Examining the Role of Online Customer Reviews on Tourist Motivation: Destination and Revisit Intention
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Abstract

With the development of science and technology, the online information search is more popular than ever. Online reviews from people who have experienced travel motivates visitors, giving them an overview of the destination before making a travel decision. Moreover, the satisfaction and attitude of visitors is a major factor for their intention to revisit. Previous studies have focused on the impact of tourist satisfaction and word-of-mouth after visiting the destination; relatively little research investigates online customer reviews about tourism. Using 253 tourists from Tien Giang Province, Vietnam, this study conducted a survey and the results indicated that, based on online customer reviews, travel motivation and destination image have significant impact on perceived quality, perceived value and trust satisfaction. These factors in turn influence attitude and revisit intention toward travel destination. Furthermore, Big-Five personality traits and experiential value can moderate the influence of antecedents on tourism performance.
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1. Introduction

Travelers are increasingly aware of the value of tourism destinations, the environments and the cultures in the places they visit. This phenomenon has contributed positively to the development of tourism in general and especially ecotourism in particular (Crouch and McCabe, 2003). Ecotourism contributes to improving people's livelihoods, generating income and solving employment issues for local people. Ecotourism provides an environmental education, contributing to the protection of the environment. Accordingly, the trend of tourism development based on nature and ecotourism is an important topic to be evaluated (Liberles et al., 2011).

Word-of-mouth (WOM) is one of the most important factors in the current travel industry. WOM contributes to the control and measurement that most companies are interested in; it contributes to pushing services and products that meet the diverse needs of customers (Harrison-Walker, 2001). Previous studies have shown that WOM has a direct influence on travel motivation and destination image (Brown et al., 2005; Sen and Lerman, 2007; Xia and Bechwati, 2008). WOM significantly influences the formation of customer attitudes and intentions of the return of visitor (Xia and Bechwati, 2008).

In addition to WOM, online customer reviews (OCRs) have become a new channel of information collection. Customers are reviewing comments from people who have previously traveled to the destination and purchased via internet (Cheong and Morrison, 2008; Elwalda et al., 2016).

Mudambi and Schuff (2010) have demonstrated that the information from customer reviews is helpful for the companies to understand customer attitudes (Dellarocas et al., 2007). Tourists tend to choose a destination that reflects their personality; personality is integrally related to human behavior. Tourists always share their experiences with friends and family when they travel.

Tien Giang-Vietnam as a tourism plot is different from Ha Long Bay, Ha Noi, or Ho Chi Minh city in context of the role OCRs, travel motivation, destination image, satisfaction, destination attitude, revisit intention. First, ecotourism is a new form of tourism in Vietnam and Tien Giang is attracting the attention of many tourists. Although quite well-known in the southern region of Vietnam, ecotourism in Tien Giang is not widely-known especially for international visitors. Second, the value and quality of services are different for tourist satisfaction. Tourism products and services are diverse but do not guarantee satisfied visitors. Therefore, to study the roles of OCRs on travel motivation, which further affects tourist satisfaction and revisit intention, this study constructed a comprehensive research model to examine the interrelationships among the following research variables: OCRs, travel motivation, destination image, perceived quality, perceived value, tourist satisfaction, attitude toward the
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destination, revisit intention, personality and experiential value, using the visitors of Tien Giang, Vietnam as respondents.

The main objectives of the study are as follow:
- To assess factors affecting tourist satisfaction including OCRs, destination image, perceived quality, and perceived value.
- To examine how attitude toward destination influence visitors’ revisit intention.
- To examine the moderating roles of Big Five personality and experiential perception on tourist satisfaction, attitude and revisit intentions toward travel destination.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Travel Motivation and Destination Image

Travel motivation is an internal part of travel behavior, the need to see what has not been seen, and the desire to know the unknown leads people to visit places (Venkatesh, 2006). To know the behavior of tourists, it is necessary to understand the characteristics of each individual, understand the positive and negative factors which impact the choice of travel destination (Holloway, 2004; March and Woodside, 2005). According to Gartner (2008), motivation is the beginning of the decision-making process and it occurs when visitors want to explore the external environment, thus motivation should be considered as one of the most important variables related to travel decision and satisfaction (Chang, 2007). From the point of view of destinations, motivation will help increase the number of tourists, in addition to being able to attract and encourage revisit (Jang and Feng, 2007).

