



Service Quality, Visitor Satisfaction, and Revisit Intention at Merci Theme Park and Resto

Kiki Natasya Simatupang^{1*}

¹Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia, kikinatasyasimatupang@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the associations of service quality and visitor satisfaction with revisit intention at Merci Theme Park and Resto in Deli Serdang, North Sumatra. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey was conducted in November 2025. Data collection comprised observation, documentation, and a structured questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. The analysis included 72 respondents recruited through convenience sampling and used partial least squares structural equation modeling in SmartPLS. The reported service-quality path was positive ($\beta = 0.284$, $t = 2.415$, $p = .016$), as was the visitor-satisfaction path ($\beta = 0.512$, $t = 4.822$, $p < .001$). Satisfaction had the larger reported coefficient, although the difference between coefficients was not tested. The reported R^2 of .685 could not be reconciled with the accompanying correlation and path-coefficient tables. Incomplete indicator information and possible overlap between satisfaction and revisit-intention measures further limit interpretation. The results therefore suggest positive associations within this sample but do not establish causality, mediation, or subsequent repeat visits. Service quality and satisfaction warrant joint attention in visitor feedback and service planning, while stronger managerial conclusions require verification of the measurement and structural model outputs.

Keywords: service quality; visitor satisfaction; revisit intention; theme park; PLS-SEM

Received: 2 January 2026

Revised: 4 February 2026

Published: 30 March 2026

INTRODUCTION

Revisit intention provides destination managers with information about visitors' stated willingness to return. It is distinct from an observed repeat visit and does not by itself establish lasting loyalty. Service research has linked perceived quality to behavioral intentions, while also treating quality and satisfaction as related but separate constructs (Cronin et al., 2000; Zeithaml et al., 1996). For a destination combining recreational facilities and restaurant services, the practical question is whether these visitor evaluations are associated with the intention to visit again.

Merci Theme Park and Resto, located in Deli Serdang, North Sumatra, provides the setting for this study. Evidence from other destinations offers a basis for examining visitor evaluations, but findings cannot be transferred without considering the setting and

measurement approach. Resort research in Batam examined the physical environment, service quality, satisfaction, and revisit intention (Wijaya & Anggraini, 2023). A theme-park study considered different experience dimensions in relation to satisfaction and revisit intention (Lee et al., 2020). These studies support examining the visitor experience beyond the availability of physical attractions alone.

Indonesian tourism research has reported positive service-quality and satisfaction relationships with revisit intention in Bilebante and The Sila's Agrotourism (Rahmayanti et al., 2022; Riadi et al., 2023). However, the strength and structure of these relationships vary. Research at Taman Ismail Marzuki reported a positive satisfaction relationship but no significant direct service-quality relationship with revisit intention (Havifa, 2024). A Vietnamese destination study also distinguished different aspects of destination quality and intentional loyalty (Cong, 2016). This variation supports a site-specific assessment rather than an assumption that one predictor always dominates.

The present study asks whether service quality and visitor satisfaction are positively associated with revisit intention among surveyed visitors to Merci Theme Park and Resto. It examines two hypotheses: H1, service quality is positively associated with revisit intention; and H2, visitor satisfaction is positively associated with revisit intention. Its contribution is a contextual account of the reported visitor evaluations at this destination.

METHODS

The study used a quantitative, cross-sectional associative design. Data were collected at Merci Theme Park and Resto, Deli Serdang, North Sumatra, in November 2025. The population of interest comprised people who had visited and experienced the destination. Recruitment used accidental, or convenience, sampling: visitors encountered at the site were approached as potential respondents. The analysis included 72 responses classified as valid in the study records.

The original sample-size description referred to Slovin's formula with a 10% error tolerance. However, the population size and calculation were not specified. Consequently, the sample is described here by its achieved size and recruitment method, without claiming a probability-based margin of error. A dedicated PLS-SEM sample-size assessment would require assumptions about the effects to be detected and statistical power; the choice of the software alone does not establish adequacy (Kock & Hadaya, 2018). No such power assessment was reported for this dataset.

Data collection combined observation, documentation, and a structured questionnaire. Questionnaire responses used a five-point Likert scale coded from 1 to 5. The modeled constructs were service quality (X1), visitor satisfaction (M), and revisit intention (Y). The symbol M is retained for consistency with the original tables, but the reported structural results treat satisfaction as a predictor of Y. The available results contain no service-quality-to-satisfaction path, indirect-effect estimate, or confidence interval for an indirect effect. A mediation conclusion is therefore outside the evidence presented here (Zhao et al., 2010).

