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Abstract
This study explores and tests the different and combined roles of variety-seeking in the satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship in order to explain the consumption behaviour of Vietnamese beach visitors. A sample of 812 Vietnamese visitors participated in this study. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was applied in order to test the relationship between the constructs, and to evaluate their reliability and the validity. As expected, the findings highlight the importance of incorporating the roles of variety-seeking in the satisfaction - destination intentional loyalty relationship. Specifically, variety-seeking is found to negatively moderate the direct effect of the visitor satisfaction-loyalty relationship.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, loyalty intention or attitudinal loyalty are in most studies assessed as both intention to recommend/worth-of-mouth, and intention to revisit (Bigne et al., 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008; Zabkar, Bernice, & Dmitrovic, 2010; Opperman, 2000). Recent studies have discussed this aggregation approach and question if re-patronage intention, and intention to recommend, reflect the same underlying construct (Keinigham et al., 2007). Lam et al. (2004) indicated that the two loyalty dimensions behaved differently with regard to their linkages with their antecedents (satisfaction, value and switching cost), thus providing support for the nomologic validity of treating customer loyalty as a two-dimensional construct. Söderlund (2006) found that a better measurement model was obtained when re-patronage intentions and word-of-mouth intentions were modeled as two separate factors, as opposed to one single factor in two service settings. Jin and Su (2009) try to explain the finding that customers may have different thresholds that are not fully captured by satisfaction ratings. Customers choose to recommend or repurchase only when their satisfaction ratings are higher than their recommendation and repurchase thresholds. Finally, extensive research in the area of customer loyalty suggests that intentional loyalty differs from behavioural loyalty (Mittal & Kamakura, 2001; Seiders et al., 2005) and recommendation/word-of-mouth differs from retention activities such as revisiting, rebuying or retention (Harrison-Walker, 2001; de Matos & Rossi, 2008; Maxham III, 2001). Thus, this study suggests that intention to revisit a tourist destination differs from a consumer’s intention to recommend the same destination.

In service in general, and in particular in the tourism area, satisfaction has attracted the attention of researchers and managers during recent years due to broad agreement on its key influence on intentional loyalty (Chi & Qu, 2008; Reichheld & Sasser, 1990). From a practical perspective, visitor’s satisfaction will mean a return to the enterprise in the future (Anderson & Sullivan, 2003) and willingness to speak positively of the experience to other people (Truong & King, 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). The research of Anderson & Sullivan (2003) indicated that loyalty customers will bring more profit than newcomers, because they will provide increased revenue with decreased costs. From a theoretical perspective, however, the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty in the tourism and marketing context is complicated (Agustin & Singh, 2005; Mittal & Kanakura, 2001; Seiders et al. 2005). This perspective may be illustrated by at least two main research approaches. One deals with the functional forms of the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty (Bloemer et al., 1998; Chi et al., 2008), and the second with what moderates this relationship (Cooil et al., 2007; Evanschitzky & Wunderlish, 2006; Seiders et al., 2005). For instance, research in the area of functional forms find divergent results, questioning if the relationship is linear (Backman & Crompton, 1991; Chi et al., 2008; Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Petrick, Morais, & Norman, 2001), or has different non-linear forms (Oliva et al., 1992). While the second has questioned why the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty differ by the inclusion
of moderator variables, such as demographic characteristics (e.g. age, education, sex, household income) (Cooil et al., 2007; Homburg & Giering, 2001; Mittal & Kamakura, 2001), and attitude strength dimensions, such as variety-seeking, knowledge, involvement, ambivalence, and certainty (Bloemer & Ruyter, 1998; Capraro et al., 2003; Chandrashekar et al., 2007; Olsen et al., 2005; Olsen, 2007; Seiders et al., 2005).

