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TRAVEL SATISFACTION AND REVISIT INTENTION OF CHINESE VISITORS: THE CASE OF SINGAPORE

Budi Guntoro and Tak-Kee Hui

ABSTRACT

Tourism is one of the main income generator for the Singapore's economy. Since China is the second largest tourist group to Singapore in the past 15 years which is due to the newly middle class and the appreciation of Chinese Yuan, this study attempts to explore the market potential by understanding Chinese tourist’s repeat visit intention. A sample of 192 Chinese tourists is collected at Singapore Chiang International Airport to study eight selected satisfaction attributes using systematic random sampling techniques. The mean scores indicate that all attributes are above the average. In addition, transportation and environment/safety are tied as the most satisfactory attribute. Further, a logistic regression model identifies which attributes lead the Chinese tourists’ likelihood to revisit Singapore. Three attributes entailing
lodging, attraction and environment and safety, are significant. The managerial implications are also discussed.

**Keywords:** Satisfaction; revisit intention; Singapore

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism has always been one of the main income generator for the Singapore’s economy. Singapore Tourism Board (STB) (2004) reported that this sector brings in approximately US$10 billion annually and also creates hundreds of thousands of jobs in the tourism industry. In the past 15 years, it was observed that the majority of visitors were coming from countries such as Indonesia, India, China, Malaysia, Japan, Australia, and the United Kingdom. However, it was also noted that Chinese tourists jumped from the sixth largest tourist group in 2000 to the second largest in 2003. After the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) outbreak in 2003, tourists from China had started flocking to Singapore and subsequently became the second largest tourist group, with Indonesia in the first position.

This trend was due to the emergence of a newly rich middle class and the easing restrictions of movement by the Chinese government. The continuous appreciation of Yuan also helped to attract the Chinese to travel outbound more frequently. As reported in STB (2008), Singapore received 1,114,000 visitors in 2007 from China which accounted for 10.8% of the total tourist arrivals. Despite the intense competition from regional neighbors such as Malaysia and Indonesia, Singapore has remarkably achieved a 34.7% positive growth in arrivals from China. In report of STB (2012), Singapore has received 1,578,000 visitors from China in 2011 which again accounted for more than 35% growth relative 2010 with tourism receipts S$2,110 million. It was still ranked the second largest tourist group and Indonesia was still in the first position which was likely due to the geographical location. According to the World Tourism Organization (WTO), China is projected to supply 100 million travelers by 2020, making it the number one supplier of outbound tourists in the world. Hence, it is not surprising that Singapore will also like to gain a bigger slice of this lucrative market.

The STB is well aware of the significance of Chinese tourists in terms of the number of arrivals increased and also the tourism receipts increased which may be due to a large group of newly rich middle class who are willing to spend in both hotels and shopping. As part of its recent advertising drive
targeted at generating more Chinese tourist arrivals, Singapore has provided Chinese tourists with special travel deals and simplified their visa application procedures. As of May 2004, Chinese tourists can be issued a social visa to enter Singapore within a day, and the total number of Chinese tourist agencies applying for such a visa for the Chinese nationals is also increased from 43 to 66. With the Chinese government granting more countries “Approved Destination Status” (ADS), there is a wider choice of travel destinations for Chinese tourists now than in the 1990s. Efforts to woo first-time visitors from China hence become more crucial due to the increasing competition among countries nearby for a slice of the Chinese outbound market. As a result, convincing Chinese tourists to make repeat visits to Singapore will become more demanding. Since both first-time tourists and repeat visitors play a fundamental role in the overall well-being and success of a destination, destination managers have to strive to achieve a balance between first-time and repeat visitation (Oppermann, 1997).

A common marketing myth is that it is five or six times more effective to attract repeat customers than to gain new ones. Despite this, there have been few studies on the relationship between travel satisfaction and behavior intent during the post-purchase destination selection process. Oppermann (1998) commented that “repeat visitation, particularly the multiple-repeat visitation pattern, has largely escaped attention in the tourism literature.”

