

## Destination Risk Profile, Message Framing, and Tourist Visiting Intention in the New Life Era

Putu Saroyini Piartrini<sup>1</sup>, Komang Ardana<sup>2</sup>, PA Andiena Nindya Putri<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Udayana, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Institut Teknologi Dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali, Indonesia

royetrini@unud.ac.id, Mang\_ardana@yahoo.com, Dinaputri1991@gmail.com

### Abstract

*This study aims to examine the effect of the level of destination risk on the intention to visit Bali by considering attitudes towards tourist risk and the framing of destination marketing communication messages in the target market. In the context of recovering tourism activities, this study provides input for tourism destination managers regarding the perception of destination risk from a tourist perspective as input in formulating a destination marketing strategy by considering the effect of destination risk perception, and the attitude of target tourists on the risk of travel to their intention to visit or travel. after the policy of limiting community activities, especially the perception of risk on tourist travel activities. The research method used a quasi-experimental design. Starting with measuring the risk perception of a Bali destination, then measuring the intention of tourist visits in groups that have a high-risk perception and a low-risk perception by considering the Bali destination advertising message framing strategy. Data was collected in cities that are the target market for Indonesian tourists, namely Jakarta, Bandung, Yogya, Solo, Semarang and Surabaya, Medan, and Manado. The types of data in this study are quantitative data and qualitative data. The findings of this study recommend to the managers of Bali tourist destinations that destination communication is managed carefully. Management of messages related to Bali destinations to consider the strategy of framing messages communicated to potential markets to manage the perceived risk of visiting the destination. The results of data analysis concluded that: 1) Perception of Bali destination affects the intention to visit Bali. 2) Destination-related message framing strategies affect the intention to visit Bali.*

### Keywords

tourism; risk profile; message framing; new life era; visiting intention



## I. Introduction

The Covid 19 pandemic that has hit the world since the end of 2019, began with the discovery of 41 patients who were later identified as patients infected with the coronavirus 19 in Wuhan, China, not the first tragedy that harmed world tourism activities. Previously, in 2002, the world of tourism was shocked by an acute respiratory disease popularly known as the SAR virus that occurred in Hong Kong as one of the famous World Tourism Destinations, then the Avian Flu outbreak in 2009, MERS disease in 2012, and the EBOLA outbreak that occurred in 2014. Control of virus transmission is carried out by limiting human interaction in various areas as indicated by closing the entrances to human movement traffic both in international and national environments. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) in a press release on March 26, 2020, predicts the impact of the pandemic at a 20% -30% decline in world tourist arrivals. In a short time, the travel restriction policy and calls for the implementation of social distancing resulted in a

decrease in the number of flights and a decrease in the occupancy rate of hotel rooms and several other accommodation facilities by 60% compared to the same period in 2019 in Indonesia. This condition shows that health risks are an obstacle for tourists to travel.

The outbreak of this virus has an impact of a nation and Globally (Ningrum *et al*, 2020). The presence of Covid-19 as a pandemic certainly has an economic, social and psychological impact on society (Saleh and Mujahiddin, 2020). Covid 19 pandemic caused all efforts not to be as maximal as expected (Sihombing and Nasib, 2020).

Traveling during a pandemic is considered to be at risk of being infected with the covid 19 virus. Ozbilen, B., Slagle, KM, & Akar, G. (2021) based on research involving people in the Middle East Region (Middle East) revealed that 63.1% of respondents stated that they were willing to reduce travel activities both in the context of work needs and needs outside work activities. Strictly speaking, 41.3% of respondents stated that they would reduce their travel activities outside the home even though the restrictions on activities had been relaxed. The policy of limiting community activities was felt by 63.6% to limit their freedom in determining when and where they wanted to travel. Respondents also reported that the use of private transportation means the lowest risk of transmission by 65% of respondents compared to public transportation modes. The research findings illustrate that activities outside the home or traveling carry a risk of being infected with the Covid 19 virus. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) is categorized as a society that has a very strong tendency to avoid risk, as indicated by a score of 80 on the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance. People who have a strong tendency to avoid risk feel the discomfort of living in uncertainty, are diligent in saving and investing, building certainty by applying the legal system and standard procedures in various aspects of life.

