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Abstract

Africa including Kenya has continued to suffer negative images due to stereotypes, prejudice, and negative reporting by international media. This has continued to negatively affect the continents’ share of the global leisure tourism market despite the rich and unique natural touristic resources. The continents’ MICE tourism, however, has been on the growth path before COVID 19 pandemic. This study, therefore, investigated the influence of perceived destination image by international MICE visitors on their post-visit behaviour. The study was carried out in the Kenyan capital city, Nairobi. The study followed a convenience sampling method with a total sample of 335 respondents. A model on destination image and post-visit behaviour was developed and tested. A blindfolding procedure in PLS showed the model had predictive relevance. Findings indicated that the cognitive image dimension had a positive and significant influence on affective image, overall image, and post-visit behaviour. Affective image positively influences overall image but not post-visit behaviour. Overall destination image had the greatest effect on post-visit behaviour. Destination Marketers in Kenya should pay particular attention to the destination’s cognitive image. The study provides valuable information for policymakers and destination marketers in developing actionable positioning strategies to enhance the destination’s image and competitiveness.
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Introduction

Most of the developing countries particularly in Africa have identified tourism as an important pillar of economic development. Kenya like most African countries, in her Vision 2030 identified tourism as one of its key pillars of economic development (Ndung’u, Thugge & Otieno, 2009; Signè, 2018). The travel and hospitality sector in the continent and more specifically in Kenya is recognized for driving exports, providing foreign exchange, and creating employment (World Travel and Tourism Council [WTTC], 2019; World Tourism Organization [WTO], 2019b; Government of Kenya (GoK), 2018). In Africa, the sector contributed 8.5% (or the US $194.2 billion) of the continent’s gross domestic product (GDP) in 2018 and was the second-fastest growing tourism region at 5.6% in 2018 against a global average growth rate of 3.9% (WTTC, 2019). In the same year, Kenya's tourism sector contributed 8.8 percent (or the US $1.57 billion) of the country’s GDP and 1.1 million jobs to the economy, with the country’s tourism economy ranking third largest in Sub-Saharan Africa after South Africa and Nigeria (Nyasuguta, 2019). The growth of the tourism sector has greatly been boosted by the growing conference tourism market in the region. In Kenya this tourism segment expanded by 14% in 2019 with the number of international conferences increasing by 6.9% from the previous year (Kenya National Bureau [KNBS], 2020). This
underscores the significant potential of the travel and hospitality industry in Kenya and Africa at large, notably due to the continent’s richness in natural resources, the potential in the development of cultural heritage, and conference tourism among other emerging forms of tourism (Signè, 2018).

However, despite Africa’s tourism potential, the continent continues to enjoy the least share of the total international tourists’ arrivals. In the year 2018, the continent had only a share of 4.8% (67.1 million) of total global international tourist arrivals (1.4 billion), compared to Europe with 50.7% (710 million), Asia and the Pacific 24.8% (347.7 million), and America’s with 15.4% (215.7 million). In the continent, Morocco and South Africa had the greatest share of international arrivals to Africa (67.1 million) with approximately 11 million (16.4%), and 10 million (14.9%) visitors respectively, and Kenya with a share of approximately 2 million visitors (3%) (Jumia Travel, 2019). Kenya also ranks 7th in Africa in terms of travel and tourism competitiveness after Mauritius, South Africa, Seychelles, Egypt, Morocco, and Namibia, in that order (World Economic Forum [WEF], 2019). This provides a significant challenge to tourism marketers in achieving a favourable destination image for Kenya and growing the country’s share of international visitor arrivals. The increasing recognition by various countries globally on the significance of the tourism sector to their economic development has resulted in intense competition among existing, and emerging destinations. Increased competition, and continuing change in international tourists’ expectations, and choice behaviour are pushing destinations to develop new ways of attracting, and retaining tourists to remain competitive (Pavlić, Puh & Mišković 2020). Despite a destination having a competitive advantage such as Africa countries including Kenya, boosting vast natural touristic resources, empirical studies indicate that the final decision to visit or return to a destination is based on its image (Marshalls, 2007; Matiza & Oni 2014).