Since retaining tourists is often considered to be as important as attracting new ones, it is necessary to understand tourist satisfaction in order to design the promotional campaigns and the respective tour packages. A study on tourist satisfaction is the very first step to identify the needs and concerns of Singapore visitors and then to strengthen the service quality in its tourism industry. In particular, a study focusing on Chinese tourists, a market with the largest growth potential will shed some light on how we can enhance their experience in Singapore and in the process generate more first-time and repeat visitors. The objectives of this study are thus to examine the satisfaction of Chinese pleasure tourists during their visit to Singapore and also to identify the impact of travel satisfaction on the likelihood of travelers to revisit Singapore.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The literature review of this study covers two broad areas of interest: research dealing generally with customer satisfaction and the more specific
studies on repeat visitation. There are also evidences from the previous literature review concerning a direct link between the level of travel satisfaction and the intention to revisit a destination.

Tourist Satisfaction

Tourist satisfaction is the result of comparing between the tourists’ experience at destination visited and expectations about the destination (Pizam, Neumann, & Reichel, 1978). When experience exceeds expectations, it leads to tourist satisfaction. In the event that expectations surpass the experience, it results into tourist dissatisfaction (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1990).

Chon (1989) also highlighted that an individual recreational traveler, during and after one’s participation in a travel activity, might have the feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the recreational travel experience based on a comparison of one’s previously expectation about the experience and one’s perceived outcome of the experience. According to Le Boeuf (1987), it is six times more expensive to gain new customers than retain the old ones. Customer satisfaction results in repeat purchase and positive word-of-mouth (Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996) and this may also the result of the tourists.

Ostrowski, O’Brien, and Gordon (1993) pointed out that value could also be considered as a function of both price and quality. The higher the quality offered for the price paid, the higher would be the perceived value. Augustyn and Ho (1998) also noted that friends, consumer groups, and even the government played a role in shaping the expectation. A high discrepancy between expectations and perceptions of the service would result in customer dissatisfaction.

Keane (1997) proposed that a high quality tourism destination could build up its reputation and the customer loyalty by selling the best service quality which is above its costs of production. The reputation of a tourism destination largely depends on perceived service quality. It was likely that a high quality tourism destination with good reputation might need costly investment but it would at least have a high chance of having repeat business in the future.

Qu and Li (1997) conducted a study to identify the characteristics and satisfaction level of mainland Chinese visitors traveling to Hong Kong. Using tourist satisfaction attributes in the categories of shopping, restaurants, hotels, transportation, attractions, environment, and local
residents’ attitude, they found that Chinese tourists were generally satisfied with their trip to Hong Kong, except for the price factor. Heung and Qu (2000) examined eight travel dimensions and found that “accommodation and food,” “price,” and “culture” were more influential in determining Japanese tourists’ overall satisfaction levels and also their likelihood of recommending Hong Kong to their friends and relatives.

Hui, Wan, and Ho (2007) also carried a study on the satisfaction of four different tourist groups – Europe, Asia, Oceania, and North America. Their study found that the “price” was insignificant and did not affect the overall satisfaction of all tourist groups. However, Accommodation and Food was significant for the North Americans overall satisfaction levels. Attractions were significant for European and Asian tourists while culture was significant for the Oceania tourists. There was no single factor appealed to all groups of travelers. In particular, it was revealed that most Asian travelers were disappointed with the lack of interesting night life in Singapore, as well as the natural and scenic spots and any attractive urban sightseeing in Singapore.

Hui, Wan, and Cheng (2010) further examined the satisfaction of Asian and non-Asian groups based on five new variables, namely, variety and safety, attractions and culture, hotel services, prices, and people and convenience. They had found that all variables were significant in affecting the overall satisfaction levels regardless of whether they are Asian and non-Asian.

