DVARAVATI HERITAGE TOURISM: EXAMINING THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN DESTINATION IMAGE, MEMORABLE TOURISM EXPERIENCES, AND TOURIST REVISIT INTENTIONS

Nipon CHUAMUANGPHAN[®]

University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce, School of Tourism and Services, Bangkok, Thailand, e-mail: niponphan@yahoo.com

Siriporn KHETJENKARN^{*}

Burapha University, International College, Chon Buri, Thailand, e-mail: siriporn.kh@go.buu.ac.th

Jittrapon SOONTORN®

Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand, e-mail: jittrapon@webmail.npru.ac.th

Piyanart IMDEE

Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand, e-mail: piyanart1996@gmail.com

Danaikrit INTHURIT

Maejo University, International College, Chiang Mai, Thailand, e-mail: danaikrit_in@mju.ac.th

Chee Keng LEE

National University of Singapore, NUS College, Singapore, e-mail: ckenglee@nus.edu.sg

Citation: Chuamuangphan, N., Khetjenkarn, S., Soontorn, J., Imdee, P., Inthurit, D., & Lee, C.K. (2025). Dvaravati heritage tourism: Examining the interplay between destination image, memorable tourism experiences, and tourist revisit intentions. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 59(2), 674–683. <u>https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.59214-1446</u>

Abstract: The growing role of tourism in economic development has significantly influenced global land use, creating complex challenges in balancing urban growth, resource utilization, and environmental conservation. Destinations now face increasing pressure to preserve natural landscapes and cultural heritage while accommodating a rising number of tourists. A destination's long-term success depends on visitor satisfaction and their intention to return. In the context of Dvaravati cultural tourism, existing research has mainly emphasized general development, with limited focus on how contemporary visitors interact with heritage sites-revealing a gap in understanding tourist engagement with these ancient locales. Understanding how visitors emotionally and experientially connect with heritage sites is essential for developing sustainable cultural tourism strategies. This study aims to address these gaps by examining the relationship between the destination image of Dvaravati cultural heritage sites, memorable tourism experiences, and revisit intention. It investigates how key elements-such as the characteristics of Dvaravati heritage and seasonal cultural activities-shape visitor perceptions and influence behavioral intentions. Data were collected from 303 participants and analyzed using structural equation modeling. The study confirms the structural validity of destination image and memorable tourism experience constructs. Destination image is composed of natural attractions, cultural attractions, and tourism facilities, while memorable experiences are defined by factors such as novelty, happiness, and involvement. Results reveal a strong positive effect of destination image on memorable tourism experiences, emphasizing the importance of integrating cultural, historical, and environmental elements to enhance visitor satisfaction and support place-based cultural revival efforts. The study contributes to experiential tourism theory by demonstrating that destination image indirectly influences revisit intention through memorable tourism experiences. These experiences, rooted in cultural engagement and emotional connection, are key drivers of tourist behavior. For practitioners, the findings underscore the importance of prioritizing immersive, culturally rich experiences over promotional strategies. By incorporating community-based activities, educational components, and meaningful tourist-local interactions, destinations can significantly enhance visitor satisfaction and foster repeat visitation.

Keywords: Dvaravati, cultural heritage, destination image, memorable tourist experience, revisit intention

* * * * * *

INTRODUCTION

Tourism's growing role in economic development (Chau, 2024) has shifted global land use patterns, affecting the balance between environmental conservation, resource production (Arif et al., 2023), and human settlement (Turdimambetov et al., 2024). This presents intricate challenges of balancing the competing interests of safeguarding natural environments, preserving historic landmarks, and accommodating an increasing number of tourists confronting nations (Chong & Balasingam, 2019; Wang et al., 2024). Tourists' satisfaction and revisit intention are essential components for the success of any destination (Nguyen Huu et al., 2024). Numerous prior studies have identified various antecedents of the factors associated with the overarching concept of destination image, mainly focusing on destination attractiveness (Braimah et al., 2024; Karim et al., 2024).

^{*} Corresponding author

The Dvaravati cultural heritage, which emerged and became prevalent in the Gulf of Thailand from the 6th to 11th centuries AD (Carter, 2023), is a unique artistic tradition that combines Indian influences with indigenous Southeast Asian elements. This is evident in the archaeological sites and artifacts found throughout the region (Waiyasusri et al., 2024). In Thailand, Nakhon Pathom province is a significant ancient center within this cultural landscape, exhibiting the rich artistic and architectural traditions of the Dvaravati, featuring landmarks such as Phra Pathom Chedi Racha Worawihan Temple, along with other historic temples, including Phra Ngam Temple, Don Yai Hom Temple, and Dhamma Sala Temple. These are significant tourist spots frequented by visitors. Despite the rich cultural heritage of Dvaravati sites, particularly their unique artistic and architectural elements, there remains a considerable research gap regarding visitor experiences and attraction management. While previous studies have documented the historical significance and cultural value of these sites (Carter, 2023; Waiyasusri et al., 2024), limited attention has been paid to understanding contemporary tourist experiences and their motivation to revisit these historical attractions.

Although research highlighted the cultural tourism potential of the region, it primarily focused on broad cultural development rather than specific visitor engagement with Dvaravati heritage sites (Cheudchim et al., 2014). Furthermore, while the physical preservation of these historical sites has been addressed (Yuenthon et al., 2023), there is insufficient research on how tourists interact with and interpret these ancient cultural spaces in the modern context; much more can be done on leveraging the unique Dvaravati artistic style and cultural elements to enhance visitor experiences, for instance. This study aims to address existing research gaps by examining the effect of the destination image of Dvaravati cultural heritage sites on visitor experiences and revisit intention.

