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This research will concentrate on the marketing strategy of diving and snorkeling tourism attractions in several areas, namely, Pemuteran and Tulemben. This study uses a mix method, which is a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The sample was determined to be 250 domestic tourists by purposive sampling method. Data analysis was performed by quantitative descriptive analysis. Data presentation is presented in tabular form and strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis. The results showed that the characteristics of tourists who come to Bali to do diving are grouped into four categories, namely, “ecotourist”, knowledge motivation (23%), “adventure”, tourists with motivation to increase their ability/competence (21%), “ego tourists”, tourists with motivation to establish relationships with relationships (16%), and “picnickers”, tourists with motivation to relax and external influence or invite friends (39%). This means that tourists who dive in Bali are divers with the type of “picnickers” with a young, educated age, beginner certificates with one to five years of diving experience. The perception of tourists towards diving tourism in Bali also shows a positive perception, with an average of 4.2 or very good. This shows that diving tourism in Bali has a very good market in future development. The development model with market penetration and product diversification of nyegaragunung become a positioning model for Bali diving tourism combined with spiritual activities in the area around diving tourism areas. The nyegaragunung tourism model has become a combination model for existing tourism products, such as the Menjangan Island area with the location of Pura Pulau Menjangan, and Tulamben with the Spiritual Yoga Bunutan tourism area. This combination of products will be able to provide benefits to increasing the number of tourist visits and the conservation of water areas.
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Introduction

The decline in the rate of guest repeaters who came to Bali in 2016 which reached 10% (Bali Travel News, 2016), and accompanied by market shifts experienced by Bali tourist destinations, also prompted a shift in promotional strategies not only focused on creating and increasing market share of tourists who are new, but also builds traveler loyalty and boosts purchases. With increasing competition among tourist destinations, it is
necessary to identify and understand the mechanisms that cause tourists to be loyal to tourist destinations (Niininen, Szivas, & Riley, 2004).

For this reason, the right marketing strategy is to retain old tourists and increase tourist loyalty (Kim et al., 2004). If in the past marketing only applied an offensive strategy that focused on acquiring new tourists, nowadays it tends to apply a combination of offensive strategies and defensive strategies, namely retaining old tourists (Fornell, 1992). An increase in customer retention rate of 5% can increase profits by 25%-95% (Reichheld & Schefter, 2000). Lee and Cunningham (2001) found that the more competitive the market is in the service industry, companies prefer to maintain their market by focusing on maintaining existing customers (Ganesh, Arnold, & Reynolds, 2000).

Until now, various research results show that tourists now pay more attention to the risks of travel before deciding to travel. Security and safety risks are the first factors in the minds of tourists. All these risks become the attention of tourists in fostering trust in a tourist destination (Sönmez & Graefe, 1998). As a result, the value of the destination from various aspects began to be taken seriously and the tourism business paid more attention to its commitment to security and social values.

Various empirical studies have shown that tourists’ concerns about safety, environment, and culture are used to become a strategy to create competitive advantage as destination values that contribute to the development of tourists’ trust and commitment. Increasing the value of a tourist destination provides an advantage or profit to the company. This supports the statement of Miles and Covin (2000), the positive result of the value of safety provides a reduction in costs and risks to tourists and has a positive effect on tourist loyalty. Based on research by Virvilaite, Saladiene, and Skindaras (2002), it is stated that loyalty can also be realized if there is a good relationship between motivation and satisfaction.

These three indicators are largely determined by the perceived risk of the tourist destination (Mingfang, 2011). Although several previous studies have shown the effect that nationality has on the decision to return to visit, none has identified a relationship between perceived risk, especially regarding safety and security which affects tourists’ behavioral intentions. The purpose of this study was to determine the partial relationship between satisfaction and trust affecting the intention of diving tourists to Bali. To find out the relationship between a simultaneous aggregation of the two components of satisfaction and trust affects the intention of diving tourists to Bali. This is to determine the relationship between perceived risk moderating tourist satisfaction and trust in the intention of diving tourists to Bali.

