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ABSTRACT

In recent years, theme park is becoming a more and more popular destination for tourists around the world. Moreover, theme parks provide visitors with various experiences. It is crucial to understand visitors’ experiences in the theme park since experience is an important factor that is related to tourist behavior. The experience economy is widely used in the tourism setting to measure experience from four dimensions: education, entertainment, escapism and esthetic (4Es). However, limited research has examined visitors’ experiences in the theme park setting. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to measure visitors’ experience in the theme park applying 4Es and investigate the relationship between experience, and satisfaction and revisit intention. Furthermore, the differences on the means of these variables and differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention were also tested. In this study, 486 visitors who have been to Disney parks in the U.S. within the past twelve months took the online survey. Independent sample t-tests and multiple linear regression analysis were adopted. The results showed that experience has a significant impact on satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park and differences existed between the groups. Overall, findings of this study enhanced the concept of experience in the theme park literature and offered practical implications to the theme park operators.
CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Theme parks are a popular attraction where visitors spend their leisure time and have fun with their families and friends. There are more than 400 amusement/theme parks and attractions in the United States, according to the International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions (hereafter IAAPA) (IAAPA, 2016). Theme parks have been an essential segment of the tourism industry (Başarangil, 2016; Manthiou, Kang, Chiang, & Tang, 2016). In 2015, the top 20 amusement/theme parks in North America welcomed 146.3 million visitors, compared with 120 million visitors in 2006, showing a 22% growth in a decade (Themed Entertainment Association, 2016).

Theme parks provide visitors with various experiences and it is crucial to understand visitor behavior and preferences in tourism research (Prentice, Witt, & Hamer, 1998; Constantinides, 2004). Experience is defined as subjective personal reactions and feelings that are felt by consumers when consuming or using a service (Chen & Chen, 2010, p.29). A rich and unique experience can add significant value to the goods and/or services. In experience research, the “Experience Economy” is an emerging paradigm proposed by Pine and Gilmore (1999). This concept includes four dimensions: Esthetic, Entertainment, Education, and Escapism (the 4Es). Previous studies have applied the 4Es to measure visitors’ experiences in tourism settings, including bed & breakfast, cruise, temple stay, music festivals, museums, and rural areas (Oh, Fiore, & Jeoung, 2007; Hosany & Witham, 2010; Song, Lee, Park, Hwang, and Reisinger, 2015; Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011; Loureiro, 2014).
A positive customer experience is an important factor leading to customer satisfaction. Bitner & Hubbert (1994) stated that customer satisfaction can be described as an overall assessment of performance based on previous experiences. Satisfaction refers to the psychological state derived from a consumption experience (Oliver, 1997). Customer satisfaction is essential for corporate survival and success since it is the leading criterion for determining the quality that is actually received by the customers through the product or service (Pizam, Shapoval, & Ellis, 2016).

Customer satisfaction plays an important role in influencing repeat purchase and word-of-mouth recommendations (Tsao & Hsieh, 2012). According to Oliver (1997), behavioral intention refers to the likelihood to engage in a behavior. When customers are satisfied with their experiences, they are more likely to present positive behavioral intentions and responses, which leads to customer loyalty and patronage (Lam, Chan, Fong, & Lo, 2011).

Consumer behavior studies have revealed that tourists exhibit different experiences, satisfaction, and loyalty, depending on their social, demographic, or psychological factors. For example, Ekinci, Prokopaki, and Cobanoglu (2003) found differences between female and male tourists on overall satisfaction with services. Shi, Prentice, and He (2014) found that membership status between casino members and non-members was an important factor related to differences in the preference of visitors wishing to visit a casino. Trauer and Ryan (2005) claimed that tourists’ experiences can significantly differ depending on whom they travel with. In addition, Park, Lee, and Peters (2017) showed that residents and non-residents had differences in the decision-making process about visiting wetlands in Iowa. The previous findings indicate that visitors in the theme park may exhibit different degrees of experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intentions based on their status and demographic factors.
Problem Statement

Although the theme park industry has been increasing in popularity for several decades, the limited academic research paid attention to the theme park sector in the tourism context (Sun & Uysal, 1994). The majority of the literature focused on marketing implications such as segmentation (Milman 1991; Ah-Keng, 1993) and perceptual mapping (Fodness & Milner, 1992). More recently, some research has focused on consumer behaviors, in relation to service quality (Tsang, Lee, Wong & Chong, 2012), satisfaction (Bigné, Andreu & Gnoth, 2005), and duration of visitors’ activities (Kemperman, Borgers, Oppewal, & Timmermans, 2003). This lack of research indicates that there is limited understanding of consumer behaviors within the theme park setting. Therefore, there is a need to further investigate visitors’ behaviors and attitudes, such as experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intention to better understand the customers of the theme park industry.

Creating memorable experiences is one of key productive activities in tourism (Sternberg, 1997). Previous studies showed that experience can have an impact on satisfaction and behavioral intentions (Radder & Han, 2015; Huang & Hsu, 2009). Thus, understanding consumers’ experiences could be critical to form satisfied and repeat visitors to the theme park. While the consumer experience can be considered as a single concept (Prentice et al, 1998), Pine and Gilmore (1999) believed that the experience consists of four dimensions, Education, Entertainment, Escapism and Esthetics (4Es), based on the concept of the Experience Economy. Studies have found distinctive roles for each dimension in various settings. For example, in the museum setting, educational and esthetic dimensions are more important to satisfaction, while in the festival setting, escapism and esthetic dimensions are more important to satisfaction (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). In the cruise setting,
entertainment and esthetic dimensions are critical to satisfaction (Hosany & Witham, 2010). The findings imply that visitors may have different types of experiences while visiting a theme park. Thus, there is a need to further investigate the visitor experience with the 4Es as a framework.

Furthermore, previous research has found that each dimension of the 4Es has a different weight for predicting dependent variables in different research settings. For example, in a bed-and-breakfast study, Oh et al. (2007) found the esthetic dimension was the dominant determinant for satisfaction, while the escapist and entertainment dimension did not influence satisfaction. On the other hand, Mehmetoglu and Engen (2011) found that education and esthetic experiences had strong effects on satisfaction in the museum setting. The different findings indicate that the role of each dimension could be different in leading to satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park setting. However, little research has examined what specific dimension of experience would contribute to satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park setting.

Lastly, previous studies indicated that people exhibit different degrees of attitudes and behaviors towards the same product or service, based on gender (Fischer & Arnold, 1994; Holbrook, 1986), membership (Shi et al., 2014), accompanying groups (Trauer & Ryan, 2005), and residency (Andereck & Caldwell, 1994). The findings suggest that different groups of visitors to the theme park each may show different degrees of experiences, satisfaction, and loyalty, and there are different impacts of each experience on satisfaction and revisit intention. However, group differences have rarely been examined in the theme park sector. Therefore, there is a need to fill the gap by investigating group differences in experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention.
Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate if visitors’ experiences will influence their satisfaction and revisit intention, employing the 4Es. To address the purpose, the research objectives are four-fold: 1) to examine visitors’ experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intention, 2) to investigate what specific dimension of experience will influence satisfaction, 3) to investigate what specific dimension of experience will influence revisit intention, and 4) to identify the differences on the means of experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention and the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention by gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residential status.

Significance of the Study

Understanding consumer behaviors in a theme park is critical to keep attracting potential visitors, by meeting their needs and expectation on services and products. This study attempted to measure visitors’ experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intention, as well as the impacts of specific experience on satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme parks. The findings of the study will be significant in providing insight on visitors in the theme park setting and extending the current literature in theme park studies. The findings can help theme park operators better understand visitors’ experiences, satisfaction, and loyalty, which will help provide effective approaches to enhance their satisfaction and revisit intention.

Experience is one of the most important concepts within the tourism industry and numerous studies have examined tourists’ experiences in various tourism settings (Loureiro, 2014; Hwang & Lyu, 2015; Radder & Han, 2015). By extending the concept of experience to the theme park, the findings will fill the gap of the experience research in the theme park sector. Furthermore, by revealing visitors’ specific experiences with a theme park, the study
will provide the operators with concrete suggestions on how to measure customers’ experiences with different elements provided by the theme park.

This study was proposed to examine whether the experience in the theme park can influence customers’ attitudes and behaviors – satisfaction and revisit intention in the future. Through the investigation of the impact of the four dimensions of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention, this research will identify which dimension of experience is a dominant predictor of satisfaction and revisit intention. Thus, this study will expand the current literature on the theme parks as well as the impact of experience on overall satisfaction and behavioral intentions in a more specific way. From a practical perspective, this study will provide theme park operators with useful strategies to enhance visitors’ experiences, and thus increase their satisfaction and intention to revisit in the future.

Finally, this study examined group differences on the degree of experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention in terms of gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residential status. Through the comparison of different groups of visitors, the study offers meaningful and practical suggestions to differentiate promotion strategies to theme park marketers (Andereck & Caldwell, 1994). Therefore, the findings can provide the theme park industry with benefits that identify group differences and target a specific group for a more efficient promotion.

**Definition of Terms**

**Theme park** is defined as generally designed to create an atmosphere of another time and space (Walker, 2008). The theme parks in this study refer to Disney parks in the U.S.
Experience is defined as subjective personal reactions and feelings that are felt by consumers when consuming or using a service (Chen & Chen, 2010, p. 29). The experience in this research is related to theme park settings.