It investigates how key elements—such as the characteristics of Dvaravati heritage and seasonal cultural activities shape visitor perceptions and influence their behavioral intentions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Destination image in cultural heritage tourism

Destination's image, in the context of cultural heritage sites, is characterized by a rich blend of tangible (architecture, artefacts) and intangible (cultural practices, spiritual significance) cultural elements (Wang et al., 2024). Religious and cultural sites possess unique characteristics that contribute to their overall image formation (Jose et al., 2024) collectively shaping their tourism appeal. Destination image encompasses the aggregate of beliefs, ideas, and impressions tourists hold regarding a destination (Sun et al., 2021). It refers to 'the core tourism product image associated with tourist attractions and tourism facilities that directly address tourists' fundamental needs' (Zhang et al., 2016), and a subjective interpretation of a location that exists in a tourist's mind, influencing their behavior across three stages: priori, loco, and posteriori (Afshardoost & Eshaghi, 2020; Agapito et al., 2013). Thus, it is a significant construct that affects tourists' decision-making, destination selection, post-trip evaluations, and subsequent behaviors (Zhang et al., 2018). Various types of destinations exist, including cities, countryside, regions, and countries, and attracted considerable attention, particularly for their substantial influence on tourists' decision-making and sustainable behavior, leading to their examination in numerous studies within tourism and hospitality literature (Lam et al., 2024).

Memorable tourism experience

Tourism experience is a complex notion that includes an individual's subjective assessment and comprehension of events associated with their travel activities across all phases of the journey—before, during, and after the trip (Tung & Ritchie, 2011). Kang & Gretzel (2012) conceptualize it as a continuous flow of thoughts and feelings that emerge through complex psychological, sociological, and cognitive interactions as visitors engage with various destination elements, from service providers to physical surroundings, during moments of consciousness. Travel and tourist activities fundamentally stem from these encounters, considered exceptional and distinct from everyday life experiences (Cohen, 1979). In the context of religious heritage sites, the cultural tourism experience includes spiritual, educational, and cultural dimensions. Recent research highlights the multidimensional nature of cultural tourism experiences, which incorporate authenticity, emotional connection, and cultural learning (Kim & Ritchie, 2014).

Additionally, the experience level has evolved from passive observation to active participation in cultural activities (Pine & Gilmore, 2013). Given that tourist experiences form the core of tourism and hospitality, competition is growing, necessitating destinations to offer memorable tourism experiences (MTEs). MTEs, defined as a selectively constructed and recalled tourism experience based on individual assessment (Kim et al., 2012), reinforce pleasurable memories of the destination (Ritchie & Ritchie, 1998). This has piqued the interest of researchers and practitioners to examine what drive the competitiveness of such destinations (Gelbman, 2021).

Academics have proposed dimensional frameworks for measuring the experience quality of MTEs that serve as the most reliable indicators of future behavior and establish a novel benchmark (Chandralal et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2012; Neuhofer et al., 2014). The measurement of MTEs includes the components of hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, engagement, and novelty which have been applied in several studies (Kim et al., 2012; Sthapit & Coudounaris, 2018; Tsai, 2016). Prior research has demonstrated that destination image plays a crucial role in shaping tourists' experience quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions, particularly regarding revisit intention (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Lee et al., 2005). The influence of destination image on visitors' satisfaction (experiences) was examined by Lu et al. (2015), who supported for the relationship. The study of Afshardoost & Eshaghi (2020) found a significantly positive correlation between the cognitive image of the destination and the intention to visit. In addition, previous studies also show that destination attractiveness impacts tourist revisits (Cong et al., 2020; Cong, 2016). Tourists who

perceive and value natural beauty and unique cultural experiences show a desire to return to the destination (Nguyen Viet et al., 2020). Therefore, the hypotheses are proposed as follows:

- H1: Destination image directly affects memorable tourism experience
- H2: Destination image directly affects revisit intention

Revisit intention

Revisit intention is the behavior intention that represents a form of post-consumption behavior (Cole & Scott, 2004) that emerged as a significant area of inquiry within tourism literature (Li et al., 2018). This behavior intention refers to a tourist's desire to return to a destination following their engagement in activities during a prior visit and is characterized as a visitor's repetition of an activity or return to a destination (Baker & Crompton, 2000). The satisfaction and experiences from previous visits to a destination fundamentally shape the revisit intention of tourists (Huseynli & Huseynli, 2024; Li et al., 2021; Teng, 2021). This behavioral pattern manifests in two key ways: through tourists' direct assessment of their likelihood to return to the same destination and their willingness to recommend the destination to others (Khasawneh & Alfandi, 2019). The relationship between experience and revisit intention operates cyclically: Tourists who have experienced satisfaction and positive encounters during their visits are more inclined to return to the same destination, while those who have encountered negative experiences form lasting unfavorable memories that discourage future visits (Seow et al., 2024). This dynamic highlight how past experiences serve as a critical determinant in tourists' decision-making process regarding future visits, ultimately influencing both their personal travel choices and their role in word-of-mouth promotion of the destination. In the study of Zhou et al. (2023), destination image and memorable tourism experiences positively correlated with tourists' revisiting intention. Tsai (2016) investigated the impact of second-order measurement of MTEs and identified its significance on behavioral intention. Studies also indicate that destination image influences tourist behavior both directly and indirectly, mediated by factors including perceived value, experience quality, and satisfaction (Lu et al., 2015). Therefore, this research hypotheses are developed as follows:

H3: Memorable tourism experience directly affects revisit intention

H4: Destination image indirectly affects revisit intention through the memorable tourism experience



Figure 1. Spatial distribution map of Dvaravati heritage tourism attractions in the study area