**Literature Review**

**Tourism Destination Management**

As explained in the abstract and background, this study concentrates on the management and marketing strategy of tourism destinations, as well as consumer behavior in particular to determine the characteristics of Indonesian tourists who are interested in tourism activities by diving and snorkeling. In essence, tourism destination management is associated with a marketing strategy (Mill & Morrison, 2009). Marketing does not only belong to producers who produce manufactured products. Even there is a tendency for marketing management, used by producers in the service sector or hospitality (Kotler & Armstrong, 2010; Kandampully, 2002). Nowadays, tourism destination management is getting serious attention again. Previously, tourism destinations were discussed in some literature (Cooper et al., 1993; Mill & Morrison, 2009). Morrison (2009) described tourism destinations with the term “Destination Mix”.
Destination Mix according to Mill and Morrison (2009) consists of the following components: (1) attraction, (2) facilities, (3) infrastructure, (4) transportation, and (5) hospitality (hospitality). These five components will form the concept of a destination, inseparable from one another. A tourism destination in which there are various tourist attractions that can be distinguished based on the scope, ownership and form of activities (Mill & Morrison, 2009). Judging from the scope, attractions can be divided into two, namely: (a) primary destinations and (b) secondary destinations. Meanwhile, in terms of ownership, a tourism destination can be divided into three, namely: (a) private property (private), (b) public property (public), and (c) non-profit.

A tourism destination is always associated with the tourists themselves. Without tourists, a tourist destination will mean nothing. Imagine a destination that was previously visited by many tourists to be very quiet, slum because it is not maintained. Being an attraction is just a name. Thus, there is no reason to say that a tourism destination does not require marketing activities and strategies (Kotler et al., 1993; Cooper et al., 1993; Mill & Morrison, 2009; Goldner & Ritchie, 2006).

Jamrozy (2007) stated a marketing is a “place” where interactions occur between consumers and producers. Jamrozy (2007) developed a model that integrates economic, social, and environmental elements as an interrelated unit so as to provide sustainable benefits. Swarbrooke and Horner (2001) developed a tourism destination management model that involves all related components, such as government, private sector, universities, and the host community. It involves all activities from planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Marketing Strategy

Middleton and Clarke (2001) described marketing strategy as an important element for the company, which prioritizes customer satisfaction and value to consumers and revenue for the company. The components of the marketing strategy according to Middleton and Clarke (2001) consist of:

1. Goals and objectives (goals and objectives to be achieved within a certain period of time);
2. Images, positioning, and branding (how to create an image for customers);
3. Strategies and programs (actions taken including product development and investment needed to achieve goals and objectives);
4. Budget (resources needed to achieve goals);
5. Review and evaluation (how to assess what is achieved in the context of competition and the external environment.

Marketing strategy, according to Hsu et al. (2012), is a series of managerial decisions and actions from companies or organizations that aim to differentiate the company from competitors and gain a sustainable advantage. Hsu et al. (2012) also provided the view that marketing strategy requires application. First, it must be able to answer the question “Where are we now?”; through situation analysis activities (covering internal and external situations). The second is to answer the question “What do you want to be?”, so that the company must determine the vision and mission, and achieve to achieve the goals that have been set. Quality control, feedback, and monitoring are essential in implementing a good marketing plan.

Marketing strategy includes activities: segmentation, target market, and positioning or positioning (Kotler et al., 2010). Furthermore, he said, segmentation is an activity to identify markets based on their geographical, demographic, psychographic, and behavioral aspects. Schiffman and Kanuk (2010) stated that market segmentation and diversity are two complementary concepts. Because without a diverse market, consisting of various people with backgrounds from countries of origin, interests, needs, and desires, there is little reason to
conduct market segmentation. Market segmentation is further described as an attempt to divide the market into distinctive slices of consumers who have needs.

The consequence of the diversity of consumers is that they are required to provide diverse products. So that consumers will be better satisfied, and improve the welfare of producers. Schiffman and Kanuk (2010) stated that there is a reciprocal relationship between consumers and producers. Satisfied consumers will be able to improve the welfare of producers. A segmentation study is an activity for planned activities to determine the unique needs and desires of different consumer groups, so that a wide variety of products can be made and satisfy consumer needs.