People participate in tourism for many reasons: relaxing, exploring nature and self-development, those are general factors of tourism motivation (Mak et al., 2009). According to Ryan (1991), motivating forces in tourism are described by the fulfillment of shopping occasions, opportunities to entertain, rest, maintain relationships among family members, and expanding knowledge and education. An analysis on tourist motivation is important to understand leisure tourist destination choice (Scrogin et al., 2010); Yoon and Uysal (2005) asserts that in an increasingly competitive marketplace, the success of marketing destinations should be guided a by a thorough analysis of tourist motivation and its interplay with tourist satisfaction and loyalty. Destination image plays an important role in the decision-making process; money, time and family are all factors based in the destination image impacting the motivation of decision maker (Gartner, 1993). Destination image also affects the intention to travel for the first time and return to the same destination (Chen and Tsai, 2007).

H1: Travel motivation has positive impact on destination image.

2.2. OCRs, Travel Motivation, and Destination Image

According to Gallarza et al. (2002), the image of tangible products is more important than intangible products; visitors do not any experience of the destination, so they choose a destination with positive images. A positive image is critical for a destination to be selected (Litvin and Ling, 2001).

Many people like to review online customer's comments via internet before travelling, a new form of e-WOM. E-WOM is “any positive or negative statement made by potential, actual, or former customers about a product or a company which is made available to multitude of the people and institutes via the Internet” (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2004). E-WOM is considered by many scholars as a key source of information for online purchasing (Cui et al., 2012); (Lee R. and Lockshin, 2011) and as a critical factor for facilitating the diffusion of online information (Sun et al., 2006). Hennig-Thurau et al. (2004) states that online customers rely on e-WOM when making decisions and shows its effect on sales (Bae and Kim, 2013; Chevalier and Mayzlin, 2006). Ye et al. (2011) also demonstrated that e-WOM has a positive influence on customer loyalty.

OCRs and e-WOM are different in several important ways. First, e-WOM is created by customers and marketers, while OCRs are defined as customer reviews and comments posted on the company's website or another company’s website (Mudambi and Schuff, 2010). With e-WOM, any individual can use Facebook or Twitter's personal social network allowing them control of their information, but for OCRs, information can only be posted on general forums like eBay and Amazon. Also, e-WOM can only share information directly to specific recipients on social networks as mentioned above, while OCRs information publicly available (Clare, 2012). Bae and Lee (2011) claimed that OCRs are a unique form of e-WOM. OCRs provide more information to customers (Park et al., 2007) and have a more positive impact on customer intention than expert reviews (Dellarocas et al., 2007). Most consumers know that a marketer can manipulate e-WOM, but it is difficult to manipulate OCRs. OCRs directly express their opinions according to their own experiences.

Traveler's reviews are crucial in purchasing travel services; the quality of service is intangible, therefore visitors find it difficult to evaluate the quality of the products (Ye et al., 2011). Furthermore, OCRs have a significant impact on brand reputation (Amblee and Bui, 2008), and trustworthiness of an online store (Awad and Ragowsky, 2008). Online reviews are an evolving market phenomenon, playing an important role in decision making (Liu and Park, 2015).

H2: Online customer reviews moderate the effect of travel motivation to destination image.

2.3. The Relationship between Travel Motivation, Destination Images, Perceived Quality, Perceived Value and Tourist Satisfaction

There are many different facets of a destination image; (Crompton, 1979) defined it as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has on a destination.
Tasci and Kozak (2006) define the destination image as the sum of attributes related to the travel experience. Destination image is found to have both a direct and indirect impact on behavioral intentions and satisfaction (Alcaraz et al., 2009).

Alcaraz et al. (2009) has shown that the functions related to intention and image are associated with both intentions and behavior. Chen and Tsai (2007) asserted that the destination image directly affects the quality of the trip, and indirectly affects value perception, satisfaction, and behavior in the future, as well as the customer’s visit intention. Travel documents describing the image of the destination are the promise of satisfaction and visitor behavior in the future. Echtner and Ritchie (1991) noted that image is a key factor in destination choice for first-time visitors.