Generally, the Africa region including Kenya continues to face a huge challenge of countering prolonged negative global stereotypes, and perceived risks affecting the continent’s touristic image particularly towards international visitors (Matiza & Oni, 2014; Lwegaba, 2013). For instance, tourism in Kenya has previously suffered setbacks leading to a contraction in international tourist arrivals. International tourist arrivals declined from 1.78 million visitors in 2011 to 1.18 million visitors in 2015 (KNBS, 2016). The decline was attributed to political instability, terrorism negative travel advisories, and fear of Ebola spread in West African countries (KNBS, 2014). These incidences significantly affected, and continue to affect the country’s touristic image and destination competitiveness to date. Kenya, however, before the COVID 19 outbreak continued to rank highly regarding international congress and conferences association meetings hosted. The country ranked third in Africa after South Africa, and Morocco, with 31 out of 414 Meetings hosted in Africa in 2018 (International Congress and Convention Association [ICCA], 2018). This was an increase from the previous year with 17 meetings out of 359 meetings hosted in Africa. This is in addition to the non-association meetings hosted in the country (ICCA, 2017). Despite the growth of conference tourism in the wider African continent, and Kenya in particular, limited studies exist on this segment. In particular, there are limited studies on the perceptions of the international MICE (Meetings, Incentives, Conferences, and Exhibitions) visitors on African countries' touristic image, and consequently the resultant post-visit behaviour. This study, therefore, sought to investigate the perceptions of international MICE visitors on Kenya’s touristic image and their post-visit behaviour. Favourable destination images among the international MICE visitors would play a significant role in eliminating negative stereotypes, boosting revisit intentions, and developing destination ambassadors.
Literature review

Destination image

Boulding’s work set the stage for the study of the concept of image as early as the 1950s (Boulding, 1956; Pavlić et al., 2020). The importance of the concept in the field of tourism was underscored as early as the 1970s (Hunt 1975; Artuger & Çetinsoz, 2017). In his study, Hunt emphasized the importance of image perceptions in tourist destination choice. Since then, the concept of destination image has been one of the most researched areas in tourism marketing (Guerreiro, Mendes, Fortuna & Pinto, 2020). From the previous studies, destination image has emerged as a complex construct with no common accepted components and definition but varied definitions being proposed by different researchers (Xu, Chan & Pratt, 2018; Pavlić et al., 2020). However, what stands out from the many definitions is that destination image involves the holistic mental perceptions and impressions held by tourists regarding a certain destination (Guerreiro et al., 2020; Lai & Li, 2015).

Destination image is dynamic, relativistic, and subjective. Destination image formed in the tourists’ mind is greatly influenced by the exposure of individual tourists to various sources of information and past experiences. Tourists, therefore, may also hold varied pre and post-travel destination images (Jani & Nguni, 2016; Xu et al., 2018). Tourists’ image perceptions towards a destination vary before, during, and after travel (Kim, Styildis & Oh, 2019). The image perceptions are influenced by among others the advertising campaigns, social media, televised documentaries, or mega-events with media publicity (Deng & Li, 2013; Pan, Santos & Kim, 2017; Guerreiro et al., 2020). Tourists’ destination image evaluations also lie in a continuum of functional to psychological characteristics of the destinations (Echtner & Ritchie, 2005; Jani & Nguni, 2016). Also, prior studies indicate that tourists based the expectations’ formed before a visit to judge their travel experiences, and ultimately the post-visit image perceptions (Chen & Tsai, 2007; De Nisco, Mainolfi, Marino & Napolitano, 2015).

Destination image has evolved from a one-dimension construct, the cognitive dimension (Guerreiro et al., 2020), to a two-dimension construct, the cognitive and affective dimensions (Kim et al., 2019), and ultimately a three-dimension construct including the cognitive, affective, and conative dimension. The conative dimension relates to tourist post-visit behaviour while cognitive, and affective dimensions relate to the destination image concept or the holistic or overall destination image. The cognitive and affective images lead to the conative image or post-visit behaviour (Xu et al., 2018). The cognitive image relates to the knowledge, and beliefs about the destination attribute, its resources, or attractions (Akgün, Senturk, Keskin & Onal, 2019; Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou & Kaplanidou, 2015). The cognitive image reflects the functional dimensions of a destination’s image, which are both tangible and observable or measurable (Jani & Nguni, 2016). On the other hand, the affective image relates to the emotional feelings towards a destination (Akgün et al., 2019; Papadimitriou et al., 2015). The two destination image dimensions though different, are highly interrelated, with the cognitive image being an antecedent of the affective image (Ji, 2011; Xu et al., 2018).