According to Schiffman and Kanuk (2010), segmentation is divided into: (1) geographical segmentation, (2) demographic segmentation, (3) psychological segmentation, (4) psychographic segmentation, (5) socio-cultural segmentation, (6) usage-related segmentation, (7) usage situation segmentation, (8) benefit segmentation, and (9) combined segmentation. Geographical segmentation is related to area, country size, area density, and climate. Demographic segmentation is related to age, gender, marital status, income, education, and work.

Psychological segmentation relates to motivation needs, personality, perceptions, involvement in learning, and attitudes. Psychographic segmentation is related to lifestyle, such as thrifty and fond of outdoor activities. Socio-cultural segmentation includes, culture, religion, socio-culture, social class, and family cycle. Usage-related segmentation includes level of use, state of awareness, brand loyalty, conditions, such as very fond, unconscious, strong, and so on. Segmentation of usage situations, such as time, destination, location, and space; work time, leisure, rush, personal, other people, and groups. Benefit segmentation is related to safety, long lasting. Combined segmentation; demographic/psychographic, geo-demographic are a combination of demographics and psychographics (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010).

Thus, producers today are not sufficient to recognize consumers from the geographical, demographic, psychographic, and behavioral aspects but are very detailed as described by Schiffman and Kanuk (2010). Value and life style (VALS), for example, has been used to evaluate the American market into eight groups: (1) actualizers; (2) experience seekers, (3) achievers, (4) makers, (5) fullfiled, (6) hard workers, (7) believers, and (8) adventurers (strugglers) (Schiffmen & Kanuk, 2008).

Tourist Satisfaction in Tourism Destinations

Previously, research on customer satisfaction was only conducted in one of the tourism sectors, such as the hotel industry and the airline industry. Currently research on customer satisfaction has been carried out in tourism destinations where in tourism destinations, there are various industries, such as the hotel industry, the airline industry, the industry that serves food and drink, the industry that provides various tourist attractions to visit, and the souvenir industry, which sells a variety of keepsakes tourists can buy to take home.

So that consumer satisfaction is a very strategic issue to be studied in a conceptual and empirical context. Furthermore, it is said that satisfaction is an essential element in maintaining long-term relationships with customers. Knowing and understanding the positive aspects and the consequences of customer behavior are very important for tourism destination management (Dmitrovic, 2008).

Research on tourism destinations was conducted by Mingfang (2011), which explored the relationship between tourist characteristics and satisfaction at a tourism destination. A research uses structural equation modeling (SEM). Mingfang’s (2011) research generally supports the customer satisfaction model. However,
this study found that there was no relationship between tourist characteristics and tourist satisfaction. Perceived performance and value have a positive effect on satisfaction and loyalty of tourism destinations. This research was conducted on inbound tourists in the Shenzhen area using nine market sources. The implication is that the right strategy is needed in understanding consumer behavior in the future.

Another study on tourist satisfaction was conducted by Spinks et al. (2005). It is illustrated that tourist satisfaction is an important component in the tourism business. This study aims to determine the effect of individual tourist characteristics on satisfaction with a tourism destination. This study used 412 respondents of domestic and non-domestic tourists. The result is that there is no significant effect of differences in respondents’ experience and knowledge on tourist satisfaction. However, there is a relationship between tourist origin, gender, and age group with customer satisfaction (Spinks et al., 2005).

The research of Spinks et al. (2005) is broadly divided into two major parts: The first is exploratory research using the in-depth method and focus groups. The second step uses a survey model. He also emphasized that it is very important to manage tourism destinations using good management by differentiating market share as a strategy in satisfying consumers. Satisfaction, according to Oliver (1997, as cited in Spinks, 2011) is the response and consideration of customers where products or services are available that can provide pleasure.