The risks associated with travel have been studied by Laver, Wetzels, and Behrens (2001) who examined knowledge related to malaria prevention measures, perceptions of risk behavior of tourists towards destinations that are facing malaria-endemic. Hamer and Connor Bradley (2004) examined the behavior of American tourists, in particular how health risk perceptions correlate with travel and precautions prepared in foreign travel, including travel to African regions (Holloway (2004) and the effect of the Travel Advisory Board on European tourist visits). on tourism destinations in developing countries (Van Herck *et al.*, 2004), the Asia Pacific region (Wilder Smith *et al.*, 2004), and the behavior of tourists from Spain on their travels to the tropics (Lopez Velez and Bayas, 2007). grouping travel risk based on risk sources in five aspects, namely destination, time of visit, the standard of accommodation facilities, food and beverage health, and tourist behavior.

The tourism sector is the backbone of Bali's economy, which is known as a destination with natural and cultural attractions. Before the pandemic hit the world, the accommodation, food, and beverage sector made a dominant contribution to the value of the Gross Regional Domestic Product in 2019 which was 23.26% (BPS, 2020). The development of the number of foreign tourists from 2015-2019 amounted to 4,927,937 – 6,275,210, indicating an average growth rate of 12.17% during the 2015-2019 period. There is a slowdown in the growth rate every year, the growth rate of foreign tourist arrivals in 2016 was 23.14% while in 2019 it only reached 3.37%. Various events coloring the 2015-2019 period that allegedly contributed to the arrival of foreign tourists to Bali, among others, the eruption of Mount Barujari in Nusa Tenggara in 2016, the eruption of Mount Agung, in Karangasem Regency, Bali in 2017, the increase in air ticket prices in 2017 is suspected to be the cause of the decline in the growth of tourist arrivals at Bali Destinations through Ngurah Rai Airport and only 35,667 visits were made by sea.

The main foreign tourist markets were Australia with 1,241,128 visits (19%); China with 1,186,057 visits (18.90%); India as many as 374,045 visits (5.96%); UK totaled

287,201 visits (4.58%); US totaled 276,859 visits (4.41%); Japan totaled 257,959 visits (4.11%); South Korea totaled 213,356 visits (3.40%); France totaled 206,941 visits (3.30%); Germany totaled 196,774 visits (3.14%) and Malaysia amounted to 185,256 visits (2.95%). Foreign tourist arrivals contributed to the supply of foreign exchange as well as contributed exports of products and services and had a positive impact on the level of regional economic growth in Bali and the provision of employment for people in the central part of Indonesia in general and Bali in particular.

The Cultural Perspective places the four main markets for foreign tourists in Bali as markets that have a high Uncertainty Avoidance dimension. indicated by the magnitude of the uncertainty avoidance dimension score 1) Australia (51); 2) China (30); 3) India (40); 4) United Kingdom (35); 5) America (46); 6) Malaysia (46); 7) German (65); 8) France (86); 9) Japan (92) and 10) South Korea (85). Measurements were made on a scale of 1-100. Uncertainty avoidance score data shows that as the main market country for tourism, Bali has a relatively strong tendency to avoid risk, namely the German, French, Japanese, and South Korean markets.

The risk of tourist destinations has been studied based on the perspective of consumer behavior theory to examine the effect of the perceived risk of visiting a particular destination to visit that destination. Maoz and Reichel (2007) examined the effect of security risk on the intention of visiting tourists.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, health risks in travel have increased, so tourist destination managers need to obtain information on how the uncertainty impacts the increase in the number of infected patients, which can have an impact on closing access to and from entering the destination for some time, which has implications for the extension of travel time and travel costs as a risk of visiting Bali tourist destinations from the perspective of tourists; how is the role of tourist attitudes towards risk and destination marketing communication strategies on tourist visiting intentions in the post-pandemic. This study aims to examine the effect of the level of destination risk on the intention to visit Bali by considering attitudes towards tourist risk and the framing of destination marketing communication messages in the target market. In the context of recovering tourism activities, this study provides input for tourism destination managers regarding the perception of destination risk from a tourist perspective as input in formulating a destination marketing strategy by considering the effect of destination risk perception, and the attitude of target tourists on the risk of travel to their intention to visit or travel. after the policy of limiting community activities, especially the perception of risk on tourist travel activities.