(A) Phra Ngam Temple, showing the revival of historical alms-giving tradition (left top), the sticky rice in bamboo (right top), and the ancient Buddha image enshrined in the historic Maha-ut Ubosot, a heritage ordination hall (bottom); (B) Don Yai Hom Temple, featuring the Luang Pho Ngoen Shrine (left top), the Dvaravati-period stone Dhammachakra pillar (right top), and Luang Pho Ngoen Images (bottom); (C) Dhamma Sala Temple, showing the Ordination Hall (top) and Wat Thammasala Archaeological Site (bottom); Satellite imagery: Google Earth Pro, 2024; Base maps: Thailand Administrative Boundary, Royal Thai Survey Department, 2023; Field survey photographs: Researchers' documentation; Tourist attraction locations: Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) data from field survey collection; Photo insertion in GIS figure: December 15, 2024

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study area

The Dvaravati cultural capital in Nakhon Pathom Province consists of two primary categories: community-based

Dvaravati heritage and cultural wisdom, each illustrating historical lifestyles, beliefs, and ancient knowledge. This cultural capital possesses intrinsic and economic value, evident in its application in Buddhist ceremonies and historical tourism. It promotes community pride and collective preservation efforts that enhance local cultural connections and heritage transmission (Pinkaew et al., 2024). This study was conducted in the context of the cultural heritage presented at Phra Ngam Temple, Don Yai Hom Temple, and Dhamma Sala in Nakhon Pathom Province, Thailand, as illustrated in Figure 1. The art of Dvaravati still exists through architecture, art, and some activities such as the revival tradition from historical events (sticky rice in bamboo alms-giving tradition).

Measurement development and questionnaire design

This study assessed three constructs: destination image, memorable tourist experience, and revisit intention. Destination images are regarded as second-order reflective constructs reflecting qualities at the first level. The items of destination image constructs were modified from Zhang et al. (2016), which encompasses the fundamental components of a destination product, including attractions and infrastructure. The items were derived from the literature encompassing natural landscape, cultural landscape, accommodation, catering, retail, and tourist activities (Zhang et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2016).

Memorable tourist experiences are characterized as a second-order reflective construct comprising first-level reflective dimensions. The evaluation of tourist experiences uses a 24-item scale derived from the seven elements adopted from memorable tourist experiences (MTEs): hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, engagement, and novelty (Kim et al., 2012; Tsai, 2016). Revisit intention is assessed by three items (Horng et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2016).

The questionnaire comprises five sections: an introduction to the study, measuring items for constructs, and demographic information. The introduction offered a concise summary of the study, the anticipated duration for participation, and guarantees concerning the confidentiality of personal data preservation.

The initial component comprised construct assessments for destination image, whereas the latter section contained items assessing perceptions of tourist experience, and revisit intention. All items utilizing a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The final component collected respondents' demographic data, including age, gender, education, occupation, frequency and duration of visit, and purpose of travel.

Data collection

The Ethics Review Committee authorized the questionnaire before beginning data collection. Data was collected between April and June 2024, from participants in three temples related to the Dvaravati cultural heritage in Nakhon Pathom Province, Thailand: Phra Ngam Temple, Don Yai Hom Temple, and Dhamma Sala Temple. The simple random sampling technique was employed. The questionnaires were administered as self-administered surveys, which are more cost-effective and require less administrative time (Sudman et al., 1965). A response rate of 59.667% was achieved, as 358 questionnaires were obtained out of the 600 that were initially distributed. 303 completed questionnaires were retained for statistical analysis after incomplete data was excluded.

Sample size

Researchers suggest multiple criteria for establishing suitable sample sizes in studies. Hoe (2008) indicates that a sample size exceeding 200 participants is typically adequate for robust data analysis. Wolf et al. (2013) advocate for a ratio of 10 participants per predictor variable to ensure the reliability of prediction models. Based on these guidelines, the 303 samples in this study are deemed appropriate for subsequent analysis utilizing the structural equation modeling (SEM) approach.

Analysis method

This study employed a quantitative approach to investigate three primary aspects: the effect of destination image on the Dvaravati cultural tourist experience and the influence of their experience on revisit intention. This deductive approach encompassed gathering of numerical data, performing statistical analyses, and evaluating hypotheses. The data analysis was conducted utilizing the Mplus 7.3 program, adhering to the two-step approach outlined by Anderson and Gerbing (1988). A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was initially performed to evaluate the reliability and validity of the measurement variables. After testing the measurement model, structural equation modeling (SEM) utilizing a maximum likelihood method was employed to analyze the relationships among the three constructs examined in this study.

RESULTS

Demographic profile of the respondents

As shown in Figure 2, of the total 303 respondents, 54.5% of participants identified as female, while 45.5% identified as male. The age distribution indicated that 42.9% of individuals were aged 31-40 years, 19.8% were 21-30 years, 18.2% were 41-50 years, 14.5% were 51-60 years, 3.3% were under 21 years, and 1.3% were over 60 years. Regarding educational attainment, 50.5% possessed bachelor's degrees, 47.2% held qualifications below the bachelor's level, and 2.3% achieved degrees beyond the bachelor's level. In terms of visit frequency, 36.3% of participants had visited more than five times, 24.4% had visited four to five times, 20.1% had visited two to three times, and 19.1% were first-time visitors. 52.8% of individuals spent 2-3 hours in the area, 33.3% spent half a day, 10.9% spent a full day, and 3.0% spent a single hour. The primary reasons for visits included merit-making, temple visits, and spiritual relaxation at 43.9%, followed by the pursuit of good fortune and auspiciousness at 18.5%, recreation and relationship building at 18.5%, local food tasting at 9.6%, photography/content creation at 6.3%, and learning about history and culture at 3.3%.



