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Abstract

This research presents a parallel mediation model in which the interplay of cognitive image, visitor satisfaction, and perceived value promotes destination loyalty. Using a convenience sample technique, the structural equation modeling approach was utilized to analyze 603 observations acquired in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh. In the study, perceived values and satisfaction directly impacted destination loyalty. However, the cognitive image does not affect destination loyalty. Both satisfaction and perceived value mediate between cognitive image and destination loyalty. Because postulated links have received little attention. The study helps advance conceptual underpinnings particularly in light of Cox's Bazar. There is merit to this study in that it demonstrates the parallel mediating effect of satisfaction and perceived value between cognitive image and destination loyalty, which has received little attention in previous tourism literature.
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INTRODUCTION

Tourism is an important source of government revenue all around the world. Destinations may also be considered features that contribute significantly to a country’s tourist income (Basaran, 2016). Since tourist consumption has been strong in the prior two decades, the importance of destinations has grown more than specific attractions (Ozturk & Qu, 2008). In consequence, visitors to a place are seeking a variety of experiences. They used to utilize several different service providers. As a result, a journey is no longer only a product but rather a collection of various services, typically offered by some organizations with different purposes (Kozak, 2003). Tourists must be happy with all of their services to attain overall destination satisfaction (Chen & Kerstetter, 1999). Knowing the destination image is crucial for predicting visitor behaviour from this perspective.

Several studies have found that the image of a location influences visitor behaviour (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Tourist behaviours might involve selecting a location to visit, evaluating...
that decision, and planning future activities. There may be further evaluations, such as an evaluation of the travel experience during the trip, an evaluation of the value, and an evaluation of overall satisfaction, in addition to the desire to return and willingness to promote the place in the future, future behavioural intentions include the desire to spread the word (Chen & Tsai, 2007). Therefore, the destination image influences not just the tourist decision-making process (Gartner, 1989), including post-decisional behaviour (Bigne’, Sanchez, & Schantz, 2001). The image may be one of the most crucial aspects of tourists’ decision-making and destination-selection processes. As the competition among destinations heats up, destinations are emphasizing their image as a source of competitive advantage (Konecnik, 2002).

Thus, studying how tourists choose a destination is important (Martin & Bosque, 2008). Nazir et al. (2021) stressed the importance of the tourism destination image. Destinations need new strategies to attract tourists in the service-dominated marketing industry. Tourism industry profits increase when tourists visit, and marketing expenses are reduced (Alegre & Juaneda, 2006).

Using tourist behavioural models, a theoretical model links cognitive image, perceived value, tourist satisfaction, and destination loyalty. This Model broadens our understanding of the issue theoretically and methodologically by incorporating cognitive image, perceived value, visitor satisfaction, and destination loyalty. This framework is being tried in Cox’s Bazar, Bangladesh’s longest sea beach. Cox’s Bazar has been designated a tourism hotspot due to its exceptional uninterrupted coastline, golden sand, and least congested location. A model was developed to analyze theoretical and empirical data about the relationship between cognitive image, perceived value, tourist satisfaction, and destination loyalty and extend our understanding of destination loyalty.

Structured equation modelling (SEM) is used to investigate the link between these components. SEM is frequently used in academic and social science research because it enables the simultaneous exploration of multivariate dependent connections (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). Study participants were tourists in Cox’s Bazar.