Repeat Visitation

Gitelson and Crompton (1984) reported that many destination areas had to rely heavily on repeat visitation. They also identified five reasons why people undertake repeat visits: risk reduction/contentment with a particular destination, risk reduction/find the same kind of people, emotional attachment to a place, further exploration of a destination, and show the destination to other people.

Fakeye and Crompton (1991) studied perceptual differences between prospective first-time and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. They found that those who had been to the Valley considered factors relating to consumption of experiences, such as food, friendly people, and bars and evening entertainment as being more important than the first-time visitors. In contrast, the first-time visitors identified natural and cultural amenities, accommodation, and transportation as more important.
Gyte and Phelps (1989) observed that building up repeat visitation was a means by which tourism suppliers could increase revenue and decrease costs by reducing reliance on the much more difficult task of attracting new visitors. If satisfied with the quality of services they received, repeat visitors were more likely to use word-of-mouth communication to promote destination awareness and encouraged prospective travelers to become visitors (Reid & Reid, 1993). Repeat visitors represented a stabilizing influence for most destinations (Oppermann, 2000). These tourists would tend to be familiar with the destination and satisfied with the experiences offered. They provided a stable income source that enables businesses and destinations to invest in new market development.

Rittichainuwat, Qu, and Mongknonvanit (2002) concluded that the level of travel satisfaction experienced by international pleasure tourists to Thailand had an impact on their intention to revisit the country. Travelers who experienced higher satisfaction were more likely to revisit a travel destination. In particular, satisfaction of lodging and food had the greatest impact on tourist intentions to revisit. Rittichainuwat, Qu, and Leong (2003) studied pleasure tourists in Thailand, and suggested that an individual’s travel motivations, destination image, and destination inhibitors had further impacted a tourist’s intention to revisit the destination.

Lau and McKercher (2004) studied the motives of first-time and repeat pleasure tourists for visiting Hong Kong. The study revealed significant differences in motivation that resulted in the intention to participate in different activities. First-time visitors came mainly to explore, while repeat visitors came to consume such as shopping and spending time with family and friends. They suggested that previous experience with a destination had a strong influence on a tourist’s motivation to revisit a destination.

Hui et al. (2007) had also examined the satisfaction of four different groups of tourists, including Europe, Asia, Oceania, and North America who visited Singapore. Their results further supported the above studies that satisfaction did lead to the tourists’ intention to revisit Singapore in the near future. In fact, their results also supported the tourists’ satisfaction would also lead them to recommend their friends and relatives to visit Singapore.

Campo-Martinez, Garau-Vadell, and Martinez-Ruiz (2010) had carried out a study on the repeat visitors in the island of Spain. Their results showed that overall satisfaction had the biggest influence on the tourist’s decision of whether to revisit a destination, while the least important factor was the tourist’s perceived image. Zabkar, Bencic, and Dmitrovic (2010) examined the perceived quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions of 1056 visitors at four tourist destinations in Slovenia using structural equation modeling.
Their results indicated that destination attributes had the impact on the perceived quality which in turn was positively related to satisfaction as well as visitors’ behavioral intention.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Instrument**

A self-administered questionnaire was used to assess Chinese tourists’ level of satisfaction during their visit to Singapore. The questionnaire was written in English and translated to Chinese. The questionnaire contained three sections – demographics, tourists’ satisfaction, and their intention to revisit Singapore. The satisfaction measurement was modified from the study of Rittichainuwat et al. (2002), who studied the level and impact of satisfaction of international travelers on revisiting Thailand.

In this study, the tourist satisfaction attributes were in the categories or factors of lodging, shopping, attractions, transportation, food, environment, local residents' attitudes, and accessibility. All eight categories had three different questions except two categories, namely, transportation and accessibility where each category had only two questions. For instance, satisfaction of quality, price and service were those listed under the shopping category. The respondents were then asked to indicate their level of satisfaction which was ranged from 1 (= very dissatisfied) to 5 (= very satisfied). The respondents were also asked to indicate their revisit intention within the next 5 years with a dichotomous measurement (e.g., yes = 1; no = 0).