Figure 2. Demographic profile of the respondents

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

CFA tests assumptions concerning whether model variable related patterns match empirical evidence. It ensures appropriate and accurate analysis results. The researchers assessed the goodness of fit between empirical data and relationship structures using five statistical criteria: criteria applicable to models between 12-30 items and more than 250 samples: chi-square (χ^2)/degrees of freedom (df) < 3, comparative fit index (CFI) > 0.920, Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) > 0.920, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) < 0.070, and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) < 0.080 (Hair et al., 2010). The suggested cutoff value of 0.70 was utilized to assess internal consistency (a) and construct reliability (CR) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). A benchmark value of 0.50 was employed to assess AVE (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

In this phase, items exhibiting low factor loadings that failed to meet the established criteria were removed, as they were deemed inappropriate for the study's context. Table 1 shows the validity and reliability of measures analyzed through CFA. The destination image variable comprises three components: natural attractions, cultural attractions, and tourism facilities, totaling 8 observed variables. MTEs comprises 7 components: happiness, novelty, local culture, refreshment, meaningfulness, involvement, and knowledge, totaling 18 observed variables. Meanwhile, the revisit intention has 3 observed variables, bringing the total to 29 observed variables in this research model.

The goodness-of-fit indices showed Chi-square = 528.637, df = 320, CFI = 0.942, TLI = 0.927, RMSEA = 0.046, and SRMR = 0.046. Reliability analysis showed Cronbach's alpha values for first-order latent variables ranging from 0.667 to 0.904. Although the natural attractions latent variable had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.667, values between 0.60 and 0.70 may be acceptable in contexts not requiring high precision, such as human behavior or social science research (Shi et al., 2012). Composite reliability (CR) values ranged from 0.672 to 0.903, surpassing the acceptable threshold of 0.600 (Hair et al., 2010), which indicates good internal consistency. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values exceeded 0.500. This indicates that each latent variable accurately accounts for the variation in its corresponding observed variables.

First-order latent variables Observed Variables	Factor Loadings	t-value	CR	AVE
Natural Attractions ($\alpha = 0.667$, KMO = 0.500)			0.672	0.506
Beautiful natural resources.	0.749	15.122**		
Beautiful landscape	0.672	13.567**		
Cultural Attractions ($\alpha = 0.740$, KMO = 0.637)			0.748	0.501
Unique traditions and way of life.	0.824	22.888^{**}		
Abundant historical and cultural heritage.	0.651	15.436**		
Unique historical culture.	0.632	14.596**		
Tourism Facilities ($\alpha = 0.744$, KMO = 0.593)			0.777	0.553
Tourism facilities in the area (toilets, parking, signage).	0.920	25.335**		
Area facilities are consistent with local resources and environment.	0.757	20.470^{**}		
Tasty and diverse local restaurants.	0.490	10.042^{**}		
Happiness ($\alpha = 0.764$, KMO = 0.594)			0.788	0.562
I really enjoyed and had fun with this tourism experience.	0.923	28.935**		
I was excited to experience new things from this trip.	0.681	18.309**		
This trip was exciting and made me want to discover new things.	0.610	14.425**		

Table 1. Confirmatory factor analysis (n = 303)

First-order latent variables	Factor	t-value	CR	AVE
Observed Variables	Loadings		_	
Novelty ($\alpha = 0.701$, KMO = 0.500)			0.709	0.550
This trip was different from previous travel experiences.	0.783	16.490**		
I experienced something new from this trip.	0.698	14.668**		
Local Culture ($\alpha = 0.812$, KMO = 0.500)			0.843	0.729
I experienced Dvaravati culture closely.	0.881	34.859**		
Local people are friendly.	0.826	30.017**		
Refreshment ($\alpha = 0.759$, KMO = 0.637)			0.756	0.513
This trip made me feel refreshed.	0.827	22.328**		
This trip gave me restoration.	0.721	18.024**		
This trip let me enjoy a sense of freedom.	0.579	12.506**		
Meaningfulness ($\alpha = 0.755$, KMO = 0.651)			0.759	0.515
I did something important on this trip.	0.837	22.062^{**}		
This trip helped me learn about myself.	0.667	15.648**		
I did something meaningful on this trip.	0.633	14.390**		
Involvement ($\alpha = 0.745$, KMO = 0.500)			0.737	0.584
I really enjoyed the activities I wanted to do.	0.797	13.896**		
I was interested in many activities on this trip.	0.730	13.081**		
Knowledge ($\alpha = 0.744$, KMO = 0.675)			0.862	0.674
Gained knowledge about tourism and Dvaravati.	0.830	32.410**		
Learned new cultural aspects about Dvaravati tourism.	0.828	27.800^{**}		
Explored new things about Dvaravati tourist attractions.	0.806	26.256**		
Revisit Intention ($\alpha = 0.904$, KMO = 0.747)			0.903	0.757
I think I will revisit here in the future.	0.904	51.397**		
I want to come back here again.	0.880	46.638**		
I am likely to come back here again.	0.824	36.541**		
Model Fit indices: $\gamma^2 = 528.637$ (p = 0.000), df = 320, CFI = 0.942	, TLI = 0.927, RM	SEA = 0.046,	SRMR = 0.0	46

Notes: χ^2 = chi-squared, df = degree of freedom, CFI = comparative fit index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, Loadings* = standardized factor loadings, t-value is significant at **p<0.001, α = Cronbach alpha reliability, CR = Composite reliability, AVE = Average variance extracted

Two main methodologies assessed the discriminant validity of the measurement model in Table 2. The Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion involved comparing the square root of AVE, which ranged from 0.707 to 0.870, for each construct against its respective correlation coefficients. All diagonal values exceeded their respective correlation coefficients (Rönkkö & Cho, 2022). In the second part, the CICFA method applied a cutoff value of 0.900 for problem classification. The upper bound coefficients (97.5%) remained below this threshold, with values ranging from 0.011 to 0.852. The absence of discriminant validity issues in the strongest correlations across latent variables indicates that each construct in the model is distinct from the others. This strengthens the measurement model's framework and makes it appropriate for hypothesis testing using structural equation modeling analysis.