Customer satisfaction research was also carried out in Kamakura, Japan, a place which is to the west of Tokyo. This research was conducted by Furutani and Fujita (2005), examining the difference between Asian and non-Asian tourist satisfaction. Kamakura is a very popular tourist destination in Japan. This study uses linear structural relations (LISREL) analysis to test a model of the relationship between satisfaction, consumer value, and quantitative behavior. The result is that the satisfaction of tourists from Asia is lower than that of foreign tourists, so that the overall service needs to be improved. This study surveyed 231 non-Asian tourists, 67 Asian tourists, and 43 foreign students. The satisfaction assessment uses 12 indicators including overall experience (overall satisfaction). This study applies the tourism marketing theory of Kotler et al. (2010).

Research on tourist satisfaction was also carried out (Rodriguez & Martin, 2008) as a form of developing knowledge in the field of consumer psychology in the field of tourism through exploring the positive and affective aspects of individuals before and after traveling (pre- and post-experience). A model explains the relationship between tourist psychology variables. The study was conducted in Spain with 807 respondents. The result is that the previous image of the three destinations affects tourist expectations and loyalty. There is support between the impact of expectations and emotions on satisfaction which significantly affects behavior intention. This study also describes academic and managerial implications (Rodriguez & Martin, 2008).

Research Methods

This research uses a quantitative research paradigm, which emphasizes the use of statistics for measurement. However, in tourism, which is multidisciplinary in discussing this research, it will also be equipped with qualitative methods as the meaning of each data review discussed. According to Jenning (2001), the use of qualitative and quantitative methods does not need to be contradicted, they complement each other.

This research is intended as a micro-policy research on the behavior of tourists. This type of research is explanatory research.

Based on the data analysis method used, the sample size can be used the rule of thumb model moderated regression analysis (MRA). Roscoe (1992, as cited in Sugiono, 2009) explained that sample determination can
be used by multiplying 10 of the number of research indicators. In this research, 22 indicators are used, so that
the number of samples that must be taken is 220 tourists who dive in Bali. Testing the validity of the research
instrument was carried out using factor analysis. The variable extraction method used is the principle axis
factoring method to form one factor. The validity of the instrument was assessed based on the criteria for a
minimum item loading factor value of 0.5 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998), a Keisser Olkin Meyer
value of at least 0.50 and cumulative explained variance of at least 0.50, and a minimum Eigen factor value of
1.0. The reliability of the instrument was measured by Cronbach alpha with minimal value 0.70. This study will
examine the relationship between causal variables from one or more independent variables to one or more
dependent variables. Hypothesis testing uses multiple regression models and MRA models with interaction
tests. The multiple regression analysis model is formulated as follows:

\[ Y = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + e \]

**Test Results Confirmatory Factor Analysis**

Moderating regression analysis (MRA) is a method based on regression, which aims to build models and
methods for the social sciences with a prediction-oriented approach. This test aims to determine whether all the
indicators used in the study constitute the latent variables of perceived risk, satisfaction, trust, and intention to
behave. This test is equipped with an outer model, convergent validity, discriminant validity, composite
reliability, and Cronbach Alpha. This means that the indicators used have sufficient meaning to define the latent
variables that are formed. The indicator is declared significant if it has a CR value > 1.96 or a p-value < 0.05, or
the indicator is declared fixed (set).

**Hypothesis Test**

The research hypothesis was tested by using the moderating regression analysis (MRA) method. This
method assumes that the dependent variable data distribution is normal; there is a linear relationship between
the pairs of variables analyzed; the dependent variable variance has the same value in each group of
independent variables. Testing this hypothesis is carried out in two stages, namely, the first aims to test the
relationship model of the satisfaction and trust variables with the intention to behave. In the second stage,
testing the relationship between the variable satisfaction and trust variables towards the intention to behave
with the perceived risk variable intervention is carried out.

**The Effect of Satisfaction and Trust on Purchase Intention Partially**

The results of testing the significance of individual parameters for the first hypothesis obtained \( t \) count of
4.877 with a significance of 0.000. The Levin test results show the variance error of the satisfaction variable
with different intentions (\( F (2.143) = 1.837; p = 0.004 \)), so that this can then be continued to test the first
hypothesis. The results of the analysis of the influence of the satisfaction and trust variables on the behavior
intention of tourists show that the average tourist satisfaction score is 3.5576 and Std. error 0.06213, while in
trust amounted to 3.5818 and Std. error 0.61818; intention to behave at 3.5636 and Std. error 0.06118.
Meanwhile, the moderating variable perceive risk shows an average of 3.4523 and Std. error 0.05898.