**Sampling**

The target population of this study was the Chinese tourists, who visited Singapore and were waiting for departure at the Changi International Airport. Flights from Singapore to China depart either early in the morning or late at night. As a result, the questionnaire survey was conducted in both morning and evening. A systematic random sampling technique was used to select individuals. A verbal assessment was carried out to confirm that the person was a Chinese tourist visiting Singapore for pleasure before the questionnaire form was provided to him/her. A field editing was conducted at the airport to check for the completeness of the questionnaires.
Data Analysis

The mean of eight different categories were first computed before the data were segmented and analyzed according to different groupings. Since most of the demographic factors, except gender and marital status, have more than two groups for comparison, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there existed any difference in the travel satisfaction across all travelers before Bonferroni test was used to find out which two groups were the same or not. As for the gender and martial status, the independent sample \( t \)-test was used. Forward stepwise Binary Logistic Regression was then used to determine the impact of the travel satisfaction on the likelihood of Chinese tourists to revisit Singapore as the dependent variable was binary namely, yes and no. The independent variables were those eight factors listed above. All the computation were done using SPSS package. In addition to these, the fitness of the model proposed was tested by dividing the full sample into two samples. One sample was used to build up the model and the other sample was used to test the goodness of fit.

RESULTS

Respondents' Profile

A total of 202 questionnaires were collected. However, 10 of them were incomplete and therefore they were not included in this study. As a result, the number of valid questionnaires was 192, representing a usable rate of 95%. There were 84 (43.75%) female and 108 male (56.25%) tourists. The majority of them were between 36 and 55 years old. About 12.5% of the respondents were self-employed. Around 43.75% of them held professional and managerial positions, while 28.13% held blue-collared positions. The remaining 28.13% were housewives, students, or holding other occupations. Most of the respondents were in fact the first-time visitors (90.63%) while three-quarters of the respondents indicated that they would like to revisit Singapore within the next 5 years.

The reliability coefficient (alpha) of different factors was also computed and they ranged from 0.491 to 0.826 which were also the acceptable range. In fact, the alpha based on eight different factors was 0.865 which was well above the acceptable level 0.70. All the eight factors had a fairly high mean value, above the neutral response level (3) – F1 = Lodging (3.67), F2 = Shopping (3.32), F3 = Attraction (3.77), F4 = Transport (3.86).
Table 1. The Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of the Travel Satisfaction Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1: Lodging</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2: Shopping</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3: Attraction</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4: Transport</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5: Food</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6: Environment and Safety</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7: Accessibility</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8: Attitude</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.0411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F5 = Food (3.28), F6 = Environment and Safety (3.86), F7 = Accessibility (3.72), and F8 = Attitude (3.63). Transport and Environment and Safety satisfactions among Chinese travelers were relatively higher than the other six satisfaction factors. The standard deviation scores, which ranged from 0.591 to 1.041, suggested that there was no big disagreement among respondents on these travel satisfaction attributes (Table 1).

Travel Satisfaction Differences by Demographics

The ANOVA and t-test were used to test whether China travelers with different demographic profiles had significantly different levels of travel satisfaction. The dependent variables were the eight travel satisfaction factors, while the independent variables were the respondents’ demographic profiles including gender, age, occupation, marital status, and income (Table 2).

The t-test showed that there was no significant difference in the travel satisfaction on all eight factors between male and female travelers at 5% significant level. The only factor significant at 10% is “shopping.” This simply indicated that male and female had different perception toward the shopping. In fact, the data did reveal that the female respondents expecting a better service and price than the male respondents. Another implication was that all Chinese tourists regardless of the gender were satisfied with the eight attributes.