A multi-attribute approach has been used in previous studies to measure the cognitive image component, based on specific destination attributes. The attributes may include infrastructure, the attitude of the local people, cuisine, landscape, and climate of a tourist destination (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Pavlić et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2018). On the other hand, four bipolar scales including arousing–sleepy, pleasant–unpleasant, exciting–gloomy, and relaxing–distressing, have been used to measure the destination’s affective image dimension (Lin, Duarte, Deborah & Jing-Shoung, 2007; Xu et al., 2018). Every destination will exhibit an image whether the destination has purposefully developed it or not, and the
images will surface with the mention of the destination influencing purchase decisions. For African destinations to present a favourable tourist image, the destination marketers must proactively develop, and monitor the destination’s image. There is a compelling need to actively differentiate the African destinations, and promote them as safe and stable destinations for the region to maintain global competitiveness (Matiza & Oni 2014).

Post-visit behaviour
Tourists’ post-visit or future behaviour can be predicted from their behavioural intentions. Tourists who during a tour in a given destination, develop positive evaluations of the destination will most likely present positive behavioural intentions (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Lee, Pan & Chung, 2019). Behavioural intentions refer to the extent to which a tourist has developed conscious plans to undertake or not undertake some specified future behaviour. That is the tourist’s likeliness to revisit a destination or how willing he or she is to recommend the destination to others (Westerbeek & Shilbury, 2003; Tsai & Chen, 2007; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019). Previous studies identify repeat purchase or revisit intention, positive word of mouth, and recommendations as to the main dimensions of behavioural intentions (Lee, 2009; Wang & Hsu, 2010; Xu et al., 2018; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019).

Revisit intention refers to the likelihood of a tourist revisiting the destination in the future. The revisit intention has been identified as the most accurate predictor of a tourist’s post-visit behaviour (Stylos, Vassiliadis, Bellou & Andronikidis, 2016; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019). Revisit intention reflects loyalty to the destination (Oppermann, 2000; Sharma & Nayak, 2019). The majority of prior studies on event attendee intention to revisit examined sport event spectator’s intention to revisit to the host city. Although the sports event participants displayed sole interest in the events, those who had a positive attachment to the host cities indicated greater intention to visit the cities (Brown, Smith & Assaker, 2016; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018). Concerning studies focusing on festival participants, a greater likelihood to revisit the destination was apparent for participants involved in a variety of event activities (Lee & Beeler, 2009; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018).

Today the positive word of mouth has also become the most reliable, and trusted travel information by potential tourists, and is an alternative to the traditional consumer marketing strategies. Electronic word of mouth (eWOM) in particular, profoundly influences visitor choice and decisions (Phillips, Wolfe, Hodur & Leistritz, 2013; Yang, Liu & Li, 2015; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019). Social media sites including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and other online platforms such as TripAdvisor have become important means through which visitors recommend, and share their personal experiences at the destination. This is not only to their close friends, and family members but also to the general public (Munar & Jacobsen, 2014; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019).

Hypotheses development
A review of existing literature indicates several prior studies focusing on destination image, destination personality, service quality, visitor experiences, and post-trip behaviour or future behavioural intentions. The studies indicated that there exist positive relationships between the constructs (Papadimitriou et al., 2015; Park et al., 2017; Liu, Li & Kim, 2017; Plunkett & Brooks, 2018; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019). Most of the existing studies have described destination image as comprising of three distinct but hierarchically interrelated components which include cognitive, affective, and conative image relating to the resultant visitor behaviour (Stylidis, Shani & Belhassen, 2017; Woosnam, Stylidis & Ivkov, 2020). The cognitive image component relates to the destination’s attributes and provides more concrete information regarding the uniqueness of a destination providing a basis for marketers to
develop more practical strategies to position a destination. The cognitive and affective image components interact with cognitive influencing the affective (Weru & Njoroge, 2021; Woosnam et al., 2020). The interaction of both cognitive and affective images results in the overall destination image. The cognitive image component, however, has a greater impact on the overall image compared to the affective image component (Weru & Njoroge, 2021; Hernández-Mogollón, Alexandre-Duarte & Folgado-Fernández, 2018). Therefore, the following hypotheses can be proposed:

H1: Cognitive image has a positive effect on the affective image for destination Kenya
H2: Cognitive image has a positive effect on the overall image for destination Kenya
H3: Affective image has a positive effect on overall image for destination Kenya

The cognitive component, affective component, and ultimately the overall destination image in turn has a positive impact on a conative image or visitor behaviour (Zhang, Fu, Cai & Lu, 2014). Related studies provide evidence on the positive relationship between destination image and post-visit behaviour. In a study on Chinese college student's intention to travel to Japan, Park et al. (2017) concluded that destination image played a significant role in the students’ travel intention. Destination image is a strong predictor of revisit intention and intention to revisit is a significant predictor of actual behaviour (Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007; Artuger & Cetinsoz, 2017). Destination image is an antecedent to tourists’ satisfaction and significantly affects their revisit intentions and willingness to pass positive word of mouth about the destination (Mohamad, Abdullah & Mokhlis, 2012).

![Figure 1: Proposed framework and hypothesized relationships](image-url)

Destination image being a multi-dimensional construct (Xu et al., 2018), both dimensions of destination image and the overall destination image have been reported to have a significant effect on revisit intention and positive word of mouth (Phillips & Jang, 2007; Baloglu, Henthorne & Sahin, 2014). The overall or holistic image resulting from the interactions of cognitive and affective images influenced tourists’ post-visit behaviour directly, and indirectly with satisfaction (Hosany & Ekinci, 2003; Baloglu et al., 2014). The overall destination image has the most significant influence on post-visit behaviour followed by the affective image, and finally the cognitive image. The cognitive image has been suggested to be an antecedent of the affective image and in turn, influences post-visit behaviour. The
cognitive image, therefore, has a less direct effect on tourists' post-visit behaviour with affective image playing a mediating role (Zhang et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2018). Therefore, a favourable image is likely to result in a high number of tourists revisiting, and giving a positive word of mouth and recommendations hence providing a competitive edge for a destination (Stylos et al., 2016; Park et al., 2017). The following hypotheses can therefore be proposed:

H4: Cognitive image has a positive effect on international visitors’ post-visit behaviour towards destination Kenya
H5: Affective image has a positive effect on international visitors’ post-visit behaviour towards destination Kenya
H6: Overall image has a positive effect on international visitors’ post-visit behaviour towards destination Kenya

Materials and methods
Sample design and data collection
The sample chosen for this study included international visitors attending business events in the Kenyan capital city, Nairobi. The MICE visitor perceptions were used in examining the research hypotheses. MICE visitors are influential in shaping the image and eroding negative stereotypes associated with destination Africa. The increasing number of international MICE events in the continent, and Kenya, in particular, provide a good platform for destination marketers. The author selected Nairobi because the city hosts the leading business event venues in the country and the majority of international business events. In the year 2017, the city hosted 13 out of 17 International Congress and Convention Association (ICCA) meetings held in Kenya, and 22 out of 31 ICCA meetings in the year 2018 (ICCA, 2018; ICCA, 2019). With a large number of respondents targeted for the study, a questionnaire was used to collect data. The study focused on three leading MICE event venues in the city. Non-probability convenience sampling was adopted for the study. For the case of conferences, and meetings the questionnaires were placed together with conference materials with the help of conference attendants, while for exhibitions questionnaires were administered at the exhibition booths. The questionnaires were administered towards the end of each event included in the study to ensure the respondents had some adequate interaction with the destination. The questionnaire included an introductory part explaining the purpose of the study and was marked as an international visitor only. In the demographics section, the questionnaire included a question on visitor origin. This helped ensure that only questionnaires from the target respondents were used in data analysis. A pilot study was carried out before the actual data collection involving 30 exhibitors in one of the three-event venues selected for the study. This ensured that the questions were comprehensive and understandable. Data were collected over six months in the year 2017 during the hosting of the MICE events. A total of 400 questionnaires were administered out of which 355 were completed and used for subsequent data analysis giving an 88.8% response rate. A sample size of 355, therefore, met the required sampling adequacy for structural equation modeling (Soper, 2020; Westland, 2010).