In this study, we explored the effects of a cognitive image on tourist satisfaction, perceived value, and loyalty to a destination. There are six distinct research concerns examined in this study: 1) Is there an effect of cognitive image on perceived value? 2) Is there a link between cognitive image and satisfaction? 3) Does the cognitive image impact destination loyalty? 4) Is there a link between visitor satisfaction and destination loyalty? 5) Is satisfaction a mediator in the link between cognitive image and destination loyalty? Also, 6) Is perceived value a mediator in the influence of cognitive image and destination loyalty?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Destination Image

Tourism destination images are bundles of perceptions or thoughts about a destination. It’s an essential concept that has an impact on visitor decisions. Prior investigation has revealed that destination image is a hot topic in tourism literature, and scholars have attempted to develop a theoretical model for it employing a variety of methodologies. Various researches on the notion of DI have revealed an inherent alliance on the real value of destination marketers; however, there has been very little agreement on the conceptualization and dimension of DI due to the complexity, subjectivity, and enigmatic nature (Song et al., 2013). Crompton (1979) defines DI as the aggregate
of beliefs, ideas, and perceptions that a person has about a destination. This definition emphasizes the individual but other definitions given by other researchers define it as the image shared by a group of people (Jenkins, 1999).

Etchner and Ritchie (1993) defined destination image as a combination of attribute-based factors and holistic perspectives. Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) also examined the destination image into cognitive and affective components commonly found in tourism literature. The cognitive image relates to thoughts and information about the features of a vacation location, whereas the affective image refers to emotions or sentiments associated with the place (Gallarza et al., 2002). However, there is no agreement on defining a destination’s image.

The significance of the destination image cannot be overstated due to its effect on visitor decision-making (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993), subsequent evaluation, and post-purchase decision (Chen and Tsai, 2007). Again (Chen & Phou, 2013) posited that destination image positively affects satisfaction and destination loyalty.

Various researches discovered a positive association between destination image, satisfaction, and loyalty (Jeong & Kim, 2020). Chen & Phou (2013) and Gallarza & Gil (2006) revealed the same results. According to Munhurrun et al. (2015), a higher destination image assures a greater perceived value. Therefore, the destination image could be considered a significant predictor of perceived value (Kim et al., 2013). Moreover, the destination image is positively associated with tourist satisfaction (Wang & Hsu, 2010). In most studies, tourists’ loyalty is related to the destination image (Tan & Wu, 2016). Therefore, the destination’s image is essential in influencing loyalty.

**Perceived Value**

Tourism perceptions of value are based on comparing the value of a destination versus the sacrifices or costs associated with it.

According to the utilitarian paradigm, value scales consider monetary and non-monetary (Petrick, 2017). Li & Petrick (2010) developed an integrated loyalty model that incorporated quality and value. Chen and Tsai used a three-item scale to assess value perception based on money, time, and effort (Chen & Tsai, 2007). Several prior studies examined the interrelationships between perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty. In most studies, perceived value strongly determines visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions (Woodruff, 1997). However, some researchers have found a direct and indirect link between perceived value and loyalty (Kim et al., 2013). Therefore, the importance of perceived value in fostering long-term connections with visitors cannot be underestimated. Moreover, Jin et al. (2013) revealed that an event’s perceived value and quality substantially impact behavioural intentions. In conclusion, these research findings indicate that perceived value is a noteworthy predictor of satisfaction and loyalty.

**Satisfaction**

Satisfaction is defined as an evaluative opinion of a destination’s products and services, and it is one of the essential phrases in today’s commercial competition. In the tourism sector, tourist satisfaction has been extensively researched for decades (Song et al., 2012).

It is commonly considered that tourist satisfaction substantially influences their loyalty and likelihood of returning (Chen & Tsai, 2007). For instance, pleased visitors may post favorable
comments about the place, promote it to family and friends, and revisit a similar location the next time. In contrast to previous studies on satisfaction, unsatisfied visitors are reluctant to promote or return to the site. This study selected a multi-item measurement scale for satisfaction. One of the most often utilized and important indicators of loyalty is satisfaction. As a result, satisfaction is the main concern for business strategy makers. The bulk of prior research has shown that satisfaction positively influences destination loyalty. As a result, it is widely accepted that tourist satisfaction is an important predictor of destination loyalty (Allameh et al., 2015).