T 1		<u> </u>	n .	•	•				• .			•
1.01	hla	· ,	1 14	0.0111	mi	nont	110	110	4 *** 7	0100	X 74	010
1 21	110		1 11	SCIL		паш	va		II V	ana	• V 3	S I S
		<u> </u>	~ 1			incurre	· • ••		107	ana		010
									~		~	

	NA	CA	TF	HD	NV	LC	RF	MF	IV	KL	RI
NA	0.711	0.631	0.402	0.411	0.499	-0.057	0.429	0.292	0.346	0.016	0.195
CA	[.510,.752]	0.707	0.360	0.290	0.439	-0.117	0.426	0.371	0.263	-0.122	0.115
TF	[.268,.536]	[.236,.483]	0.744	0.259	0.306	0.057	0.343	0.206	0.232	0.034	0.126
HD	[.282,.541]	[.160,.419]	[.131,.387]	0.750	0.534	0.166	0.194	0.238	0.311	0.149	0.285
NV	[.358,.640]	[.303,.575]	[.160,.452]	[.415,.653]	0.742	0.121	0.377	0.248	0.343	0.211	0.193
LC	[207,.094]	[254,.019]	[073,.188]	[.037,.295]	[022,.264]	0.854	0.110	0.200	0.328	0.789	0.331
RF	[.287,.571]	[.301,.552]	[.219,.467]	[.062,.326]	[.240,.515]	[027,.247]	0.716	0.488	0.288	0.149	0.106
MF	[.139,.446]	[.239,.502]	[.071,.340]	[.106,.371]	[.098,.398]	[.066,.335]	[.364,.611]	0.718	0.270	0.228	0.104
IV	[.198,.495]	[.121,.406]	[.094,.370]	[.177,.445]	[.200,.485]	[.194,.461]	[.148,.428]	[.128, .412]	0.764	0.345	0.178
KL	[129,.161]	[256,.011]	[093,.161]	[.023,.275]	[.075,.346]	[.727,.852]	[.017,.281]	[.100,.356]	[.219,.471]	0.821	0.208
RI	[.055,.335]	[018,.248]	[001,.252]	[.166,.405]	[.056,.329]	[.215,.447]	[027,.238]	[028,.236]	[.043,.312]	[.088,.327]	0.870

Note: The bold numbers in parentheses on the diagonal are the square roots of AVE. The upper right triangle elements are the correlation values between the latent constructs. The lower left triangle elements are correlation values of latent constructs at 2.5% lower/ upper bound. NA = Natural Attractions, CA = Cultural Attractions, TF = Tourism Facilities, HD = Happiness, NV = Novelty, LC = Local Culture, RF = Refreshment, MF = Meaningfulness, IV = Involvement, KL = Knowledge, RI = Revisit Intention

Second-order confirmatory factor analysis

This statistical technique confirms whether a main hypothesized structure is effectively measured by its subcomponents, which are, in turn, measured by questionnaire items. Model fit is evaluated using statistics like chi-square, SRMR, RMSEA, and CFI. As shown in Table 3, the second-order CFA results revealed good model fit for both destination image ($\chi^2 = 41.874$, df = 17, CFI = 0.964, TLI = 0.941, RMSEA = 0.069, SRMR = 0.040) and memorable tourism experience ($\chi^2 = 231.410$, df = 126, CFI = 0.949, TLI = 0.938, RMSEA = 0.053, SRMR = 0.059). The destination image comprised three first-order factors (natural attractions, cultural attractions, and tourism facilities), while the memorable tourism experience included seven factors (happiness, novelty, local culture, refreshment, meaningfulness, involvement, and knowledge). All first-order latent variables showed significant Cronbach's alpha coefficients (p<0.001), confirming them as valid components of their respective second-order structures.

Second-order construct	First-order construct	Factor Loadings	t-value			
	Natural attractions	0.823	9.191**			
Destination image	Cultural attractions	0.746	9.032**			
	Tourism facilities	0.468	6.860^{**}			
Model Fit indices: $\chi^2 = 41.874$	(p = 0.000), df = 17, CFI = 0.964, TLI = 0	0.941, RMSEA = 0.069, S	RMR = 0.040			
	Happiness	0.567	7.643**			
	Novelty	0.709	9.702^{**}			
	Local culture	0.284	3.729**			
Memorable tourism experience	Refreshment	0.520	6.924**			
	Meaningfulness	0.492	6.176^{**}			
	Involvement	0.541	7.317**			
	Knowledge	0.341	4.609**			
Model Fit indices: $\chi^2 = 231.410$ (p = 0.000), df = 126, CFI = 0.949, TLI = 0.938, RMSEA = 0.053, SRMR = 0.059						

m 11 m		1	1	C ¹			c .	1	•
Table -	5. S	lecond-or	der (conti	rmat	orv	tactor	anal	VS1S
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~					···· , ·			,

Note: t-value is significant at **p<0.001)

#### Structural model

This study developed a structural model to confirm the relationships between variables. It showed acceptable fit indices ( $\chi 2 = 489.179$ , df = 330, CFI = 0.956, TLI = 0.946, RMSEA = 0.040, SRMR = 0.079). The results shown in Table 4 revealed that destination image affect memorable tourism experience (H1:  $\beta = 0.738$ , p < 0.001), and the experience of the Dvaravati tourism also effect on revisit intention (H3:  $\beta = 0.402$ , p < 0.010). Destination image had no direct affect revisit intention (H2:  $\beta = -0.085$ , p > 0.05) but showed a significant indirect effect through memorable tourism experience (H4:  $\beta = 0.297$ , p < 0.050). The Sobel test (z = 2.708, p = 0.006) confirmed the mediating role of memorable tourism experience between destination image and revisit intention.