H3: Travel motivation has positive effect on (a) perceived quality, (b) perceived value and (c) tourist satisfaction toward tourist destination.
H4: Destination image has positive effective on (a) perceived quality, (b) perceived value, and (c) tourist satisfaction toward tourist destination.

2.4. The Relationship between Perceived Quality and Perceived Value

For the customer, quality of services means that expectations are meet and needs satisfied. Therefore, quality is determined by the customer. Because customer needs are diverse, quality can be divided by several levels. Example of services delivery to visitors include: friendliness, politeness, efficiency, staff ability and reliability, service outcomes are accommodation, food and beverage, facilities and entertainment.

Han et al. (2014) stressed that from customer views, customer do not need to assess the level of quality, because quality is evaluated by their perception. Their perception is shaped by the overall excellence and superiority of service as compared with other alternative.

Chen and Tsai (2007) defined perceived quality as the “visitor’s assessment of the standard of the service delivery process in association with the trip experience”. According to Woodruff (1997), the perceived value for the customer is the customer's favorite elements of the product or service. Perceived value is a combination between the desired value and the value received, which emphasizes that value comes from the customer's perception, preference and assessment.

Cronin et al. (2000) contended that higher perceived quality typically leads to higher perceived value. Therefore, quality is a direct antecedent, as well as the best predictor, of perceived value (Petrick, 2004).

H5: Perceived quality has positive impact on perceived value.

According to Zeithaml (1988), perceived value is “the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product (or service) based on perceptions of what is received and what is given,” (p.14). Based on this, Zeithaml identified the four means of value: (1) low price; (2) all the things that customers want in a product; (3) quality customers get for what the price-tag; and (4) what customers get for what they give.

Perceived values of a tourist destination denote the relationship between the travel time or money invested and the experience gained through visiting that specific destination (Murphy and SHON, 2000). Generally, tourists estimate the values of a destination on the basis of perceived benefits and costs, based on the destinations offerings. According to the equity theory (Oliver and Swan, 1989), consumer satisfaction occurs when more value is received than what was spent. Indeed, several researchers have found that when tourists perceive that the quality of services given to them is greater than the money paid by them, they will feel satisfied with the services received (Song et al., 2012). Tourist satisfaction is directly affected by value-visitors, who perceive a greater destination value are more likely to experience superior satisfaction with the destination.

H6: Perceived value has positive affect to tourist satisfaction.

2.5. The Relationship between Perceived Quality, Perceived Value, Tourist Satisfaction and Revisit Intention

Meeting demand and satisfying customers are important objectives for business activities and the tourism industry, the higher the satisfaction, the more willingness to buy. Therefore, satisfaction, being positive or negative, can be determined by performance and regarded as a vital basis of competitive issues (Peters, 1994). Moreover, it plays a vital role in tourists’ minds to choose the destination and their revisit-intention (Yoon and Uysal, 2005).

Many studies have examined the antecedents of re-purchase intentions. Quality, perceived value, and satisfaction all have been shown to be suitable predictors of behavioral intentions (Petrick, 2004). Lee (2009) found that perceived service quality, operationalized as a set of attributes, better predicts visitors’ revisit intention to the destination and their willingness to recommend it than an alternative model which defines perceived service quality as an overall construct.

H7: Perceived quality has positive effect on (a) attitude toward the destination and (b) revisit intention
H8: Perceived value has positive effect on (a) attitude toward the destination and (b) revisit intention
H9: Tourist satisfaction has positive effect on (a) attitude toward the destination and (b) revisit intention

2.6. The Relationship between Attitude toward Of the Destination and Revisit Intention

According to Ajzen (2001), attitude of a behavior is “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question”. In other words, attitude is an important variable that influences customer behaviors because attitude consistence, certainty, and stability were associated with greater attitude-behavior correlation (Kraus, 1995).
Visitor attitude can help predict the decision to travel to a certain destination (Reza and Samiei, 2012). Crompton (1979) found that attitude is influential in determining whether a potential destination is selected as part of the evoked set and in selecting a final destination. Lee (2009) found tourist attitude affects future tourist behavior. Hosany et al. (2006) showed that the attitudes of travelers to destinations impact their behavioral intentions, he also demonstrated the positive attitude of visitors has significant influence to make the tourist return and recommend the destination to other people.