The results of testing the significance of individual parameters for the first hypothesis (satisfaction with
the intention to behave) obtained \( t \) count 5.641 with a significance of 0.000. A value greater than 0.005 and a
parameter coefficient value of 0.402 indicate that the satisfaction variable has a positive and significant effect (> 0.05) on the intention to behave in tourists. Thus, the results of data analysis support Hypothesis 1.
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Table 1

Model Summary

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. E of E | Change statistics | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
|       |     |          |                   |             | R Square | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F change |             |
| 1     | 0.856a | 0.732 | 0.730 | 0.47187 | 0.732 | 296.489 | 2 | 217 | 0.000 | 1.676 |

Notes. a. predictors: (constant), trust, satisfaction; b. dependent variable: behave intention.

Table 2

Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized coefficients | Standardized coefficients | t | Sig. | 95.0% confidence interval for B | Collinearity statistics |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
|       | B | Std. error | Beta | | | Lower bound | Upper bound | Tolerance | VIF |
| (Constant) | 0.448 | 0.132 | | 3.400 | 0.001 | 0.188 | 0.708 |
| 1 Satisfaction | 0.402 | 0.071 | 0.408 | 5.641 | 0.000 | 0.262 | 0.542 | 0.236 | 4.242 |
| Trust | 0.471 | 0.072 | 0.476 | 6.571 | 0.000 | 0.329 | 0.612 | 0.236 | 4.242 |

Note. a. dependent variable: behave intention.

The results of the individual parameter significance test for the second hypothesis (trust with the intention to behave obtains t count of 6.571 with a significance of 0.000. This value indicates a value greater than 0.05 and the value of the trust parameter coefficient of 0.471. This indicates that the trust variable has a positive and significant effect towards the intention to behave tourists. Thus, the results of data analysis support Hypothesis 2.

The Effect of Satisfaction, Trust on Intention to Behave Simultaneously

Based on the results of statistical tests simultaneously on the regression, the F count is 296.489 with a significance level of 0.000; p = 0.05. This shows that the overall model can be used to predict tourists’ behavioral intentions. Satisfaction and trust are both proven to have a positive and significant effect on the behavioral intention of diving tourists in Bali. Based on the adjust $R^2$ value in this research model of 0.73 or 73%, the variation of the purchase intention of tourists who dive to Bali is influenced by the satisfaction and trust variables, while the remaining 27% is explained by other factors, which are not examined in this study.

Table 3

ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|---|------|
| Regression | 132.032 | 2 | 66.016 | 296.489 | 0.000a |
| 1 Residual | 48.317 | 217 | 0.223 | |
| Total | 180.349 | 219 | | |

Notes. a. dependent variable: behave intention; b. predictors: (constant), trust, satisfaction.

Table 4

Model Summary

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. E of E | Change statistics | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
|       |     |          |                   |             | R Square change | F change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F change |
| 1     | 0.856a | 0.732 | 0.730 | 0.47187 | 0.732 | 296.489 | 2 | 217 | 0.000 |

Note. a. predictors: (constant), trust, satisfaction.
Effects of Perceived Risk as Moderation on Satisfaction and Intention to Behave

The results of testing the role of perceived risk on the effect of satisfaction and behavioral intention indicate that the average score of perceived risk (mean = 3.4523; stddev = 0.87477; Std. error = 0.48486). Compared to moderate values, it is obtained an average of 12.9090, stddev = 5.32950. This shows that there is no difference in the mean from the original data. The results of the moderated regression analysis (MRA) test and the third hypothesis testing are described in Table 5.