Table 4. The structural model hypothesis conclusion

Hypotheses	β	t-values	Confidence Interval (97.5% CI)	Results
H1: DI — MTE	0.738	11.186***	[0.609, 0.868]	Accepted
H2: DI	-0.085	-0.573	[-0.375, 0.205]	Rejected
H3: MTE → RI	0.402	$2.797^{**}$	[0.120, 0.684]	Accepted
H4: DI → MTE→ RI	0.297	$2.579^{*}$	[0.071, 0.523]	Accepted

Note:  $\beta$  = Path coefficient, *** = p < 0.001, ** = p < 0.01, * = p < 0.05, the confidence intervals are the values of the standardized coefficient at 2.5% lower/upper bound. DI = destination image, MTE = Memorable tourism experience, RI = revisit intention

### DISCUSSION

The study's results support the components behind the constructs of both the destination's image and the memorable tourism experience. For the destination image, the second-order construct was validated through three first-order factors: natural attractions, cultural attractions, and tourism facilities. All three factors exhibited significant factor loadings (natural attractions = 0.823, cultural attractions = 0.746, tourism facilities = 0.468; p < 0.001), demonstrating their strong contributions to the overall construct. Seven first-order factors were used to accurately describe the memorable tourism experience: happiness (0.567; p < 0.001), novelty (0.709; p < 0.001), local culture (0.284; p < 0.001), refreshment (0.520; p < 0.001), meaningfulness (0.492; p < 0.001), involvement (0.541; p < 0.001), and knowledge (0.341; p < 0.001). Each factor demonstrated significant factor loadings, confirming their importance in shaping the overall tourism experience.

This study's findings also underscore the important influence of cultural dynamics on the Dvaravati historical tourism experience. The significant effect of destination image on memorable tourism experience ( $\beta = 0.738$ , p < 0.001) highlights the necessity of an integrated approach that includes natural landscapes, historical heritage, distinctive cultural traditions, and adequate amenities (e.g., restaurants, parking facilities).

These factors work together to make the visitor experience better, which is in line with what Chen & Tsai (2007) and Lu et al. (2015) found, which showed how important geographical and contextual factors are in cultural heritage tourism. This study contributes to the discussion on place-based cultural revival programs by demonstrating that the integration of cultural practices with historical and natural environments can improve visitor experiences.

The findings demonstrate that memorable tourism experience significantly influences tourists' intentions to revisit ( $\beta = 0.402$ , p < 0.010). This supports the claims made by Tung & Ritchie (2011) and Cohen (1979), who contend that tourists' engagement in unique and culturally enriching experiences fosters positive memories, serving as significant motivators for revisits. The reinforcement of these memories enhances emotional attachment to the destination, as noted by Li et al. (2021) and Teng (2021). While the destination image does not directly affect revisit intention ( $\beta = -0.085$ , p > 0.05), its indirect effect via memorable tourism experience is significant ( $\beta = 0.297$ , p < 0.050). An appealing destination image provides a basis for developing distinctive experiences; however, it alone does not ensure repeat

visits. This finding, within the framework of Dvaravati tourism, corresponds with Seow et al. (2024), who highlight that the quality of experiences—especially those that are unique, rare, and memorable—promotes intentions to revisit.

### CONCLUSION Theoretical Contribution

These findings have several theoretical implications for destination image and tourism experience literature. First, the lack of correlation between destination image and revisit intention indicates a more intricate mechanism. Although the direct effect is insignificant, the indirect effect through MTEs of Dvaravati highlights the importance of memorable experiences in influencing tourism behavior. Tourists find happiness and novelty in discovering ancient archaeological sites and engage with local culture through culture and religious ceremonies. They also feel refreshed by unique historical experiences, connection with local wisdom, participation in community-based activities, and learning about cultural heritage. These experiences are memorable because they allow tourists to participate in and deeply understand local communities' deep-rooted traditions and pride while experiencing something different from their daily lives.

This shows that the destination influences behavioral intentions through experiential rather than cognitive processes. These findings support and extend experiential tourism theory, proposing that location qualities must be transformed into memorable experiences to understand tourist behavior and loyalty formation.

## **Managerial implications**

There are several significant managerial implications for tourism stakeholders and professionals who manage destinations. As opposed to concentrating merely on advertising the characteristics of the destination, management should make the creation of immersive experiences a top priority. This can be accomplished by implementing carefully crafted experiential programs that actively involve tourists in ancient sites, religious rites, and community activities. The enhancement of tourist experiences should encompass all seven dimensions of memorable tourism experiences. This can be accomplished by 1) creating joyful discovery moments, 2) ensuring exceptional experiences, 3) facilitating meaningful interactions with locals, 4) providing spaces for restoration, 5) enabling self-discovery, 6) offering a variety of opportunities for engagement, and 7) developing comprehensive educational components about the heritage of Dvaravati.

Tourism management organizations and local governments should continually take steps to create and improve cultural events that foster interactions between foreign tourists and the culture of the host country (Nguyen Huu et al., 2024). Additionally, developing partnerships with local communities is vital for creating authentic cultural experiences. The genuine encounters with community members greatly contribute to creating experiences that leave lasting impressions in visitors' memories; thus, it could boost their intention to revisit the Dvaravati tourism destination.

## **Future Research Directions**

While this study uses quantitative approaches to provide valuable insights into the links between destination image, MTEs, and revisit intention in the Dvaravati tourism area, Future research may benefit in two key ways. First, researchers could use a mixed-methods approach to better understand tourists' experiences and motivations at Dvaravati cultural sites. Furthermore, the quantitative approach could enhance studies on many groups of visitors based on their distinct demographic profiles, as these destination factors may have varying effects on perceptions across these groups. A qualitative technique could be used to investigate the attitudes, readiness, and engagement levels of the local community in the area. Second, future studies could broaden the geographical scope by conducting comparative research at various Dvaravati cultural heritage sites in Thailand, identifying regional differences in tourist perceptions and experiences while providing more comprehensive implications for cultural tourism development in the larger Dvaravati context.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, N.C. and S.K.; methodology, S.K.; software, S.K. and J. S.; validation, S.K. and P. I.; formal analysis, S.K.; investigation, J.S., P.I. and D. I.; data curation, S.K.; writing- original draft preparation, S.K. and C.K.L.; writing - review and editing, N.C., S.K., J.S., P.I. and D.I.; visualization, J.S.; supervision, N.C.; project administration, S.K., J.S., P.I and C.K.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research was funded by the National Science and Technology Development Agency, through the Local Development Fund Administration and Management Unit, Thailand (Fiscal Year 2023).

