

The Role of Tourism Development in Tourist Satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground, Malang Regency, Indonesia

Sunarti and Jason Lambert Samallo

Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.910000522>

Received: 18 July 2025; Accepted: 24 July 2025; Published: 18 November 2025

ABSTRACT

For tourism to grow in a way that is good for the environment, it is important to understand what makes tourists happy, especially in emerging adventure tourism destinations like camping grounds. This study examines how attractions, accessibility, and amenities affect tourist satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground in Malang Regency, East Java, Indonesia, using the established 3A tourism development framework. We employed a quantitative explanatory research methodology with 119 tourists selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using validated questionnaires with established reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.7$ for all constructs) and analyzed using descriptive statistics, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, and F-tests. Results revealed that attractions had a significant positive effect on tourist satisfaction ($\beta = 0.855$, $p < 0.001$), as did amenities ($\beta = 0.426$, $p = 0.002$). However, accessibility did not significantly influence tourist satisfaction ($\beta = 0.102$, $p = 0.281$), which contradicts conventional tourism theory but aligns with adventure tourism literature where moderate access challenges may enhance rather than diminish the experience. The combined effect of all three variables was significant ($F = 64.547$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 62.5% of the variance in tourist satisfaction.

This study contributes to tourism literature by demonstrating context-dependent relationships within the 3A framework, particularly in adventure tourism settings where traditional accessibility assumptions may not apply. The findings suggest that destination managers should prioritize natural attraction preservation and amenity development while recognizing that accessibility improvements may serve market expansion rather than satisfaction enhancement purposes.

Keywords: camping ground, tourist satisfaction, attractions, accessibility, amenities, nature-based tourism, adventure tourism

INTRODUCTION

Tourism represents a complex phenomenon encompassing recreational, educational, and cultural activities that significantly contribute to global economic development (UNWTO, 2019). As an archipelagic nation with diverse natural attractions, Indonesia has positioned tourism as a strategic sector for economic growth, attracting both domestic and international visitors (Susanto & Jiap, 2016). Tourism development must consistently prioritize tourist satisfaction, as it directly influences destination competitiveness, visitor loyalty, and long-term economic sustainability (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

According to Indonesia's Central Statistics Agency (2024), the country recorded 734,864,693 domestic tourists and 5,889,031 international tourists in 2022, demonstrating substantial industry potential. Malang Regency, situated in East Java's highlands, has emerged as a prominent nature-based tourism destination offering diverse attractions that appeal to various tourist segments.

The "3A" framework—Attractions, Accessibility, and Amenities—provides the theoretical foundation for tourism development analysis. These three components collectively determine destination competitiveness (Cooper et al., 2016). Attractions serve as primary pull factors motivating tourist visits (Holloway et al., 2009), accessibility encompasses transportation infrastructure and ease of access (Page, 2019), while amenities represent facilities and services that enhance visitor experiences (Buhalis, 2000).

Bedengan Camping Ground, located in Selorejo Village, Dau District, and managed by Perum Perhutani, exemplifies emerging nature-based tourism products targeting the growing adventure tourism market. Understanding satisfaction determinants at such destinations is crucial for sustainable development and visitor retention.

Previous research has demonstrated inconsistent relationships between tourism development factors and satisfaction. While Wijayanti et al. (2023) found positive amenity effects on satisfaction, Surya and Ningsih (2020) reported non-significant relationships. Accessibility impacts have also varied across studies (Biswas et al., 2020; Hayati & Novitasari, 2017), suggesting context-dependent relationships requiring further investigation.

This study addresses existing gaps by examining camping site tourism, where factor importance may differ from conventional tourist destinations. The research contributes to tourism literature by providing empirical evidence from an emerging market segment and practical insights for destination management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

Tourist Satisfaction Theory

Tourist satisfaction represents a post-consumption evaluation resulting from comparing expected and perceived performance (Oliver, 2010). In tourism contexts, satisfaction encompasses cognitive and affective responses to destination experiences, influencing future behavioral intentions including revisit likelihood and recommendation propensity (Chen & Chen, 2010).

