Influence of Event Image and Destination Image on Visitor Satisfaction and Intentions to Revisit

Mohammed Riyad Al-Dweik*

Faculty of Tourism and Geography, Rovira i Virgili University, Tarragona, Spain, E-mail,

mohammadaldweik@yahoo.com

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Understanding the variables that influence visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit within the context of events has not been widely observed in the developing countries. This study investigated whether the influence of event image and destination image with each other and their effect on visitor satisfaction and intentions to revisit by examining Jerash and Fuheis festivals events in Jordan and their differences based on the frequency of visit. Data were collected face to face by the author from 223 visitors' attended festivals events. Multiple regressions were used to evaluate the hypotheses of this study. The results revealed as follow: 1) the positive effects of destination image on event image; 2) the positive effects of the event and destination images on visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit; 3) the higher the frequency of visits to the event, the longer the time spent in the destination with more satisfaction and intention to revisit. The key contribution of this study showed clearly the importance of collaborations between event organisers and destination marketers is discussed along with the significance of visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit as a driver of event and destination images formation.

Keywords: Event image, destination image, visitor satisfaction, intentions to revisit, frequency of visit

Introduction

Examining the influence of destination image on event image, Xing and Chalip (2006) mentioned that there is a significant influence of destination image on event image based on the transfer of image among event and destination. The image transfer from an event to the destination may influence each other (Gwinner & Eaton, 2000; Xing & Chalip, 2006). The destinations have significantly recognised the important role and potential benefits by hosting events such as festivals as forms of entrepreneurial display, despite the huge costs and related social problems when preparing and hosting the event such as lengthen the average visitor length of stay and enticing visitor spending (Getz & Page, 2014; Prentice & Andersen, 2003; Robertson & Wardrop, 2004).

The image of event and destination influence the satisfaction of visitor positively and contribute to a sustainable visitor (Carse, Venski & Steyn, 2018; Deng, Li & Shen, 2015; Viviers & Slabbert, 2014), behavioural intention and the frequency of visit (Kaplanidou & Gibson, 2012). The tourists could visit a destination for the first time due to the positive effect of re-visitation intentions (Bigne, Sanchez & Sanchez, 2001). However, no empirical work has examined the influence of event image and destination image on visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at a festival event, particularly in developing countries such as Jordan (Alananzeh, Al-Badarneh, Al-Mkhadmeh & Jawabreh, 2019; Carse et al., 2018). These studies, therefore, only partially captured the influence because the investigation was limited to certain levels and dimensions of the two image constructs. Event image is previously

418

known to affect destination image and vice versa, but the intensity of such influence still requires investigation. Another unresolved issue is the uncertainty about whether event image and destination image mutually affect each other as well as their effect on visitor satisfaction and behavioural intention (Lai, Hitchcock, Lu & Liu, 2018; Ramukumba, 2017).

These issues regarding the influence of destination image on event image, and the image enhancement effect of Hallmark events such as festivals. Therefore, this study aimed to explore the influence of event image and destination image with each other and their effect on visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions further by examining Jerash and Fuheis festivals as important hallmark events in Jordan as well as find the differences based on the frequency of visit. In other words, hosting festivals events may contribute to the image of destination and event profile formation and has the potential to create additional co-branding and marketing benefits in long term (Carse et al., 2018; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). This goal was achieved by addressing four critical issues concerning the influence. First, how does destination image affect event image at different levels and dimensions of these two constructs? Second, what is the relative importance of event image and destination image in affecting visitor satisfaction? Third, what is the relative importance of event image and destination image in affecting behavioural intention? Fourth, explore the differences based on the frequency of visits to the event and destination to find the level of visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit.

Literature review
Effect of destination image on the event image
The destination image is a very important marketing concept and one of the most researched topics in the tourism field (Kim & Richardson, 2003). It is created by different information sources with social media users that can generate contents and influences in destination image formations well as changed by several marketing tools when hosts an event such as word of mouth and social media (Avraham, 2014; Huertas, Míguez-González & Lozano-Monterrubio, 2017; Xing & Chalip, 2006). Keller (1993:3) also defines the destination image as a "perceptions of a destination as reflected by the associations held in the consumer memory". Previous tourism research confirms the importance of destination image as a key concept to be analysed as to its influence directly leads to event image (Byon & Zhang, 2010; Gartner & Shen, 1992; Schneider & Sönmez, 1999; Xing & Chalip, 2006). Hence, insight is needed to determine how the destination image affects the event image to inform future target-marketing in the tourism industry (King, Chen & Funk, 2015), and fit together (Brown, Chalip, Jago & Mules, 2002).

On the other hand, the event image like festivals also has a significant role in changing the destination image positively and enhances cultural attractions based on the events types such as sport, music or festival events (Gwinner, 1997). Gwinner (1997, p. 147) defines the event image as "the interpretation of meanings or associations attributed to events by consumers". Thus, the festivals can vary significantly in the theme and activities offered when they provide that unique opportunity and contribute to residents learning (Getz, 1997; Sdrali & Chazapi, 2007).