Research instrument
A five-point scale was adopted for the study with the response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The instrument consisted of four main sections: demographic characteristics, cognitive image, affective image, overall destination image, and post-visit behaviour. The measures of a cognitive image, affective image, overall image, and post-visit behaviour were derived from existing literature. To measure cognitive image
question items were developed based on the cognitive attribute themes identified in the literature. Some common attributes across destinations include accommodation quality, general infrastructure, and beautiful scenery (Xu et al., 2018). Sahin & Baloglu (2011) operationalized cognitive image based on such attributes as destination safety and security, scenery, people, level of cleanliness, value for money, climate, cultural attractions, cuisine, entertainment, general infrastructure, quality of accommodation, and level of service. Based on these attributes, 8 items were developed to measure cognitive image. In measuring affective image 4 items including destination being arousing, pleasant, exciting, and relaxing were used (Lin et al., 2007; Xu et al., 2018). Overall destination image was measured using 3 items focusing on general perceptions of both the cognitive and affective images. Lastly, concerning measuring post-visit behaviour 4 items were used focusing on whether the visitors were happy with their choice of destination, the intention to revisit, willingness to recommend, and motivation to attend future similar events in the destination (Lee, 2009; Wang & Hsu, 2010; Xu, et al., 2018; Leri & Theodoridis, 2019).

Data analysis
Harman’s single-factor analysis was conducted to check for common method variance likely to bias the findings of this study. This was deemed important because the study relied on the same respondents as a source of obtaining data for both the independent and dependent variables (Jakobsen & Jensen, 2015; Tehseen, Ramayah & Sajilan, 2017). All the 19 items of both the independent and dependent variables were loaded into factor analysis, and run under principal component analysis without rotation. The factor analysis revealed 4 factors accounting for 70.95% of the variance in the data. The first unrotated factor captured only 40% of the variance in data. Thus, no single factor emerged, and the first of the 4 factors did not capture most of the variance (Tehseen et al., 2017). Therefore, results suggesting that common method variance was not an issue in this study. In the data analysis, a Partial Least Square (PLS) approach was adopted to test the study hypotheses using SmartPLS 3. This approach is more appropriate for social science research as data collected often follow a non-normal distribution (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins & Kuppelwieser, 2014). Besides, PLS is also an appropriate analytical approach when the analysis seeks to test a theoretical model from a predictive perspective, a structural model includes multiple relationships, and the path model includes a formatively measured construct (Hair, Risher, Sarstedt & Ringle, 2019). Data were first tested for normality; Kurtosis statistics were in the range of -0.543 to 5.51 while Skewness statistics ranged from -1.732 to 0.439. Kurtosis’s upper limit value was greater than +1, while that of skewness was lower than -1 indicating violation of normal distribution of the data (Hair, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2017). The validity and reliability of the measurement model were first determined, and the structural model thereafter tested. In testing the path coefficients, and the loadings, a bootstrapping method was used based on 5000 resamples, and following a bias-corrected and accelerated bootstrapping routine (Hair et al., 2014; Ali, Rasoolimanesh, Sarstedt, Ringle & Ryu., 2018).