The expectation-disconfirmation paradigm forms the foundation of tourist satisfaction theory, having dominated consumer satisfaction research for over five decades. According to this paradigm, satisfaction/dissatisfaction (CS/D) results from the gap between tourist expectations and actual experience outcomes (disconfirmation) (Pizam & Milman, 1993). This cognitive-affective framework conceptualizes satisfaction as the psychological state resulting from tourism experiences, with disconfirmation serving as the primary determinant and expectations providing the evaluation standard (Bigné et al., 2008).

Confirmation occurs when experiences match expectations, positive disconfirmation results in satisfaction when outcomes exceed expectations, while negative disconfirmation leads to dissatisfaction when outcomes fall short of expectations. Recent research has expanded beyond cognitive factors to incorporate emotional dimensions, recognizing that both cognitive and affective evaluations influence satisfaction levels (Bagheri et al., 2024).

Contemporary studies demonstrate that tourist well-being represents a multidimensional construct essential for achieving satisfaction and loyalty, with well-being emerging from tourist experiences and influencing satisfaction and future behavior (Seow et al., 2024). Modern applications combine expectation-disconfirmation theory with consumption value theory to examine how various perceived value types—social, emotional, functional, and financial—influence tourist satisfaction and revisit intentions.

Meta-analytical evidence confirms that higher expectations generally lead to increased satisfaction, though the relative contributions of expectations, disconfirmation, and emotional responses to overall tourist satisfaction remain subjects of ongoing academic debate (Szymanski & Henard, 2024).

The 3A Tourism Development Model

The 3A model provides a comprehensive framework for understanding destination competitiveness through three core components:

Attractions constitute primary pull factors motivating tourist travel decisions (Gunn & Var, 2002). These include natural features, cultural heritage, entertainment facilities, or unique experiences that differentiate destinations

from competitors. In adventure tourism contexts, natural attractions gain particular significance through their ability to provide authentic, immersive experiences (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2021).

Accessibility encompasses the ease and convenience of reaching and moving within destinations (Khadaroo & Seetanah, 2008). This includes transportation infrastructure, connectivity, travel time, and associated costs influencing destination choice. However, in adventure tourism, moderate accessibility challenges may paradoxically enhance rather than diminish satisfaction by contributing to exclusivity and adventure appeal (Hayati & Novitasari, 2017).

Amenities represent supporting infrastructure and services facilitating tourist experiences (Murphy et al., 2000). These encompass accommodation, food services, information centers, and recreational facilities enhancing comfort and convenience. In camping contexts, amenities such as sanitation facilities, safety equipment, and food services become particularly crucial for positive experiences.

Empirical Studies and Hypothesis Development

Attractions and Tourist Satisfaction

Recent empirical evidence consistently supports positive relationships between attraction quality and tourist satisfaction across various tourism contexts. Zhang et al. (2023) found that natural attraction authenticity significantly influenced satisfaction in eco-tourism settings, while Martínez-García et al. (2022) confirmed similar relationships in cultural tourism contexts. In adventure tourism specifically, Liu and Wang (2023) demonstrated that natural attraction uniqueness and accessibility contributed significantly to overall experience satisfaction.

The mechanism through which attractions influence satisfaction operates through expectation confirmation and emotional engagement. High-quality attractions that meet or exceed visitor expectations create positive disconfirmation, leading to enhanced satisfaction levels (Pearce, 2011). Natural attractions particularly contribute to satisfaction through their uniqueness, beauty, and experiential value in adventure tourism contexts (Shaykh-Baygloo, 2021).

H1: Attractions have a significant positive effect on tourist satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground.

Accessibility and Tourist Satisfaction

Recent international research presents nuanced findings regarding accessibility-satisfaction relationships. Kumar et al. (2023) found positive accessibility effects on satisfaction in urban tourism contexts, while Chen and Lee (2022) reported non-significant relationships in rural adventure tourism settings. Thompson et al. (2023) suggested that accessibility perceptions vary by tourist motivation, with adventure seekers potentially viewing moderate access challenges positively.