Consequently, understanding how the destination and event images work together is important (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). As Keller (1993:3), defines the image of destination and event as "the way of thinking of people in the context of an event/a destination as reflected by the link that held in consumer memory". Destination image can affect the event image as a supplier of the place of experiences (Hinch & Higham, 2001). This effect has not been studied in developing countries such as Jordan (Carse et al., 2018; Harahsheh, Morgan & Edwards, 2010). Thus, few destination and event images studies have focused on Jordan in the Middle

East or Africa (Carse et al., 2018; Harahsheh et al., 2010; Tichaawa & Mhlanga, 2015; Viviers & Slabbert, 2014).

Accordingly, a proper understanding and contribution of knowledge of the type and categories of the event visitors can help the event organisers and destination marketers tailor out the event that will best suit and meet the needs of visitors at festivals events in the tourist destination (Carse et al., 2018). Therefore, this research proposes that destination image related and directly affects the event image and then examines the relative contribution of the perspectives of visitors', which in turn, determine future travel. This area is investigated via hypotheses 1a which is:

H1: Destination image does not affect the event image positively.

Effect of event image and destination image on visitor satisfaction
Event image has both direct and indirect influences on visitor satisfaction as well as satisfied visitors in the event tend to be loyal (Sharma & Kumar, 2019), thus, can positively influence visitor satisfaction (Bigne et al., 2001; Hallmann & Breuer, 2010). For example, the quality of functional aspects of the festival such as the facilities can influence the perception of attendees overall experience and satisfaction (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). Severt, Wang, Chen and Breiter (2007) examined visitor satisfaction and behavioural intention toward a conference event. They found that satisfaction will have a more significant effect on return intention than word of mouth, and the more conferences an attendee attends, the more positive recommendation an attendee will promote, and therefore, event image positively affects visitor satisfaction. Fundamentally, there is a need to understand how event image can affect visitor satisfaction that can contribute to enhancing the level of satisfaction among all visitors and attendees at festivals events in developing countries (Ramukumba, 2017; Viviers & Slabbert, 2014).

Destination image positively affects visitor satisfaction with a strong relationship, and it would be worthwhile for destination marketers to endeavour to improve the destination image to contribute to greater satisfaction levels (Jeong & Kim, 2019). Destination image plays a significant and effective role in visitor satisfaction and destination selection, thus, help for a decision-making process, and affect the level of satisfaction with the tourist experience in the destination by the frequency of visit to the destination (Castro et al., 2007). Hence, tourism destinations need to develop and create a positive image, then contribute to help tourists and visitors in their decision-making process (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Prayag, 2009).

Therefore, the image of event and destination with visitor satisfaction considered good predictors of visitor revisit (Bigne et al., 2001; Hallmann & Breuer, 2010), and limited research explains this relationship which contributes to visitor satisfaction in the middle east such as Jordan or Africa (Alananzeh et al., 2019; Carse et al., 2018; Viviers & Slabbert, 2014). The present research will provide new contribution insights into the importance of event and destination images in effects visitors' satisfaction in developing countries such as Jordan. Consequently, the research hypotheses 2a and 2b are:

H2a: Event image does not affect visitor satisfaction positively.
H2b: Destination image does not affect visitor satisfaction positively.

Effect of event image and destination image on intentions to revisit

Event image has a significant positive effect on visitor re-visit (Puad, Som, Marzuki, Yousefi & Abukhalifeh, 2012; Xing & Chalip, 2006), the visitors' number attending an event is one of the indicators of event success (Hussein, 2016). The event image can influence the visitors' intention to revisit positively, likelihood towards an individual repeat visit in some subsequent periods based on the attractiveness of festivals events (Darrell & Johnson, 2001; Sun & Lin, 2011). Gibson, Qi and Zhang(2008) have found that an event image has a significant positive effect on visitor re-visit. On the contrary, some scholars did not find the effect of event image on visitor revisit intention (Chi & Qu, 2008; Hernández-Lobato, Solis-Radilla, Moliner-Tena & Sánchez-García, 2006). Hence, there is no consensus among scholars about the relationships between event image and visitor revisit intention, as well as, can contribute toward this relationship (Hussein, 2016).

The destination image positively influenced re-visitation intentions and recommend the destination (Bigne et al., 2001; Castro et al., 2007; Lee, Taylor, Lee & Lee, 2005). The visitors' behavioural intentions to visit for the first time or revisit a destination be influenced by destination image perceptions (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). However, some scholars (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008) argue that the destination image will positively affect the behavioural intentions of visitors. The destination perceptions of first-time visitors are likely to involve more complex than those held by repeat visitors (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991), and the destination image plays a significant role when the tourists and visitors decide to visit a destination for the first time (Baloglu, 1999). Hence, the positive and strong destination image can motivate tourists to consider the destination and increase their frequency of visits to the destination (Kassean & Gassita, 2013).

Therefore, the destination image is essential due to the effects on the tourist behaviour of visiting a certain destination and event, and very interesting topic in marketing that can influence the decision-making process (Thwala & Slabbert, 2018). The tourism organisations are interested in studying the image event and destination that can contribute to help them in design and develop their promotional campaigns and favourable images about the destination (Jenkins, 1999). However, the effects of event image and destination image on re-visit intentions by visitors are not well understood in developing countries. Consequently, the research establishes further hypotheses 3a and 3b.

H3a: Event image does not affect intentions to revisit positively.
H3b: Destination image does not affect intentions to revisit positively.