**H10: Attitude toward of the destination has positive effect to revisit intention**

### 2.7. The Moderating Roles of Tourist’s Personality

The Big Five factor of personality refers to different thoughts, emotions, and behaviors that shape individuals’ adaptation to the situation of their life (Laesser and Zehrer, 2012). It includes neuroticism, agreeableness, openness to experience, extraversion, emotional stability and conscientiousness. Melamed (1995) stated that people choose a tourist destination that reflects their personality. Scott and Mowen (2007) pointed out that there is a relationship between Big Five personality traits and the propensity to be an adventure traveler. For hard adventure tourist, they prefer to participate in challenge, risk and uncertainly activities, while soft adventure activities do not provide enough adrenaline for arousal needs to act for recreationist. Previous studies have shown that aggressive personality traits can increase the likelihood of commitment behavior. According to attribute behavior theory (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1975), people having a personality with higher levels of extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and openness tend to behave positively. Therefore, when tourists have a chance to evaluate travel destination, their perception including destination image, perceived quality, and perceived value toward travel destination will be much higher for tourists having a higher positive personality. According to consumer identity model, if the personality of the destination is consistent with the personality of the tourists, then it will assist tourists in forming positive judgments toward their destination (Ahn et al., 2009). Cronin et al. (2000) stated customers’ buying-decisions depend on whether the perceived service value is worth the cost customers have to pay. In other words, the level of personality traits will moderate the influences of travel motivation and destination image on perceived quality, perceived value and travel satisfaction.

For travelers with higher levels of aggressive personality, perception of higher levels of quality, value, travel destination and satisfaction toward destination, indicates that their attitude and revisit intention will be higher. On the other hand, travelers with lower levels of aggressive personality, may be more passive on travel events and consequently the influence of perceptions of quality, value and travel satisfaction on attitude and revisit intention will be low. In other words, the levels of personality traits will moderate a traveler’s perceptions toward quality, value and travel satisfaction on attitude revisit intention.

**H11a: The Big Five personality moderate the effect of destination image to perceived value**

**H11b: The Big Five personality moderate the effect of travel motivation to perceived value**

### 2.8. The Moderating Roles of Experiential Value

According to Holbrook and Hirschman (1982), experiential perception may be more effective for attitude change and purchase intention. They further state that “hedonic consumption designates those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multisensory, fantasy and emotion aspects of one’s experience with product or service”. Tourists will be more satisfied when they have experiences related to attributes or functional matters at travel destination such as destination image, the arrangement or the organizers’ service at the destination. Also, they will be more satisfied when they have feelings of well-being, happiness and playful enjoyable experiences (Coghlan and Pearce, 2010). Besides, Tsaur et al. (2013) explained that happiness is created from an individual’s activities, becoming their experience through experiential value. If the visitors have high levels of experiential values, they tend to have favorable behavioral intentions like revisit intention (Chua, 2014). In other words, if the visitors have high levels of enjoyment and playfulness at their destination, they will be encouraged to recommend that destination to others and revisit it themselves in the future.

**H12a: The experience value moderates the effect of perceived value to attitude toward to the destination.**

**H12b: The experience value moderates the effect of perceived value to the revisit intention.**

### 3. Data Analysis and Results

#### 3.1. Characteristic of Respondents

This survey conducted a questionnaire from tourists who traveled to Tien Giang. For 253 valid respondents, 138 were male (54.5%) and 115 were female (45.5%). Most respondents were aged 21-30 (47.4%) and most of respondents know Tien Giang tourism by social network (71.1%)
Table 1: Characteristic of the respondent