Loyalty

Loyalty is seen as an important component of marketing and visitor success. According to Oliver (1999), loyalty is the highest level of devotion. According to recent research, Loyalty is more complicated because it can entail both attitudinal and behavioral loyalty. In marketing and tourism research, tourist loyalty is completely interchangeable with behavioural goals. Positive word-of-mouth, referrals, and a willingness to buy or return have all been used to gauge loyalty (Wendy et al., 2015).

As a result, a recent study has concentrated on aspects influencing loyalty, such as image, value, quality, trust, and satisfaction. In this study, three antecedents are highlighted as important characteristics for the theoretical framework: destination image, perceived value, and visitor satisfaction. As previously stated, the image of a location determines its perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty. Perceived value impacts both visitor satisfaction and loyalty, and tourist satisfaction is crucial for loyalty. Furthermore, according to actual experience, building long-term relationships with visitors has become a key component of a business nowadays. Customers who are loyal to a company are seen as valuable assets. Furthermore, the tourist business should concentrate on the most important aspects. As a result, cognitive image perceived value and satisfaction are the most critical elements influencing tourists’ desire to revisit or recommend a destination (Jalilvand & Samiei, 2012) and tourist loyalty.

Role of Perceived Value and Satisfaction as a mediator

Research has shown that destination image and loyalty are directly or indirectly connected. As mediators, perceived value and satisfaction, according to some academics, are likely to impact loyalty. Wang et al., 2017a; Jeong & Kim, 2020 discovered the role of satisfaction as a mediator between destination image and destination loyalty.

H1: Cognitive Image positively influences destination loyalty
H2: Cognitive Image positively influences perceived value
H3: Cognitive image has a positive influence on satisfaction
H4: perceived value has a positive influence on destination loyalty
H5: perceived value has a positive influence on satisfaction
H6: satisfaction has a positive influence on destination loyalty
H7: Perceived value mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty
H8: Satisfaction mediates between perceived value and destination loyalty
H9: Perceived value mediates between cognitive image and satisfaction
H10: Satisfaction mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty
H11: Perceived value and satisfaction positively and sequentially mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty.

Figure 1. shows the proposed theoretical model.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Research Setting**

Cox's Bazar is 152 kilometres away from the south of Chittagong. Tourism is, in fact, Cox's Bazar's main source of income (Rashed & Polas, 2019). It has commercial and social importance in the economy (Abdullah et al., 2019). From November to March, almost two million visitors visit Cox’s Bazar during the peak season. Tourists are primarily domestic tourists from all around the country. Labonee Beach is believed to be one of the country’s most popular tourist destinations, with daily maximum visitor numbers reaching 30,000 (Kalam & Hossen, 2018).

**Sample Design**

A causal research design was used in this study. This stage’s target demographic consisted of tourists visiting Cox’s Bazar who were 18 years of age or older. In the absence of precise data on the number of tourists, a number of research studies have used a non-probability sampling method to study destination images (Iordanova & Stylidis, 2019). Many previous studies used convenience sampling techniques to evaluate destination images (Chen & Tsai, 2007). The empirical study was carried out on Cox’s Bazaar, Bangladesh, at the three most visited sea beaches, laboni point, kolatali, and inani beach, during the winter season. The Winter season is considered Cox's Bazar's peak season for tourists. The information was collected at Cox’s Bazar between November 2019 and February 2020. Six hundred thirty questionnaires were distributed to eligible responders. Following that, respondents submitted 610 completed questionnaires, with 7 items being deleted due to incoherence. Ultimately, 603 queries were genuine and were assigned to be evaluated after that. The total sample size of 603 exceeds the sample-to-item ratio (i.e., 17x5 =85), the sample-to-variables ratio (i.e., 20x4 = 80), and Krejcie and Morgan (1970) recommended threshold value of 384 (Memon, 2020; Hair et al., 2017) as established in behavioural science.