The measurement summary lists service-quality labels for tangibles, responsiveness, and assurance, as well as one row without an indicator code. Satisfaction is represented by labels for expectation and return intention, while revisit intention includes visit plan, interest continuation, and return commitment. The complete questionnaire wording,

response anchors, and rules for excluding responses were not documented in the material available for analysis. These omissions restrict assessment of content validity and reproducibility, particularly because return intention appears among the satisfaction indicators.

Data analysis used partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS. The measurement-model assessment comprised indicator loadings, Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and the Fornell–Larcker criterion. The structural summary comprised R^2 and the two path coefficients with their reported t-statistics and p-values. These measures address different properties and should be interpreted together rather than as interchangeable evidence of validity (Cheung et al., 2024; Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2019).

The SmartPLS version, algorithm settings, resampling configuration, confidence intervals, and missing-data treatment were not specified. The reported significance results are therefore presented as supplied, rather than as independently reproduced estimates. The reporting threshold for the two hypotheses is $p < .05$. A displayed p-value of .000 is expressed as $p < .001$; it is not interpreted as a probability of zero. No test of the difference between the two path coefficients was reported.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Measurement-model results are presented first, followed by the reported structural relationships. Table 1 reproduces the numerical loading information and abbreviated indicator labels. All listed values exceed the source criterion of .70, although the incomplete labeling prevents a full assessment of the indicator set.

Table 1. Reported loadings for service quality, satisfaction, and revisit intention

Construct	Indicator label in source	Loading	Criterion
Service quality (X1)	Unspecified code: “Service Quality (X1)”	.798	> .70
Service quality (X1)	X1.1 – Tangibles	.825	> .70
Service quality (X1)	X1.2 – Responsiveness	.845	> .70
Service quality (X1)	X1.4 – Assurance	.810	> .70
Visitor satisfaction (M)	M1 – Expectation	.862	> .70
Visitor satisfaction (M)	M2 – Return intention	.885	> .70
Revisit intention (Y)	Y1 – Visit plan	.880	> .70
Revisit intention (Y)	Y2 – Interest continuation	.892	> .70
Revisit intention (Y)	Y3 – Return commitment	.884	> .70

Note. The first service-quality row has no indicator code in the source; no X1.3 label is supplied. The source classifies all rows as valid against the displayed loading criterion. This classification does not establish content or discriminant validity.

The listed loadings range from .798 to .892. They indicate relatively strong reported indicator–construct relationships under the specified measurement model; they do not identify which service attribute visitors rated most favorably or which attribute has the greatest managerial effect. In particular, the loading for responsiveness cannot establish that responsiveness has a stronger effect on satisfaction than other service dimensions. That comparison would require a separately specified analysis.

Table 2 summarizes the reported internal-consistency and convergent-validity statistics. Cronbach's alpha ranges from .845 to .882, composite reliability from .906 to .916, and AVE from .682 to .785.

Table 2. Reported construct reliability and convergent validity

Construct	Cronbach's α	Composite reliability	AVE
Service quality (X1)	.882	.914	.682
Visitor satisfaction (M)	.845	.906	.764
Revisit intention (Y)	.862	.916	.785

Note. AVE = average variance extracted. All numerical values are retained from the reported analysis.

The values in Table 2 exceed the conventional reporting thresholds used in the source analysis: .70 for internal-consistency measures and .50 for AVE. Nevertheless, threshold attainment does not resolve incomplete indicator specification or possible construct overlap. Measurement quality requires an assessment of the scale content and the consistency of the reported estimates as well as summary coefficients (Cheung et al., 2024). The reported composite reliability for satisfaction also requires reconciliation with the two loadings shown in Table 1; those two values alone do not reproduce .906 under the usual standardized reflective-model calculation.

Table 3 presents the Fornell–Larcker matrix. Its diagonal contains the reported square roots of AVE (.826, .874, and .886), and the lower triangle contains the reported interconstruct correlations.

Table 3. Reported Fornell–Larcker matrix for the three study constructs

Construct	X1	M	Y
Service quality (X1)	.826	—	—
Visitor satisfaction (M)	.612	.874	—
Revisit intention (Y)	.585	.715	.886

Note. Diagonal entries are square roots of AVE; off-diagonal entries are reported construct correlations.

The diagonal values exceed the corresponding off-diagonal correlations, so the displayed matrix satisfies the Fornell–Larcker comparison (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). However, this result alone cannot establish that respondents distinguish all three concepts. The criterion may fail to detect insufficient discriminant validity; the heterotrait–monotrait ratio of correlations offers an additional assessment (Henseler et al., 2015). No HTMT results were reported. The satisfaction indicator labeled “Return intention” is especially relevant to this concern because its meaning may overlap with the outcome. The full item wording is needed before that issue can be resolved.