Event image, destination image, visitor satisfaction and intentions to revisit differences based on the frequency of visit
In term of event image and destination image, the differences between first-time and repeat visitors have received renewed interest among tourism researchers, differences were found in motivations, expectation, and satisfaction between those who had previously attended and those attending for the first time, however, repeat visitors considered as a source of revenue, and word of mouth (Li, Cheng, Kim & Petrick, 2008). Understanding the relationship between the satisfaction of event attendees and visitors, their perception of the service quality and their intention to repeat their attendance at an event is very important for destination marketers and experts who wish to create a market of loyal visitors (Carse et al., 2018).

The importance of first-time visitors, however, should not be overlooked as it was concluded that first-time visitors spend more than repeat travellers and tended to explore the destination extensively (Kassean & Gassita, 2013; Li et al., 2008). Destination image differs before and after visitation by visitors and tourists expectations based on the image and reality,

the more likely it is that a tourist will be satisfied, therefore, increase his/her frequency of visit (Pizam & Milman, 1993).

In term of visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit based on the frequency of visit, the results in the literature were inconsistent. For example, some scholars (Anwar & Sohail, 2004; McKercher & Wong, 2004) have found that repeat visitors are less likely to be satisfied, however, Li et al. (2008) found that repeat visitors have a higher level of satisfaction than first-time visitors. Based on these findings, several implications for marketers were suggested. The frequency of visit is more likely to the same destination and event than first-time visitors, this result in lower marketing expenditures required for bringing in repeat visitors and effort should be focused on targeting first-time visitors (Sadq, Othman & Khorsheed, 2019). Therefore, the current research provides a new contribution to the festival organisers that it could develop unique programming about MICE visitors. The present study added value to explore the differences based on the frequency of visit in the developing countries. Consequently, the research establishes further hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d.

H4a: There is no difference in mean at event image based on the frequency of visit.
H4b: There is no difference in mean at destination image based on the frequency of visit.
H4c: There is no difference in mean at visitor satisfaction based on the frequency of visit.
H4d: There is no difference in mean at an intention to revisit based on the frequency of visit.

Methodology
The main objective of this study is to explain the effects of the variables of event image and destination image on visitor satisfaction and intentions to revisit. Besides, differences between these variables based on the frequency of visit have been analysed. The data were collected through a face-to-face questionnaire by the author. Participants (N = 223) were visitors and attendees of Jerash and Fuheis festivals held in Jerash and Amman cities, Jordan during July and August 2019. This is an annual event in Jordan, which is hosting and organising by the Jordanian Ministry of Culture. The questionnaire contained 53 questions, which were pretested and revised to clarify the meaning and remove all ambiguity. The first part of the questionnaire included questions to measure the demographic characteristics of the visitors and attendees. The second part of the questionnaire included items to measure the main perceptions and evaluations of the event image. The third part included items to measure the destination image. Fourth part included items to measure visitor satisfaction. The last part of the questionnaire included the items to measure intentions of re-visit.

Table 1 represents the demographic characteristics of the sample visitor's attendees in Jordan. The demographics results indicate that the majority of respondents were male (55.6%) and female (44.4%), the majority were single (55.2%), married (43%), while others (1.8%), and aged between 18 to 45 years (74.5%), followed by 46-55 years (10.3%), less than 18 years (9.9%) and older than 55 years (5.4%). The results also show that the largest group of respondents earned less than US$20,000 (81.6%). Concerning education levels; approximately (97.7%) had a college degree or higher qualification. The biggest group of respondents was employed (36.8%), while retirees (3.1%) formed the smallest group. Concerning occupations, the largest group (52%) of respondents were shown as private and government employee. Approximately, (84.8%) of respondents had travelled with family and friends. Regarding the frequency of visit was the first-time visit as a spectator (61%), and the first-time visit as a participant (26.9%), followed by repeat visit as a spectator (10.3%), and repeat visit as a participant (1.8%).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of sample (N= 223)

		Frequency	Percent			Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	124	55.6	**Occupation**	professional	8	3.6
	Female	99	44.4		Self-employed	14	6.3
	Total valid	223	100.0		Housewife	15	6.7
Marital status	Single	123	55.2		Government employee	34	15.2
	Married	96	43.0		Business owner	13	5.8
	Other	4	1.8		Student	42	18.8
	Total valid	223	100.0		Private sector employee	82	36.8
Age	Less than 18 years	22	9.9		Retiree	8	3.6
	18-25 years	64	28.7		Other	7	3.1
	26-35 years	51	22.9		Total valid	223	100.0
	36-45 years	51	22.9	**The companions**	Alone	8	3.6
	46-55 years	23	10.3		With my spouse	16	7.2
	More than 55 years	12	5.4		With my family	99	44.4
	Total valid	223	100.0		With my friends	90	40.4
Annual income	Less than $20K	182	81.6		With my relatives	0	0.0
	$20 k ≤ x< $40 k	28	12.6		With my business associates	8	3.6
	$40 k ≤ x< $60 k	8	3.6		With a tour group	1	.4
	$60 k ≤ x< $80k	0	0		Others	1	.4
	$80 k ≤ x< $100 k	3	1.3		Total valid	223	100.0
	More than 100 k	2	.9	**Frequency of visit**	First-time visit as a participant	60	26.9
	Total valid	223	100.0		First-time visit as a spectator	136	61.0
Educational level	Elementary school	5	2.2		Repeat visit as a participant	4	1.8
	High school	36	16.1		Repeat visit as a spectator	23	10.3
	Undergraduate	126	56.5		Total valid	223	100.0
	High diploma	32	14.3				
	Postgraduate	24	10.8				
	Total valid	223	100.0				

The results conclusively demonstrate that respondents were more likely to be male 55.6%. The age group of 18-45 years accounted for 74.5% of respondents. Concerning occupation, Table 1 shows that respondents were mostly employed, with the majority being private or government sector, while the most common income level for respondents was less than US$20.000 (approximately 81.6%).