## **II. Review of Literature**

### **2.1 Visitor Risk Perception and Tourist Behavior**

Manrai, L. A., & Manrai, A. (2011) revealed that the individualistic-communalistic cultural dimensions and uncertainty avoidance influence tourist behavior before and during a visit to a destination. Traveling in groups is a form of risk minimization compared to traveling alone. The behavior of Chinese and Japanese tourists is in line with this pattern. Collective behavior is a strategy to reduce the risk of travel. Jonas, A., Mansfeld, Y., Paz, S., & Potasman, I. (2011) measured the risk perception of Israeli tourist destinations in general based on the causes of unexpected events during visiting tourist destinations, namely criminal risk, health risk, risk natural disasters, risk of terrorist attacks and risks arising from political events and health risks are measured based on indicators of water quality, quality of health facilities, the health of food and beverages, bacterial/viral

infections, physical accidents, safety system of tourist facilities, physical environmental conditions of tourist destinations, sexually transmitted diseases, and drug abuse. The analysis findings show that Israel's general risk level score is 2 measured on a scale of 1-5, with the perceived criminal risk being the highest, followed by health risk. In the health risk group, the risk originating from water quality is rated the highest with a score of 3.04 followed by the risk of health care facilities (2.56) and food health. (2.48). Han, P., Balaban, V., & Marano, C. (2010) reported that attitudes towards tourist risk are correlated with tourist behavior. Tourists who are driven by the sensation-seeking motive do not seek treatment or disease prevention efforts before traveling. Hamid, S., & Bano, N. (2021) reported that the intention to travel to Indian society, 35% is influenced by attitudes towards the destination, perceived behavioral control, and perceived risk of destination. The perception of potential tourists to Bali destinations is formulated as follows:

H1: In a pandemic condition, the perception of the risk of tourist visits to Bali is higher than the risk of tourist visits before the pandemic.

## **2.2 Travel Risk Perception, Destination Message Framing Strategy and Tourist Behavior**

Perception of risk is a subjective risk that is the result of processing individual information related to the potential for adverse events to occur which is expressed in the form of opportunities/probability of occurrence of events that have an adverse impact (Renn, 2004). In the realm of tourism, risk perception is a function of uncertainty and impact (Moutinho, 2000), where some consequences are preferred over others because the risk is a beneficial or detrimental outcome or impact. Adverse impacts include the closure of access to and from destinations, longer duration of travel, and tourists losing the opportunity to earn income because they cannot carry out work activities and have to incur additional accommodation costs while waiting for access to open, or pay for medical treatment costs during visits. because of being infected with the covid 19 virus in the destination visited. Gray and Wilson (2009) report that disasters originating from terrorist attacks are rated as a higher risk than natural disasters and local people's attitudes are rude and aggressive towards visiting tourists. Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2007) reported that destination risks are grouped based on risk sources, namely risks caused by human behavior; financial risk, service quality risk, social-psychological risk, natural disaster risk, and weather, and food risk. Perceptions of financial risk of tourist destinations that visit for the first time are not significantly different from those of tourists who make repeat visits. Visiting experience is correlated with perceptions of destination risk in general. The perception of risk at the first visit is higher than the perception of risk at the next visit. Strategies to minimize the risk of visits are carried out by obtaining information from friends who have visited the destination, using products and services that have been published in 1998; Pizam and Smith, 2000; Fuchs and Reichel, 2006 previously, read articles related to destinations and staying in the same hotel, on subsequent visits, and shortening visits to destinations. Travel risks comprehensively include functional risk, physical/health risk, financial risk, social risk, psychological risk, time risk, satisfaction risk, political stability risk, and terrorism risk (Roehl and Fesenmaler, 1992; Sonmez and Graefe, 1998; Pizam and Smith, 2000; Fuchs and Reichel, 2006).

Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005) revealed that the perception of destination risk influences tourist decisions in determining travel time, mode of transportation, travel organization (group vs. independent), the form of travel, travel costs, and destinations visited. Hajibaba et al., (2015) reported that risk mitigation strategies were carried out by purchasing travel insurance and using tour guides, choosing expensive hotels, and



experienced tour operators. Mitigation strategy that converts physical risk into financial risk. The perception of the high risk of a particular destination is correlated with the cancellation of visits to the destination (Sonmez and Graefe, 1998). A study of community behavior after the terrorist attacks in New York revealed the significant influence of social and security risks on the choice of tourist destinations (Floyd et al., 2004) and delays in international travel (Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty, 2009), lower terrorism risk increases visits. tourists in Mediterranean destinations (Drakos and Kutan, 2003), a risk-avoidance strategy is applied by choosing alternative destinations that are considered to have low risk (Steiner, Al Hamaneh and Meyer, 2006).

The decision to choose a tourist destination is influenced by individual factors, including personality. The individual characteristics of sensation seeking are proven to determine the choice of destination. This group of tourists tends to visit destinations that are unique, different from most destinations, and offer high sensations, and are willing to bear the relatively high risk of visiting (Zuckerman, 2010). Fish (2013) reported a negative relationship between social risk and sensation seeking. Lepp and Gibson (2008) revealed that the high sensation-seeking tourist group compared to the low sensation-seeking tourist group did not have a significant difference in risk perception, but had a significant difference in intention to visit a destination that had certain risks. Kozak et al., (2007) reveal the effect of culture on the choice of tourist destinations, based on Hofstede's cultural dimension, uncertainty avoidance. The findings show that different levels of uncertainty avoidance have an impact on different risk assessments, not on the type of destination risk. Cultural familiarity is reported to have an impact on destination choice (Karl, Reintinger, and Schmude, 2015). Differences in the level of uncertainty avoidance correlate with perceptions of destination risk. Previously in different studies, it was also reported that the risk of domestic tourism was rated lower than want international travel. The level of education of tourists is proven to have a negative correlation with perceived risk (Sonmez and Graefe, 1998; Park and Reisinger, 2010). lower levels, especially for the social risk dimension (Park and Reisinger, 2010). A similar finding was also reported by Thapa et al., (2013) about the effect of perceptions of natural disaster risk on the intention to travel. Choe, Y., & Kim, H. (2021) proved that the respondent group was female, young, and had a high-income level and had a positive attitude towards Brazil and had never been to Brazil, had lower health care, but had a perceived risk of being infected. Zika virus was higher had higher intention to visit Brazil than male tourist group, older age, high income level had never visited Brazil, attitude towards Brazil was lower, health concern was high and perceived risk of being infected with Zika virus was lower.

### **2.3 Prospect Theory, Framing and Tourist Response**

Framing or how messages are presented/framed is a process of how individuals build an understanding of a message or reorient the issue. Prospect theory (Kahneman, and Tversky, 1979) explains that individuals have different tolerances in the face of loss. Some individuals are more sensitive to potential losses than others. Losses in small values that often occur are felt more painful than losses with large values that occur at one time. Prospect theory also predicts the effect of endowments on individual preferences. The value sacrificed has a stronger impact than the value gained and determines the value of the benefits obtained by the individual. Thus, the seller's asking price is higher than the purchase price that buyers are willing to pay for the same product. The decision-making process under conditions of uncertainty, the Framing Effect affects individual choices, which is determined by the presentation of the focus of attention that is on whether the benefits or potential losses as a result of individual choices are reflected by the probability

of occurrence of an event that has a positive (gain) or negative (loss) impact. . Levin (1987) proves that positive or negative associations related to destination attributes or travel activities mediate the results of consumer assessments of an object. In the experiment, two groups were asked to rate beef that was informed that it contained 75% fiber and 25% fat. Individual evaluation is carried out with a scale that shows the characteristics of the object of assessment in a positive or negative form, including high quality/low quality, and good tasting/bad tasting. The association is more positive when beef is presented as a percentage of meat fiber than the fat percentage. Exposure to objects that are framed in a certain way by third parties is part of the information processing process.