For the structural model, the reported R^2 for revisit intention is .685. Ordinarily, this quantity describes the proportion of variance explained within the estimated model; it is not evidence of predictive accuracy for new visitors. Out-of-sample prediction requires a separate assessment, such as a holdout-based procedure (Shmueli et al., 2019). In this study, the R^2 value is also inconsistent with the accompanying correlations and standardized coefficients if they refer to the same two-predictor model. It should therefore be treated as unresolved, and no verified claim that the model explains 68.5% of revisit intention is made.

Table 4 reports the two structural paths. Both reported p-values are below .05. The hypothesis decisions describe the supplied estimates and do not remove the measurement and reporting limitations identified above.

Table 4. Reported path coefficients and hypothesis tests

Hypothesis	Relationship	β	t	p	Reported result
H1	Service quality → Revisit intention	.284	2.415	.016	Supported
H2	Visitor satisfaction → Revisit intention	.512	4.822	< .001	Supported

Note. The source p-value of .000 is expressed as $p < .001$. Confidence intervals and resampling settings were not reported; the two coefficients were not formally compared.

The reported service-quality coefficient is positive ($\beta = .284$, $t = 2.415$, $p = .016$), consistent with H1. The reported satisfaction coefficient is also positive ($\beta = .512$, $t = 4.822$, $p < .001$), consistent with H2. Satisfaction has the larger point estimate. However, separate significance tests for the two coefficients do not test whether their difference is statistically significant. The estimates also do not show that an investment in satisfaction would be twice as effective as an investment in service quality.

The positive service-quality estimate is directionally consistent with research at Sesaot and Bilebante, where service quality was associated with revisit intention (Rahmawati et al., 2021; Riadi et al., 2023). Similar relationships were reported in resort and agrotourism settings (Rahmayanti et al., 2022; Wijaya & Anggraini, 2023). These comparisons help situate the Merci findings, but they do not establish the same effect size across destinations. Differences in recruitment, questionnaire content, and model specification can change the estimated relationships.

The reported satisfaction relationship is also consistent with studies that connect visitors' evaluations of a destination to their willingness to return. Research at Goa Kreo and Kampung AEWO Mulyaharja examined satisfaction alongside facilities and attractions (Masriah et al., 2024; Septianing & Farida, 2021). These settings differ from Merci Theme Park and Resto, but they support considering satisfaction together with concrete service conditions. Conversely, the Taman Ismail Marzuki findings show why a positive satisfaction relationship should not be taken to guarantee a significant direct quality relationship in every setting (Havifa, 2024).

Mediation needs a separate interpretation. An indirect service-quality relationship through satisfaction was reported in one tourism survey (Sumarni et al., 2024), but another study did not find satisfaction to mediate this relationship (Sitepu & Rismawati, 2021). Other research examined memorable tourism experience as a different intermediary (Laela, 2024). Thus, neither the presence of a satisfaction variable nor a larger satisfaction coefficient is sufficient evidence of mediation. The Merci results lack the indirect-effect analysis needed to distinguish these explanations.

The findings also do not establish an emotional mechanism. Theme-park experience research has examined specific experience dimensions (Lee et al., 2020), but this study did not report measures of peak experience, emotional engagement, or memorable tourism experience. The current data therefore cannot identify empathy, emotional responses, or peak-season conditions as the reasons for the reported associations. Destination-quality

research provides a basis for examining these additional aspects in subsequent work, rather than attributing the unexplained variation to them in advance (Cong, 2016; Laela, 2024).

For management, service quality and satisfaction warrant joint monitoring. Visitor feedback could identify concerns about facilities, staff interactions, waiting times, cleanliness, and complaint handling before improvements are selected. These are candidate areas for assessment; the present data do not establish specific deficiencies. Any service change would require evaluation against visitor feedback and subsequent behavior.

The study has several limitations. Convenience sampling limits generalization beyond the recruited visitors, and the cross-sectional design does not establish temporal or causal order. All modeled constructs were collected through the same questionnaire, while subsequent visits were not observed. Incomplete indicator information, possible overlap between satisfaction and intention, and inconsistencies among the reported model summaries constrain the credibility of precise effect-size and variance-explanation claims. The absence of confidence intervals, resampling details, and a sample-size justification further limits assessment of uncertainty.