As previous research has mentioned, some scholars have paid greater attention to explain the divergence in variety-seeking between customers. However, the lack of research places focus on explaining and combining the role of variety-seeking in the satisfaction-intentional loyalty in the tourism perspective (Biggen et al., 2008). Because it is reasonable to anticipate that visitors may satisfy their need for variety, either through the enjoyment of new options or alternating between the facets of different destinations. As a result, differences in the proportion of variety-seekers could lead to disparity in visitors’ loyalty to different destinations. Thus, the role of variety-seeking behavior is of particular interests in this study. In addition, destination intentional loyalty is defined as multi-dimensional. An interesting question is if the effects differ in the satisfaction-loyalty model based on the different facets of loyalty (e.g., intention to WOM, intention to revisit/return).

Most studies of factors affecting tourists’ intentional loyalty have been made in industrialized countries (Alegre & Cladera, 2006; Baker & Crompton, 2000; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Oppermann, 2000; Yoon & Uysal, 2005) or on foreign travelers in less industrialized countries (Kozak, 2003; Alegre & Juaneda (2006). We are aware that less than a handful of empirical studies have been done in Vietnam (Truong & Foster, 2006; Truong & King, 2009). Meanwhile, tourism is regarded as a “Smokeless Industry”, developing quickly and yielding significant sources of revenue to the Vietnamese economy (Vietnam National Administration of Tourism - VNAT, 2011). Specifically, in the development of the world tourism industry, the Pacific Asia Region, including Vietnam, has continued to be the most dynamic area. Over the past decade – despite variations such as the 2003 SARS epidemic and the 2009 economic downturn – Vietnam’s tourism industry has reached a growth of more than 10% on average (VNAT, 2011). International and domestic travelers have increased dramatically, which in turn has attracted both domestic investment and FDI. The tourist industry is also beneficial for foreign investors, since government authorities pay more attention to proposals developing local talent and resources (VNAT, 2011).

However, according to the Tourism Authority of Vietnam report, the tourism industry has also faced the major problem of the return rate of domestic tourists to the same destination being relatively low (about 20%). In addition, the average length of stay varies from 1 day to 1.5 days for domestic tourists. In other word, the average daily expenditure by domestic visitors is a low $20 per day (VNAT, 2011). Therefore, domestic tourism’s experts have argued that one of the challenges of developing quickly and sustaining a competitive advantage is not only to offer strategies in order to increase the number of new visitors,
but also to pay attention to improve visitor satisfaction in order to increase the length of their visit, their potential to recommend Vietnam for others, and to revisit Vietnam as soon as possible in the future. Thus, the purpose of the research reported here is to investigate how variety-seeking and visitor satisfaction influence intentional loyalty within this multidimensional perspective in a tourist destination context. In addition, knowledge about visitor satisfaction, variety-seeking behaviour and different aspects of loyalty (e.g., positive intention to word-of-mouth (WOM), and intention to return/revisit), is of vital importance for the Vietnamese tourist industry (VNAT, 2011).

2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

2.1. Destination intentional loyalty

Loyalty has been defined and measured differently in the marketing (Oliver, 1999; Olsen, 2007) and tourism destination literature (Niininen et al., 2004; Oppermann, 2000). For instance, as intentional versus behavioral (Bloemer & Ruyter, 1998; Fornell, 1992; Johnson et al., 2001); as global versus transaction specific evaluation (Jacoby & Chesnut, 1978), or with different forms of evaluation such as intention to revisit/return or intention to WOM (Truong & King, 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Oliver (1999) suggests that loyalty can be defined as a hierarchy from cognition (e.g., perceived quality), via affect (e.g., satisfaction) and a conative (intention or commitment to consume) component (Macintosh & Lockshin, 1997; Oliver, 1999) toward a behavioral loyalty concept termed action loyalty. In the tourism context, a number of researchers have examined the differences between first-time and repeat travelers (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Gitelson & Crompton, 1984). This study will use this hierarchical approach, and define destination loyalty as multidimensional in order to discuss a deeper understanding about how the different components variety-seeking and visitor’s satisfaction relate along different dimensions. For example, it is reasonable to question that the antecedents to stay longer are different from WOM intention or intention to revisit/return. Meanwhile, intention is the motivation of individuals to revisit/return. Some authors have found that intention willingness to recommend positively correlates with the intention to revisit/return (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Oppermann, 2000). Thus, the hypothesis is as follows:

H1: Intention to WOM is positively related to intention to revisit/return.