Measures
All scales used a common five-point Likert scales with anchors 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree were used. Event image was measured by using thirteen items adapted from

the study of (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). Twenty items were used for the measurement of destination image adapted by (Byon & Zhang, 2010; Gartner & Shen, 1992; Schneider & Sönmez, 1999) scales. Five items for visitor satisfaction adapted from (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007; Schneider & Sönmez, 1999). Six items for revisit intention scale was adopted from (Bigne et al., 2001; Lee, Taylor, Lee & Lee, 2005; Puad et al., 2012) study.

Table 2 shows all factor loadings and reliability 44 estimates for each construct. Consequently, it is observed that composite reliability (CR) scores are ranged between 0.930-0.966 and Cronbach's alpha estimates scores are ranged between 0.938-0.965 which indicate that all measures are significantly reliable as suggested by Netemeyer, Bearden and Sharma (2003). Additionally, for convergent validity; the factor loadings of all constructs are large and significant. Discriminant validity of the constructs are determined by average variance extracted (AVE), and the AVE scores for all constructs exceed the minimum standard cut point of 0.50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2: Factor loadings and reliability scores

Variables	N	AVE	CR	Cronbach's Alpha
Event Image	13	0.509	0.930	0.938
Destination Image	20	0.504	0.952	0.946
Visitor Satisfaction	5	0.852	0.966	0.956
Intention to Re-visit	6	0.7243	0.940	0.965

All items are acceptable because the Average Variance Extracted is higher than 0.5. Composite reliability and Cronbach's Alpha is higher than 0.6.

Measure assessments

SPSS-22 has been used for testing the research hypotheses within the context of the study. Table 3 presents the scale statistics including the means, standard deviations and correlations between all variables in the study. All correlation estimates are found significant and in the expected direction.

Table 3: Mean, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlation Coefficients

	Visitor Satisfaction	Intention to Re-visit	Event Image	Destination Image
Visitor Satisfaction	1	.816	.444	.514
Intention to Re-visit		1	.394	.524
Event Image			1	.347
Destination Image				1

*Remark: p<0.001

Therefore, the previous table presented the multiple regressions because of the correlation between visitor satisfaction with visitor Re-visit and destination image is more than 50%. However, the correlation between event image with destination image as well as visitor satisfaction with visitor revisit and event image is less than 50% as mentioned by Fornell and Larcker (1981).

Analyses and results

One of the main aims of this study is to determine the influence of destination image on event image which leads to visitor satisfaction and intention to re-visit. A multiple regression analysis has been employed to test such influence by visitors.

Testing of hypothesis 1a

Table 4 shows the result of the initial multiple regressions which investigated the significant effects of destination image on the event image. In this regard, this analysis demonstrates that the factors of destination image of each of the variables were found to be significantly related to statistically significant event image ($F = 30.246$, $p < 0.001$) with significant level less than 5%. As expected, this result demonstrates that the destination image would have an important impact on the variable of event image ($F = 30.246$, Sta. Beta= 0.392, $p < 0.001$). Durbin Watson close to two which is suggested as tolerable (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 4 Multiple regression of h la: destination image on event image

Model	coefficient				ANOVA					
	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
(Constant)	2.506	.293	8.565	.000	Regression	16.177	1	16.177	30.246	.000 b
Destination image	.392	.071	5.500	.000	Residual	118.204	221	.535		
					Total	134.382	222			
	R-Square	.120	Adjusted R Square	.116	Std. Error of the Estimate	.731	Durbin-Watson	1.652		

The research findings indicate that the first proposed hypothesis for visitors H la was rejected by the data that Hypothesis1a: Destination image does not affect event image positively. Hence, it was concluded that the destination image significantly influenced the event image positively ($F = 30.246$, $P = 0.00$). The total variance in destination image was explained by visitors (R square= 12%, adjusted R square= 311.6%, $P = 0.00$). Overall, the findings suggest that noteworthy roles of destination image, acting as factors which can be used to predict the event image associated with visitor satisfaction and their re-visit (Sta. Beta= .392, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, it is rational to advocate that destination image play a considerable part for visitors and attendance in making decisions for future events, and change the image of the event positively (Getz, 1997; Sdrali & Chazapi, 2007).

Testing of hypothesis 2a and 2b

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test hypotheses 2a and 2b for visitors. These two hypotheses were developed to achieve a better understanding of the effects of the image of event and destination on visitor satisfaction. The findings related to Table 5, suggesting that both event and destination images are important contributors to visitor satisfaction. This analysis appears to be statistically significant ($F = 57.740$, $p < 0.001$) with a significant level of less than 5%. The explained variance in visitor satisfaction was calculated by visitors in the regression model (R square = 34.4%, adjusted R square = 33.8%, $P = 0.00$) and Durbin Watson close to two.