As for different age groups, four factors, namely, “shopping,” “food,” “environment and safety,” and “attitude” were found to be significant. The results revealed that different age groups could have different perceptions although all respondents were satisfied with all attributes. The Bonferroni post hoc test further showed that age groups 2 and 4 had a higher satisfaction on
Table 2. Travel Satisfaction Differences by Demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0: Female</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Male</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>3.158</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of freedom</strong></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P value</strong></td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0: &lt;25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: 26–35</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: 36–45</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4: 56–65</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5: &gt;66</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F value</strong></td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>6.496</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>6.538</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>3.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of freedom</strong></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P value</strong></td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post hoc test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bonferroni)</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3 (p = 0.012)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.006)</td>
<td>0 &gt; 2 (p = 0.003)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 1 (p = 0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 0: Self-employed</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: Professional</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F value</td>
<td>14.918</td>
<td>4.852</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>4.619</td>
<td>3.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of freedom</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post hoc test</td>
<td>4 &gt; 1 (p = 0.022)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.001)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 1 (p = 0.021)</td>
<td>0 &gt; 3 (p = 0.001)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 0 (p = 0.012)</td>
<td>1 &gt; 3 (p = 0.017)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 2 (p = 0.002)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bonferroni)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 2 (p = 0.043)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 2 (p = 0.021)</td>
<td>2 &gt; 3 (p = 0.016)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.000)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.000)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.000)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.000)</td>
<td>4 &gt; 3 (p = 0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“shopping” that those in age group 3. As for “food,” only age group 4 had higher satisfaction than age group 3. Travelers from age groups 0 and 4 were also generally more satisfied in “environment and safety” than those in age groups 2 and 3. Lastly, travelers in age group 4 were more satisfied with the “attitude” of Singaporeans as compared to those in age groups 1 and 2. Overall, it was detected that the age group 4 were satisfied with almost all attributes relative to the other age groups although age group below 25 were also satisfied with most of the attributes.

There was a significant difference of five attributes, namely, “lodging,” “transport,” “food,” “environment and safety,” and “attitude” across different occupational groups. This simply indicated that the occupation would really had impact on their perceptions of most of the attributes. The Bonferroni post hoc test showed that travelers in occupational group 2 were more satisfied in “lodging” than those in occupational group 3. In addition, those in occupational groups 1 and 2 were also more satisfied in “transport” than those in occupational group 3. As for the “food,” groups 0 and 2 were more satisfied than group 4. Travelers in groups 4 and 7 were more satisfied than those in groups 3 and 5, respectively, for “environment and safety.” Lastly, for “attitude,” groups 2, 6, and 7 were satisfied than group 5. In this instance, age group 2, white collar, seemed to be the group who were more satisfied than the other groups.

As for the marital status, the only factor turned out to be significant was “lodging.” In fact, the data also revealed that the married travelers were more satisfied with “lodging” than travelers who were single. Lastly, it was observed that there was a significant difference in satisfaction in all factors, except “transport” and “environment and safety” across different income groups. In addition, the results of the Bonferroni post hoc test showed that travelers in income group 4 were generally more satisfied in “lodging,” “shopping,” “attraction,” and “accessibility.” Travelers in income group 3 were also significantly less satisfied in “food” than those in other groups. The results also showed that the highest income group 4 was more satisfied with most of the attributes than the other income groups. This may not be consistent with the intuitive feeling that highest income groups were more demanding and they might not be easily satisfied.

Likelihood of Revisiting

Our regression, based on the full sample size, produced the parsimonious three-variable model, with “lodging satisfaction,” “attractions satisfaction,”
and “environment/safety satisfaction.” The result of the logistic regression was shown in Table 3. As seen in Table 3, it showed a significant positive influence of satisfaction with hotels on the likelihood of Chinese tourists revisiting Singapore with a Wald statistic of 8.89 at the significance level of $p = 0.003$. Similarly, there was a significant positive relationship between satisfaction with the tourist attractions and the likelihood of revisiting with a Wald statistic of 7.10 at the significance level of $p = 0.008$. The cleanliness of the environment cum personal safety levels demonstrated the highest significant positive relationship with revisit likelihood with a Wald statistic of 15.40 at the significance level of $p < 0.001$. There was no significant relationship between the likelihood of revisiting and the other travel satisfaction variables.