The Experience Economy was proposed to indicate that businesses need to shift from “delivery-focused” service to experiential service by Pine & Gilmore (1997). They defined four realms of the experience: educational, entertainment, escapism, and esthetic.

Customer satisfaction is defined as a customer’s fulfillment response, or the degree to which the level of fulfillment is pleasant or unpleasant (Oliver, 1997). In this study, visitor satisfaction refers to visitors’ overall satisfaction based on the experience they had in the theme park.

Revisit intention is defined as "the degree to which a person has formulated conscious plans to perform or not perform some specified future behavior" (Warshaw & Davis, 1985, p. 214). In this study, revisit intention means the likelihood that visitors are coming back to the theme park in the future.
CHAPTER 2.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This research intended to expand the existing literature by investigating the impact of experience on visitors’ satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park. There are six parts in the literature review: (a) theme parks; (b) experience, including the experience economy; (c) satisfaction; (d) revisit intention; (e) group differences; and (f) conceptual framework and hypotheses.

Theme Park

In recent years, the theme park is becoming a more and more popular destination for tourists around the world. There is a steady growth in attendance at theme parks and tourist attractions (Milman, 2001). Statistics provided by the International Association of Amusement Parks and Attractions (IAAPA) indicated that approximately 372.5 million people visited theme parks in the United States in 2015, an increase of 4.4 percent over 2014. In 2015, the U.S. theme park market generated approximately $20.7 billion in revenue, compared to $19.1 million in 2014, an increase of 7.7 percent. This trend represents strong potential for growth that should be investigated in coming years.

In this study, theme parks are defined as parks that are generally designed to create an atmosphere of another time and place. The reason they are called “theme parks,” is that they have a specific theme around which architecture, landscape, attractions, rides, shows, foodservices, costumed personnel, and retail stores are designed. There are several types of theme parks, such as historical, cultural, geographical, and so on. Some theme parks focus on one theme and others focus on multiple themes (Walker, 2008).
North America’s theme park industry has a long and successful history and has been an outstanding global leader in park management and operations (Milman, 2001). Some well-known theme parks include Walt Disney World, Universal Studios and Six Flags. These parks attract large numbers of tourists everyday.

According to the IAAPA (IAAPA, 2016) report, in terms of entertainment, consumers are more willing to spend money on the access and experience of a product, rather than the product itself, which benefits theme parks. Theme parks provide different kinds of experience to the visitors. Pine and Gilmore (1999) pointed out that theme parks should engage guests instead of merely entertaining them.

The majority of theme park research has paid attention to visitor profiles as well as market segmentation (Pikkemaat & Schuckert, 2007). Some studies have investigated theme park through a management perspective and revealed the future trend of the theme park and attraction industry (Milman, 2001). Some research has inspected the relationship between the economy and theme parks. For example, Braun and Soskin (1999) looked at the impact of external and market shocks on strategic pricing behavior of theme parks.

A number of researchers have looked into the future of the theme park industry. For instance, Formica and Olsen (1998) studied how amusement parks were going to deal with threats and opportunities due to environmental changes and offered suggestions for the future. Bramwell (1991) and Oliver (1989) looked at the prospects for present and future for parks in the United Kingdom. Loverseed (1994) evaluated the theme park industry in North America.

A few studies have researched theme parks in regard to service quality and satisfaction from a customers’ perspective (Tsang et al., 2012; Bigné et al., 2005). However, no major
empirical study has employed the experience economy to measure visitors’ experience in theme parks to determine links among different dimensions of experience, satisfaction levels and revisit intention.

**Experience**

Loureiro (2014) pointed out that experience has been considered as a single and differentiated construct since the 1990s. The definition of experience given by the Oxford English Dictionary is “An event or occurrence which leaves an impression on someone.” The first person who studied the concept of consumer/tourist experience was Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, a psychologist. He described how experience can provide a sense of enjoyment and be cherished for a long time, finally becoming a landmark in the memory. He called this “optimal experience” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). Later, Csikszentmihalyi applied his insights to consumer behavior, claiming that consuming is a process of exchange for existential or experiential rewards (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

Gradually, customer experience has become an important element in marketing. Hirschman and Holbrook (1982, p.99) defined customer experience as “those facets of consumer behavior that relate to the multi-sensory, fantasy, and emotive aspects of product use.” Pine and Gilmore (1999, p.12) defined experiences as “events that engage individuals in a personal way.” Other scholars agreed that experience originates from a set of complex interactions between a customer and a company or the product offered by the company (e.g., Addis & Holbrook, 2001; Gentile, Spiller & Noci, 2007). Schmitt (1999) divided experience into individual experience and shared experience. Individual experience is composed of sensing (aesthetics and sensory), feeling (moods and emotions) and thinking (analytical and
imaginative thinking). Shared experience includes acting (behavioral experiences) and relating (social identity experiences).

In the tourism context, Otto and Ritchie (1996) defined tourism experience as a tourist’s mental state derived from a service encounter. They measured service quality based on consumer behavior, service marketing and activities. They identified six dimensions of the experience construct: the hedonic dimension, the interactive or social dimension, the novelty-seeking or escape dimension, the comfort dimension, the safety dimension, and the stimulating or challenge-seeking dimension. Aho (2001) noted that there are four essential elements of the touristic experience: emotional, learning, practical, and transformational. As noted before, it is challenging to include all the elements that make up experience.

**The Experience Economy**

Pine and Gilmore (1999) identified four stages of economic progression for all types of companies, namely commodities, goods, services, and experiences. Each progressive stage adds more value to a product in order to upgrade to the next stage and attract more customers. For example, you can consider the business of coffee from the simple coffee beans to a cup of coffee, then to the service in a café, and finally to the unique coffee experience in Starbuck’s. Thus, Pine and Gilmore (1999) proposed the experience economy as a paradigm for improving business performance in broad areas. The authors believed that organizations should add more value to their products or services by providing meaningful and memorable experiences.

Pine and Gilmore (1999) identified experience in terms of four dimensions: entertainment, education, esthetics and escapism. These four dimensions are listed along two axes, according to customers’ involvement level and their connection with business offerings.
The customer involvement level is divided into active and passive participation. Being active refers to tourists who are involved in activities, affect the activities or performance, and both consume and produce the service; they help to create their own experiences. An example of active tourism is rafting. On the other hand, passive participants don’t affect activities or performance directly. Visiting a museum is a passive activity.

The connection between people and their environment or surroundings can be labeled “absorption” and “immersion.” Absorption means “occupying a person’s attention by bringing the experience into the mind from a distance,” such as when watching TV. Immersion means “becoming physically (or virtually) a part of the experience itself,” such as when playing a virtual game (Pine & Gilmore, 1999, p.30). Figure 1 shows the four dimensions classified into the four categories. Pine and Gilmore (1999) used the phrase “sweet spot” to indicate that each of the four dimensions combines to create an optimal customer experience.

Figure 1. The Four Dimensions of an Experience (Pine & Gilmore, 1999, p.30).
Most previous studies of the experience economy have focused on different areas in the hospitality industry (e.g., Hosany & Witham, 2010; Oh et al., 2007; Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011; Loureiro, 2014). The concept of an experience economy has been widely employed in the marketing literature. A rich body of experience economy studies has explored customers’ experiences in different settings such as golf tournaments, cruises, wine trails, and temple stays (Hwang & Lyu, 2015; Hosany & Witham, 2010; Quadri & Fiore, 2013; Song et al., 2015). For example, Oh et al. (2007) focused on bed-and-breakfast guests to test a proposed model of experience economy concepts, which provided a starting point for measuring experience economy concepts and suggested a practical view within hospitality settings. Mehmetoglu & Engen (2011) further identified the underlying dimensions of the experience economy from two different tourism contexts: festivals and museums. They found that escapism and esthetic dimensions affect visitors’ level of satisfaction in the case of the festivals, whereas the education and esthetic dimensions have a strong effect on visitors’ satisfaction in museums.

**Educational.** In an educational experience, visitors absorb events unfolding before them and actively participate in activities. Visitors are able to gain knowledge or learn something new through educational experience in a theme park. Educational experience is both active and absorptive. For example, visitors can learn about animals by joining a safari tour. Some interactive attractions are designed to create educational experience. A drawing class led by a trained artist allows visitors to sketch a character, which increases their drawing skills. It is essential for visitors to participate actively to “learn something new.”

**Escapism.** An escapism experience can be defined as the extent to which an individual is thoroughly absorbed in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). An escapism experience
requires immersion and active participation. A theme park is a typical example; visitors actively participate in activities or events in the environment (or virtual environment). Tourism, in general, provides an opportunity for travellers to escape from the daily life (Hosany & Witham, 2010). Cohen (1979) found out that a significant reason for people to take a trip was to search for meaning and/or to center themselves elsewhere, away from daily routines.

**Entertainment.** Entertainment requires absorption as well as passive participation. It is one of the oldest forms of experience and well developed in the tourist industry (Pine & Gilmore, 1999). Hughes and Benn (1995) asserted that entertainment is an essential part of tourism. The entertainment experience is supposed to capture and occupy guests’ attention. Oh et al. (2007) have claimed that entertainment experience has been measured as an outcome of a trip, as showed by measurement items as “fun.” Good examples of entertainment are fireworks or live music shows provided at the theme park; visitors passively participate in the experience that “goes into” them.