2.2. The relationship between visitor’s satisfaction and destination intentional loyalty

In the tourism field research have suggested that overall tourist satisfaction is primarily referred to as a function of prior expectation and perceived performance after experiences (Chen & Chen, 2010; Crompton & Love, 1995). This implies that a tourist who enjoys travelling is satisfied when prior expectation is compared to post-travel experiences and results in a feeling of pleasure. In contrast, a visitor is dissatisfied when the result is feelings of displeasure (Chen & Chen, 2010). In addition, visitor’s satisfaction is a good predictor of intention to revisit/return (Petrick & Backman, 2002; Truong & King, 2009) and intention to WOM (Truong & King, 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Truong & King (2009) indicated that the importance of revisit/return
in tourism has been widely acknowledged at the level of both the overall economy and of the individual attraction. Alongside the intention to revisit, WOM communication has been identified as a significant market phenomenon and as a means by which tourists express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with products (Chen & Chen, 2010; Gremler, 1994; Murray, 1991). Furthermore, the satisfaction of tourists may lead to intention to revisit/return or express favorable comments about the destination to other visitors (Chi & Qu, 2008). Nevertheless, dissatisfied tourists may not revisit/return to the same destination and may express negative comments about a destination and damage its market reputation (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Thus, the hypotheses are as follows:

**H2:** The more the satisfaction with previous stays at the tourist destination, the more positive the intention to revisit/return.

**H3:** The more the satisfaction with previous stays at the tourist destination, the more positive the intention to WOM.

### 2.3. The relationship between variety seeking and destination loyalty intention

Kahn et al., (1995) proposed that variety seeking as a tendency to change the item consumed in the last purchase or propensity to seek diversity in the choice of goods and services. Consumers can satisfy their need for variety, either through the purchase of new options or alternating among familiar brands or providers. When customers seek variety, they have wants and needs that cannot be filled best by a single brand, but by a purchase history involving consistent switching between brands (Feinberg et al., 1992). Customers seek variety in product choices, in order to avoid feelings of monotony and to increase feelings of freedom (Kahn et al., 1995). Thus, it is logical to expect that the temporal horizon considered will affect the role played by variety-seeking and satisfaction on destination loyalty intention (intention to revisit/return and intention to WOM).

Some research has paid attention to variety-seeking and has suggested that variety seeking propensity plays a role as a negative predictor of destination loyalty intention (Niininen et al., 2004; Barroso et al., 2007; Bigne et al., 2008). According to Niininen et al. (2004) visitors who have a high variety-seeking propensity are likely to have a varied pattern of destination loyalty intention. In addition, more variety-seeking visitors show less behavioral intention in grocery retailing (Berne et al. 2005). Based on the contributions previously mentioned:

**H4:** Variety seeking propensity has a negative effect on intention to revisit/return.

**H5:** Variety seeking propensity has a negative effect on intention to WOM.

Variety seeking is seen as an intrinsically motivated phenomenon. Thus, variation in behavior that is instigated by the instrumental or functional value of the alternatives is not included (van Trijp et al., 1996). Intrinsically motivated variety-seeking means that a customer switches brands only for the sake of variety and the stimulation it brings to the situation, irrespective of his satisfaction with the original brand and the consequences implied by his switching behavior (Raju, 1980; Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). Hence, in this context, it is proposed that a visitor’s drive for variety will influence the relationship
between satisfaction with the destination intentional loyalty. Therefore, the hypotheses are as follows:

**H6:** Variety-seeking propensity decreases the satisfaction-intention to revisit/return relationship.

**H7:** Variety-seeking propensity decreases the satisfaction-intention to WOM relationship.

Based on the above discussions and the proposed hypotheses, the theoretical model is given in the Figure 1.