Table 5

| Coefficientsa |
|---------------|
| Model | Unstandardized coefficients | Std. coef. | 95.0% confidence interval for B | Collinearity statistics |
| B | Std. error | Beta | Lower bound | Upper bound | Tolerance | VIF |
| (Constant) | -0.463 | 0.414 | -1.117 | 0.265 | -1.279 | 0.354 |
| Satisfaction | 0.886 | 0.142 | 0.900 | 6.245 | 0.000 | 0.607 | 1.166 | 0.063 | 15.929 |
| Risk | 0.629 | 0.155 | 0.606 | 4.061 | 0.000 | 0.324 | 0.934 | 0.059 | 17.073 |
| satisfaction*risk | -0.100 | 0.044 | -0.590 | -2.296 | 0.003 | -0.187 | -0.014 | 0.020 | 50.620 |

Note. a. dependent variable: behave intention.

Table 5 shows that the satisfaction variable provides a coefficient parameter value of 0.886 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.005). Perceived risk variable provides a parameter coefficient value of 0.629 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.005). The Moderate Variable 1 which is the interaction between satisfaction and intention to behave gives a coefficient value of -0.100 with a significance level of 0.003 (< 0.005) giving a value. Negative values indicate that perceptual perceptions will strengthen satisfaction and increase behavioral intention. Thus, the variable considered risk is a moderating variable between satisfaction and intention to behave.

Table 6

| Model Summaryb |
|----------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. E. of E | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change | Durbin-Watson |
| 1 | 0.848a | 0.718 | 0.715 | 0.48486 | 0.718 | 183.712 | 3 | 216 | 0.000 | 1.450 |

Notes. a. predictors: (constant), satisfaction*risk, satisfaction, risk; b. dependent variable: behave intention.

Based on the results of the $F$ test in Table 6, it produces a calculated $F$ value of 183.712 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.005), then the regression model can be used to predict behavior intention. This also means that satisfaction, risk, and the role of moderation together influence the behavior intention of diving tourists in Bali.

Table 7

| ANOVAb |
|--------|
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Regression | 129.569 | 3 | 43.190 | 183.712 | 0.000b |
| 1 | Residual | 50.780 | 216 | 0.235 |
| Total | 180.349 | 219 |

Notes. a. dependent variable: behave intention; b. predictors: (constant), satisfaction*risk, satisfaction, risk.
Effects of Perceived Risk on Trust Relationships and Intention to Behave

The role model of perceived risk in the relationship between then and intention to behave shows adequate validity shown by the results of the Levine test which shows the value of $F (2.762) = 1.881; \ p = 0.000$ error variance of each risk perception with homogeneous intention. The results of testing the role of perceived risk in the relationship between trust and intention to behave showed that the mean score of behavioral intention (mean = 3.563; mean deviation = 0.907), trust (mean = 3.581, standard deviation = 0.917), perceived risk (mean = 3.452, standard deviation = 0.875), moderation 2 (mean = 12.956; standard deviation = 5.209).

Table 8

| Coefficients for trust*risk
| Model                      | Unstandardized coefficients | Stized coef. | Sig.     | 95.0% confidence interval for B | Collinearity statistics |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
|                            | B                           | Std. error   | Beta     | Lower bound                    | Upper bound             | Tolerance | VIF     |
| (Constant)                 | -0.146                      | 0.390        | -0.373   | 0.709                           | 0.623                   |
| Trust                      | 0.745                       | 0.129        | 0.753    | 5.760                           | 0.000                   |
| Risk                       | 0.499                       | 0.149        | 0.481    | 3.340                           | 0.001                   |
| trust*risk                 | -0.053                      | 0.042        | -0.302   | -1.259                          | 0.209                   |

Note. a. dependent variable: behave intention.

Based on Table 8, it shows that the trust variable has a parameter coefficient value of 0.745 with a significance of 0.000 (< 0.005), the risk variable with a coefficient of 0.499 with a significance level of 0.001 (< 0.005), and the Moderate Variable 2 gives a coefficient value of -0.53 with a significance level of 0.209 (> 0.005). It can be concluded that the variable perceived risk is not a moderator in the relationship between trust and behavior intention.