Van Kleef, E., van Trijp, HC, & Luning, P. (2005) reported that the group of subjects exposed to advertisements for healthy food products with framing benefits rated the product as more attractive and showed higher intention to try than the group exposed to advertisements with framing. negative/risk. Cucchiara, C., Kwon, S., & Ha, S. (2015). It is proven in studies that use organic food stimuli, that advertising messages that use positive framing are more persuasive and increase respondents' purchase intentions. Bobo, J., & Chakraborty, S. (2015) examines the effect of message framing strategies on individual attitudes towards leftover food. Research findings suggest that positive framing increases individual support for leftover food. The findings of previous studies serve as a reference for formulating the influence of the Bali destination advertising framing strategy on the visiting intentions of potential tourists and the influence of the interaction of destination risk perception with the framing strategy on the intention to visit Bali is formulated as follows.

- H2: The visiting intention of the group that received a destination message with a positive framing was higher than the group that received a destination message with a negative framing.
- H3: For groups of respondents who have a high perception of visit risk, groups exposed to destination messages with positive framing have higher visit intentions than groups exposed to destination messages with negative framing.

### **III. Research Method**

This study uses a quasi-experimental design. Starting with measuring the risk perception of a Bali destination, then measuring the intention of tourist visits in groups that have a high-risk perception and a low-risk perception by considering the Bali destination advertising message framing strategy. Data was collected in cities that are the target market for Indonesian tourists, namely Jakarta, Bandung, Yogya, Solo, Semarang and Surabaya, Medan, and Manado.

Measurement of visit intention data which is defined as the opportunity to make a tourist visit to Bali within the next 12 months, the perception of the risk of a visit is measured including the dimensions of social risk, the approval of the social environment of individual tourists on tourist visits to Bali, a financial risk which is operationalized as an opportunity for an increase in accommodation costs due to extension of visit time due to closure of access at destinations as a result of the pandemic, operationalized psychological risk as a decrease in individual tourist confidence due to visiting Bali, the health risk is an individual's belief in the chance of being infected with the coronavirus 19 during tourist visits and time risk which is defined as lost time as a result of having to quarantine after making a tourist visit outside the region/overseas. Destination promotional messages are

divided into 2 types, namely messages with negative framing (Release Boredom in Bali) and messages with negative framing (Explore Ketenangan Bali).

The types of data in this study are quantitative data and qualitative data. Quantitative data is data in the form of numbers, can be measured and expressed in certain units of measure, including the age of the individual respondent, length of stay, annual travel budget. Qualitative data is data that is not in the form of numbers, including the gender of the respondent and occupation, perception of destination risk, and intention to visit. Sources of data in this study are primary data sources and secondary data sources. Primary data sources are prospective tourists who were selected as respondents, data collected from primary sources, among others, is the level of risk for Bali destinations. The secondary data source is the Central Statistics Agency which publishes data on tourist visits to Bali. Data obtained from secondary sources include the number of Indonesian tourists visiting Bali in 2019 and the annual growth rate of Indonesian tourists.

The population of foreign and domestic tourist visits in 2020 is not yet available data that can be used as a reference, therefore it is assumed that the total population cannot be calculated or infinite. The number of observations is determined based on the Slovin formula, based on a maximum error rate of 5% and a 95% confidence level. Research respondents based on this calculation amounted to 396 people.