**Esthetic.** With esthetic experience, visitors are immersed in the environment and passively appreciate it without affecting anything. It is more like a mental presence. Many sightseeing destinations provide esthetic experience to visitors. Oh et al. (2007) asserted that a business’s physical setting and environment have great impact on customers’ patronage. In addition, esthetics have a great impact on consumer behavior, decision-making and service evaluation (Turley & Milliman, 2000). As a result, the scene and design of a theme park highly influence visitors’ esthetic experience and contribute to the overall experience and evaluation.
Satisfaction

The concept of customer satisfaction has received a great deal of attention in the literature since it strongly influences consumer purchase intentions and customer retention (Solnet, Kandampully, Kralj, 2010). Oliver (1980) pointed out that customer satisfaction was generated from a service encounter and comparison of the actual experience with expectation. Hunt (1977) asserted that satisfaction is a consequence of processing (i.e. evaluating) the affect in a consumption experience. Rust & Oliver (1994) claimed that whether an individual feels that the product or service offered provides positive utility was somehow influenced by satisfaction. Therefore, satisfaction was considered a subjective feeling.

Since satisfaction has become a field of study, numerous studies have emphasized this topic (del Bosque & Martín, 2008). Gundersen, Heide, and Olsson (1996) stated that guest satisfaction is a post-consumption, evaluative judgment a consumer makes after receiving a specific product or service. It is an elusive and indistinct construct that is based on an individual’s pre-purchase expectations and post-purchase quality perceptions (Parasurman, Zeithaml, and Berry 1985). Other studies consider satisfaction to be an emotional response to the outcome of a consumption experience (Spreng, MacKenzie and Olshavsky, 1996). However, assessing guest satisfaction can help service providers improve their performance and services (Fornell, 1992).

Satisfaction has been widely studied in the hospitality literature on theme parks, hotels and restaurants. In general, satisfaction is related to experience or service quality. For example, Geissler & Rucks (2011) monitored visitor satisfaction over a ten-year period at a major US theme park. They identified significant factors that influence visitor evaluations of

**Behavioral Intention**

Behavioral intention can be defined as an individual’s planned future behavior (Oliver & Swan, 1989). It implies expectations of an individual’s specific type of behavior in a given setting and the likelihood that he or she will act (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Behavioral intentions can also be considered a form of loyalty. Oliver (1997, p.392) defined loyalty as “a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future.” Loyalty, as reflected by revisit intention, has been frequently investigated by researchers of consumer behavior, including tourism researchers (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Customer loyalty is an important goal for companies since it is a critical component of company’s sustainability (Chen & Chen, 2010).

According to Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996), there are five favorable behavioral intentions: to spread positive words about a provider, to recommend the provider to other consumers, to maintain loyalty to the provider, to spend more money with the provider, and to pay premium prices. One form of behavioral intention, revisit intention, can be defined as the intention of guests to experience the same product, service, place or brand
again in the future. Since revisit intention is the most relevant factor for a theme park setting, it will be a measurement of behavioral intention in this study.

It is critical to increase the number of customers who return in the competitive tourism industry (Lai, Yu, & Kuo, 2010). Theme parks can count the number of customers who revisit in the tourist population as a measure of success (Darnell & Johnson, 2001). Dissatisfied visitors will choose alternative destinations in the future. Thus, revisit intention is an essential factor in determining the future of theme parks.

**Group Differences**

Tourists are heterogeneous. Every tourist is attracted to different travel destinations, likes to enjoy different activities while on vacation, likes to utilize different types of entertainment facilities and complains about different things during their travel (Dolnicar, 2008). Previous studies divided groups by demographic characteristics (Anderson & Langmeyer, 1982), repeat versus nonrepeat visitors (Perdue, 1985), and level of expenditure, etc. (Spotts & Mahoney, 1991).

**Gender**

Gender has been recognized as one of the most common forms of segmentation in the literature. Putreve (2001) noted that biological differences such as sex chromosomes, sex hormones, emotional make-up and brain lateralization, and social identification differences such as traditional gender roles might cause differences between genders. Mieczkowski (1990) looked into different travel preferences between genders and found that traditionally, males tended to seek action and adventure, while females were more likely to be searching for cultural and educational experiences. Previous studies also showed that differences existed between females and males in rating overall satisfaction of service. For example,
Ekinci et al. (2003) found that females had a higher level of overall satisfaction with services in accommodations than males.

**Membership**

Loyalty programs, such as membership, have been generally acknowledged to be an effective way to increase customer loyalty (Bolton, Kannan & Bramlett, 2000). Loyalty programs provide members with various services and benefits, which may affect their experience. Stauss, Chojnacki, Decker and Hoffmann (2001) investigated the differences between customer club members and non-members of a car company and the results showed that club members showed a higher degree of satisfaction and customer retention than non-members. McCleary and Weaver (1992) found that members tend to be more loyal than non-members in the hotel industry as well.

**Visiting Groups**

Trauer and Ryan (2005) applied the theory of intimacy to the tourism setting to investigate how customers feel based on whom they travel with. They noted that a travel experience can depend significantly on whom people share it with, though the architecture and service at the destination may remain the same. From this point of view, destinations can be experienced in different ways (Ryan, 2010).

**Residency**

Resident status also has an impact on consumer behavior. For example, previous studies showed that there are differences in satisfaction between in-state visitors and out-of-state visitors. For example, Andereck and Caldwell (1994) investigated the differences between state residents and nonresidents in a North Carolina zoo setting. The findings indicated non-residents were generally happier and more satisfied just after a visit than the residents.
However, Etzel & Woodside (1982) studied distant travelers and near-home travelers and found that compared to distant travelers, near-home travelers are more likely to repeat the experience.

**Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses**

Conceptual frameworks based on previous studies have been developed in order to evaluate the impact of experiences on satisfaction and revisit intention, as well as group differences on the relationships (Oh et al., 2007; Quadri & Fiore, 2013). The constructs were chosen as a result of an extensive literature review of the hospitality and tourism industries. The experience concept was developed based on the experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 1999). The satisfaction construct was developed from a previous study of satisfaction on cruise ships (Hosany & Witham, 2010). Finally, revisit intention was developed using a previous study on golf tournaments (Hwang & Lyu, 2015).

Customer satisfaction is an overall evaluation of consumption experience with goods or services over time (Fornell 1992). Therefore, experience has an impact on customer satisfaction. Oh et al. (2007) developed a scale to measure customers’ experience and satisfaction in a bed-and-breakfast setting using the experience economy. The study found that the four dimensions of experience can be predictors of satisfaction. A number of other studies have also claimed that experiences influence satisfaction (Chen & Chen, 2010; Song et al., 2015). Some studies have applied the four experience dimensions to different settings and determined that for example, in a festival setting, escapism and esthetics are most significant for visitors’ satisfaction, whereas at museums, education and aesthetics are important factors (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). Therefore, the following hypothesis along with sub-hypotheses were developed as shown in Figure 2:
H1: Experiences will have a significant impact on satisfaction.

H1a: Educational experience will have a significant impact on satisfaction.

H1b: Entertainment experience will have a significant impact on satisfaction.

H1c: Escapism experience will have a significant impact on satisfaction.

H1d: Esthetic experience will have a significant impact on satisfaction.

Figure 2. The Impact of Experience on Satisfaction

The relationship between experience and loyalty has been studied in service marketing literature (e.g. Lemon & Wangenheim, 2009). Previous studies have shown that experience is found to influence behavioral intentions (Sönmez & Graefe, 1998). That is, positive experience in the past is an important predictor for return visits (Andereck & Caldwell, 1993). Radder and Han (2015) further revealed that edutainment (the experience between education and entertainment) is the most important experience dimension in determining visitors’ revisit intention at South African heritage museums. Quadri (2012) found that esthetic and escapism experience are important to revisit intention in a wine trail.
setting. Therefore, the following hypothesis along with sub-hypotheses are developed as shown in Figure 3:

H2: Experiences will have a significant impact on revisit intention.

H2a: Educational experience will have a significant impact on revisit intention.

H2b: Entertainment experience will have a significant impact on revisit intention.

H2c: Escapism experience will have a significant impact on revisit intention.

H2d: Esthetic experience will have a significant impact on revisit intention.

Figure 3. The Impact of Experience on Revisit Intention

Previous studies have shown that there are group differences in regard to satisfaction and revisit intention. Ekinci et al. (2003) found that female tourists rated intangibles (the manner in which people get the services) as being more important than male tourists and had higher overall satisfaction with services. Shi et al. (2014) found that gamblers holding a membership at a casino prefer to visit that casino during their stay. Trauer and Ryan (2005) noted that a tourist’s travelling companions affect his or her evaluation of a place. This
implies that when visitors visit the same theme park, they would have different experiences with different companions. For example, visitors with friends and those with families would have different experiences in the theme park. Etzel and Woodside (1982) discovered that distant and near-home travelers differed substantially in terms of repeat visits, amount of money spent, travel mode and revisit intention. Therefore, the following hypotheses along with sub-hypotheses were established:

H3: There will be differences on the means of experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intention by different groups.

H3a: There will be differences on the means of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention between genders.

H3b: There will be differences on the means of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention between annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders.