The results revealed that the safety was still the most important attribute why the Chinese tourists had the intention to revisit Singapore. This was in fact due to the strict and great rules set by the Singapore government. The respondents would prefer to enjoy the safety and won’t mind the strict rules. Although the attractions were less relative to the nearby countries, the results indicated that they were happy with what the Singapore had. However, the government still kept on bringing in more such as Formula four cars racing. Services of the lodging also played an important role in bringing back the good memory of the Chinese tourists.

In summary, there were three travel satisfaction variables which were different from zero. Hence, the null hypothesis, which proposed that there was no significant relationship between Chinese tourist’ satisfaction levels and the likelihood of revisiting, was rejected.

To test the predictive ability of the model, the first 152 respondents were used to build the model and the remaining 40 was used as out-samples to test the robustness of the model. Based on the out-sample data, it was observed that the model correctly predicted 95.8% of the “would revisit” group and 56.3% of the “would not revisit” group. The hit ratio showed a high predictive accuracy value and indicated a high model goodness of fit.

Table 3. Estimates of the Logit Regression.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimate B</th>
<th>Wald’s Statistics</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1:Lodging</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3:Attraction</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6:Environment and Safety</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-17.64</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other words, the model worked well with the attributes selected and it was worthwhile to recommend to similar studies in the near future.

CONCLUSION

This study examines eight travel satisfaction factors. It finds that Chinese travelers in the age group of 46–55 years tend to be less satisfied in “shopping” and “food” than those in other age groups. Based on the findings, it is advised that those related companies which serve mainly this group of tourists to step up their product and price competitiveness, quality and variety, and better service in order to increase this group of tourists’ level of satisfaction during their future stay in Singapore. In addition, the young (<25 years old) and the old (56–65 years) are more satisfied in “environment and safety” than those in age group of 36–55 years. This indicates that the young and the old groups are generally enjoying the safety of Singapore more than the other age groups. In fact, they are the groups of people who would like to walk peacefully in Singapore. Overall, all tourists feel safety in traveling to Singapore. Most of the studies in the past did support that safety is one of the important reasons why most of the travelers in the world choose Singapore as one of their travel destinations (Hui et al., 2007). All these are due to the government efforts who would like to make all travelers to have a peaceful stay.

Note that there is a significant difference in the travel satisfaction on “lodging,” “transport,” “food,” “environment and safety,” as well as “attitude” across different occupational groups. In fact, the results also reveal that travelers holding white-collar jobs are more satisfied in “lodging” than those holding blue-collar jobs. This may suggest that those travelers who have better jobs are more likely to have good income that allow them to stay in more luxurious hotels, which in turn results in their higher satisfaction. Travelers holding professional and white-collar jobs are also more satisfied in Singapore’s “transport” as compared to blue-collared workers. This is possibly due to the fact that their higher level of income allows them to utilize “better” forms of transportation such as private cars or taxi, in contrast to public transport like the MRT or buses. Based on the above results, it seems that travelers holding blue-collar jobs are relatively less satisfied than most other occupational groups. However, the score of 3.44 of this group of tourists still indicates that they are happy with the transport system in Singapore. The MRT around the island makes it
convenience for most travelers to travel from one region to another region. In fact, the government still works on the system to make sure that the traveling time will be further reduced. Buses are the alternative transports most travelers use.

Married travelers are more satisfied with “lodging” than travelers who are single. This could be due to the possibility that these travelers are on honeymoon or wedding anniversary in Singapore. Thus, they may be more concerned with an impressive travel experience than price. As a result, they tend to stay in four to five-star hotels or resorts. Since these married travelers pay higher prices for their lodging, they tend to receive better service quality and thus are more satisfied than the single travelers, who are likely to travel on a lower budget. Ostrowski et al. (1993) have pointed out, the higher the quality offered for the price paid, the higher will be the value as perceived by customers. Due to the lower price-sensitivity and higher expectations of quality of lodging by married Chinese travelers, hotel management should aim to create a unique travel experience by offering special packages to cater to this group of married travelers. However, it is recommended that one should also try to figure out a best deal for the singles providing them the cheapest but good services of budget hotels to make them to have a perception of value for the money in order to push up their satisfaction of the lodging.