Table 5 Multiple regression of H2a and H2b: the image of event and destination variables on visitor satisfaction

Model	coefficient				ANOVA					
	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

(Constant)	1.216	.297	4.095	.000	Regression	47.778	2	23.889	57.740	.000ᵇ
Event Image	.306	.059	5.178	.000	Residual	91.021	220	.414		
Destination Image	.470	.067	7.035	.000	Total	138.799	222			
	R - Square	.344	Adjusted R Square	338	Std. Error of the Estimate	.6432	Durbin-Watson	1.567		

These findings indicate that most key determinant factors concerning event image and destination image were established as significantly affecting visitor satisfaction positively for visitors. Hence, the research findings indicate that the second proposed hypothesis for visitors H 2a and H 2b was rejected by the data, which the image of event and destination does not affect visitor satisfaction positively.

The regression results (see Table 5) provide strong evidence suggesting that the affective of event image and destination image was found to be an important determinant factor in predicting visitor satisfaction, which can significantly impact destination and event selection (Beta= 0.306, t = 5.178, p <0.001) for event image, while (Beta= 0.470, t = 0.067, p <0.001) for destination image. Therefore, this regression result is also in agreement with a previous study by Severt et al. (2007), Jeong and Kim (2019) and Prayag (2009) that the image of event and destination positively affects visitor satisfaction.

Testing of Hypothesis 3a and 3b
The multiple regression analysis employed to identify the effects of the two hypotheses factors of event image and destination image on the intention to re-visit. Therefore, the regression analysis in this phase was designed to examine the proposed hypotheses 3a and 3b. Table 6 shows statistically significant effects between both the image of event and destination on intention to re-visit (R square = 32.6%, adjusted R square= 32.0%, F = 53.133, P = 0.00) and the Durbin Watson close to two.

Table 6 Multiple regression of H 3a and H3b: The image of event and destination on intention to re-visit

Model	coefficient				ANOVA					
	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
(Constant)	1.048	.327	3.203	.002	Regression	53.321	2	26.660	53.133	.000ᵇ
Event Image	.266	.065	4.090	.000	Residual	110.388	220	.502		
Destination Image	.548	.074	7.455	.000	Total	163.709	222			
	R - Square	.326	Adjusted R Square	.320	Std. Error of the Estimate	.708	Durbin-Watson	1.676		

Table 6 indicated that the determinant factors of event image (t = 4.090, Beta= 0.266, p < 0.01), and destination image (t = 7.455, Beta= 0.548, p < 0.001), all appear to have statistically significant positive effects on intentions to re-visit. Hence, the research findings indicate that the third proposed hypotheses for visitors H 3a and H3b were rejected by the data and statistics, which the image of event and destination does not affect the intention to re-visit positively.

The variation was explained by both event and destination images (F = 53.133, p < 0.001). It can be seen in Table 6, that a direct and positive effect of both event and destination images was found towards MICE tourism events (Beta = 0.266 and 0.548, p < 0.001). So a

more attractive and desirable image towards the event itself and destination is more likely to increase the behavioural intention and their re-visit in the future events (Darrell & Johnson, 2001; Sun & Lin, 2011).

Testing of hypothesis 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d
Table 7 appears the results of One Way-ANOVA analysis used to investigate the significant differences based on the frequency of visit among the image of event and destination, visitor satisfaction and intentions to re-visit. Hence, ANOVA analysis in this section was designed to examine the proposed hypotheses 4a, 4b, 4c and 4d.

Table 7 Summary of the One Way-ANOVA on statistical differences based on frequency of visit between the image of event and destination, visitor satisfaction and intention to re-visit

		N	Mean	S.D	One Way-ANOVA					
						Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Event Image	First-time visit as a participant	60	4.145	0.586	Between Groups	.564	3	.188	.308	.820
	First-time visit as a spectator	136	4.076	0.863	Within Groups	133.818	219	.611		
	Repeat visit as a participant	4	4.327	0.698	Total	134.382	222			
	Repeat visit as a spectator	23	4.013	0.724						
Destination Image	First-time visit as a participant	60	4.194	0.468	Between Groups	3.367	3	1.122	2.408	.068
	First-time visit as a spectator	136	4.038	0.725	Within Groups	102.065	219	.466		
	Repeat visit as a participant	4	4.050	0.424	Total	105.432	222			
	Repeat visit as a spectator	23	3.748	0.896						
Visitor Satisfaction	First-time visit as a participant	60	4.700	0.603	Between Groups	9.578	3	3.193	5.411	.001
	First-time visit as a spectator	136	4.284	0.851	Within Groups	129.220	219	.590		
	Repeat visit as a participant	4	4.150	0.574	Total	138.799	222			
	Repeat visit as a spectator	23	4.087	0.641						
Intention to Re-visit	First-time visit as a participant	60	4.661	0.729	Between Groups	9.885	3	3.295	4.691	.003
	First-time visit as a spectator	136	4.303	0.871	Within Groups	153.823	219	.702		
	Repeat visit as a participant	4	4.000	1.080	Total	163.709	222			
	Repeat visit as a spectator	23	3.971	0.864						

There is no statistical difference (p> 0.05) in the event image; however, there are statistical differences (p < 0.05) in the destination image, visitor satisfaction and intention to re-visit toward key determinants that play crucial roles in determining the visitors. Therefore, understanding the differences between the variables in order to identify this kind of visitors as follow: (1) Event image (F-test = 0.308, p > 0.05), thus, Hypothesis 4a (There is no difference in mean at event image based on the frequency of visit) is accepted; (2) Destination image (F-test = 2.408, p < 0.05), thus, Hypothesis 4b (There is no difference in mean at destination image based on the frequency of visit) is rejected; (3) Visitor satisfaction (F-test = 5.411, p < 0.05), thus, Hypothesis 4c (There is no difference in mean at visitor satisfaction based on the frequency of visit) is rejected; and (4) Intentions to re-visit (F-test = 4.691, p < 0.05), consequently, Hypothesis 4d (There is no difference in mean at an intention to revisit based on the frequency of visit) is rejected.