### 3. Research methodology

#### 3.1. Sample and product

A convenience sample including 812 local visitors form the basis of the present study. The data were collected by a survey questionnaire by interviewing directly the persons mainly responsible for visiting Nha Trang, Da Nang, and Vung Tau beach cities. The three beach cities were chosen by purposeful sampling as they are the main beaches visited by a large

| Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample (% of respondents, n = 812) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Gender**                      | **Male**            | 57.4            | Over high school | 68.1         |
|                                  | **Female**          | 42.6            | High school     | 19.2         |
| **Marital status**              | **Single**          | 60.8            | Under high school | 12.7         |
|                                  | **Married**         | 39.2            | Under 5 million VND | 38.2         |
| **Age**                         | **Under 22 years**  | 27.0            | From 5 to 10 million VND | 42.7         |
|                                  | **From 22 to 35 years** | 39.7            | Over 10 million VND      | 19.1         |
|                                  | **From 36 to 60 years** | 25.6            |                   |              |
|                                  | **Over 60 years**   | 7.8             |                   |              |
majority of domestic visitors (estimated to be over 40% of domestic visitors).

In the respondents’ demographic profile, the findings showed that the typical respondents were male (57.4 per cent), married (39.2 per cent), educated at higher than high school level (68.1 per cent), and their average age was 29.0 years old, which ranged from 18 to 65. In terms of income, the majority of the respondents (50 per cent) had an annual income of more than 7.5 million VND. (Table 1).

3.2. Measurement of the constructs

3.2.1. Destination intentional loyalty

This study uses some items that are framed as evaluation of intentional loyalty (intention to WOM and intention to revisit/return) by asking the respondents to indicate on a 7-point bipolar scale as follows. A 7-point Likert type scale ranging from “1 = totally disagree” to “7 = totally agree” is used to measure intentional loyalty. The respondents indicate their ideas regarding three statements for intention to revisit/return: “I will visit X city again in the future”, “If I could have done it again, I would have chosen this destination”, “I have a plan to visit X city again”. In addition, the respondents have opportunity to show their ideas regarding three statements for intention to WOM: “I would positively recommend X city to others”, “I speak positively about X city to others”, and “I am willing to recommend X city to others”. These items are adapted from some recent studies (Chen & Chen, 2010; Chi & Qu, 2008; Faullant et al., 2008; Yoon & Usnal, 2005).

3.2.2. Tourist satisfaction

Satisfaction is assessed on six items using the same 7-point Likert type scale: “I really enjoyed the visit”, “I am satisfied with my decision to visit X city”, “I prefer this destination”, “This experience is exactly what I need”, “This was a pleasant visit”, “This visit was better than expected”. These items have been used previously (Chen, 2008; Chen & Chen, 2010; De Rojas & Camerero, 2008).

3.2.3. Variety-seeking

Variety-seeking is often measured focusing on the propensity of consumers to seek variety in their purchases in general, without reference to a concrete product category (Bigne et al., 2009). Thus, variety-seeking is assessed on three items on 7-point Likert type scale: “I like to visiting many different destinations”, “I prefer to go to destinations I have not visited before”, “I would not like to return to a destination I am familiar with”. These items were developed previously (Bansal et al., 2005; Bigne et al., 2008; Bourdeau et al., 2005; van Trijp et al.,1996)

3.3. Analytical procedures

The first goal of a quantitative analysis was to confirm that each measure taps facets of the intended construct (convergent validity) and that the constructs are distinct from each other (discriminant validity). The second goal was to test appropriate constructs in our conceptual model and the causal relations as presented in figure 1. These analyses were conducted using maximum likelihood estimation in Amos 16.0. Hair et al., (1998) found that structural equation modeling can apply a correlation or variance matrix as its key in constructing the model. In addition, a variance matrix applied is seen as input appropriate to test a theory. Some index such as the Chi-square ($\chi^2$),
### Table 2: Standardized confirmatory factor analysis coefficients and construct reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and indicators</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>SFL</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>VE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety-seeking (VS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to visiting many different destinations</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to go to destinations I have not visited before.</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>22.365***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not like to return to a destination I am familiar with.</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>22.336***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitors satisfaction (SA)</strong></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoyed the visit to X city</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my decision to visit X city</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>26.212***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer this destination</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>27.994***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This experience is exactly what I need</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>25.131***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a pleasant visit</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>24.813***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This visit was better than expected</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>26.748***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to revisit/return (RE)</strong></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will visit X city again in the future</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could have done it again, I would have chosen this destination</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>23.364***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to visit X city again</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>23.134***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to WOM (WOM)</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend X city to others</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak positively about X city to others</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>26.924***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to recommend X city to others</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>25.016***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FL: Factor loadings; SE: Standard Error; SFL: Standardized factor loading