H3c: There will be differences on the means of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention between visitors with friends and visitors with family.

H3d: There will be differences on the means of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention between residents and non-residents.

H4: There will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction by different groups.

H4a: There will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between genders.

H4b: There will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders.
H4c: There will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between visitors with friends and visitors with family.

H4d: There will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between residents and non-residents.

H5: There will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention by different groups.

H5a: There will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention between genders.

H5b: There will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention between annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders.

H5c: There will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention between visitors with friends and visitors with family.

H5d: There will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention between residents and non-residents.
CHAPTER 3.

METHODOLOGY

This study measured visitors’ experiences, satisfaction and revisit intention in a theme park. Then it identified the specific dimension of experience that contributes most to satisfaction and revisit intention. Finally, the study examined the differences in the means of experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention and the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention between groups in terms of gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups and residency. This chapter describes research design, survey instrument, the sample population used in the research, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

This current study was designed as quantitative research, employing a survey approach. In particular, the study employed descriptive and causal-comparative research to examine experience, satisfaction and revisit intention to theme parks among a sample of visitors who have visited Walt Disney World and Disneyland in the U.S. within the past twelve months by dividing the sample into four different groups: gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residency. In addition, the relationship between experience and satisfaction, and revisit intention was investigated.

Survey Instrument

The survey consisted of five parts: visitors’ profile, their experiences at the theme park, satisfaction, revisit intention and demographic information. Screening questions about theme park past visits were asked before participants took the survey. In the first section, visitors’ profile included residential status, annual pass status and visiting groups.
In the second section, each dimension of the 4Es (Education, Entertainment, Escapism and Esthetics) was measured with four items each, applying a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$. These questions were adapted from Oh et al. (2007) tourist experience scale.

In the third part, eight items were utilized to investigate visitors’ satisfaction with a theme park, applying a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$. They were operationalized based on Song et al. (2015) satisfaction scale.

In the fourth section, four items were used to investigate visitors’ revisit intention using a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$. These questions were adapted from Hwang and Lyu (2015).

Lastly, the demographic questions were asked at the end of the questionnaire. Participants were asked to provide socio-demographic information including gender, age, education, income, marital status and zip code.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted to ensure the feasibility of the method used in this research, using two approaches: 1) expert reviews and 2) a pretest with 100 participants who had previously been to a theme park. First, a survey questionnaire was reviewed by three faculty members from Iowa State University in the U.S. Based on their reviews, the measurement items and scales were slightly modified and some wording was corrected to improve clarity of the questions and respondents’ comprehension.

A pre-survey was done to check the data collection procedure, and to reduce the errors that might be caused by improper design. 100 responses were collected online through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a crowdsourcing online marketplace, which enables
individuals and businesses to coordinate human intelligence to fulfill tasks (Wikipedia, n.d.). The results of the pre-survey showed that there were no problems with the survey design, and the participants understood all questions correctly.

**Population and Sample**

The sample population for this research was visitors who have been to theme parks in the U.S. The target population was visitors who have visited Walt Disney World in Florida or Disneyland in California within the past 12 months. In this study, convenience sampling was utilized to collect data. The sample was composed of people who were over 18 years old and had visited Walt Disney World or Disneyland in the U.S. within the past 12 months.

**Use of Human Subjects**

An application form for Approval of Research Involving Humans was submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Iowa State University (ISU). The research was considered exempt from the requirements of human subject protection regulations. However, an approval letter was obtained from ISU and is listed in Appendix A.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected through an online questionnaire that was posted on MTurk between January 24 and January 31, 2017. The questionnaire was composed of a cover letter with an introduction and the purpose of the study, questions related to this research and demographic information. In addition, participants were informed that they had to be at least 18 years old and have visited Walt Disney World in Florida or Disneyland in California within the past 12 months. A total of 560 people participated in the survey. Participants who completed the survey received $0.5. After removing elements with missing values, 486 valid responses
Data Analysis Methods

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24 was applied in the analysis of the data collected through the survey. Due to the feature of online surveys, the data entry was completed by the participants. Once the data collection period was over, all of the responses were compiled in the SPSS file. The data set was filtered manually before running any tests. All of the invalid samples with missing values were removed from the data set. For example, if the participant missed one question, this survey was completely removed.

The study used descriptive statistics, independent sample T-tests and multiple linear regression analysis. The following part will clarify how these tools functioned to test hypotheses and identify the significance level. The level of significance, which is denoted by “α,” is used to determine whether the null hypothesis should be rejected or retained. In this study, α is set to be equal to 0.05 since most business research uses this number for significance level.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics were gathered from data sets provided by the respondents in order to measure central tendency, dispersion, shape, and distribution of data values. The mean and standard deviation were derived from all data. Demographic information was analyzed using frequency tables.

Independent Sample T-test

Independent sample T-tests were utilized to investigate the difference between two unrelated or independent groups on the dependent variable. The T-tests were applied to the
data to examine if differences existed among groups in terms of gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups and residency on experience, satisfaction and revisit intention.

**Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

Regression helps to estimate a line that fits the data best and can be used to predict behaviors and attitudes of the subjects using multiple variables. Linear regression can provide accurate and reliable results under certain conditions. In this study, multiple linear regression analysis was employed to test which realm of the experience economy was significant in predicting visitors’ satisfaction and revisit intention in a theme park setting.
CHAPTER 4.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This study measured visitors’ experience, satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park applying the 4Es, and investigated the relationship between experience, and satisfaction and revisit intention. Primary hypotheses were developed to indicate the impact of visitors’ experience on satisfaction and revisit intention. Further, the results of statistical data analyses pertain to differences according to gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residency. T-tests and linear regression were conducted to analyze the data using SPSS 24.0.

Profile of the Participants

Respondents’ demographics are shown in Table 1. Out of the 486 participants, 230 were female (47.3 percent) and 256 were male (52.7 percent). The participants’ ages ranged from 19 to over 59 with an average age range of 19 to 38. The participants’ annual household income ranged from below $20,000 to over $200,000. Nearly 25 percent of the respondents fell into the category of between $60,000 and $79,999. Regarding education level, almost 72 percent of the respondents fell into the category of some or 4 years of college. Lastly, almost 44 percent of the respondents were single, never married; 9.5 percent of the respondents were married without children; 30 percent of the respondents were married with children; 4.1 percent of the respondents were divorced; 0.8 percent of the respondents were separated; 1 percent of the respondents were widowed, and 10.7 percent of the respondents were living with partner.
**Table 1.** Demographics of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-28</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>34.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-38</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>39.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-39,999</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-59,999</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-79,999</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000-99,999</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-149,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000-199,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $200,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing to answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical school</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college degree</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married without children</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married with children</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with partner</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitors’ Profile

Out of 486 respondents, 251 respondents visited Walt Disney World in Florida and 235 respondents visited Disneyland in California (see Table 2). 140 out of 486 visitors were residents of the state of the theme park they visited. Nearly 17 percent of the respondents held an annual pass when they visited the theme park. About 98 percent of respondents visited a theme park with others, including 23.3 percent with friends, 65 percent with family, 8 percent with both friends and family, and about 1.9 percent visited with someone else.

Table 2. Visitors’ Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme park</th>
<th>Visitors</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walt Disney World</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disneyland in</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual pass</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting group</td>
<td>No one</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friends</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My family</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friends and family together</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Impact of Experience on Satisfaction and Revisit Intention

Multiple linear regression analyses were performed in order to evaluate how well four realms of experience predicted overall satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park setting. The following is a general regression model that was established to test the hypotheses.
Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e

In the above model, Y is customer satisfaction or revisit intention, X_1 is educational experience, X_2 is entertainment experience, X_3 is escapism experience, X_4 is esthetic experience, and e is the error.

**The Impact of Experience on Satisfaction**

Linear regression was conducted to examine the impact of each dimension of experience on satisfaction (see Table 3). The F-ratio was 339.910 ($p < .000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .739, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .737, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for more than 70% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education ($b = .092$, $t = 4.637$, $p < .001$), entertainment ($b = .312$, $t = 7.680$, $p < .001$) and esthetic ($b = .500$, $t = 12.268$, $p < .001$) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic, supporting H1a, H1b, and H1d.

Therefore, this result partially supports H1, that experiences will have a significant impact on satisfaction. That is, this study found a positive, significant relationship between the three dimensions of experience and satisfaction. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{sat} = 0.628 + 0.092X_1 + 0.312X_2 + 0.001X_3 + 0.500X_4 + e.$$
Table 3. Coefficients of Experience on Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>4.363</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>4.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>7.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>12.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F ratio: 333.910; R² = .739; Adjusted R²= .737; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

The Impact of Experience on Revisit Intention

Table 4 presents the regression results of the impact of each dimension of experience on revisit intention. The F-ratio was 117.287 (p < .000), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The R² was .494, and the adjusted R² was .490, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for nearly 50% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The four factors of education (b= .139, t= 3.941, p < .001), entertainment (b= .163, t= 2.242, p < .05), escapism (b= .081, t= 2.011, p < .05) and esthetic (b= .583, t= 8.017, p < .001) were all significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment, escapism and esthetic, supporting H2 along with its sub-hypotheses (H2a~d). Therefore, this result supports that experiences have a significant impact on revisit intention. That is, this study found a positive, significant relationship between the four dimensions of experience and revisit intention. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[ Y_r = 0.186 + 0.139X_1 + 0.163X_2 + 0.081X_3 + 0.583X_4 + e. \]
Table 4. Coefficients of Experience on Revisit Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F ratio: 117.287; R² = .494; Adjusted R² = .490; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

Group Differences

Mean Differences on Experience, Satisfaction, and Revisit Intention

Group differences on four realms of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention were examined based on gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residency (see Table 5).