| Demographic Variable | Frequency (n=253) | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| **Gender**           |                  |                |
| Male                 | 138              | 54.5%          |
| Female               | 115              | 45.5%          |
| **Ages**             |                  |                |
| Less than 20         | 80               | 31.6%          |
| 21-30                | 120              | 47.4%          |
| 31-40                | 25               | 10%            |
| 41-50                | 20               | 8%             |
| More than 50         | 8                | 3%             |
| **Income (USD/month)** |                |                |
| Less than 300        | 68               | 26.9%          |
| 301-600              | 131              | 51.8%          |
| 601-900              | 30               | 11.9%          |
| 901-1200             | 13               | 5.1%           |
| More than 1200       | 11               | 4.3%           |
| **Education**        |                  |                |
| High school          | 88               | 34.8%          |
| College              | 53               | 20.9%          |
| University           | 93               | 36.8%          |
| Master               | 10               | 4%             |
| Others               | 9                | 3.5%           |
| **Channels**         |                  |                |
| Social network       | 180              | 71.1%          |
| Word of mouth        | 73               | 28.9%          |

3.2. Reliability and Validity Analysis

To ensure the dimension and reliability of the research constructs, this study conducted factor analysis, item-to-total correlation, and Cronbach’s alpha tests. Table 2 shows that factor loading of all the questionnaire items are higher than 0.6 (0.612–0.957), all item-to-total correlation coefficients are higher than 0.5 (expected PV1), and all Cronbach’s alpha of factors are higher than 0.6 (0.652–0.929), which all exceed the generally accepted guideline from Hair et al. (2011). Therefore, we can conclude all the questionnaire items show a high degree of internal consistency and their factors are appropriated to be used for further analysis.

Table 2: Factor loading and reliability

| Research Item               | Factor Loading | Eigen Value | Accumulative Explained | Item to Total Correlation | Cronbach’s α |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Travel Motivation           | 0.612–0.799    | 6.080       | 65.277                  | 0.543–0.738                | 0.918         |
| Online Customer Reviews     | 0.837–0.889    | 3.755       | 75.098                  | 0.746–0.817                | 0.917         |
| Destination Image           | 0.779–0.873    | 4.152       | 69.193                  | 0.687–0.805                | 0.911         |
| Perceived Quality           | 0.753–0.865    | 4.058       | 67.639                  | 0.652–0.790                | 0.904         |
| Perceived Value             | 0.788–0.906    | 2.173       | 64.319                  | 0.427–0.652                | 0.652         |
| Tourist Satisfaction        | 0.803–0.917    | 6.884       | 76.494                  | 0.755–0.887                | 0.961         |
| Attitude Toward Of The Destination | 0.887–0.954 | 2.531 | 84.372 | 0.611–0.886 | 0.907 |
| Revisit Intention           | 0.907–0.957    | 2.585       | 86.157                  | 0.794–0.897                | 0.919         |
| Big Five Personality        | 0.612–0.841    | 5.558       | 65.576                  | 0.542–0.772                | 0.909         |
| Experiential Value          |                |             |                         |                            |               |
| Emotional Value             | 0.886–0.931    | 3.296       | 82.404                  | 0.800–0.874                | 0.929         |
| Functional Value            | 0.889–0.916    | 3.253       | 81.337                  | 0.805–0.848                | 0.923         |
| Social Value                | 0.856–0.913    | 3.215       | 80.363                  | 0.752–0.839                | 0.918         |

3.3. Analysis Results

According to Hair et al. (2011), the partial least square SEM (PLS-SEM) has called a great deal of attention in recent years. PLS-SEM focuses on maximizing the explained variance of the dependent latent constructs. PLS has been recognized as an effective analytical technique, particularly for those studies focusing on prediction of outcomes (Chin et al., 2003). The PLS-SEM tried to maximize the explained variance ($R^2$ value) of the dependent constructs. Hair et al. (2011) argued that there are several criteria to measure the reliability and validity of the measurement model. The first criterion is the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). According to Schroer and Schroer and Hertel (2009), $R^2$ value of less than 0.19 is considered to be weak, 0.33 is described as moderate, while more than 0.672 is considered be to substantial. The second criterion is the average variance extracted (AVE) which assess the convergent validity, AVE should be greater than 0.5 to assure that the latent variables can explain more than average (Henseler et al., 2009). The third criterion is the composite reliability (CR), which should be greater than 0.6 to confirm that the variance shared by the respective indicators is robust. The fourth
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criterion is the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, which should be higher than 0.7 to confirm the internal consistency of the research construct.