***p<0.001
Normed Fit Index (NFI), Relative Fit Index (RFI), The Tucker-Lewis coefficient (TLI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), are applied in order to evaluate the overall model fit (measurement and construct model). Acceptable model fits are indicated by NFI and CFI values exceeding .90 and RMSEA values below .08 representing a moderate fit, while values less than .05 are seen to be good (Browne & Cudeck, 1992).

4. Results

4.1. Measurement model analysis

As shown in Table 2, all factor loadings on the constructs are highly significant (p < 0.001; t-value > 22.336) with values ranging from 0.751 to 0.862, which shows the convergent validity and reliability of the constructs are acceptable. The composite reliabilities exceed the minimum value of 0.60 and the variances extracted surpass the recommended threshold of 0.50 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). In addition, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of the measurement model, including four constructs in the theoretical model, as in Figure 1, results in a good fit with the data (c² = 286.342; df = 84, p = 0.000; RMSEA = 0.054; TLI = 0.964; CFI = 0.971) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Tables 2 and 3 present the results of the CFA.

As shown in Table 4, all the correlations are less than 0.60, and the squared correlation between each of the constructs (the highest value at 0.256) is less than the average variance extracted from each pair of constructs (the lowest value at 0.61), which constitutes discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

4.2. Testing direct effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χ²-test</td>
<td>χ² &lt; p&lt;0.05 286.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ²/d.f.</td>
<td>&lt;5 3.41 (286.342/84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Goodness of fit indices of model
The estimated results of the structural model, only including direct effects, in Figure 1 indicate a good fit with the data ($\chi^2 (85) = 286.471, p=0.000; TLI = 0.964, CFI = 0.971, RMSEA = 0.054$) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). As shown in Table 5, all hypotheses involving direct effects are supported by the data. Hypothesis 1 suggested that intention willingness to recommend positively correlates with the intention to revisit/return. The results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized paths</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Support/does not support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to WOM $\Rightarrow$ Intention to revisit/return</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>5.742***</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction $\Rightarrow$ Intention to revisit/return</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>11.938***</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor satisfaction $\Rightarrow$ Intention to WOM</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>6.269***</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety-seeking $\Rightarrow$ Intention to revisit/return</td>
<td>H4</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>-3.357***</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety-seeking $\Rightarrow$ Intention to WOM</td>
<td>H5</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-1.932*</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$P < 0.05; ** p < 0.001; *** p < 0.0001; ns: non-significant; intention to revisit/return (R^2 = 0.322), intention to WOM (R^2 = 0.16)$
support this hypothesis by indicating a significant positive effect of intention to WOM on intention to revisit/return ($\beta = 0.213$, $t = 5.742$, $p < 0.001$).

This study expected that tourists satisfied with previous stays at the tourist destination increased both the intention to revisit/return (H2) and the intention to WOM (H3). As expected, both hypotheses are confirmed by the data which indicate that tourist satisfaction with previous stays has a significantly positive effect on intention to revisit/return and intention to WOM ($\beta_2 = 0.460$, $t = 11.938$, $p < 0.001$; $\beta_2 = 0.244$, $t = 6.269$, $p < 0.001$).

Hypotheses (H4) and (H5) suggested that variety seeking propensity has a negative effect on intention to revisit/return and intention to WOM. These two hypotheses are supported, showing that variety-seeking propensity is significantly negatively related to intention to revisit/return ($\beta_4 = -0.120$, $t = -3.357$, $p < 0.001$), and is significantly negatively associated with intention to WOM ($\beta_5 = -0.073$, $t = -1.933$, $p < 0.05$).

4.3. Variety-seeking (VS) as a moderator

In order to analyze the moderating role of variety-seeking, a regression in SPSS 16.0 was used to test the main effect of visitor satisfaction and the interaction of it and variety-seeking on destination loyalty intention. Baron and Kenny (1986) show that a moderator effect can be represented as the product of an independent variable and a factor that specifies a condition for its operation.