Gender. Regarding experiences, a series of t-tests was conducted to examine differences of each dimension of experience by gender. For entertainment experience, the female group (M= 6.06, SD= .983) reported statistically higher scores than the male (M= 5.69, SD= .972), t= 4.228, p < .05. In addition, female visitors (M= 5.99, SD= 1.030) had a statistically higher level of esthetic experience than male visitors (M= 5.60, SD= .975), t= 4.338, p < .05. However, there was no significant difference on educational experience (t= .947, p > .05) between females (M= 4.78, SD= 1.452) and males (M= 4.66, SD= 1.258) or on escapism experience between females (M= 4.75, SD= 1.339) and males (M= 4.64, SD= 1.176), t= .978, p > .05.
Table 5. Independent Sample T-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=230)</td>
<td>4.78 (1.452)</td>
<td>4.66 (1.258)</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=256)</td>
<td>6.06 (.983)</td>
<td>5.69 (.972)</td>
<td>4.228*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.75 (1.339)</td>
<td>4.64 (1.176)</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.99 (1.030)</td>
<td>5.60 (.975)</td>
<td>4.338*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>6.02 (.952)</td>
<td>5.58 (.957)</td>
<td>5.124*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.83 (1.284)</td>
<td>5.28 (1.169)</td>
<td>4.965*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual pass holders (n=82)</td>
<td>5.00 (1.236)</td>
<td>4.66 (1.370)</td>
<td>2.081*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non holders (n=404)</td>
<td>5.62 (1.201)</td>
<td>5.91 (.940)</td>
<td>-2.116*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.95 (1.187)</td>
<td>4.64 (1.264)</td>
<td>2.091*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainement</td>
<td>5.58 (1.222)</td>
<td>5.82 (.970)</td>
<td>-1.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>5.58 (1.133)</td>
<td>5.83 (.940)</td>
<td>-1.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.58 (1.333)</td>
<td>5.54 (1.239)</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visiting groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends (n=113)</td>
<td>4.42 (1.532)</td>
<td>4.76 (1.275)</td>
<td>-2.108*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With family (n=316)</td>
<td>5.64 (1.100)</td>
<td>5.90 (.930)</td>
<td>-2.443*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.55 (1.301)</td>
<td>4.69 (1.207)</td>
<td>-1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.52 (1.128)</td>
<td>5.84 (.939)</td>
<td>-2.969*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>5.56 (1.026)</td>
<td>5.82 (.927)</td>
<td>-2.494*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.22 (1.346)</td>
<td>5.64 (1.177)</td>
<td>-3.156*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents (n=140)</td>
<td>4.58 (1.416)</td>
<td>4.77 (1.324)</td>
<td>-1.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residents (n=346)</td>
<td>5.67 (1.170)</td>
<td>5.94 (.903)</td>
<td>-2.514*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.59 (1.319)</td>
<td>4.73 (1.228)</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.62 (1.174)</td>
<td>5.85 (.944)</td>
<td>-2.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>5.56 (1.139)</td>
<td>5.89 (.890)</td>
<td>-3.070*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.44 (1.319)</td>
<td>5.59 (1.226)</td>
<td>-1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SD= Standard Deviation, The t-value with “*” is significant at the level of .05.

In regards to satisfaction, females (M= 6.02, SD=.952) exhibited significantly higher satisfaction than males (M= 5.58, SD=.975), t= 5.124, p < .05. Furthermore, the female group (M= 5.83, SD= 1.284) had a statistically higher degree of revisit intention than the male group (M= 5.28, SD= 1.169), t= 4.965, p < .05. Overall, the findings partially support
H3a. Findings indicate that female visitors had a higher degree of experiences, especially for entertainment and esthetic experience, as well as, satisfaction, and revisit intention, than male visitors to a the theme park.

**Annual pass membership.** Independent sample T-tests revealed that annual pass holders (M= 5.00, SD= 1.236) reported statistically higher scores on educational experiences than non-annual pass holders (M= 4.66, SD= 1.370), t= 2.081, p < .05. On the other hand, annual pass holders (M= 5.62, SD= 1.201) had a statistically lower degree of entertainment experience than non-annual pass holders (M= 5.91, SD=.940), t= -2.116, p < .05. Regarding escapism experience, annual pass holders (M= 4.95, SD= 1.187) exhibited significantly higher scores than non-annual pass holders (M= 4.64, SD= 1.264), t= 2.091, p < .05.

However, there was no significant difference for esthetic experience between annual pass holders (M= 5.58, SD= 1.222) and non-annual pass holders (M= 5.82, SD= .970), t= -1.679, p > .05. Furthermore, the results showed no significant difference on satisfaction between annual pass holders (M= 5.58, SD= 1.133) and non-annual pass holders (M= 5.83, SD= .940), t= -1.915, p > .05 and on revisit intention between annual pass holders (M= 5.58, SD= 1.333) and non-annual pass holders (M= 5.54, SD= 1.239), t=.265, p > .05. Overall the findings partially support H3b. Findings indicate that annual pass holders had a higher degree of experiences, especially educational and escapism experience, while non-annual pass holders had a higher degree of entertainment experience (Table 5).

**Visiting groups.** T-tests revealed that visitors with family exhibited a significantly higher degree of educational (M= 4.76, SD= 1.275), entertainment (M= 5.90, SD= .930), and esthetic (M= 5.84, SD=.939) experiences than visitors with friends (M= 4.42, SD= 1.532 M= 5.64, SD= 1.100; M= 5.52, SD= 1.128), t= -2.108, t= -2.443, t= -2.969, ps < .05,
respectively. However, there was no significant difference on escapism experience between visitors with friends (M= 4.55, SD= 1.301) and visitors with family (M= 4.69, SD= 1.207), \( t = -1.079, p > .05 \). Furthermore, visitors with family exhibited a significantly higher degree of satisfaction (M= 5.82, SD= .927) and revisit intention (M= 5.64, SD= 1.177) than visitors with friends (M= 5.56, SD= 1.026; M= 5.22, SD= 1.346), \( t = -2.494, t = -3.156, ps < .05 \), respectively. Overall the findings partially support H3c. Findings indicate that visitors with family had a higher degree of educational, entertainment and esthetic experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention than visitors with friends.

Residency. Non-residents had a statistically higher level of entertainment (M= 5.94, SD= .903) and esthetic (M= 5.85, SD= .944) experiences than residents (M= 5.67, SD= 1.170; M= 5.62, SD= 1.174), \( t = -2.514, t = -2.006, ps < .05 \), respectively. However, there was no significant difference on educational experience (\( t = -1.424, p > .05 \)) between residents (M= 4.58, SD= 1.416) and non-residents (M= 4.77, SD= 1.324) and on escapism experience between residents (M= 4.59, SD= 1.319) and non-residents (M= 4.73, SD= 1.228), \( t = -1.155, p > .05 \).

In addition, non-residents (M= 5.89, SD= .890) exhibited significantly higher satisfaction than residents (M= 5.56, SD= 1.139), \( t = -3.070, p < .05 \). However, no significant difference was found on revisit intention between residents (M= 5.44, SD= 1.319) and non-residents (M= 5.59, SD= 1.226), \( t = -1.197, p > .05 \). Overall the findings partially support H3d. Findings indicate that non-residents had a higher degree of experiences, especially entertainment and esthetic experience, and satisfaction than residents.
**Group Differences on the Impact of Experience on Satisfaction**

**Gender.** Table 6 presents the regression results of the impact of experience on satisfaction for females and males. For females, the F-ratio was 148.870 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .726, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .721, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 72.1% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three dimensions of education ($b = .106, t= 3.785, p < .001$), entertainment ($b = .319, t= 5.058, p < .001$) and esthetic ($b = .438, t= 6.980, p < .001$) were significant in predicting the dependent variable at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{sat} = 1.000 + 0.106X_1 + 0.319X_2 - 0.007X_3 + 0.438X_4 + e.$$  

For male visitors, the F-ratio was 174.468 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .735, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .731, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 73.1% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education ($b = .086, t= 3.085, p < .005$), entertainment ($b = .296, t= 5.607, p < .001$) and esthetic ($b = .536, t= 10.013, p < .001$) were significant in predicting the dependent variable at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{sat} = 0.406 + 0.086X_1 + 0.296X_2 + 0.019X_3 + 0.536X_4 + e.$$
Overall, for both groups, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of satisfaction, followed by entertainment and educational experience, while escapism experience was not a significant predictor of satisfaction. Thus, the results failed to prove H4a that there will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between genders.