Consequently, firstly, the first-time and repeat visit as a participant and spectator gives the same scores on the variable of event image. However, the first-time and repeat visit as a participant gives the different scores. This means that the event image has less effect on the visitors compared with the destination image. Secondly, the first-time and repeat visit as a spectator assigned a higher score on the variable of the destination image. Finally, the first time as a participant assigned a higher score compared to repeat visit as a spectator at a statistical significance level on the variable of visitor satisfaction and intentions to revisit. This means that the longer the time spent in the destination can increase the level of satisfaction and intention to revisit. The finding is in agreement with (Anwar & Sohail, 2004; McKercher & Wong, 2004) that promotional costs of attracting repeat visitors are less than first-time visitors, therefore, increasing the profitability of the business through preserving loyal visitors and travellers (Sadq et al., 2019).

Discussion
The purpose of the study was to explore the influence of event image and destination image with each other and their effect on visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions by examining Jerash and Fuheis festivals events in Jordan and identify the differences based on the frequency of visit. The results found that the destination image has direct effects predictors of event image to attend the event again. This study supported the supposition that destination image is a driving variable of positive attitude in a festival event as well as has a robust complementary role in event participation intentions by influencing attitudes toward festivals events attendance and participation.

For this sample, there was rejected for Hypothesis 1 that destination image does not affect the event image. In drawing upon the ideas from MICE tourism literature, the event and destination images are important to work together (Getz & Page, 2014), the destination image and event image positively influences when they are fit together (Brown et al., 2002). Thus, destination image positively affects event image as a supplier of the place related to the event (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007), and it is likely in tourism decision making that the influence of destination image on event image is not as straightforward because these active event MICE visitors might consider taking part in another event out of the country, rather than the event hosted inside the country.

Nonetheless, the image of event and destination towards visitor satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of future intentions to take part and attend the festival events inside the country, thus rejected Hypothesis 2a and 2b that the image of event and destination does not affect visitor satisfaction. The influence on visitor satisfaction has been investigated in the tourism literature (Severt et al., 2007). Bigne et al. (2001) explained that the image of event and destination, and visitor satisfaction considered good predictors of visitor revisit, the image of event and destination positively affect visitor satisfaction (Carse et al., 2018; Sharma & Kumar, 2019). However, in the current study, it may be that visitor satisfaction with a festival event is a more stable predictor for repeat attendance. Thus, the role of affecting the image of event and destination on visitor satisfaction might be important in predicting tourism behaviour within the context of certain event types.

Consequently, the results of this study show that the image of event and destination (Hypothesis 3a and 3b) was found to influence directly intention to revisit the event and destination. The influence of event and destination images on intentions was direct through visitor satisfaction toward the festival event. This effect has not been previously examined in the tourism literature in developing countries and it thus provides empirical support for the important role of these variables in MICE tourism (Thwala & Slabbert, 2018). Chi and Qu (2008) found a direct relationship between satisfaction and intention to revisit; however, the

intention in their studies included both willingness to recommend and to revisit the event and destination. The visitors appear therefore to pay more attention to specific factors, an explanation that supports the finding of the direct influence of event and destination images on the intention to revisit the festival event.

Accordingly, the frequency of visit differences was examined the ability to predict the next events were enhanced, but the results also have inconsistency. In terms of event image in Hypothesis 4a was accepted, these visitors viewed that there are no differences based on the frequency of visit, finding it pleasant, exciting and entertaining (McKercher & Wong, 2004). Indeed, in the test of hypotheses 4b, 4c and 4d, destination image, visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit towards the frequency of visits to take part and attend the festival event again. This finding certainly supports the importance of first-time visitors should not be overlooked as it was concluded that first-time visitors spend more than repeat travellers (Li et al., 2008).

Therefore, results support that the destination image can positively affect the event image as a multidimensional construct. More importantly, the results provide evidence for the predictive ability of various destination image and event image dimensions on predicting outcomes related to visitor satisfaction and intentions to revisit. From a theoretical standpoint, there are four contributions in this study is offering: 1) hosting festivals events may contribute to the image of destination and event profile formation and has the potential to create additional co-branding and marketing benefits in long term; 2) sustainable visitor to the destination and event in developing countries; 3) type and categories of the event visitors can help the event organisers, experts and destination marketers tailor out the event that will best suit and meet the needs of the visitors based on the frequency of visit; and 4) the importance of event image and destination image can effect visitor satisfaction and intention to revisit in developing countries.