A significant regression coefficient on the product term would confirm the interaction of

| Table 6: Moderating effect of variety seeking in visitor satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model                           | RE                        | WOM                        |
|                                 | Estimate  | S.E | Sig. | Estimate  | S.E | Sig. |
| Intercept                       | 2.245     | 0.219 | 10.257*** | 4.047     | 0.240 | 16.866*** |
| SA                              | 0.54      | 0.050 | 13.326*** | 0.230     | 0.055 | 5.147*** |
| SA*VS                           | -0.125    | 0.06 | -3.084** | -0.062    | 0.006 | -1.952* |
| ANOVA                           | Sum of squares | F   | Sig. | Sum of squares | F   | Sig. |
| Regression                      | 291.738   | 114.739 | 0.000 | 61.493    | 20.118 | 0.000 |
| Residual                        | 1028.487  | 1236.415 |
| Total                           | 1320.225  | 1297.908 |

$R^2$                            | 0.219     | 0.075 |

***$p < 0.001$; **$p < 0.05$; *$p < 0.10$; ns: non significance; S.E: Standard error
Figure 2: Moderating role of variety-seeking in the visitor satisfaction-intention to revisit/return relationship

Figure 3: Moderating role of variety-seeking in the visitor satisfaction-intention to WOM relationship

visitor satisfaction and variety seeking on destination loyalty intention. The direction of the interaction effect explains how visitors with the same level of satisfaction become more loyal, maybe unwillingly, as variety-seeking becomes more difficult. Figure 2 illustrates one possible moderating role of variety-seeking in the satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship.

For a given level of visitor satisfaction (SA*), visitors may have two different levels of loyalty, LY1 and LY2, depending on the level of variety-seeking. The difference between LY1 and LY2 is due to the moderating effect of variety-seeking on the satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship (Figure 2, 3)

The findings are reported in Table 6. All parameter estimates of the visitor satisfaction components and the interaction effect are negative and significant at the 5 per cent significance level. The significant interaction effect implies that customers with high variety-seeking behavior have less intention loyalty, since high variety-seeking makes them more likely to seek novelty.

5. Theoretical discussion and managerial
implications

5.1. Theoretical discussion

This paper explores the relationship between tourist satisfaction and destination intentional loyalty in the beach cities of Vietnam. In addition, this research also extends previous studies to test the moderator role of variety-seeking on the satisfaction-loyalty relationship. The proposed hypotheses are tested by maximum likelihood estimation (Aiken & West, 1991; Ping, 1996) and a moderated regression analysis in SPSS for latent variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The results indicate satisfactory reliability and validity of the constructs and support the five hypotheses within a structural equation modeling. This study also confirms that variety-seeking and visitor satisfaction are important variables to explain destination intentional loyalty.

With the coefficient correlation of 0.213 (p < 0.000), this study also found a highly positive relationship between intention willingness to recommend and intention to revisit for Vietnamese beach visitors. This finding supports earlier studies by arguing that intention to WOM represents the most important predictor of intention to revisit/return (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Oppermann, 2000). In addition, extensive research in the area of customer loyalty suggests that recommendation/word-of-mouth differs from retention activities such as visiting, rebuying or retention (Harrison-Walker, 2001; de Matos & Rossi, 2008; Maxham III, 2001). Thus, this study suggests that intention to revisit a tourist destination differs from consumer intention to recommend the same destination.

This study confirms that there is a positive and significant relationship between tourist satisfaction and destination intentional loyalty in the beach cities of Vietnam. These results are similar to the findings of Western studies (Chen & Chen, 2010; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Truong & King, 2009; Weber, 1996; Zabkar et al., 2010).