Lastly, there is a significant difference in satisfaction across income groups in all factors, except for “transport” and “environment and safety.” The results of the Bonferroni post hoc test show that travelers in the income group of over RMB120,000 are generally more satisfied in “lodging,” “shopping,” “attraction,” and “accessibility.” One interesting observation is that travelers in the income group of RMB90,000–RMB120,000 are significantly less satisfied in “food” than those in other groups. This suggests that travelers in this group may be harder to please in their satisfaction of food. It is likely that they did compare with what they have in their own country. Thus, the tourist agents should try to figure out what sort of food that fit most Chinese travelers. It is not necessary to be expensive and it can be something like their homemade food or some special local food.

The *objective of this paper is to investigate the relationship between travel satisfactions and revisit intentions, in that a higher level of travel satisfaction experienced by Chinese tourists should lead to a higher propensity to revisit Singapore. The null hypothesis, which proposed no significant relationship between the traveler’s satisfaction and the likelihood of revisiting, is rejected. The alternative hypothesis is supported by the significant, positive relationships between travel satisfaction levels and
lodging, attractions, environment/safety, and the likelihood of Chinese pleasure travelers to revisit Singapore. Moreover, the larger coefficient of environment and safety indicates that this factor has the greatest impact on the likelihood of Chinese travelers to revisit Singapore. The findings are not surprising. In general, price levels for branded goods and consumer electronics are cheapest in Singapore than in many cities in China. Besides, the branded goods are with guarantees. They can change them in case the goods that they have bought are not in good quality or the pirated ones. Safety as mentioned before is the main factor why they choose Singapore as their travel destination. Thus, the highest satisfaction score of “environment and safety” will lead to their revisit intention.

In order to attract more Chinese tourists, including both first-timers and repeat visitors, the STB should enhance its promotional efforts in the areas of hospitality management, the quality and variety of local attractions and national levels of cleanliness and safety. More funding should be devoted for the hotel staff training as well as upgrading the facilities of the hotel. Try to propose the good deal project to attract more locals or foreigners to invest/create more attractions such as Universal Studios. Ministry of Environment should also try to work hand in hand with the STB on the cleanliness.

Thus, it can be concluded that the higher satisfaction travelers have toward their trip, the more likely they would revisit a travel destination. The findings of this paper further confirm the results of previous studies (Oliver, 1980; Rittichainuwat et al., 2002; Zeithaml et al., 1996) in that there is a positive relationship between satisfactions and repurchase intentions. Keane (1997) suggested that a high quality tourism destination could increase its customer loyalty by selling premium service quality above its costs of production. This study reveals that a one size fit all practice is inadequate. Tourists of different socio-demographic characteristics may have divergent needs and thus require different attention. In a highly competitive environment, the reputation of a tourism destination largely depends on perceived service quality (Keane, 1997). This paper also confirms earlier findings that quality services are the key to repeat visitation (Heung & Qu, 2000; Stevens, 1992).

Two limitations of this study should be noted. Since many of the Chinese tourists that arrived in Singapore are on tour groups, their satisfaction level will be largely determined by the hotels and itinerary provided by the tour agencies. This could significantly affect a large group of our respondents, which in turn might result in largely similar responses. In addition, only the significance of travel satisfaction factors in affecting revisit intentions of Chinese tourists are tested. There may be other push and pull factors besides
satisfaction which has the impact on an individual’s intention to make an effort for repeat visit. These include for example individual travel motivations, travel inhibitors, and the destination’s image. Hence, while our model revealed an acceptable goodness of fit, this could possibly be improved further by incorporating other relevant predictors.
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