The contextual nature of accessibility effects appears particularly pronounced in adventure tourism, where some degree of access difficulty may enhance rather than diminish satisfaction by contributing to exclusivity, challenge, and authentic experience perceptions (Davidson & Roberts, 2022). This contrasts with conventional tourism where easy accessibility typically correlates with higher satisfaction.

H2: Accessibility has a significant positive effect on tourist satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground.

Amenities and Tourist Satisfaction

Contemporary research strongly supports positive relationships between amenity quality and satisfaction across tourism contexts. Anderson et al. (2023) found significant amenity effects on satisfaction in outdoor recreation settings, while García-López et al. (2022) confirmed similar relationships in camping tourism. Specifically in Indonesian contexts, Pradana and Sari (2023) demonstrated that amenity quality significantly influenced satisfaction in nature-based tourism destinations.

The importance of amenities in camping tourism extends beyond basic comfort provision to encompass safety, convenience, and experience enhancement. Modern camping tourists expect facilities that support their outdoor experience while maintaining connection with nature (Wilson & Taylor, 2023).

H3: Amenities have a significant positive effect on tourist satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground.

Combined Effects

The synergistic effects of attractions, accessibility, and amenities collectively contribute to destination appeal and tourist satisfaction (Cooper et al., 2016). Recent studies suggest that optimal satisfaction results from balanced development across all components, though relative importance may vary by tourism context (Johnson et al., 2023).

H4: Attractions, accessibility, and amenities collectively have a significant positive effect on tourist satisfaction at Bedengan Camping Ground.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design to investigate relationships between independent variables (attractions, accessibility, amenities) and the dependent variable (tourist satisfaction). This approach enables statistical hypothesis testing and generalization of findings to similar contexts.

Population and Sample

The target population comprised tourists visiting Bedengan Camping Ground during the data collection period. Inclusion criteria required participants to be at least 17 years old and have completed their camping experience. Following Hair et al.'s (2019) guidelines for multivariate analysis, a minimum sample of 120 respondents was targeted, maintaining a 20:1 observation-to-variable ratio.

Purposive sampling was employed to ensure respondents met criteria and could provide informed responses about their experiences. This non-probability sampling method was selected due to the specialized nature of camping tourism requiring experience-based responses. The final sample comprised 119 valid responses.

Data Collection

Primary data were collected using structured questionnaires administered directly at the research site over a four-week period in July-August 2024. The instrument comprised five sections: demographic information, attractions evaluation, accessibility assessment, amenities evaluation, and satisfaction measurement. All constructs utilized 5-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Measurement Instruments

Survey instruments were adapted from established scales in tourism literature, modified for camping tourism contexts. Content validity was ensured through expert evaluation by three tourism academics, while construct validity and reliability were confirmed through pilot testing with 30 respondents prior to main data collection.

Attractions Scale

The attractions construct was measured using eight items adapted from Oviedo-García et al. (2019) and Shaykh-Baygloo (2021):

1. "The natural scenery at Bedengan Camping Ground is beautiful"
2. "The camping ground offers unique natural experiences"

3. "The natural environment at Bedengan remains authentic"
4. "The camping ground provides diverse outdoor activities"
5. "The location offers excellent photo opportunities"
6. "The natural attractions meet my expectations"
7. "The camping ground's natural features are well-preserved"
8. "The attractions provide value for money"

Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.847$

Accessibility Scale

The accessibility construct utilized six items modified from Biswas et al. (2020) and Khadaroo & Seetanah (2008):

1. "The camping ground is easy to reach by vehicle"
2. "Road conditions to the site are satisfactory"
3. "Clear directional signage is available"
4. "Transportation costs are reasonable"
5. "Parking facilities are adequate"
6. "The location is accessible for various visitor types"

Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.763$

Amenities Scale

The amenities construct employed seven items adapted from Wijayanti et al. (2023) and Buhalis (2000):

1. "Sanitation facilities are clean and adequate"
2. "Food service quality meets expectations"
3. "Safety equipment and measures are sufficient"
4. "Information services are helpful"
5. "Camping equipment rental is available when needed"
6. "Recreational facilities enhance the experience"
7. "Overall amenity quality supports comfortable camping"

Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.821$

Tourist Satisfaction Scale

Tourist satisfaction was measured using six items adapted from Chen & Chen (2010) and Oliver (2010):

1. "My overall experience at Bedengan exceeded expectations"

2. "I am satisfied with my decision to visit this camping ground"
3. "The camping experience met my needs"
4. "I would recommend this destination to others"
5. "This camping ground provides good value for money"
6. "Overall, I am satisfied with my visit"

Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.889$

Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures included:

1. Descriptive statistics for respondent profiling and variable distributions
2. Classical assumption testing including normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), multicollinearity (VIF), heteroscedasticity (Glejser test), and linearity assessment
3. Multiple linear regression analysis
4. Individual hypothesis testing using t-tests
5. Overall model testing using F-tests
6. Coefficient of determination (R^2) evaluation

SPSS version 26.0 was utilized for statistical analysis with significance criteria set at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Research Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design limits causal inference capabilities, while the single-site focus restricts generalizability to other contexts. Purposive sampling may introduce selection bias, and self-reported measures could result in response bias. The study period (July-August) may not capture seasonal variations in satisfaction determinants.

RESULTS

Respondent Profile

The sample comprised 119 respondents with diverse demographic characteristics. Age distribution showed 34.5% aged 17-25, 41.2% aged 26-35, 18.5% aged 36-45, and 5.8% over 45. Gender distribution was relatively balanced (52.1% male, 47.9% female). Education levels included 45.4% university graduates, 31.9% high school graduates, and 22.7% with postgraduate education. Visit frequency showed 67.2% first-time visitors and 32.8% repeat visitors.

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics revealed positive perceptions across measured dimensions (Table 1). Attractions received the highest mean score ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.67$), indicating very positive perceptions of the camping ground's natural features and appeal. Tourist satisfaction also achieved a high score ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.62$), suggesting predominantly positive experiences.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| Variable | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
|----------------------|------|----------------|----------------|
| Attractions | 4.23 | 0.67 | Very Good |
| Accessibility | 3.57 | 0.84 | Good |
| Amenities | 3.73 | 0.79 | Good |
| Tourist Satisfaction | 4.21 | 0.62 | Very Good |

Accessibility received the lowest score ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.84$), indicating moderate satisfaction with transportation and access infrastructure. Specific items revealed concerns about road surface quality ($M = 3.24$) and signage clarity ($M = 3.41$). Amenities achieved a moderate score ($M = 3.73$), with restaurant quality ($M = 3.68$) and recreational facilities ($M = 3.71$) identified as areas for improvement.

Classical Assumption Testing

All classical assumptions were satisfied. Normality tests confirmed normal distribution for all variables ($p > 0.05$). Multicollinearity assessment revealed acceptable VIF values (all < 5.0), indicating no problematic correlations between independent variables. Heteroscedasticity testing confirmed homoscedastic residuals ($p > 0.05$), while linearity assessment supported linear relationships between variables.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The regression model demonstrated good fit and satisfied all classical assumptions. The final equation was:

$$\text{Tourist Satisfaction} = 4.590 + 0.855(\text{Attractions}) + 0.102(\text{Accessibility}) + 0.426(\text{Amenities})$$

Table 2: Regression Coefficients

| Variable | B | Std. Error | t | Sig. | Interpretation |
|--------------------|-------|------------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Constant | 4.590 | 1.521 | 3.018 | 0.003 | Significant |
| Attractions (X1) | 0.855 | 0.106 | 8.071 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Accessibility (X2) | 0.102 | 0.094 | 1.084 | 0.281 | Non-significant |
| Amenities (X3) | 0.426 | 0.132 | 3.241 | 0.002 | Significant |

Model Summary: $R^2 = 0.625$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.615$, $F = 64.547$, Sig. = 0.000

Hypothesis Testing Results

H1: Attractions → Tourist Satisfaction The analysis revealed a significant positive relationship ($\beta = 0.855$, $t = 8.071$, $p < 0.001$), strongly supporting H1. This indicates that for every one-unit increase in attraction quality, tourist satisfaction increases by 0.855 units, representing the strongest influence among all variables.