**Instruments for conducting surveys**

A closed-ended, self-administered questionnaire was used in this study to obtain the essential information from the respondents. Tourism research has widely used measures of cognitive image, perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty. Therefore, these constructs and demographic factors were incorporated into the survey questionnaire. Only three items were used to document tourists’ impressions of cognitive image and adopted from the study of Baloglu and McCleary (1999). The items were graded on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 demonstrating
strongly disagree and 5 demonstrating strongly agree. Tourist satisfaction was measured to assess the tourists’ satisfaction with Cox’s Bazar. However, five items were utilized to measure satisfaction. Six items modified from (Lee, Yoon, and Lee, 2007) were used to measure perceived value. The desire to suggest Cox’s Bazar to others (Chiu, Zeng, and Cheng, 2016); and the willingness to return to Cox's Bazar as a tourist site (Bigne et al., 2005) were used to determine destination loyalty in this study. Several studies have used positive word of mouth or revisit intention to assess future behaviour or loyalty among consumers. (Chen & Tsai, 2007). Overall satisfaction was measured using a five-point Likert scale, with 1 denoting “strongly dissatisfied” and 5 “strongly satisfied”. With the aid of translation professionals, the questionnaire was translated into Bangla. Because the investigation was conducted in Cox’s Bazar, and Bengali was the mother tongue of the respondents, the questions were transliterated for the interviewees’ convenience. Respondents’ age, gender, educational qualification, and visitation frequency were all queried to reveal the demographic profile of the participants.

Data Analysis
Descriptive statistics have been developed based on the demographic information provided by visitors. The SEM was tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Using structural equation modelling, the relationship between destination image, perceived value, satisfaction, and destination loyalty was explored. SPSS 15.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) and SmartPls were used to conduct CFA and SEM.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Demographic Profile
First, the demographic profile of the visitors who took part in this survey is provided (Appendix 1). We deemed 603 questionnaires valid for further analysis. In all, 369 (61.2 percent) of the 603 responders were male, while 234 (38.8 percent) were female. The majority of responders (58.2 percent) were between 22 and 35, with nearly one-quarter (23.2 percent) being between 36 and 50. 2.2 percent were over the age of 65.

The respondents’ education levels were pretty high, with more than 176 of the respondents (29.2 percent) being postgraduates (Masters and others), 133 respondents having bachelor’s degrees (22.1 percent), 132 having higher secondary certificates (21.9 percent), and the rest of the respondents having educational qualifications up to the secondary school certificate. According to the travel profiles of the respondents, 359 (59.5 percent) were first-time tourists to Cox’s Bazar, the rest of the tourists had a previous experience of Cox’s Bazar 244 (40.5 percent). However, the number of people visiting Cox’s Bazar over two or more times is fascinating.

Measurement Model
This research adhered to Anderson and Gerbing’s specifications (1988). Consequently, the internal consistency of the measuring concept was tested before analyzing the Model of the postulated variables. To assess construct consistency, Cronbach’s alpha was utilized. Cronbach’s alpha values ranging from (0.762 to 0.83) greater than 0.7 were found, indicating that the scale exhibits internal consistency (Hair et al., 2014). Similarly, convergent validity was evaluated to determine the validity of the measure. The composite reliability varies from (0.839-0.879) to more than 0.7, representing the reliability of the constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The outer factor loadings should be more than 0.70, but this value may be acceptable between 0.50-0.60 in the case of exploratory research (Chin, 1998). This study’s factor loadings are between 0.640 to 0.877 and significant. Likewise, average variance extracts crossed the minimum threshold of 0.50 (Hair et al., 2014).

Table 1. Constructs reliability and validity assessment
The squared value of the inner variable was compared to the value of the average variance extract to determine discriminant validity. According to this study, the average variance extract had a higher value than the squared inter-construct correlation. Hence, the measurements are discriminantly valid. (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2. Fornell-Larcker Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cognitive Image</th>
<th>Destination Loyalty</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Image</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the HTMT values. The HTMT is superior to Fornell and Lacker and cross-loadings (Sahabuddin et al., 2021). All HTMT scores are smaller than the suggested and preferred values of 0.85 and 0.90, respectively (Henseler et al., 2015). Besides, no confidence interval includes 1. As a result, the discriminant validity of the measurement model is confirmed (Hair et al., 2017).