The quality of research data is measured based on the magnitude of validity and reliability. The validity of the data was tested using the Factor method (PCA). Data validity was determined based on the critical value of the Total Explained Variance parameter  $> 0.50$  for all factors that had eigenvalues  $> 1.0$ . The data reliability test was carried out using the scale method, with a critical value of Cronbach's Alpha  $> 0.60$ . The research hypothesis testing was carried out using the Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) method.

Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) is a special application of linear multiple regression where the regression equation contains an element of interaction between the destination risk perception variable and the message framing strategy variable. The regression equation for the research conceptual model equation is as follows:

$$Y_{\text{intensi}} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{\text{persepsi risiko}} + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

$$Y_{\text{intensi}} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{\text{framing}} + \epsilon \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{\text{persepsi risiko}} + \beta_2 X_{\text{framing}} + \beta_3 (X_{\text{risiko}} * X_{\text{framing}}) + \epsilon \dots (3)$$

## IV. Results and Discussion

The results of the validity test show that all variables have a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) value of 0.50, the total cumulative variance 50%, and the data measurement indicator has a factor loading value of 0.50. The reliability test showed that all research variable data were reliable with Cronbach's Alpha value  $> 0.60$ . The results of the validity and reliability test of the research variables are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Validity and reliability test results

| No. | Variabel                               | Cronbach's Alpha | Standard AlphaCronbach | Description |
|-----|--|------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 1.  | Perceived Risk destinasi (X)           | 0,951            | 0.69                   | Reliabel    |
| 2.  | Framing(Y <sub>2</sub> )               | 0,889            | 0.89                   | Reliabel    |
| 3.  | Intention to revisit (Y <sub>3</sub> ) | 0,870            | 0.67                   | Reliabel    |

Source: Primary data

Individual characteristics of research respondents are presented in detail in table 2.

**Table 2.** Characteristics of respondents

| No                      | Characteristics of Respondents | Amount |                  |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------------------|
|                         |                                | Person | Contribution (%) |
| City/Place of residence |                                |        |                  |
| 1                       | Jakarta                        | 46     | 0,12             |
| 2                       | Bandung                        | 43     | 0,11             |
| 3                       | Semarang                       | 36     | 0,09             |
| 4                       | Yogyakarta                     | 35     | 0,09             |
| 5                       | Solo                           | 36     | 0,09             |
| 6                       | Surabaya                       | 38     | 0,10             |
| 7                       | Medan                          | 40     | 0,09             |
| 8                       | Makasar                        | 36     | 0,09             |
| 9                       | Menado                         | 38     | 0,10             |
| 10                      | Palangkaraya                   | 38     | 0,10             |
|                         | Total                          | 386    | 100%             |
| Gender                  |                                |        |                  |
| 1                       | male                           | 241    | 0,62             |
| 2                       | female                         | 145    | 0,38             |
|                         | Total                          | 386    | 100%             |
| Age                     |                                |        |                  |
| 1                       | <20                            | 17     | 0,04             |
| 2                       | 21-30                          | 76     | 0,20             |
| 3                       | 31-40                          | 108    | 0,28             |
| 4                       | 41-50                          | 120    | 0,31             |
| 5                       | >51                            | 65     | 0,17             |
|                         | Total                          | 386    | 100%             |
| Work                    |                                |        |                  |
| 1                       | Government employees           | 69     | 0,18             |
| 2                       | Private employees              | 123    | 0,32             |
| 3                       | Businessman                    | 86     | 0,22             |
| 4                       | Student                        | 70     | 0,18             |
| 5                       | Other                          | 38     | 0,10             |
|                         | Total                          | 386    | 100%             |
| Level of education      |                                |        |                  |
| 1                       | < SMU                          | 6      | 0,02             |
| 2                       | SMU                            | 18     | 0,05             |
| 3                       | S1                             | 86     | 0,22             |
| 4                       | > S1                           | 276    | 0,72             |
|                         | Total                          | 386    | 100%             |