H2: Accessibility → Tourist Satisfaction Accessibility did not significantly affect satisfaction ($\beta = 0.102$, $t = 1.084$, $p = 0.281$), therefore H2 was not supported. This suggests that accessibility improvements do not significantly impact satisfaction in this context.

H3: Amenities → Tourist Satisfaction A significant positive relationship was found ($\beta = 0.426$, $t = 3.241$, $p = 0.002$), supporting H3. Amenity improvements enhance satisfaction, though with less impact than attractions.

H4: Combined Effects The overall model was highly significant ($F = 64.547$, $p < 0.001$), supporting H4. The three factors collectively explained 62.5% of variance in tourist satisfaction, indicating substantial explanatory power.

DISCUSSION

Attractions as Primary Satisfaction Driver

The strong positive relationship between attractions and satisfaction ($\beta = 0.855$) reinforces theoretical propositions that attractions serve as primary destination visit motivators. This finding aligns with recent studies (Zhang et al., 2023; Liu & Wang, 2023) emphasizing natural feature importance in adventure tourism contexts.

The high attractions mean score ($M = 4.23$) indicates that Bedengan Camping Ground's natural setting effectively meets visitor expectations. However, the item "the nature at Bedengan Camping Ground remains natural" received the lowest score ($M = 3.11$), potentially indicating visitor concerns about environmental authenticity that management should address through enhanced conservation efforts.

This finding contributes to tourism literature by confirming attraction primacy in emerging adventure tourism contexts, supporting expectation-disconfirmation theory applications in natural settings. The practical implication suggests that destination managers should prioritize natural resource preservation and authentic experience provision as primary satisfaction strategies.

Non-significant Accessibility Effects: A Contextual Interpretation

The non-significant relationship between accessibility and satisfaction ($p = 0.281$) contradicts conventional tourism theory but aligns with adventure tourism literature suggesting that moderate access challenges may enhance rather than diminish satisfaction (Hayati & Novitasari, 2017; Davidson & Roberts, 2022). This finding provides empirical support for context-dependent relationships within the 3A framework.

Several factors may explain this unexpected result:

Geographic Context: Bedengan's highland location inherently involves access challenges that visitors may anticipate and accept as part of the adventure experience. The moderate accessibility score ($M = 3.57$) suggests adequate but not exceptional access conditions that do not significantly detract from satisfaction.

Tourist Motivation: Camping tourists likely seek authentic outdoor experiences, potentially viewing moderate access difficulties as contributing to adventure appeal and destination exclusivity rather than as impediments.

Expectation Alignment: Visitors may expect some access challenges when choosing camping destinations, leading to expectation confirmation rather than negative disconfirmation.

This finding significantly contributes to tourism theory by demonstrating that traditional accessibility assumptions may not apply universally across tourism contexts. In adventure tourism settings, moderate accessibility challenges might actually enhance satisfaction through increased adventure perception and exclusivity feelings.

Amenities as Supporting Satisfaction Factor

The significant positive relationship between amenities and satisfaction ($\beta = 0.426$) confirms their important role in overall tourism experiences, though secondary to attractions. This finding supports recent research (Anderson et al., 2023; García-López et al., 2022) emphasizing amenity importance in outdoor tourism contexts.

The moderate amenities score ($M = 3.73$) and specific concerns about restaurant quality ($M = 3.68$) indicate improvement opportunities. Enhanced dining services and supportive facilities could increase satisfaction levels while maintaining the destination's natural character.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to tourism theory in several ways:

1. Context-dependent 3A relationships: Demonstrates that factor importance varies across tourism contexts, with accessibility effects differing between conventional and adventure tourism.
2. Adventure tourism specificity: Provides empirical evidence for unique satisfaction determinants in adventure tourism, where traditional accessibility assumptions may not apply.
3. Expectation-disconfirmation theory application: Confirms theory applicability in camping tourism contexts while highlighting context-specific variations.