Further research should establish distinct satisfaction and intention measures, retain a complete indicator-to-construct mapping, and report reproducible estimation settings. A larger and more systematically recruited sample would improve coverage, while a planned power assessment would support sample-size decisions (Hair et al., 2019; Kock & Hadaya, 2018). Longitudinal follow-up could compare intentions with actual return visits. If satisfaction is proposed as a mediator, the analysis should explicitly estimate and assess the indirect effect (Zhao et al., 2010); if prediction is claimed, predictive performance should be evaluated separately from R^2 (Shmueli et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION

The reported paths suggest positive associations of service quality and visitor satisfaction with revisit intention among 72 surveyed visitors to Merci Theme Park and Resto. Satisfaction has the larger reported coefficient, but its statistical superiority was not tested. The study does not establish that satisfaction mediates the service-quality relationship, that either construct causes repeat visits, or that the model has verified out-of-sample predictive accuracy.

Service quality and satisfaction merit joint consideration in visitor feedback and service planning. However, the incomplete measurement information and inconsistent structural summaries require verification before precise managerial priorities or variance-explanation claims can be justified. Subsequent work should use clearly differentiated measures, fully documented estimation procedures, and follow-up evidence of actual visiting behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Cheung, G. W., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Lau, R. S., & Wang, L. C. (2024). Reporting reliability, convergent and discriminant validity with structural equation modeling: A review and best-practice recommendations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 41(2), 745–783. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-023-09871-y>

- 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>
- Cronin, J. J., Jr., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 193–218.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4359\(00\)00028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-4359(00)00028-2)
- 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/10.2307/3151312>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/eb-11-2018-0203>
- Havifa, M. (2024). Pengaruh destination image, perceived value, service quality terhadap visitor satisfaction dan revisit intention pada Taman Ismail Marzuki. *Jurnal Bisnis, Manajemen, dan Keuangan*, 5(1), 11–23. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jbmk.005.1.2>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Kock, N., & Hadaya, P. (2018). Minimum sample size estimation in PLS-SEM: The inverse square root and gamma-exponential methods. *Information Systems Journal*, 28(1), 227–261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12131>
- Laela, E. (2024). Understanding memorable tourism experiences and revisit intention from destination service quality. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 8(5), 1197–1206. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmbk.v8i5.29967>
- Lee, S., Jeong, E., & Qu, K. (2020). Exploring theme park visitors' experience on satisfaction and revisit intention: A utilization of experience economy model. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(4), 474–497.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008x.2019.1691702>
- Masriah, I., Ingkadijaya, R., & Mumin, A. T. (2024). The influence of tourism facilities and attractions on revisit intentions with visitor satisfaction as an intervening variable. *International Journal of Applied Sciences in Tourism and Events*, 8(2), 109–124.
<https://doi.org/10.31940/ijaste.v8i2.109-124>
- Rahmawati, N., Permadi, L. A., & Rinuastuti, B. H. (2021). The influence of attraction, location, and service quality on revisit intention to Sesaut rural tourism. *JMM UNRAM - MASTER OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL*, 10(1A), 43–57.
<https://doi.org/10.29303/jmm.v10i1a.636>

- Rahmayanti, P. L. D., Suartina, I. W., Wijaya, N. S., Wardana, M. A., Sumerta, K., & Yasa, N. N. K. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan persepsi harga terhadap kepuasan dan niat berkunjung kembali pada The Sila's Agrotourism. *Journal of Innovation in Management, Accounting and Business*, 1(2), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.56916/jimab.v1i2.169>
- Riadi, D., Permadi, L. A., & Retnowati, W. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan terhadap minat berkunjung kembali ke Desa Wisata Hijau Bilebante yang dimediasi oleh kepuasan wisatawan. *Jurnal Riset Pemasaran*, 2(2), 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jrp.v2i2.2678>
- Septianing, A. D., & Farida, N. (2021). Pengaruh fasilitas wisata dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap niat berkunjung kembali melalui kepuasan pengunjung (studi obyek wisata Goa Kreo kota Semarang). *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, 10(1), 781–792. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jiab.2021.29796>
- Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J.-H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: Guidelines for using PLSpredict. *European Journal of Marketing*, 53(11), 2322–2347. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejm-02-2019-0189>
- Sitepu, E. S., & Rismawati (2021). The influence of service quality, destination image, and memorable experience on revisit intention with intervening variables of tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Applied Sciences in Tourism and Events*, 5(1), 77–87. <https://doi.org/10.31940/ijaste.v5i1.2097>
- Sumarni, I., Baskara, I., & Fadli, J. A. (2024). The effect of service quality and destination image on return visit intention through tourist satisfaction. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 12(6), 2309–2336. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i6.2861>
- Wijaya, D. S., & Anggraini, R. (2023). Analysis of the influence of physical environment, service quality, and satisfaction on revisit intention at resort in Batam city. *Pusaka : Journal of Tourism, Hospitality, Travel and Business Event*, 5(1), 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.33649/pusaka.v5i1.115>
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299606000203>
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., Jr., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 37(2), 197–206. <https://doi.org/10.1086/651257>