Implications

This study has implications for event organisers, destination marketers and managers. In terms of event management, it appears that the destination image with event image is particularly powerful in predicting the likelihood that visitors will take part in future events, but also of their attitudes toward event attendance. Such a notion provides an opportunity for event organisers to influence their satisfaction through the provision of services that meet and exceed the expectations of them.

Interestingly, the role of destination image in event management was found to be important in this study. This finding encourages collaborations between the public and private sector in any destination, particularly in developing countries (Alananzeh et al., 2019; Carse et al., 2018), for their need to this kind of festivals events for the economic development to secure a positive destination image outcome among visitors (Prentice & Andersen, 2003). This finding also reinforces the recommendation of the need for event organisers and destination marketers to work more closely and maximize the benefits for the host community. Therefore, from a marketing perspective, this study is important and examines the relative contribution it could provide information to help event organisers to build more attractive event image and improve marketing strategies to maximise their use of resources when hosting an event.

Conclusion and future work

This study explored the influence of event image and destination image with each other and their effect on visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions further by examining Jerash and Fuheis festivals in Jordan as a developing country. The results encourage collaborations among event organisers and destination marketers. The importance of attitudes toward event visitors

is also highlighted as it seems to impact behavioural intentions directly, as well as visitor satisfaction with the event and destination is critical to be positive but also as a direct predictor of intentions to revisit. This study utilized two festival events; which can limit the generalizations of the findings to similar events.

Therefore, recommend that further research in the future can be made to test these hypotheses with other types of events to establish further support for the importance of event image, destination image, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Based on the above results, future research can also examine the specific variables associated with event management importance within the context of this study. Nonetheless, this study constitutes a starting point in examining how the event and destination-related characteristics may affect the decision making of MICE visitors and attendees to take part in a particular event again. Finally, future research should examine the role of specific the image of event and destination with global events, to determine whether there are differences in predictive validity among the measures.

References

Alananzeh, O., Al-Badarneh, M., Al-Mkhadmeh, A. & Jawabreh, O. (2019). Factors influencing MICE tourism stakeholders' decision making: The case of Aqaba in Jordan. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 20(1), 24–43.

Anwar, S. & Sohail, S. (2004). Festival tourism in the United Arab Emirates: First-time versus repeat visitor perceptions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(2), 161–170.

Avraham, E. (2014). Hosting events as a tool for restoring destination image. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 8(1), 61–76.

Baloglu, S. (1999). A path analytic model of visitation intention involving information sources, socio-psychological motivations, and destination image. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 8(3), 81–91.

Bigne, J., Sanchez, M. & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: Inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, 22(6), 607–616.

Brown, G., Chalip, L., Jago, L. & Mules, T. (2002). The Sydney Olympics and brand Australia. In Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. & Pride, R. (Eds). In *Destination Branding. Creating the Unique Destination Proposition* (pp. 163–185).

Byon, K. K. & Zhang, J. J. (2010). Development of a scale measuring destination image. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 28(4), 508–532.

Carse, C., Venski, E. & Steyn, J. N. (2018). Critical factors influencing visitor attendance at a literary arts festival in Stellenbosch. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(3), 1–17.

Castro, C.B., Armario, M. & Ruiz, M. (2007). The influence of market heterogeneity on the relationship between a destination's image and tourists' future behaviour. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 175–187.

Chen, C.F. & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115–1122.

Chi, C. G. Q. & H. Qu. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 624–636.

Darrell, A.C. & Johnson, P. S. (2001). Repeat visits to attractions: A preliminary economic analysis. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 119–126.

Deng, Li, M. & Shen, H. (2015). Developing a measurement scale for event image. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 39(2), 245–270.

Fakeye, P. C. & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, *30*(2), 10–16.

Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural model with unobserved variables and measurement errors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39–50.

Gartner, W. C. & Shen, J. (1992). The impact of Tiananmen square on China's tourism image. *Journal of Travel Research*, *30*(4), 47–52.

Getz, D. (1997). *Event management & event tourism (1st ed.)*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corp.

Getz, D. & Page, S. J. (2014). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, *52*, 593–631.

Gibson, H. J., Qi, C. & Zhang, J. (2008). Destination image and intent to visit China and the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management*, *22*(4), 427–450.

Gwinner, K. (1997). A model of image creation and image transfer in event sponsorship. *International Marketing Review*, *14*(3), 145–158.

Gwinner, K. P. & Eaton, J. (1999). Building brand image through event sponsorship: The role of image transfer. *Journal of Advertising*, *28*(4), 47–57.

Hallmann, K. & Breuer, C. (2010). Image fit between sport events and their hosting destinations from an active sport tourist perspective and its impact on future behaviour. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, *15*(3), 215–237.

Harahsheh, S.S., Morgan, M.E. & Edwards, J. R. (2010). The influence of religious belief on destination image the case of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. *International Journal of Management Cases*, *9*(3/4), 63–73.

Hernández-Lobato, L., Solis-Radilla, M. M., Moliner-Tena, M. A. & Sánchez-García, J. (2006). Tourism destination image, satisfaction and loyalty: A study in Ixtapa-Zihuatanejo, Mexico. *Tourism Geographies*, *8*(4), 343–358.

Hinch, T.D. & Higham, J. E. (2001). Sport tourism: A framework for research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *3*(1), 45–58.