Source: primary data

Testing the research hypothesis begins with testing the classical assumptions. The classical assumption test is carried out before performing the regression model analysis to ensure that there is no violation of the rules of normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests. The normality test aims to determine whether the residuals from



the regression model made are normally distributed or not. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results. This indicates that the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.186. These results indicate that the regression equation model is normally distributed because of the Asymp value. Sig. (2-tailed) which is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. The multicollinearity test aims to test whether the regression model found a correlation between independent variables. The existence of multicollinearity can be seen from the value of tolerance or variance inflation factor (VIF). If the tolerance value is  $> 10$  percent (0.10) or  $VIF < 10$ . The tolerance value for each variable is greater than 10 percent (0.10) and the VIF value is less than 10, which means the regression equation model is free from multicollinearity. This test aims to determine whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation which is carried out by the Glejser test. If there is no single independent variable that has a significant effect on the absolute value of the residual. Glacier test results show the value of each independent variable is 0.181 and 0.248. This value is greater than 0.05 which means that there is no influence between the independent variables on the absolute residual. Thus, the regression model does not contain symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

The results of the analysis of the moderation regression model show that the coefficient of determination is 0.282 or 28.2%, which indicates that perceived destination risk affects the intention to visit Bali by 28.2%; The calculated t value is 7,245 with a significance level of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ) and the calculated F value is 52.495 with a significance level of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ). Thus it is stated that the results of the analysis support hypothesis 1 that the perception of destination risk significantly affects the intention to visit the destination.

The test results of the positive framing strategy effect on the intention to visit Bali, show that the variation in the intention to visit the Bali destination is influenced by variations in the perception of risk framing variations as indicated by the coefficient of determination of 0.373 or 37.3%; The calculated F value is 40.010 with a significance level of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ) and the t-count value for perceived organizational support is 6.399 with a significance level of 0.000 ( $<0.05$ ). Thus it is stated that the results of data analysis support hypothesis 2.

Model test results show that the variation in intention to visit Bali destinations is influenced by variations in destination risk perceptions, variations in destination message framing strategies and the interaction effect of destination risk perceptions with framing strategies ( $F = 29.241$ ;  $p 0.05$ ). The main effect of destination risk perception significantly influences the intention to visit Bali ( $1 = 0.425$  ;  $t= 5.950$  ;  $p < 0.05$ ). The main effect of the framing strategy was also significant on the intention to visit Bali ( $2 = 0.295$ ;  $t= 4.139$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). The interaction effect of destination risk perception with message framing strategy significantly influences the intention to visit Bali destinations ( $\beta_3 = 0.140$  ;  $t= 2.339$  ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

A more detailed analysis is carried out by comparing the values of 1 and 3 where both coefficients 1 and 3 have positive and significant values, indicating that the framing strategy acts as a quasi-mediator (quasi-mediator) in the relationship between destination risk perception and the intention to visit Bali destinations.

The findings of this study are in line with findings (Floyd et al., 2004) on public behavior after the terrorist attack in New York which revealed a significant influence of social and security risks on the choice of tourist destinations and delays in international travel. (Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty, 2009) reported that a low risk of terrorism increases tourist visits to Mediterranean destinations (Drakos and Kutan, 2003) as a form

of risk avoidance strategy implemented by choosing alternative destinations that are considered low risk (Steiner, Al Hamaneh and Meyer, 2006).

The finding of the effect of the destination message framing strategy on the intention to visit Bali destinations is similar to the findings of Van Kleef, E., van Trijp, HC, & Luning, P. (2005) who reported that the group of subjects exposed to advertisements for healthy food products with framing benefits rated the product more attractive and showed higher intention to try than the group exposed to advertising with negative/risk framing and Cucchiara, C., Kwon, S., & Ha, S. (2015) which proved in a study using organic food stimuli, that advertising messages which use positive framing is more persuasive and increases respondents' purchase intentions and Bobo, J., & Chakraborty, S. (2015) which confirms the effect of message framing strategies on individual attitudes towards leftover food. Research findings suggest that positive framing increases individual support for leftover food.

The findings of this study recommend to the managers of Bali tourist destinations that destination communication is managed carefully. Management of messages related to Bali destinations to consider the strategy of framing messages communicated to potential markets to manage the perceived risk of visiting the destination.