The goodness-of-fit (GoF) index is used to measure the overall fitness between the data and the model. Following Vinzi et al. (2010), GoF greater than 0.36 is considered to be large, 0.25 is described as medium, while 0.10 is described as small.

This study used the parameter estimates of the path between research constructs to test the hypothesis. The result confirmed that the structural model is appropriate with high predictive power. The structural model is shown as figure 1 and table 3 below:

Figure-1. The measurement of this study

Table-3. Evaluation of Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

| Hypo | Path | Standardize Estimate | t-value | p- value |
|------|------|----------------------|---------|----------|
| H1   | Travel motivation -> Destination image | 0.0055 | 0.0462 | _ |
| H2   | Online customer reviews * Travel motivation -> Destination image | 0.7725 | 3.5797 | *** |
| H3a  | Travel motivation -> Perceived quality | 0.0374 | 1.8703 | _ |
| H3b  | Travel motivation -> Perceived value | 0.2394 | 3.6212 | *** |
| H4a  | Destination Image -> Perceived Quality | 0.7656 | 46.8186 | *** |
| H4b  | Destination Image -> Perceived value | 0.2231 | 2.9197 | *** |
| H5   | Perceived Quality -> Perceived value | 0.5027 | 14.9986 | *** |
| H6   | Perceived value -> Tourist satisfaction | 0.2337 | 10.6071 | *** |
| H7a  | Perceived quality -> Attitude toward of the destination | 0.0891 | 7.6018 | *** |
| H7b  | Perceived quality -> Revisit intention | 0.1892 | 6.3665 | *** |
| H8a  | Perceived value -> Attitude toward of the destination | 0.0214 | 5.1553 | *** |
| H8b  | Perceived value -> Revisit intention | 0.4121 | 5.3498 | *** |
| H9a  | Tourist Satisfaction -> Attitude toward of the destination | 0.0426 | 1.1497 | _ |
| H9b  | Tourist Satisfaction -> Revisit intention | 0.5588 | 23.0787 | *** |
| H10  | Attitude toward of the destination -> Revisit intention | 0.0792 | 3.9705 | *** |
| H11a | Destination image * Big five -> Perceived value | 0.0252 | 0.2073 | _ |
| H11b | Travel motivation * Big five -> Perceived value | 0.4150 | 3.2419 | *** |
| H12a | Perceived value * Experiential value -> Attitude toward of the destination | 0.6171 | 5.9660 | *** |
| H12b | Perceived value * Experiential value -> Revisit intention | 0.5699 | 5.1904 | *** |

Note: ***p<0.001

The empirical results show that travel motivation does not have significant influence on family destination image (β=0.0055; t=0.0462) and perceived quality (β =0.0374; t=1.8703), but it does have significant influence on perceived value (β 0.2394, t=3.6212) and tourist satisfaction (β=0.1495, t=9.3824). Furthermore, the interaction between travel motivation and OCRs has significant influence on travel motivation (β=0.7725, t=3.5797), and
destination image ($\beta=0.0555, t=0.0462$). These results also indicate that when OCRs are dominated, the influence of travel motivation and destination image will be applied. Then destination image will have significant influence on perceived quality ($\beta=0.7656, t=46.8186$), perceived value ($\beta=0.2231, t=2.9197$), tourist satisfaction ($\beta=0.5968, t=29.4227$). Perceived quality has significant influence on perceived value ($\beta=0.5027, t=14.9986$), perceived value has significant influence on tourist satisfaction ($\beta=0.2337, t=10.6071$). The results seem to suggest that travel motivation does not directly influence perceived quality; however, indirectly it has impact through destination image. In other words, travel motivation will be closely related to destination image, which further impact perceived quality, perceived value and tourist satisfaction. Perceived quality ($\beta=0.0891, t=7.6018$) and perceived value ($\beta=10.0214, t=5.1553$) have significant influence on attitude toward the destination, but tourist satisfaction ($\beta=0.0426, t=1.1497$) does not have a significant influence on attitude toward the destination. Perceived quality ($\beta=0.1892, t=6.3665$), perceived value ($\beta=0.4121, t=5.3498$) and tourist satisfaction ($\beta=0.5588, t=23.0787$) have significant influence on revisit intention. Finally, attitude toward the destination has significant influence on revisit intention ($\beta=0.0792, t=3.9705$).