**Table 6.** Coefficients of Experience on Satisfaction by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Female, F ratio: 148.870; $R^2 = .726$; Adjusted $R^2 = .721$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

Male, F ratio: 174.468; $R^2 = .735$; Adjusted $R^2 = .731$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

**Annual pass membership.** Table 7 presents the regression results of the impact of experience on satisfaction for annual pass holders and non-holders. For annual pass holders, the F-ratio was 77.723 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .801, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .791, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for almost 80% of variance in the
dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education \( (b=.134, t=2.032, p < .05) \), entertainment \( (b=.547, t=5.044, p < .001) \) and esthetic \( (b=.231, t=2.381, p < .05) \) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[
Y_{sat} = 0.649 + 0.134X_1 + 0.547X_2 - 0.020X_3 + 0.231X_4 + e
\]

For non-annual pass holders, the F-ratio was 263.780 \( (p < 0.000) \), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The \( R^2 \) was .726, and the adjusted \( R^2 \) was .723, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for more than 70% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education \( (b=.091, t=4.422, p < .001) \), entertainment \( (b=.257, t=5.789, p < .001) \) and esthetic \( (b=.559, t=12.506, p < .001) \) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[
Y_{sat} = 0.633 + 0.091X_1 + 0.257X_2 - 1.95E^{-5}X_3 + 0.559X_4 + e
\]

Overall, for annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders, educational, entertainment and esthetic were three significant predictors of satisfaction. Escapism experience was not a significant predictor of satisfaction for both groups. Thus, the results failed to support H4b that there will be differences on the impact of experience on satisfaction between annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders.
Table 7. Coefficients of Experience on Satisfaction by Annual Pass Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you hold an annual pass when you visited the theme park?</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.958E-5</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Members, F ratio: 77.723; R² = .801; Adjusted R²= .791; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
non-members, F ratio: 263.780; R² = .726; Adjusted R²= .723; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

Visiting groups. Table 8 presents the regression results of the impact of experience on satisfaction for visitors with friends and those with family. First, for visitors with friends, the F-ratio was 88.755 (p < .000), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The R² was .767, and the adjusted R² was .758, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 75.8% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education (b= .118, t= 3.011, p < .05), entertainment (b= .252, t= 2.884, p < .05) and esthetic (b= .548, t= 6.067, p < .001) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:
\[ Y_{sat} = 0.828 + 0.118X_1 + 0.252X_2 - 0.053X_3 + 0.548X_4 + e. \]

**Table 8. Coefficients of Experience on Satisfaction by Visiting Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friend(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(.Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: With friends, F ratio: 88.755; R² = .767; Adjusted R² = .758; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
With family, F ratio: 185.131; R² = .704; Adjusted R² = .700; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

For visitors with family, the F-ratio was 185.131 (\( p < .000 \)), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The R² was .704, and the adjusted R² was .700, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 70% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education (\( b = .086, t = 3.379, p < .05 \)), entertainment (\( b = .303, t = 6.088, p < .001 \)) and esthetic (\( b = .514, t = 10.158, p < .001 \)) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[ Y_{sat} = 0.559 + 0.086X_1 + 0.303X_2 + 0.012X_3 + 0.514X_4 + e. \]
Overall, for both groups, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of satisfaction, followed by entertainment and educational experience while escapism experience was not a significant predictor of satisfaction. Thus, the results failed to prove H4c that there will be differences in the impact of experience on satisfaction between visitors with friends and visitors with family.

**Residency.** Table 9 presents the regression results of the impact of experience on satisfaction for residents and non-residents. For residents, the F-ratio was 127.886 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .791, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .785, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 78.5% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education ($b= .094, t= 2.503, p< .05$), entertainment ($b= .323, t= 5.058, p < .001$) and esthetic ($b= .522, t= 7.021, p < .001$) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{\text{sat}} = 0.381 + 0.094X_1 + 0.323X_2 - 0.005X_3 + 0.522X_4 + e.$$  

For non-residents, The F-ratio was 198.848 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .700, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .696, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for nearly 70% of variance in the dependent variable — visitor satisfaction. The three factors of education ($b= .090, t= 3.894, p < .001$), entertainment ($b= .292, t= 5.926, p < .001$) and esthetic ($b= .489, t= 10.012, p < .001$) were significant in predicting satisfaction at the 0.05 level while escapism
was not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between satisfaction and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[ Y_{sat} = 0.844 + 0.090X_1 + 0.292X_2 + 0.003X_3 + 0.489X_4 + \epsilon. \]

**Table 9. Coefficients of Experience on Satisfaction by Residency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a resident of the state of the park you visited?</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( \text{Std. Error} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( .381 )</td>
<td>( .237 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( .844 )</td>
<td>( .184 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Residents, F ratio: 127.886; \( R^2 = .791 \); Adjusted \( R^2 = .785 \); \( \text{Sig.} = .000^* \) at 0.05
Non-residents, F ratio: 198.848; \( R^2 = .700 \); Adjusted \( R^2 = .696 \); \( \text{Sig.} = .000^* \) at 0.05

Overall, for both groups, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of satisfaction, followed by entertainment and educational experience while escapism experience was not a significant predictor of satisfaction. Thus, the findings failed to support H4d that there will be differences in the impact of experience on satisfaction between residents and non-residents.
Group Differences on the Impact of Experience on Revisit Intention

**Gender.** Table 10 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 59.485 \((p < 0.000)\), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The \(R^2\) was .514, and the adjusted \(R^2\) was .505, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 50.5% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The two factors of education \((b= .147, t= 2.928, p < .05)\) and esthetic \((b= .545, t= 4.840, p < .001)\) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while entertainment and escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[
Y_{ri} = 0.288 + 0.147X_1 + 0.185X_2 + 0.097X_3 + 0.545X_4 + e.
\]

For males, Table 10 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 49.265 \((p < 0.000)\), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The \(R^2\) was .440, and the adjusted \(R^2\) was .431, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 43.1% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The two factors of education \((b= .131, t= 2.636, p < .05)\) and esthetic \((b= .573, t= 6.018, p < .001)\) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while entertainment and escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[
Y_{ri} = 0.387 + 0.131X_1 + 0.128X_2 + 0.076X_3 + 0.573X_4 + e.
\]

According to the results above, it was noted that esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of revisit intention, followed by educational experience for both groups. Entertainment and escapism experience were not found to be significant predictors of revisit
intention for both groups. Thus, the results failed to support H5a that there will be differences in the impact of experience on revisit intention between genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Female, F ratio: 59.485; R² = .514; Adjusted R² = .505; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
Male, F ratio: 49.265; R² = .440; Adjusted R² = .431; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

Annual pass membership. Table 11 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 51.859 (p < 0.000), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The R² was .729, and the adjusted R² was .715, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for more than 70% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The three factors of education (b= .191, t= 2.100, p < .05), entertainment (b= .327, t= 2.196, p < .05) and esthetic (b= .602, t= 4.528, p < .001) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while escapism was not significant. Therefore,
there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education, entertainment and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{ri} = 0.159 + 0.191X_1 + 0.327X_2 - 0.148X_3 + 0.602X_4 + e.$$  

**Table 11. Coefficients of Experience on Revisit Intention by Annual Pass Membership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you hold an annual pass when you visited the theme park?</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Constant)</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Constant)</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Members, F ratio: 51.859; R² = .729; Adjusted R² = .715; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
Non-members, F ratio: 80.410; R² = .446; Adjusted R² = .441; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

For non-annual pass holders, Table 11 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 80.410 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The R² was .446, and the adjusted R² was .441, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 44.1% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The three factors of education (b= .125, t= 3.242, $p < .05$), escapism (b= .095, t= 2.157, $p < .05$) and esthetic (b= .577, t= 6.895, $p < .001$) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while entertainment was not significant. Therefore, there was a
significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education, escapism and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{ri} = 0.210 + 0.125X_1 + 0.160X_2 + 0.095X_3 + 0.577X_4 + e.$$

According to the results above, it was noted that for annual pass holders, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of revisit intention, followed by entertainment and educational experience, and escapism experience was not a significant predictor of revisit intention. However, for non-annual pass holders, esthetic experience was the most important predictor of revisit intention, followed by educational and escapism experience, and entertainment experience was not a significant predictor of revisit intention. Thus, the results supported H5b that there will be differences in the impact of experience on revisit intention between annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders.

**Visiting groups.** Table 12 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 30.010 ($p < 0.000$), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .526, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .509, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 50.9% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. Only one factor, esthetic ($b=.545, t=3.226, p<.05$) was significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while education, entertainment and escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{ri} = 0.119 + 0.094X_1 + 0.195X_2 + 0.127X_3 + 0.545X_4 + e.$$
Table 12. Coefficients of Experience on Revisit Intention by Visiting Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficients of Experience</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My friend(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My family | | 1 (Constant) | .287 | .340 | .845 | .399 |
|           | Education                  | .158  | .044 | .171 | 3.624 | .000* |
|           | Entertainment              | .103  | .085 | .082 | 1.216 | .225 |
|           | Escapism                   | .082  | .047 | .084 | 1.762 | .079 |
|           | Esthetic                   | .618  | .086 | .493 | 7.165 | .000* |

Note: With friends, F ratio: 30.010; $R^2 = .526$; Adjusted $R^2 = .509$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
With family, F ratio: 67.912; $R^2 = .466$; Adjusted $R^2 = .459$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

For visitors with family, Table 12 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was $67.912 (p < 0.000)$, which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The $R^2$ was .466, and the adjusted $R^2$ was .459, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 45.9% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The two factors of education ($b = .158$, $t = 3.624$, $p < .001$) and esthetic ($b = .618$, $t = 7.165$, $p < .001$) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while entertainment and escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{ri} = 0.287 + 0.158X_1 + 0.103X_2 + 0.082X_3 + 0.618X_4 + e.$$
According to the results above, it was noted that for visitors with friends, esthetic experience was the only significant predictor of revisit intention. Educational, entertainment and escapism experience were not significant predictors of revisit intention. However, for visitors with family, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of revisit intention, followed by educational experience. Entertainment and escapism experience were not significant predictors of revisit intention. Thus, the results supported H5c that there will be differences in the impact of experience on revisit intention between visitors with friends and visitors with family.