Table 3. Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Image</th>
<th>Destination Loyalty</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Image</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural Model

The structural Model's quality or strength was evaluated using the following criteria: (1) establish collinearity; (2) model prediction accuracy using (R2) and the Q2 (Hair et al.,2017) (3) assessment of the impact size f2, and (4) statistical relevance and significance of the path coefficients.

Collinearity Assessment: When using PLS-SEM, VIF values more than or equal to 5 indicate a potential collinearity issue (Hair et al., 2019). Several studies, however, adopt different limits, taking VIF values larger than 3.3 into account (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw,2006) and even if it is a value of 5 (Hair et al.,2014). The VIF evaluation findings indicate that there are no collinearity issues in this analysis (see Table 4).

Predictive Power of the Model:

To measure the strength of the Model, R2 and Q2 were employed. First, R2 enumerates the Model’s strength. R2 Values 0.25, 0.50, and 0.75 indicate low, moderate, and high prediction accuracy, respectively (Merli et al.,2019). The findings are more than the minimal threshold R2 0.1, destination loyalty R2 = 0.45, satisfaction R2 = 0.301 (near substantial); and perceived value R2=0.07 (Weak). Hence, our Model has significant predictive potential regarding R2 (Table 6). A predictive model is defined as having a cross-validated redundancy of Q2 more than 0. In this study, the Stone–Geisser Q2 criteria are more than the stated threshold value (Table 5).

Effect Size (f2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Variance inflation factor (VIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Variance explained and cross-validated redundancy index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endogenous Construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is possible to determine if an omitted construct significantly impacts an endogenous construct by observing the shift in R2 caused by removing an exogenous latent variable from the structural Model. The effect size is used to quantify this change \( f^2 \). The effect size of the construct measures the impact of the exogenous variable on the predictive capacity of the structural Model. As Cohen (1992) noted, \( f^2 \) values in the range of 0.02, 0.15, 0.35 suggest mild, moderate, and significant impacts. In our situation, all \( f^2 \) values range from 0.00 to 0.348. When describing satisfaction, the \( f^2 \) of the Cognitive Image is mild (0.019). Also, the \( f^2 \) of perceived value is significant when explaining satisfaction (0.338), and loyalty is significant when explaining satisfaction (0.348). Almost none of the other effects (0.000 to 0.051) have any impact.

### Table 6. (\( f^2 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Image</th>
<th>Destination Loyalty</th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Image</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Path Coefficients and Significance

In the Smartpls bootstrapping approach, subsamples are created randomly from the initial data set (603 representations) with the same sample size as the original sample.

A significant number of subsamples are required to confirm the reliability of the results. The standardized path coefficient was calculated using a bootstrapping resampling approach with 5000 iterations. The structural path diagram depicts the standardized path coefficients at a significance level of 5%.

The cognitive image and perceived value have substantial and positive direct path coefficients (Table 7). A similar finding was found for the relationship between cognitive image and satisfaction. Perceived value, destination loyalty, and satisfaction all have a positive relationship. The association between satisfaction and destination loyalty stays intact, showing that it is favourable. The relationship between cognitive image and destination loyalty, on the other hand, is not statistically significant. Only satisfaction has a considerable influence (0.523) on destination loyalty compared to the other components.