Results
Table 1 indicates that the majority of the international business events visitors in Nairobi are Europeans (34.9%), and Asians (31%), with the majority being male visitors (55.8%), above the age of 41, and have attended events at the destination previously (54.6%). The adequacy of the measurement model was assessed based on both the convergent, and discriminant validity. Convergent validity reflects the extent to which measures of the same construct strongly correlate with each other. This was examined based on factor loadings, composite reliability, and average extracted variance (AVE). Composite reliability values show the
extent to which the indicators of a construct reflect the latent construct while average variance extracted shows the total amount of variance explained by the latent construct. Table 2 shows that all the loadings with exception of one item for the cognitive image were greater than 0.6.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents and business events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Place of Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African but non-Kenyan</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Business Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference/Convention</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a Similar Event at the Destination Previously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite reliability is considered a more accurate measure of reliability compared to Cronbach’s alpha. Table 2 indicates the composite reliability values were greater than 0.8 indicating all the constructs are reliable. It also indicates that the measures exhibited convergent validity as the average variance explained for each construct is at least 0.5 (Hair et al., 2017; Maria & Loureiro, 2014). The measurement model was then tested for discriminant validity. Discriminant validity indicates that items of the same constructs should highly correlate among themselves than with those of other constructs. The average variance extracted analysis method was used to test for discriminant validity.

Table 2: Convergent validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Cognitive Image</td>
<td>Venue well designed with state-of-the-art audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodation facilities are well maintained with essentials facilities</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The destination has a variety of natural attractions</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The destination has rich local culture</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The destination has interesting social places and nightlife</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destination guarantees visitor security in a venue and other tourist sites</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing in venues &amp; hotels demonstrate professionalism</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The destination is exciting</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The destination is arousing</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The destination is pleasant 0.931
The destination is relaxing 0.752
Overall Destination Image
Overall destination infrastructure and attractiveness 0.79
Value for money in all services provided 0.827  0.856  0.665
General hospitality and destination friendliness 0.829
I feel motivated to have a holiday in Kenya 0.918
I would recommend Kenya to friends and relatives 0.918  0.942  0.665
I would consider attending future events in Kenya 0.92
Post Visit Behaviour
The choice of the destination was satisfactory 0.827

Table 3 shows the results of the average variance extracted analysis indicating that the square root of AVE for each construct, the values on the diagonal line are greater than corresponding correlations. Thus, confirming the adequacy of discriminant validity of the measurement model (Zait & Bertea, 2011).

### Table 3: Discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Affective Image</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Cognitive Image</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Destination Image</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Visit Behaviour</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In testing the structural model, a nonparametric bootstrapping procedure with 5000 resamples was performed to obtain the path coefficients and t-statistics for the respective paths. All the paths except for the relationship between the affective image and post-visit behaviour were found to be significant. The values of $R^2$, predictive relevance ($Q^2$), and the effect sizes ($f^2$) were also determined and reported (Ali et al., 2018; Hair et al., 2017). Cognitive image positively, and significantly affected destination’s affective image ($\beta = 0.646; p < 0.01$), the overall destination image ($\beta = 0.166; p < 0.01$), and post-visit behaviour ($\beta = 0.133; p < 0.01$). The affective image had a positive and significant effect on the overall destination image ($\beta = 0.509; p < 0.01$) but not on post-visit behaviour. The overall destination image positively, and significantly affected post-visit behaviour ($\beta = 0.438; p < 0.01$). Therefore $H_1$, $H_2$, $H_3$, $H_4$, and $H_5$ were all supported while $H_6$ was unsupported as indicated in Table 4. The cognitive image explained 41.7% of the variance in the affective image ($R^2 = 0.417$). Both affective, and cognitive images explained 40.3% of the variance in the overall destination image ($R^2 = 0.403$), while cognitive, affective, and overall destination image explained 27.8% of the variance in post-visit behaviour ($R^2 = 0.278$). Any values of $R^2$ higher than zero are considered meaningful (Hair et al., 2019).

### Table 4: Structural Equation Model estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>$f$ Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: Destination Cognitive Image -&gt; Destination Affective Image</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>20.145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$: Destination Cognitive Image -&gt; Overall Destination Image</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$: Destination Affective Image -&gt; Overall Destination Image</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>11.061</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$: Destination Cognitive Image -&gt; Post Visit Behaviour</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>2.127</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$: Destination Affective Image -&gt; Post Visit Behaviour</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the $p$ values only demonstrate the significance of the relationships between variables and do not indicate the effect size ($f^2$). Except for $H_4$ and $H_5$, the $f^2$ values for the other relationships meet the minimum threshold of 0.02 for small effect (Cohen, 1988). In determining the predictive relevance ($Q^2$) of the structural model, a blindfolding procedure was performed. For a construct to indicate predictive relevance $Q^2$ values should be greater than zero, with values of 0, 0.025, and 0.5 indicating small, medium, and large predictive accuracy respectively (Hair et al., 2019). For affective image $Q^2$ value was 0.313, the overall image a $Q^2$ value of 0.247, and post-visit behaviour a $Q^2$ value of 0.222 which was greater than zero demonstrating acceptable predictive relevance.

