, M. R. (2024). Tourist satisfaction model: Structural relationship of destination image, electronic word of mouth, and service quality in Bali destination. *Nurture, 18*(2), 360–372. https://doi.org/10.55951/nurture.v18i2.623

Arowosafe, F., Akinwotu, O., Tunde-Ajayi, O., Omosehin, O., & Osabuohien, E. (2022). Push and pull motivation factors: A panacea for tourism development challenges in Oluminrin waterfalls, Nigeria. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 14*(1), 63–74.

Bali Management Vilas. (2025). Kunjungan wisatawan ke Bali. *Bali Management Vilas*. https://balimanagement.villas/id/blogs/kunjungan-wisatawan-ke-bali/

Bellinda, N. P. W. N. B., & Kusuma, P. S. A. J. (2024). Pengaruh isu overtourism terhadap sustainable tourism yang ada di Bali. *Akuntansi, 45*(5), 348–359. https://doi.org/10.30640/akuntansi45.v5i2.3358

Chia, S. K.-S., Lo, M.-C., Razak, Z. Bin, Wang, Y. C., & Mohamad, A. A. (2021). Impact of destination image on tourist satisfaction: The moderating effect of information technology (IT). *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites, 34*(1), 88–93. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.34112-623

Dewi, P. R. A., Sukaatmadja, I. P. G., & Giantari, I. G. A. K. (2024). Role of destination image mediates the influence of tourist experience and service quality on revisit intention (Study on domestic tourists Tanah Lot tourism destination areas). *European Journal of Business and Management Research, 9*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2024.9.1.2076

Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2021). Partial least squares structural equation modeling. In *Handbook of Market Research* (pp. 587–632). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57413-4_15

Jebbouri, A., Zhang, H., Imran, Z., Iqbal, J., & Bouchiba, N. (2022). Impact of destination image formation on tourist trust: Mediating role of tourist satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 845538.

Junaedi, S., & Harjanto, J. (2020). Examining the effect of destination awareness, destination image, tourist motivation, and word of mouth on tourists' intention to revisit. In *Advanced Issues in the Economics of Emerging Markets* (pp. 27–38). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Lim, W. M., Jasim, K. M., & Das, M. (2024). Augmented and virtual reality in hotels: Impact on tourist satisfaction and intention to stay and return. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 116*, 103631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2023.103631

Lustono, L., & Suryani, R. (2022). The effect of destination image and service quality toward tourists' visiting decisions through visiting interest as intervening variable. *Journal of Economic Empowerment Strategy (JEES), 5*(2), 134–151. https://doi.org/10.23969/jees.v5i2.5404

Mahendra, D. (2024). The impact of tourism on the preservation and transformation of cultural identity in Bali, Indonesia. *Studies in Social Science & Humanities, 3*(6), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.56397/sssh.2024.06.05

Martínez-Cañas, R., Ruiz-Palomino, P., Jiménez-Moreno, J. J., & Linuesa-Langreo, J. (2023).

Push versus pull motivations in entrepreneurial intention: The mediating effect of perceived risk and opportunity recognition. *European Research on Management and Business Economics, 29*(2), 100214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ermbe.2022.100214

Pham, T. Van, Duc Le, T., Dang Thi, K. T., Nguyen, T. L., & Tran, T. N. T. (2025). Unveiling the impacts of eWOM on tourist revisit intention from a cognitive perspective: The moderating role of trade-offs. *Cogent Business and Management, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2452239

Priatmoko, S., Kabil, M., Magda, R., Pallas, E., & David, L. D. (2021). Bali and the next proposed tourism development model in Indonesia. *Regional Science Inquiry, 13*(2), 161–180.

Ramadhani, D. P., Alamsyah, A., Febrianta, M. Y., & Damayanti, L. Z. A. (2024). Exploring tourists' behavioral patterns in Bali's top-rated destinations: Perception and mobility. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 19*(2), 743–773. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer19020040

Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Iranmanesh, M., Seyfi, S., Ari Ragavan, N., & Jaafar, M. (2023). Effects of perceived value on satisfaction and revisit intention: Domestic vs. international tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 29*(2), 222–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766723116440

Ratih, I. K., & Noer, L. R. (2024). Impact of tourist experience on satisfaction and revisit intention: A bibliometric review and content analysis. *Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting (COSTING), 7*(5), 602–613.

Shantika, B., & Bestari, N. M. P. (2024). Crises and disruption on Bali tourism: Natural disaster, civil unrest and terrorism. *Barista: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa Dan Pariwisata, 11*(02), 104–114. https://doi.org/10.34013/barista.v11i02.1751

Siregar, M. R., Siregar, M. I., Saputra, J., Muzammil, A., & Muhammad, Z. (2021). The mediating role of service quality, tourists' satisfaction, and destination trust in the relationship between destination image and tourist revisiting intention. *Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism, 12*(6 (54)), 1603–1616.

Trius, N. V., Agustina, N. K. W., & Yudhistira, P. G. A. (2023). The effect of travel experience, destination image, and destination trust on revisit intention at Ubud Monkey Forest. *International Journal of Social Science and Business, 7*(3), 680–689. https://doi.org/10.23887/ijssb.v7i3.50231

Wulansari, I., Andajani, E., & Rahayu, S. (2024). Word of mouth and revisit intention on the island of Bali. *1*, 39–49.

Yudiantika, K. A., & Prasada, D. K. (2025). The evaluating land regulation challenges in mitigating gentrification: Insights from Bali's mass tourism impact. *Jurnal Akta, 12*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.30659/akta.v12i1.43449

Zulvianti, N., Aimon, H., & Abror, A. (2022). The influence of environmental and non-environmental factors on tourist satisfaction in halal tourism destinations in West Sumatra, Indonesia. *Sustainability, 14*(15), 9185. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14159185