For the roles of moderator effect, the results show that Big Five personality traits have significant influence on the relationship between travel motivation ($\beta=0.4150, t=3.2419$) and perceived value, but it is not a significant for the influence of destination image on perceived value ($\beta=0.0252, t=0.2073$). These results seem to indicate that if tourist personality is more aggressive, the influence of travel motivation to perceived value will be strengthened. Simultaneously the influence of destination image on perceived value will also be amplified if tourist personality is more aggressive.

In addition, the interaction of experience value between perceived and attitude toward destination image and revisit intention, the results indicated that experience value also has significant influence on attitude toward the destination ($\beta=0.6171, t=5.9660$) and revisit intention ($\beta=0.5699, t=5.1904$). Therefore, these results seem to indicate that when experience value is dominated, the influence of perceived value in attitude toward destination and revisit intention will be also amplified.

### 4. Conclusion and Suggestions

#### 4.1. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study is to assess the role of OCRs on the relationship between tourist motivation and destination image and to analyze the factors affecting tourist satisfaction, perceived quality and perceived value. This study also aims to examine how the attitude toward destination influences visitors’ revisit intention. Finally, this study examines the moderating roles of Big Five personality traits and experiential perception for the influence of travel motivation and destination, perceived value on attitude and revisit intention toward destination.

The study tried to identify that the level of travel motivation has a positive effect on the destination image. The study results suggest that this hypothesis is not supported. The reason may be that when visiting Tien Giang, the landscape is different than what was expected. Moreover, OCRs moderate the influence of destination image toward travel motivation. The study results support this hypothesis. These results are also in line with Sakas and Fodor (2012). These authors argued that most travelers find their trips through the internet and refer to online reviews before making a decision. The next hypothesis stated that travel motivation and destination image have positive effects on perceived quality, perceived value and tourist satisfaction toward tourist destination. The study results support the hypothesis. Chen and Tsai (2007) mentioned that destination image directly impacts the quality of the trip, satisfaction and value perceptions. Furthermore, the study aims to identify that perceived quality has a positive impact on perceived value and the perceived value has a positive effect on tourist satisfaction. These results also support the hypothesis. Cronin et al. (2000) found that higher perceived quality will lead to higher perceived value. Oliver and Swan (1989) stated that visitor satisfaction occurs when more value is received.

The results support the hypothesis that perceived quality, perceived value and tourist satisfaction have impact on revisit intention and attitude toward the destination. This indicates tourists with higher perceived value, perceived quality and tourist satisfaction have a significantly higher attitude toward the destination and revisit intention. The attitudes toward destination has an effect on revisit intention. The results support the hypothesis and are in-line with the results of previous studies. Lee (2009) stated that tourist attitude impacts future tourist behavior, and their likelihood of a return to the same destination to travel.

The results suggest that the hypothesis of tourists’ personality moderating the influence of destination image on perceived value is not supported; however, this hypothesis stated that tourist’s personality will moderate the influence of travel motivation on perceived value which is supported. According to Scott and Mowen (2007) travelers with higher levels of aggressive personality tend to become more adventurous. The study results show that tourists’ experiential value has significant moderating influence of perceived value on attitude toward destination and revisit intention. Chua (2014) stated that if visitors have high levels of experience values, they tend show favorable behaviors like intention to revisit.

#### 4.2. Limitation and Future Research Direction

Although the results of this study are fruitful, it still suffers from several limitations. First, the sample size in this study used 253 respondents for empirical validation. We focused on the OCRs and tourist satisfaction in Tien Giang destination, so the sample was collected from the people who have travelled Tien Giang, explaining why half of them are Vietnamese, and some of them are ASEAN citizen. Most of respondents are young people, so their opinion may not represent the old and ASEAN tourist opinion. Further research will benefit by adding more respondents.
from other groups of people representing different nations such as America, England, France, etc., to get more empirical validation.

Second, the conceptual model still has three hypotheses that are not supported by quantitative research. Future research may combine interviewing the tourists to gain additional insights.

Third, during the research process, the study found out the impact of culture, nationality and multiculturalism on using online customer reviews. Therefore, the decision-making process may need to be studied in depth.
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