**Discussion, implications and limitations**

**Discussion**

By focusing on the business event perspective this study is believed to have the following theoretical implication. First, it provides the perspective of MICE visitors on a host destination’s image, and the resultant post-visit behaviour. It expands the prior studies on events, destination image, and the attendees' revisit intentions. Although several studies exist on perceived destination image and revisit intentions limited studies provide the perspective of MICE attendees. The majority of such studies have provided the perspectives of festivals, sports, and cultural events visitors. These studies have also been carried in the developed world. This study provides the perspective of MICE events, and more particularly in the developing world that is the Kenyan context. The study is therefore one of the few studies that have investigated the effect of perceived destination image on post-visit behaviour from the MICE event perspective.

Secondly, a model was developed on perceived destination image, and post-visit behaviour based on existing literature. In testing the model, in addition to determining the significance of the relationships between variables, the effect sizes were also determined. To the best knowledge of the author, despite the growth of this tourism segment in the developing world, and particularly in Kenya, such a model has not been tested. Business events often bring high-profile business people and government officials in addition to other participants with the potential of being destination ambassadors. Favourable destination image through hosted events would greatly contribute to destination image and promotion. The proposed hypotheses on the cognitive image, and overall image influencing post-visit behaviour were supported. Despite the affective image not directly influencing post-visit behaviour, this has an indirect influence through the overall destination image. The findings differ from Xu et al., (2018) on the affective image having a direct, and significant influence on post-visit behaviour, and not the case with the cognitive image. This is in a study on the perceptions of Hong Kong residents on Taiwan's destination image. However, the findings are consistent with that of Artuger & Cetinsoz (2017) who also found that cognitive image had a positive influence on post-visit behaviour while affective image did not. The overall destination image had a higher effect size ($f^2 = 0.16$) on post-visit behaviour followed by the cognitive component of the destination image ($f^2 = 0.01$). This indicates that the interaction of the two overall image components is important in influencing the international visitors' post-visit behaviour and that mere affective emotions were not adequate to positively influence the visitors’ behaviour.

In conclusion, it has been determined that the cognitive image dimension of the overall destination image has a significant influence on the international MICE visitors' post-
visit behaviour. However, this dimension alone did not have a high effect size on post-visit behaviour. Therefore, the interactions of both the cognitive, and affective image were important in shaping the overall destination image, and therefore a great influence on post-visit behaviour.

**Implications**

As the competition among destinations for a share of the global tourism market continues to become more intense, developing countries, and regions such as Africa must develop strategies to attract, and retain international visitors. This segment of the tourism market continues to account for the majority of tourists in African destinations. Africa countries are also increasingly focusing on tourism as an avenue for economic development (Weru & Njoroge, 2021; Andrades & Dimanche, 2017). With existing empirical evidence suggesting that events including MICE events are important image builders for host destinations’ (Jensen & Kwiatkowski, 2019), the findings of this study are of great importance to marketers not only in Kenya but also in other African destinations. The destination marketers must therefore pay special attention to the functional attributes in hosting MICE events as these will particularly have a significant effect on the attendees’ post-visit behaviour.

**Limitations and suggestions for future research**

Like every other scientific study, this study is not without some limitations which present opportunities for further study. The study adopted convenience sampling with data only having been collected from the three leading MICE event venues in Kenya's capital city, Nairobi. The study particularly excluded all hotel venues that also host MICE events and specifically focused on international MICE visitors. The study findings should therefore be generalized with caution. Future studies may consider including hotel venues and the domestic visitors in the MICE events Future studies may consider collected data after the MICE events by following up with the visitors. This would provide a more elaborate evaluation of the host destination’s image by the MICE visitors. The studies may also include MICE venues in other regions outside the relatively more developed cities in African countries.
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