## V. Conclusion

The results of data analysis concluded that: 1) Perception of Bali destination affects the intention to visit Bali. 2) Destination-related message framing strategies affect the intention to visit Bali

In the future, it is necessary to develop studies that include the target market's attitude towards risk, considering that based on prospect theory, individual reference points in assessing alternatives under conditions of uncertainty can change and affect individual decisions.

## References

- Ardèvol-Abreu, A. (2015). Framing theory in communication research. Origins, development and current situation in Spain. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, (70).
- Bobo, J., & Chakraborty, S. (2015). Pink Slime versus Garbage Chic: A Consideration of the Impact of Framing on Consumer Behavior Towards Food Waste. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 6(3), 445-447.
- Cucchiara, C., Kwon, S., & Ha, S. (2015). Message framing and consumer responses to organic seafood labeling. *British Food Journal*.
- Hidayat, M. S., & Isnaini, N. F. (2019). ANALISIS DAMPAK FRAMING IKLAN TERHADAP PENGUNJUNG WARKOP ANGKRINGAN BERBASIS INTERNET (WIFI) DI KAB. MOJOKERTO. *Bisman (Bisnis dan Manajemen): The Journal of Business and Management*, 2(1), 61-71.
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 10, 103-126.
- Choe, Y., & Kim, H. (2021). Risk perception and visit intention on Olympic destination: Symmetric and asymmetric approaches. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 1356766721995983.
- Fuchs, G., & Reichel, A. (2007). Correlates of destination risk perception and risk reduction strategies. In *Progress in tourism marketing* (pp. 191-200). Routledge.

- Han, P., Balaban, V., & Marano, C. (2010). Travel characteristics and risk-taking attitudes in youths traveling to nonindustrialized countries. *Journal of travel medicine*, 17(5), 316-321.
- Hamid, S., & Bano, N. (2021). Behavioral Intention of Traveling in the period of COVID-19: An application of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and Perceived Risk. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*.
- Jonas, A., Mansfeld, Y., Paz, S., & Potasman, I. (2011). Determinants of health risk perception among low-risk-taking tourists traveling to developing countries. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 87-99.
- Karl, M., & Schmude, J. (2017). Understanding the role of risk (perception) in destination choice: A literature review and synthesis. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 65(2), 138-155.
- Kapuściński, G., & Richards, B. (2016). News framing effects on destination risk perception. *Tourism Management*, 57, 234-244.
- Manrai, L. A., & Manrai, A. (2011). Hofstede's cultural dimensions and tourist behaviors: A review and conceptual framework. *Journal of Economics, Finance & Administrative Science*, 16(31), 23.
- Ningrum, P. A., et al. (2020). The Potential of Poverty in the City of Palangka Raya: Study SMIs Affected Pandemic Covid 19. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)* Volume 3, No 3, Page: 1626-1634
- Perpiña, L., Camprubí, R., & Prats, L. (2019). Destination image versus risk perception. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(1), 3-19.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel anxiety and intentions to travel internationally: Implications of travel risk perception. *Journal of travel research*, 43(3), 212-225.
- Saleh, A., Mujahiddin. (2020). Challenges and Opportunities for Community Empowerment Practices in Indonesia during the Covid-19 Pandemic through Strengthening the Role of Higher Education. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*. Volume 3, No 2, Page: 1105-1113.
- Sihombing, E. H., Nasib. (2020). The Decision of Choosing Course in the Era of Covid 19 through the Telemarketing Program, Personal Selling and College Image. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)* Volume 3, No. 4, Page: 2843-2850
- Van Kleef, E., van Trijp, H. C., & Luning, P. (2005). Functional foods: health claim-food product compatibility and the impact of health claim framing on consumer evaluation. *Appetite*, 44(3), 299-308.
- Xie, C., Huang, Q., Lin, Z., & Chen, Y. (2020). Destination risk perception, image and satisfaction: The moderating effects of public opinion climate of risk. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 44, 122-130.