Practical Implications

For Destination Managers:

1. Prioritize natural environment preservation and attraction authenticity as primary satisfaction strategies
2. Develop comprehensive amenity packages including enhanced dining services and supporting facilities
3. Consider accessibility as market expansion tool rather than satisfaction enhancement mechanism
4. Implement integrated management approaches recognizing differential 3A effects

For Policy Makers:

1. Support sustainable tourism development policies emphasizing environmental preservation
2. Facilitate infrastructure development balancing accessibility with adventure tourism appeal
3. Establish appropriate incentives for private sector amenity development investment

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This study provides empirical evidence demonstrating differential tourism development factor effects on satisfaction in adventure tourism contexts. Key findings include:

1. Attractions primacy: Natural features serve as the primary satisfaction determinant, emphasizing the importance of environmental quality and authenticity preservation.
2. Context-dependent accessibility effects: Accessibility lacks significant satisfaction impact, suggesting that moderate access challenges may be viewed positively in adventure tourism contexts.
3. Amenities importance: Supporting facilities significantly contribute to satisfaction, though secondary to attractions.
4. Integrated 3A framework validity: The combined framework explains substantial satisfaction variance while highlighting component-specific differences.

These findings contribute to tourism literature by demonstrating context-dependent relationships within established theoretical frameworks and provide practical insights for adventure tourism destination management.

Recommendations

For Destination Managers

1. **Attraction Enhancement:** Prioritize natural environment preservation and authenticity maintenance as primary satisfaction strategies. Implement comprehensive conservation programs addressing visitor concerns about environmental authenticity.
2. **Amenity Development:** Create comprehensive amenity packages emphasizing enhanced dining services and supporting facilities while maintaining natural character.
3. **Strategic Accessibility Approach:** Treat accessibility as market expansion tool rather than satisfaction enhancement mechanism. Maintain moderate access challenges that contribute to adventure appeal while ensuring safety.
4. **Integrated Management:** Implement holistic approaches recognizing differential 3A effects and their interactions.

For Policy Makers

1. **Sustainable Development Support:** Develop policies supporting sustainable tourism growth with strong environmental preservation emphasis.
2. **Infrastructure Balance:** Facilitate infrastructure development balancing accessibility with adventure tourism appeal maintenance.
3. **Investment Incentives:** Establish appropriate mechanisms encouraging private sector amenity development investment.

Future Research Directions

Future research should address current limitations through:

1. **Longitudinal Designs:** Employ temporal studies establishing causal relationships and seasonal variation effects.
2. **Multi-site Comparisons:** Examine multiple adventure tourism destinations for broader generalizability.
3. **Visitor Characteristic Investigation:** Explore how tourist demographics and motivations moderate satisfaction relationships.
4. **Additional Factor Analysis:** Investigate roles of service quality, destination image, and social factors in satisfaction determination.
5. **Sustainability Impact Assessment:** Examine long-term environmental and social impacts of different development strategies.
6. **Mediation and Moderation Analysis:** Conduct advanced statistical analyses exploring complex variable relationships and conditional effects.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, K., Smith, J., & Brown, M. (2023). Amenity quality and satisfaction in outdoor recreation: A comprehensive analysis. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 41, 45-58.
2. Bagheri, F., Guerreiro, M., Pinto, P., & Ghaderi, Z. (2024). From tourist experience to satisfaction and loyalty: Exploring the role of well-being. *Tourism Management*, 95, 104709.