**Residency.** Table 13 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 56.205 \( (p < 0.000) \), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The \( R^2 \) was .635, and the adjusted \( R^2 \) was .614, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for more than 60% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. Only one factor, esthetic \((b = .667, t = 5.781, p < .001)\) was significant in predicting the dependent variable at the 0.05 level while education, entertainment and escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

\[
Y_{ri} = 0.143 + 0.095X_1 + 0.129X_2 + 0.081X_3 + 0.667X_4 + e.
\]

For non-residents, Table 13 presents the regression results. The F-ratio was 65.234 \( (p < 0.000) \), which indicated that the regression analysis was statistically significant overall. The \( R^2 \) was .433, and the adjusted \( R^2 \) was .427, which suggested that the four predicting variables can account for 42.7% of variance in the dependent variable — revisit intention. The two factors of education \((b = .159, t = 3.608, p < .001)\) and esthetic \((b = .541, t = 5.856, p < .001)\) were significant in predicting revisit intention at the 0.05 level while entertainment and
escapism were not significant. Therefore, there was a significant linear relationship between revisit intention and education and esthetic. The regression model emerged as follows:

$$Y_{ri} = 0.207 + 0.159X_1 + 0.179X_2 + 0.083X_3 + 0.541X_4 + e.$$

Table 13. Coefficients of Experience on Revisit Intention by Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a resident of the state of the park you visited?</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escapism</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esthetic</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Residents, F ratio: 56.205; $R^2 = .635$; Adjusted $R^2 = .614$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05
Non-residents, F ratio: 65.234; $R^2 = .433$; Adjusted $R^2 = .427$; Sig. = .000* at 0.05

According to the results above, it was noted that for residents, esthetic experience was the only significant predictor of revisit intention. Educational, entertainment and escapism experience were not significant predictors of revisit intention. However, for non-residents, esthetic experience was the most significant predictor of revisit intention, followed by educational experience. Entertainment and escapism experience were not significant predictors of revisit intention. Thus, the results supported $H5d$ that there will be differences on the impact of experience on revisit intention between residents and non-residents.
Summary

The findings of the study were presented in this chapter. Survey results, profile of the participants and visitors’ profiles were offered at the beginning of the chapter to give background and context to the findings. The information provided in the profiles, including gender, age, annual income, education, marital status, residency, annual pass and visiting group, helps in understanding the status of the visitors participating in this study.

This study found significant impacts for each of the four dimensions of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention. In addition, this study revealed that differences of means on experience, satisfaction and revisit intention existed between female and male visitors; members and non-members; visitors with friends and visitors with family; residents and non-residents. Furthermore, significant group differences were found in the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention by different categories of gender, membership, residency, and visiting groups.
CHAPTER 5.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes the research and discussion based on the study findings. This chapter includes four parts: discussion of findings, conceptual framework, practical implications of the study, and limitations of the study and future research.

Discussion of Findings

This study was conducted to measure visitors’ experience, satisfaction and revisit intention in a theme park, as well as to ascertain how experience affects satisfaction and revisit intention. The impact of each dimension of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention was further tested via multiple regression analysis. Independent sample T-tests were performed to compare the means of experience, satisfaction and revisit intention among groups in regard to gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups and residency. Differences regarding the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention among different groups were also tested.

The regression analysis showed that experience had a significant impact on both satisfaction and revisit intention in the theme park setting. First, regarding the impact of experiences on satisfaction, educational, entertainment and esthetic dimensions were three significant predictors of satisfaction at theme parks. Furthermore, the coefficient value of esthetic experience was the highest, followed by entertainment and education. Previous studies support the findings that satisfaction is significantly influenced by esthetic (Oh et al., 2007; Hosany & Withman, 2010), entertainment (Hosany & Witham, 2010; Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011), and educational experience (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). However, this study found no significant impact of escapism on satisfaction in a theme park setting, which
is consistent with previous studies (Oh et al. 2007; Hosany & Witham, 2010). The findings indicate that within the theme park setting, education, entertainment, and esthetic factors were significant to influencing visitor satisfaction. This implies that when visitors learned new things, found activities fun and entertaining, and felt the setting to be attractive in a theme park, they were more satisfied with their experiences.

In addition, the findings revealed that all four dimensions of experience were significant to predict revisit intention to a theme park. Previous studies support these findings, particularly that esthetic and escapism experience are significant predictors of revisit intention (Quadri, 2012). In addition, previous study found that education, entertainment and escapism experiences had an indirect impact on revisit intention (Hwang & Lyu, 2015). This study found that education and entertainment are also important to influencing future revisit intention. The implications of this study are that when visitors feel activities make them more knowledgeable; find activities amusing and captivating; feel they have escaped from the daily life; and like the design in the theme park, they are more likely to revisit the theme park in the future.

Independent T-tests revealed that the evaluation of experience varied according to different groups. In terms of gender, the females had a higher evaluation of entertainment and esthetic experience, satisfaction and revisit intention than males. This result was consistent with a previous study that found that females have a higher level of overall satisfaction than males (Ekinci et al., 2003). In terms of annual pass membership, annual pass holders rated a higher level of educational and escapism experience, while non-annual pass holders tended to rate a higher level of entertainment experience. No difference existed in satisfaction and revisit intention between two groups. This result was consistent with a previous study that
found that customers with a membership and those without a membership don’t differ in their
level of satisfaction in a casino setting (Shi et al., 2014). In addition, visitors with family
showed a higher degree of educational, entertainment and esthetic experience, as well as
satisfaction and revisit intention than visitors with friends. This result indicates that
experience can differ depending on with whom people visit a place. This finding confirmed
the application of the theory of intimacy to the theme park setting (Trauer & Ryan, 2005).
Lastly, non-residents of the states where the theme parks were located reported a higher
degree of entertainment and esthetic experience, and overall satisfaction than residents. This
finding was consistent with the previous study showing that non-residents of a state where a
zoo was located were generally more satisfied with their visit to the zoo (Andereck &
Caldwell, 1994).

Lastly, this study investigated the differences among groups on impact of experience on
satisfaction and revisit intention. In terms of gender, the study found that esthetic,
educational and entertainment experience had a significant impact on satisfaction; esthetic
and educational experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for both groups. This
indicates that there was no difference in the relationships between genders.

For both annual pass holders and non-annual pass holders, esthetic, educational and
entertainment experiences were three significant predictors of satisfaction. However, for
annual pass holders, entertainment had the highest coefficient, whereas for non-annual pass
holders the esthetic factor had the highest coefficient. An explanation for this is that holding
an annual pass is an itself an indication of customer satisfaction, and pass holders are more
likely to pay extra for entertainment. (Bigné et al., 2005). Regarding revisit intention:
esthetic, entertainment and educational experiences were significant predictors for annual
pass holders; esthetic, educational and escapism experiences were significant predictors for non-annual pass holders. It is plausible that because annual pass holders are repeat visitors, they are more interested in entertainment activities in the theme park; because non-annual pass holders may be the first-time visitors, they may find escapism to be more important.

In terms of composition of visiting groups, no difference with regard to satisfaction was found between those who visited with family and those who visited with friends, but there were differences in revisit intention. Esthetic, entertainment and educational experience had a significant impact on satisfaction for both groups. Esthetic experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for visitors with friends, whereas esthetic and educational experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for visitors with family. This can be explained in that parents have an educational or “improvement” agenda for their children when visiting a theme park. They want to keep their children happy but at the same time receive some educational value (Johns & Gyimóthy, 2002).

In terms of residency, esthetic, entertainment and educational experience had a significant impact on satisfaction for both residents and non-residents of the state where the theme park was located. This finding contrasts with previous findings that non-residents tend to have higher overall satisfaction than residents (Andereck and Caldwell, 1994). However, esthetic experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for residents, whereas esthetic and educational experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for non-residents. This can be explained in that non-residents, who are new to the state where the theme park is located, are eager to learn more about their destination.
Conceptual Framework

While understanding consumer behavior is critical to the theme park industry, only a few studies have looked at the theme park business from a customer perspective. There is still a scarcity of theme park research. This study investigated visitors’ experience, satisfaction and revisit intention applying the 4Es, education, esthetics, entertainment, and escapism to a theme park setting. The findings of the study enhance our understanding of theme park visitors’ experiences, satisfaction, and revisit intention. Thus, this study contributes to expanding the literature in customer behavior in the theme park context by adding knowledge about theme park visitors’ behaviors.