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** This research was ethically approved by the Research Ethics Committee of The Yanasangvorn Research Institute, Mahamakut Buddhist University (Certificate No. 419/2566).

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study may be obtained on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements: The research undertaken was made possible by the equal scientific involvement of all the authors concerned.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### REFERENCES

Afshardoost, M., & Eshaghi, M. S. (2020). Destination image and tourist behavioural intentions: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 81, 104154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104154

- Agapito, D., Oom do Valle, P., & da Costa Mendes, J. (2013). The cognitive-affective-conative model of destination image: A confirmatory analysis. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 30(5), 471-481. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2013.803393
- Akgün, A. E., Senturk, H. A., Keskin, H., & Onal, I. (2020). The relationships among nostalgic emotion, destination images and tourist behaviors: An empirical study of Istanbul. *Journal of destination marketing & management*, 16, 100355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.03.009
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411
- Arif, M., Jie, Z., Behzad, H. M., & Changxiao, L. (2023). Assessing the impacts of ecotourism activities on riparian health indicators along the Three Gorges Reservoir in China. *Ecological Indicators*, 155, 111065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2023.111065
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the academy of marketing science, 16, 74-94.
- Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of tourism research*, 27(3), 785-804. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5
- Braimah, S. M., Solomon, E. N. A., & Hinson, R. E. (2024). Tourists satisfaction in destination selection determinants and revisit intentions; perspectives from Ghana. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2318864. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2318864
- Carter, A. K. (2023). Building from the ground up: The archaeology of residential spaces and communities in Southeast Asia. Journal of Archaeological Research, 31(1), 1-54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10814-021-09170-4
- Chandralal, L., Rindfleish, J., & Valenzuela, F. (2015). An application of travel blog narratives to explore memorable tourism experiences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(6), 680-693. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2014.925944
- Chau, T. M. (2024). Evaluation results on factors affecting regional linkage in An Giang tourism development from a geographical perspective. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 57, 1893–1901. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.574spl03-1356
- Chen, C. F., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115-1122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.07.007
- Cheudchim, S., Pattarakitsophon, S., & Khaopongampai, S. (2014). Development of cultural tourism in the Nakhon Chai Si river basin. *Rajabhat J. Sci. Humanit. Soc. Sci*, 15(2), 125-132.
- Chong, K. Y., & Balasingam, A. S. (2019). Tourism sustainability: Economic benefits and strategies for preservation and conservation of heritage sites in Southeast Asia. *Tourism Review*, 74(2), 268-279. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2017-0182
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. Sociology, 13(2), 179-201. https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857901300203
- Cole, S. T., & Scott, D. (2004). Examining the mediating role of experience quality in a model of tourist experiences. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 16(1), 79-90. https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v16n01_08
- Cong, L. C. (2016). A formative model of the relationship between destination quality, tourist satisfaction and intentional loyalty: An empirical test in Vietnam. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 26, 50-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2015.12.002
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104
- Gelbman, A. (2021). Tourist experience and innovative hospitality management in different cities. *Sustainability*, *13*(12), 6578. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126578
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Hoe, S. L. (2008). Issues and procedures in adopting structural equation modelling technique. Journal of Quantitative Methods, 3(1), 76-83.
- Horng, J. S., Liu, C. H., Chou, H. Y., & Tsai, C. Y. (2012). Understanding the impact of culinary brand equity and destination familiarity on travel intentions. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 815-824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.09.004
- Huseynli, B., & Huseynli, N. (2024). Examination of the moderator role of country image in the effect of eWOM and emotional involvement on visit intention. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 57, 2090–2100. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.574spl23-1376
- Jose, A., Rejikumar, G., Asokan Ajitha, A., Mathew, S., & Chakraborty, U. (2024). Destination image and perceived meaningfulness for visitor loyalty: A strategic positioning of Indian destinations. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 49(3), 577-596. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2022.2040294
- Kang, M., & Gretzel, U. (2012). Differences in social presence perceptions. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism* 2012 (pp. 437-447). Springer.
- Karim, R. A., Rabiul, M. K., & Arfat, S. M. (2024). Factors influencing tourists' behavioural intentions towards beach destinations: the mediating roles of destination experience and destination satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(4), 2033-2054. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-04-2023-0276
- Khasawneh, M. S., & Alfandi, A. M. (2019). Determining behaviour intentions from the overall destination image and risk perception. *Tourism and hospitality management*, 25(2), 355-375. https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.25.2.6
- Kim, J. H., & Ritchie, J. B. (2014). Cross-cultural validation of a memorable tourism experience scale (MTES). Journal of Travel Research, 53(3), 323-335. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513496468
- Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. Journal of Travel Research, 51(1), 12-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510385467
- Lam, J. M., Makhbul, Z. K. M., Aziz, N. A., & Ahmat, M. A. H. (2024). Incorporating multidimensional images into cultural heritage destination: does it help to explain and analyse better? *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 14(4), 563-580. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-11-2021-0192
- Lee, C. K., Lee, Y. K., & Lee, B. (2005). Korea's destination image formed by the 2002 World Cup. Annals of tourism research, 32(4), 839-858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.11.006
- Li, F., Wen, J., & Ying, T. (2018). The influence of crisis on tourists' perceived destination image and revisit intention: An exploratory study of Chinese tourists to North Korea. *Journal of destination marketing & management*, 9, 104-111. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.11.006
- Li, H., Lien, C. H., Wang, S. W., Wang, T., & Dong, W. (2021). Event and city image: the effect on revisit intention. *Tourism Review*, 76(1), 212-228. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-10-2019-0419
- Lu, L., Chi, C. G., & Liu, Y. (2015). Authenticity, involvement, and image: Evaluating tourist experiences at historic districts. *Tourism Management*, 50, 85-96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.01.026
- Neuhofer, B., Buhalis, D., & Ladkin, A. (2014). A typology of technology-enhanced tourism experiences. International Journal of Tourism Research, 16(4), 340-350. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1958