3. Bigné, J. E., Andreu, L., & Gnoth, J. (2008). Tourist satisfaction: A cognitive-affective model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 551-573.
4. Biswas, C., Omar, H., & Rashid-Radha, J. Z. R. R. (2020). The impact of tourist attractions and accessibility on tourists' satisfaction: The moderating role of tourists' age. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 32(4), 1202-1208.
5. Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 97-116.
6. Central Statistics Agency of Indonesia. (2024). Number of domestic tourist trips by province of origin. <https://www.bps.go.id>
7. Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29-35.
8. Chen, L., & Lee, S. (2022). Accessibility perceptions in rural adventure tourism: A mixed-methods approach. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 44, 100982.
9. Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Fyall, A., Gilbert, D., & Wanhill, S. (2016). *Tourism: Principles and practice* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
10. Davidson, R., & Roberts, K. (2022). Challenge and satisfaction in adventure tourism: Redefining accessibility expectations. *Journal of Adventure Tourism*, 18(3), 234-248.
11. García-López, M., Fernández, A., & Martín, C. (2022). Camping tourism satisfaction: The role of amenities and service quality. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 102, 103178.
12. Gunn, C. A., & Var, T. (2002). *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, cases* (4th ed.). Routledge.
13. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
14. Hayati, N., & Novitasari, D. (2017). An analysis of tourism service quality toward customer satisfaction: Study on tourists in Indonesia travel destinations to Bali. *International Journal of Marketing and Human Resource Management*, 8(2), 232-245.
15. Holloway, J. C., Humphreys, C., & Davidson, R. (2009). *The business of tourism* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
16. Johnson, P., Williams, T., & Davis, R. (2023). Integrated destination management: Balancing the 3A framework components. *Tourism Management*, 98, 104756.
17. Khadaroo, J., & Seetanah, B. (2008). The role of transport infrastructure in international tourism development: A gravity model approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 831-840.
18. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
19. Kumar, S., Patel, A., & Singh, M. (2023). Urban tourism accessibility and satisfaction: Evidence from Indian metropolitan cities. *Cities*, 134, 104187.
20. Liu, X., & Wang, Y. (2023). Natural attraction authenticity and tourist satisfaction in adventure tourism contexts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 62(4), 892-908.
21. Martínez-García, E., Ramos-Soler, I., & Campillo-Alhama, C. (2022). Cultural tourism satisfaction: The moderating role of attraction authenticity. *Tourism Management*, 90, 104485.
22. Murphy, P., Pritchard, M. P., & Smith, B. (2000). The destination product and its impact on traveller perceptions. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 43-52.
23. Oliver, R. L. (2010). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer* (2nd ed.). M.E. Sharpe.
24. Oviedo-García, M. Á., Vega-Vázquez, M., Castellanos-Verdugo, M., & Orgaz-Agüera, F. (2019). Tourism in protected areas and the impact of servicescape on tourist satisfaction, key in sustainability. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 12, 74-83.
25. Page, S. J. (2019). *Tourism management* (6th ed.). Routledge.
26. Pearce, P. L. (2011). *Tourist behaviour and the contemporary world*. Channel View Publications.
27. Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Predicting satisfaction among first time visitors to a destination by using the expectancy disconfirmation theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 12(2), 197-209.
28. Pradana, G. Y., & Sari, D. P. (2023). Amenity quality and tourist satisfaction in Indonesian nature-based destinations. *Indonesian Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 87-102.
29. Seow, A. N., Foroughi, B., & Choong, Y. O. (2024). Tourists' satisfaction, experience, and revisit intention for wellness tourism: E word-of-mouth as the mediator. *SAGE Open*, 14(3), 21582440241274049.

30. Shaykh-Baygloo, R. (2021). Foreign tourists' experience: The tri-partite relationships among sense of place toward destination city, tourism attractions and tourists' overall satisfaction—Evidence from Shiraz, Iran. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 19, 100518.
31. Susanto, I., & Jiap, T. F. (2016). Tourism development planning in the region: A study of program implementation at the Youth Sports and Tourism Office of Pekalongan Regency. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik*, 2(3), 185-194.
32. Szymanski, D. M., & Henard, D. H. (2024). Expectancy-disconfirmation and consumer satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52(4), 891-918.
33. Thompson, A., Clark, B., & Wilson, D. (2023). Tourist motivation and accessibility perceptions: A segmentation approach. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 47, 101124.
34. United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2019). *International tourism highlights 2019 edition*. UNWTO.
35. Wijayanti, R., Pratiwi, I. K., & Pratowo, E. (2023). The influence of accessibility, amenities, attractions, and promotion factors on tourist satisfaction: A case study at Tanjungsari Agrotourism, Wonosobo Regency. *Jamasy: Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen & Perbankan Syariah*, 3(1), 45-58.
36. Wilson, S., & Taylor, M. (2023). Modern camping expectations: Balancing amenities with nature connection. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 43, 67-79.
37. Zhang, H., Liu, J., & Chen, W. (2023). Natural attraction authenticity and eco-tourism satisfaction: A Chinese perspective. *Tourism Management*, 96, 104712.