Table 9

| ANOVA for trust*risk
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F   | Sig. |
|-------|---------------|----|-------------|-----|------|
| Regression | 133.224  | 3  | 44.408 | 203.547 | 0.000 |
| Residual | 47.125  | 216 | 0.218 |            |      |
| Total   | 180.349 | 219 |          |      |      |

Notes. a. dependent variable: behave intention; b. predictors: (constant), trust*risk.

The results of the $F$ test show the calculated $F$ value of 203.547 with a significance level of 0.000. With a significance level of probability much smaller than 0.005, this regression model can be used to predict tourist behavior intentions. With another explanation, it can be concluded that trust, perceived risk together affect the behavioral intention of diving tourists to Bali. Adjust $R^2$ value is 0.748 (75%), which means that 75% of the purchase intention variable is explained by the satisfaction, trust and indirect effects of the moderating variable perceived risk. The remaining 25% is explained by other variables outside the model. So, it can be concluded that there is a negative influence on the role of perceived risk on the effect of satisfaction and trust on the behavior intention of diving tourists in Bali. A negative and significant effect occurs in the role of perceived risk in the relationship between satisfaction and tourist behavior intentions. This means that the higher the risk received by tourists visiting a diving tourism destination, the lower the intention to visit tourists.
Discussion

The findings of this study revealed that there is an effect of satisfaction received by consumers during a purchase, which will result in an increase in individual behavioral intentions to return to want to be served by the same provider. The results of the analysis of the role of risk perceptions on the relationship between satisfaction and intention to behave proved to be statistically significant. Perceived risk is positively related to anxiety measures. The lower the level of anxiety or risk experienced by the individual, the stronger the effect on the tourists’ intention to behave. Perceptions of risk are not facts or situations that are actually risky, which can influence the behavior of tourists to avoid or cancel trips to certain destinations. In general, tourists will make travel decisions based on perception rather than reality. Tourists will seek information processing as one of the components taken into account in consumer purchasing decisions.

The individual’s intention to carry out tourism activities is based on the calculation of the profit and loss and the risk obtained during the trip. Negative perceptions of the risks a destination raises can build or strengthen tourist trust. The risk in an individual does not strengthen or weaken trust, but in trust a risk perception is formed that moves the intention of tourists to travel.

To build the loyalty of diving tourists in Bali, apart from controlling perceived risk and increasing satisfaction, it is deemed necessary to observe the trust of tourists. The findings of this study emphasize actual loyalty, namely tourists who have come, some even have visited Bali three times. The satisfaction received during the diving experience is the reason for returning to diving even in different diving spot areas.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Conclusions

Based on the results of the analysis and testing carried out with quantitative and qualitative approaches, in detail the conclusions of the study are stated as follows:

1. The results show that the characteristics of tourists who come to Bali diving are grouped into four categories, namely, “ecotourist” knowledge motivation (23%), “adventure”, tourists with motivation to increase their ability/competence (21%), “ego tourist”, tourists with motivation to establish a relationship with relationship (16%), and “picnickers”, tourists with motivation to relax and external influence or invite friends (39%). This means that tourists who dive in Bali are divers with the type of “picnickers” with a young, educated age, beginner certificates with one to five years of diving experience.

2. The perception of tourists towards diving tourism in Bali also shows a positive perception, with an average of 4.2 or very good and satisfied. This shows that diving tourism in Bali has a very good market in future development.

3. Development model with market penetration and product diversification of nyegaragunung (sea-mountain) into a positioning model for Bali diving tourism combined with spiritual activities in the area around diving tourism areas.

Suggestions

Based on the results and conclusions above, several things can be suggested as follows:

1. The nyegaragunung (sea-mountain) tourism model becomes a combination model for existing tourism products, such as the Menjangan Island area the temple Menjangan, Tulamben with the Spiritual Yoga Bunutan
tourism area. This combination of products will be able to provide benefits to increasing the number of tourist visits and the conservation of water areas.

2. Strengthening the character of Bali diving tourism products, with competitive branding and prices, so that tourists switch to diving tours in other areas.

3. This research is qualitative in nature, it is necessary to conduct an assessment of foreign tourists in order to obtain a clearer and broader market share.
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