In addition, the results also demonstrate that variety-seeking has a negative effect on both intention to WOM, and intention to revisit/return (Niininen et al., 2004; Barroso et al., 2007; Berne et al. 2005; Bigné et al., 2008). In particular, in the tourism context, visitor satisfaction is found to have a weaker effect on both intention to WOM and intention to revisit/return by the role moderator of variety-seeking. This result may be explained by a novelty-seeking behavior to avoid boredom by finding stimulus that acts as a release mechanism (Mc Alister & Pessemier, 1982). Furthermore, from a theoretical perspective, with different levels of customer’s satisfaction and these intentional loyalty dimensions, it is possible that there is a low satisfaction-loyalty relationship (Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Truong & King, 2006, 2009).

5.2. Managerial implications

These research findings highlight the importance of incorporating the role of variety-seeking in the satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship. Specifically, variety-seeking is found to be a moderator of the visitor satisfaction-loyalty relationship. As far as implications for management are concerned, knowledge of the role of variety-seeking behaviour in the satisfaction-destination intentional loyalty relationship should lead to better design of marketing strategies and policies,
adapting them according to the key dimensions.

In fact, the result obtained concerning variety-seeking behavior, through which it is considered a dissuasive element in the choice of destination, implies that public and private managers should promote tourist destinations in the closest administrative units (provinces) as Vietnamese tourists are more likely to travel to closer destinations.

However, the results reached regarding the moderating role of variety-seeking behaviour leads one to re-orientate the former implication for destination. In fact, although tourists are satisfied with a particular destination, they are still looking for new destinations. In this case, private managers and enterprises should emphasize the creation of uniqueness in the beach city’s destination to increase competition with other destinations. On the other hand, improving the quality of the destination, so that although visitors do not have the intention to revisit/return, they are ambassadors, willing to spread word of their positive experience to their family/friends…

Furthermore, the advertising message should be customized for the target market segments. For instance, beach advertisers, journals of beach tourism and travel guidebooks should all adopt a message that suggests that providing relaxation as a regular purpose is key to a life of satisfaction at beaches.

5.3. Limitations and future research

First, this research is related to interpersonal conflict regarding preference. Future research should investigate different assessments of sociological ambivalence in order to find aspects of family life where interpersonal conflict is not present. Second, the results presented here were based on cross-sectional data, and thus causal effects can only be inferred. Future research should manipulate one or several of the antecedent’s constructs in order to verify the causal relationship between the variables.

The present research is based on data collected from national visitors to Nha Trang, Da Nang and Vung Tau beach cities. Future studies should include more representative samples in other cities, and include both national and international visitors. In addition, the proposed model intends to combine some components of attitude strength dimensions (involvement, ambivalence, certainty) to test the satisfaction and destination intentional loyalty within this multidimensional perspective that a tourist destination context should include. The future findings, therefore, would help to extend the traditional theories of attitude strength (i.e., Lavine et al., 2000; Visser et al., 2006) to confirm involvement, ambivalence, and certainty as an important attribute of satisfaction strength (Chandrashekaran et al., 2007; Park & Moon, 2003). Finally, this study uses correlation methods on cross-sectional data, so the nature of the relationships is problematic. Experimental designs should be used in order to address issues of causality in future studies.
## APPENDIX - PAPER

### Constructs and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and indicators</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to revisit/return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE1</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.3461</td>
<td>1.51513</td>
<td>-.836</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE2</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.5739</td>
<td>1.36748</td>
<td>-.824</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE3</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.3978</td>
<td>1.48586</td>
<td>-.716</td>
<td>-.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to WOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM1</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.4187</td>
<td>1.46964</td>
<td>-.643</td>
<td>-.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM2</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.5259</td>
<td>1.40128</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>-.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOM3</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.6761</td>
<td>1.37523</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA1</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.6909</td>
<td>1.16854</td>
<td>-.933</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA2</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.6256</td>
<td>1.30549</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA3</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.7106</td>
<td>1.18404</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA4</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.6071</td>
<td>1.22534</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA5</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.5751</td>
<td>1.24269</td>
<td>-.827</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA6</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.5936</td>
<td>1.26310</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variety seeking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS1</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.5209</td>
<td>1.31511</td>
<td>-.857</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS2</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.4446</td>
<td>1.32997</td>
<td>-.796</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS3</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>5.4741</td>
<td>1.35383</td>
<td>-.839</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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