- Nguyen Huu, T., Nguyen Ngoc, H., Nguyen Dai, L., Nguyen Thi Thu, D., Truc, L. N., & Nguyen Trong, L. (2024). Effect of tourist satisfaction on revisit intention in Can Tho City, Vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2322779. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2322779
- Nguyen Viet, B., Dang, H. P., & Nguyen, H. H. (2020). Revisit intention and satisfaction: The role of destination image, perceived risk, and cultural contact. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1796249. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1796249
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (2013). The experience economy: past, present and future. In *Handbook on the experience economy* (pp. 21-44). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Pinkaew, W., Nuanhom, W., Taweesuk, L., & Rungchareankiat, D. (2024). Creating collaborative networks to elevate the value of Dvaravati culture and develop a cultural map of Nakhon Pathom Province [Karn Sang Krau Khwam Ruam Muea Phuea Yok Rad Khun Kha Wa Dhamnatham Thawarawadee Lae Sang Panthi Tang Watthanatham Jangwat Nakhon Pathom]. Journal of Roi Kaensarn Academi, 9(10), 1254-1275 (in Thai).
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Ritchie, J. R. R. (1998). The branding of tourism destinations. Annual Congress of the International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism (1-31), Marrakech, Morocco.
- Rönkkö, M., & Cho, E. (2022). An updated guideline for assessing discriminant validity. Organizational Research Methods, 25(1), 6-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428120968614
- 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. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241274049
- Shi, J., Mo, X., & Sun, Z. (2012). Content validity index in scale development. *Journal of Central South University*, 37(2), 152-155. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1672-7347.2012.02.007
- Sthapit, E., & Coudounaris, D. N. (2018). Memorable tourism experiences: Antecedents and outcomes. Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 18(1), 72-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2017.1287003
- Sudman, S., Greeley, A., & Pinto, L. (1965). The effectiveness of self-administered questionnaires. Journal of Marketing Research, 2(3), 293-297.
- Sun, W., Tang, S., & Liu, F. (2021). Examining perceived and projected destination image: A social media content analysis. Sustainability, 13(6), 3354. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063354
- Teng, H. Y. (2021). Can film tourism experience enhance tourist behavioural intentions? The role of tourist engagement. Current Issues in Tourism, 24(18), 2588-2601. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1852196
- Tsai, C. T. (2016). Memorable tourist experiences and place attachment when consuming local food. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(6), 536-548. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2070
- Tung, V. W. S., & Ritchie, J. B. (2011). Exploring the essence of memorable tourism experiences. Annals of tourism research, 38(4), 1367-1386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.03.009
- Turdimambetov, I., Murgaš, F., Victor, F., Oteuliev, M., Madreimov, A., Shamuratova, G., & Reymov, A. (2024). Measurement of environmental indicators of the quality of life in a region with extreme climatic conditions: Evidence from around the Aral Sea. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 57, 1941–1951. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.574spl08-1361
- Waiyasusri, K., Usaard, N., Kiriwongwattana, K., & Wetchayont, P. (2024). Geo-information technology application for investigating the Old Lopburi River and the ancient city of Dvaravati period (6th–8th century AD) based on the records of Queen Cāmadevi's watercourse travels in the Chao Phraya River Basin. *Scientific Culture*, 10(1), 83-103. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10400878
- Wang, J., Su, M. M., Wall, G., Dong, H., & Zhang, H. (2024). Intergenerational evolution of intangible cultural heritage through tourism development: perspectives of practitioners in Hangzhou China. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2024.2363793
- Wang, S., Tian, Q., Chen, X., Zhang, Q., Deng, F., & Arif, M. (2024). Study of the evolving relationship between tourism development and cultural heritage landmarks in the eight Chengyang scenic villages in China. *Ecological Indicators*, 167, 112702. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2024.112702
- Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample size requirements for structural equation models: An evaluation of power, bias, and solution propriety. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 73(6), 913-934. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164413495237
- Yuenthon, N., Yaemjamuang, B., & Prakancharoen, S. (2023). A study of potential for cultural tourism activities along the Nakhon Chai Si River, Nakhon Pathom Province. *Actual Economy: Local Solutions for Global Challenges* International Academic Conference on Educational and Social Innovations (ACE-2023), Istanbul, Turkey.
- Zhang, H., Wu, Y., & Buhalis, D. (2018). A model of perceived image, memorable tourism experiences and revisit intention. *Journal of destination marketing & management*, 8, 326-336. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.06.004
- Zhang, H., Xu, F., Leung, H. H., & Cai, L. A. (2016). The Influence of Destination-Country Image on Prospective Tourists' Visit Intention: Testing Three Competing Models. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 21(7), 811-835. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2015.1075566
- Zhou, Q., Pu, Y., & Su, C. (2023). The mediating roles of memorable tourism experiences and destination image in the correlation between cultural heritage rejuvenation experience quality and revisiting intention. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 35(6), 1313-1329. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-11-2021-0829

Article history:	Received: 02.12.2024	Revised: 18.03.20
------------------	----------------------	-------------------

2025 Accepted: 15.04.2025

Available online: 20.05.2025