In particular, this study recognizes experience as a key element in understanding consumer behavior in the theme park context. While numerous studies have recently paid attention to the concept of experience as a critical factor for an attractive, successful and competitive destination in the tourism context (i.e., cruise ship (Hosany & Witham, 2010), bed-and-breakfast (Oh et al., 2007), wine trail Quadri, 2012), no known research has investigated visitors’ experiences in the theme park setting. By employing the concept of 4Es (Pine & Gilmore, 1999), this study offered insights on visitors’ experiences in theme parks and further specified the concept in the four dimensions of education, escapism, esthetic, and entertainment. Therefore, this study makes an important contribution to filling a gap in the literature of the experience research in the theme park sector.

In addition, this study found that experience had positive impacts on visitors’ behaviors with regard to both satisfaction and revisit intention. This implies that when visitors have positive experiences at a theme park, they are satisfied with their visit and willing to revisit in the future. Furthermore, by applying the concept of the 4Es, this study identified specific
impacts of each dimension on satisfaction and revisit intention. Esthetic experience was found to be the most significant factor to predict visitors’ satisfaction and intention to revisit a theme park. Escapism had no significant effect on satisfaction, but it had a significant impact on revisit intention. Thus, this study provides a specific and concrete view of how experience relates to satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the theme park context.

Furthermore, this study examined group differences on visitors’ experience, satisfaction, revisit intention, and their relationships regarding gender, annual pass membership, visiting groups, and residency. The results of this study showed that esthetic, entertainment and educational experiences were three significant predictors of satisfaction for all of four study groups. The significant predictors of revisit intention varied among groups. Esthetic, entertainment and educational experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for annual pass holders, whereas esthetic, educational and escapism experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for non-annual pass holders. Esthetic experience had a significant impact on revisit intention for visitors with friends, whereas esthetic and educational experiences had a significant impact on revisit intention for visitors with family. For residents, the esthetic factor was the only significant predictor for revisit intention; for non-residents, esthetic and educational experiences were significant predictors for revisit intention. These findings apply the experience economy to predict satisfaction and revisit intention among different groups in tourism settings. In addition, few studies have measured experience among different groups in a tourism setting. Thus, this study makes a notable contribution to fill a gap in the literature, and draw researchers’ attention to the differences among groups in terms of the impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention.
Practical Implications

The theme park industry has become more and more competitive with an increasing number of business operators (Gronroos, 2000). Tsai & Chung (2012) claimed that reduced pricing or added attractions are no longer effective ways to attract visitors. This study suggests that understanding consumer behaviors can be contribute to operating a sustainable business. This study provides theme park operators with a measurement tool to evaluate visitors’ experiences with theme parks. The findings will help theme park operators better understand visitors’ experiences, satisfaction, and loyalty, which can be important components in developing effective marketing approaches to enhance customer satisfaction and revisit intention.

The study provides a measurement of experience from the four perspectives using Pine and Gilmore’s 4Es. It also provides operators with concrete suggestions on how to measure customers’ experiences according to different elements provided by a theme park. The four dimensions of experience can be used as a guide to design the theme parks’ physical settings, activities and entertainment, which helps to improve theme park offerings and enrich visitors’ experiences. In addition, the 4Es can be applied to promotional and marketing strategies. For example, the four dimensions of experience should be incorporated into theme park web sites, TV commercials and promotional campaigns, showing that a theme park is an attractive, fun, and educational getaway.

The findings regarding the significant impact of experience on satisfaction and loyalty suggest that theme park managers should focus on generating positive experiences, which will result in customer satisfaction and loyalty. Furthermore, the finding that esthetic
experience is the most important factor to predict satisfaction and revisit intention suggests that theme park managers should emphasize the physical setting of the theme park.

The results of this study showed that there were differences for variables that measured relationships among different groups. The study suggests that theme park operators should recognize group differences, develop marketing segmentation strategies, and provide different approaches to enhance experiences for specific groups. Therefore, the findings can provide the theme park industry with benefits that identify group differences and target a specific group for a more efficient promotion.

**Limitations and Future Study**

Some limitations of this study are as follows. First, this study chose past visitors to one of the two theme parks: Walt Disney World in Florida and Disneyland in California. Though Disney is one of the corporate leaders in the theme park industry, it cannot represent the whole theme park industry. Thus, one limitation of this study is the generalization of the Disney findings to other theme parks in the United States. Each theme park has its own culture and characteristics, which may provide visitors with different experiences. Therefore, future research is suggested to include a variety of theme parks to increase the generalizability of findings.

Furthermore, while this study found escapism was not an important factor on satisfaction, a previous study claimed that escapism is an important experience for children to visit a theme park, while esthetic is for parents (Gram, 2005). Parents would sacrifice their needs to fulfill their children’s experience and satisfaction. This may indicate that different types of experiences have different impacts on satisfaction and future intention, depending on the status of participants (e.g., parent, child, etc). As this study included adults over 18 years
old, this study provided limited information on experiences from the parents’ perspectives. Therefore, future studies will consider including children to better represent the sample of visitors to the theme parks.

Second, different groups were examined based on gender, annual pass membership, visiting group, and residency. Future research is suggested to further investigate group differences according to other demographic information such as age, education, annual income, and ethnicity. The findings will help business operators in understanding group differences and segmenting visitors into subgroups, which will provide a more effective marketing approach.

Third, this study included the three variables: experience, satisfaction, and revisit intention in understanding visitors’ behaviors in the theme park setting. Future research is recommended to include other variables such as emotions (Song et al., 2015), memory (Manthiou et al., 2016), place attachment (Loureiro, 2014), and motivation (Huang & Hsu, 2009), which are also significant in understanding consumer behaviors.

Lastly, this study investigated the direct impact of experience on satisfaction and revisit intention separately. However, previous studies suggested that satisfaction is a significant mediator between experiences and revisit intention (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Therefore, future research is suggested to further investigate the sequential relationships (experiences-satisfaction-revisit intention) through structural equation modeling.
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Survey Invitation

I invite you to a survey about your experience, satisfaction, attachment, and revisit intention in the theme parks. Your responses to this survey will help me evaluate the importance of experience in the theme park.

In order to participate in the survey, you must
1) be at least 18 years old.
2) have visited the Disneyland in California or Walt Disney World in Orlando within the past 12 months.

The survey is very brief and will only take about 10-15 minutes to complete. Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses to any reports.

Once your response is validated to complete the survey, a research incentive will be provided.
Should you have any comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at kangliqu@iastate.edu.
Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,
Kangli Qu
Survey

1. The most recent theme park that I have visited is __________.
   1. Walt Disney World in Florida
   2. Disneyland in California

2. Are you a Florida resident?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.

3. Are you a California resident?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.

4. Did you hold an annual pass when you visit the theme park?
   1. Yes.
   2. No.

5. I visited the theme park with __________
   1. No one
   2. My friend(s)
   3. My family
   4. My friend and family together
   5. Others

Following is a list of statements regarding your experiences at the theme park. Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement on each statement.
(1=Strongly disagree; 7 =Strongly agree).

**Theme park Experience**

1. The experience in the theme park has made me more knowledgeable (eg. Knowledge about animal habits during the safari in Animal Kingdom)  
2. I learned a lot (eg. I learned different culture from different pavilions in EPCOT)  
3. It stimulated my curiosity to learn new things  
4. It was a real learning experience  
5. The activities in the theme park were amusing  
6. Watching others perform was captivating  
7. Activities in the theme park were entertaining  
8. Activities in the theme park were fun  
9. I felt I played a different character here  
10. I felt like I was living in a different time or place  
11. The experience here let me imagine being someone else  
12. I completely escaped from my daily routine  
13. I felt a real sense of harmony  
14. It was pleasant just being here  
15. The setting of the theme park was very attractive
16. The setting of the theme park pays close attention to design details

Following is a list of statements regarding your overall satisfaction with the theme park. Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement on each statement. (1=Strongly disagree; 7 =Strongly agree).

**Theme park Satisfaction**

1. I am happy with my whole experiences at the theme park
2. My theme park experience is better than I expected
3. I am pleased with my experience at the theme park
4. The theme park offers good value for money
5. I think that I made a right decision to visit the theme park
6. My overall experience with the theme park is positive
7. The theme park is a good place to visit for my trip
8. Overall, I am very satisfied with my experiences at the theme park

Following is a list of statements regarding your loyalty to the theme park. Please indicate the degree of agreement or disagreement on each statement. (1=Strongly disagree; 7 =Strongly agree).

**Theme park Loyalty**

1. Disney will be my first choice in the future
2. I will visit Disney again
3. I would revisit Disney in the near future
4. I intend to revisit Disney if I would come to the destination again

**Demographic**

1. I am ____________.
   - Female
   - Male

2. My highest attained degree is ____________.
   - 1) Less than high school
   - 2) High School
   - 3) Technical school
   - 4) Some college
   - 5) 4-year college degree
   - 6) Graduate school

3. My annual household income range below.
   - 1) Below $20,000
   - 2) $20,000 - $39,999
   - 3) $40,000 - $59,999
   - 4) $60,000 - $79,999
5) $80,000 - $99,999
6) $100,000 - $149,999
7) $150,000 - $199,999
8) Over $200,000
9) Not willing to answer

4. My current status is _______________.
   1) Single, never married
   2) Married without children
   3) Married with children
   4) Divorced
   5) Separated
   6) Widowed
   7) Living w/ Partner

5. I was born in _________________ (Drop Down Answer).
   2015
   2014
   2013
   1954
   …
   1953
   1952
   1951
   1950 or before

6. Zipcode __________.