Huertas, A., Míguez-González, M. & Lozano-Monterrubio, N. (2017). YouTube usage by Spanish tourist destinations as a tool to communicate their identities and brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, *24*(3), 211–229.

Hussein, A. S. (2016). How event awareness, event quality and event image creates visitor revisit intention? A lesson from car free day event. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *35*, 396–400.

Jenkins, O. H. (1999). Understanding and measuring tourist destination images. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *1*, 1–15.

Jeong, Y. & Kim, S. (2019). Exploring a suitable model of destination image: The case of a small-scale recurring sporting event. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *31*(5), 1287–1307.

Kaplanidou, K. & Gibson, H. J. (2012). Event image and traveling parents' intentions to attend youth sport events: A test of the reasoned action model. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *12*(1), 3–18.

Kaplanidou, K. & Vogt, C. (2007). The interrelationship between sport event and destination image and sport tourists' behaviours. *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, *12*(3–4), 183–206.

Kassean, H. & Gassita, R. (2013). Exploring tourists push and pull motivations to visit Mauritius as a holiday destination. *African Journal for Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *2*(3), 1–13.

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, *57*(1), 1–22.

Kim, H. & Richardson, S. L. (2003). Motion picture impacts on destination images. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *30*(1), 216–237.

King, C., Chen, N. & Funk, D. C. (2015). Exploring destination image decay: A study of sport tourists' destination image change after event participation. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *39*(1), 3–31.

Lai, I. K. W., Hitchcock, M., Lu, D. & Liu, Y. (2018). The influence of word of mouth on tourism destination choice: Tourist-resident relationship and safety perception among Mainland Chinese tourists visiting Macau. *Sustainability*, *10*(7), 2114–2130.

Lee, Taylor, Lee. & Lee. (2005). The impact of a sport mega-event on destination image: The case of the 2002 FIFA World Cup Korea/Japan. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, *6*(3), 27–45.

Li, X., Cheng, C., Kim, H. & Petrick, J.F. (2008). A systematic comparison of first-time and repeat visitors via a two-phase online survey. *Tourism Management*, *29*(2), 278–293.

McKercher, B. & Wong, D. Y. (2004). Understanding tourism behavior: Examining the combined effects of prior visitation history and destination status. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*(2), 171–179.

Netemeyer, R., Bearden, W. & Sharma, S. (2003). Scaling procedures: Issues and applications. *Thousand Oaks, CA7 Sage*.

Pizam, A. & Milman, A. (1993). Predicting satisfaction among first time visitors to a destination by using the expectancy disconfirmation theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *12*(2), 197–209.

Prayag, G. (2009). Tourists' evaluations of destination image, satisfaction, and future behavioral intentions-the case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *26*(8), 836–853.

Prentice, R. & Andersen, V. (2003). Festival as creative destination. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *30*(1), 7–30.

Ramukumba, T. (2017). An evaluation of festival activities as motives for festival attendance: A case study of strawberry festival at the redberry farm in George, South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *6*(4), 1–12.

Robertson, M. & Wardrop, K. M. (2004). Events and the destination dynamic: Edinburgh festivals, entrepreneurship and strategic marketing.In I. Yeoman, M. Robertson & J. Ali-Kight*(Eds.), Festivals and Events Management: An International Arts and Culture Perspective* (pp. 115–129). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann..

Sadq, Z. M., Othman, B. & Khorsheed, R. K. (2019). The impact of tourism marketing in enhancing competitive capabilities. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *8*(5), 1–11.

Schneider, I. & Sönmez, S. (1999). Exploring the touristic image of Jordan. *Tourism Management*, *20*(4), 539–542.

Sdrali, D. & Chazapi, K. (2007). Cultural tourism in a Greek insular community: The residents' perspective. *Tourismos: An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Tourism*,*2*(2), 61–78.

Severt, D., Wang, Y., Chen, P. J. & Breiter, D. (2007). Examining the motivation, perceived performance, and behavioral intentions of convention attendees: evidence from a regional conference. *Tourism Management*, *28*(2), 399–408.

Sharma, P. & Kumar Nayak, J. (2019). Examining event image as a predictor of loyalty intentions in yoga tourism event: A mediation model. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, *20*(3), 202–223.

Puad, A., Som, M., Marzuki, A., Yousefi, M. & Abukhalifeh, N. (2012). Factors influencing visitors' revisit behavioral intentions: A case study of Sabah, Malaysia. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, *4*(4), 39–50.

Sun, M. L. & Lin, Y. H. (2011). The effects of motivation, background, attraction and loyalty in the 2010 international thousands swimming cross to sun moon lake. *APBITM 2011 - Proceedings2011 IEEE International Summer Conference of Asia Pacific Business Innovation and Technology Management*, 19–23.

Thwala, K. C. & Slabbert, E. (2018). The effectiveness of the marketing mix for guesthouses. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *7*(20), 1–15.

Tichaawa, T. M. & Mhlanga, O. (2015). Residents' perceptions towards the impacts of tourism development : The case of victoria falls , Zimbabwe. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *4*(1), 1–15.

Viviers, P.A. & Slabbert, E. (2014). Should arts festivals focus on push or pull factors in marketing efforts? *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, *3*(2), 1–18.

Xing, X. & Chalip, L. (2006). Effects of hosting a sport event on destination brand: A test of co-branding and match-up models. *Sport Management Review*, *9*(1), 49–78.