### Table 7 Output of the Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Structural Path</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Perceived Value -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>3.652</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Perceived Value -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 shows how perceived value and visitor satisfaction influence the cognitive image and destination loyalty. According to the mediation study, perceived value mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty with $\beta=0.0535$, $t$-value=3.55 at $p$-value 0.00, which is less than 0.05. Furthermore, the Perceived value mediates the relationship between cognitive image and satisfaction with $\beta=0.1137$, $t$ value=7.31 at a $p$-value of 0.00, which is less than 0.05. Again, at the level of 0.05, the mediating impact of satisfaction on perceived value and destination loyalty is significant, with $\beta=0.264$, $t$ value=8.79, and $p$-value 0.00. Furthermore, satisfaction mediates the relationship between cognitive image and destination loyalty with a $t$ value of 2.93 and a $p$-value of 0.00 at the significance level of 0.05. Finally, with $\beta=0.07$, $t$ value=5.94, and $p$-value 0.000.05, perceived value and satisfaction sequentially and positively mediate between cognitive image and destination loyalty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Structural Path</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p Values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Perceived Value -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.0535</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Perceived Value -&gt; Satisfaction -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Perceived Value -&gt; Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.1337</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Satisfaction -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.0632</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Cognitive Image -&gt; Perceived Value -&gt; Satisfaction -&gt; Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(P values significant at the level of 0.05; 0.001)
Test of hypotheses at a glance

Ten out of eleven hypotheses are supported in this study.

**H1**: Cognitive Images have no relationship with destination loyalty showing $\beta=0.052$, $t$ value 1.451, and $p$ value=0.147$<0.05$. Hence, $H_1$ is rejected.

**H2**: Cognitive Images have a significant relationship with the perceived value showing $\beta=0.265$, $t$ value 8.044, and $p$ value=0.000$<0.05$. Therefore, $H_2$ is accepted.

**H3**: There is a relationship between cognitive image and satisfaction showing $\beta=0.121$, $t=3.267$ and $p$ value=0.001$<0.05$. As a result, $H_3$ is accepted.

**H4**: There is a relationship between perceived value and destination loyalty representing $\beta=0.202$, $t=3.652$, and $p$ value=0.000$<0.05$. Hence $H_4$ is supported.

**H5**: There is a relationship between satisfaction and a perceived value representing $\beta=0.504$, $t=12.47$, and $p$ value=0.000$<0.05$. Hence, $H_5$ is supported.

**H6**: Cognitive Image have a relationship between satisfaction destination loyalty representing $\beta=0.523$, $t=10.44$ and $p$ value=0.00$<0.05$. Hence, $H_6$ is supported.

**H7**: Perceived value mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty with $\beta=0.0535$, $t=3.55$, and $P$ Values 0.00 significant at the level of 0.05. Therefore, $H_7$ is supported.

**H8**: Satisfaction mediates between perceived value and destination loyalty with $\beta=0.264$, $t=8.79$, and $P$ Values 0.00 significant at the level of 0.05. Therefore, $H_8$ is supported.

**H9**: Perceived value mediates between cognitive image and satisfaction, showing $\beta=0.133$, $t=7.31$, and $P$ values 0.00 significant at the level of 0.05. Therefore, $H_9$ is supported.

**H10**: The results showed that satisfaction mediates between cognitive image and destination loyalty with $\beta=0.0632$, $t=2.93$, and P values 0.003 significant at the level of 0.05. Therefore, $H_{10}$ is supported.

**H11**: The results showed that perceived value and satisfaction sequentially and positively mediates between satisfaction and destination loyalty with $\beta=0.07$, $t=5.94$, and $p$-value 0.00$<0.05$. Therefore, $H_{11}$ is supported.

Discussion and Implications

The study investigates the relationship between cognitive image, perceived value, tourist satisfaction, and destination loyalty in Cox’s Bazar. Our integrated Model used image-satisfaction-loyalty and value-satisfaction-loyalty frameworks to assess destination loyalty at Cox’s Bazaar. Cox’s Bazar’s cognitive image, perceived value, and satisfaction were analyzed to identify critical destination evaluative traits to promote destination loyalty.

The study’s outcomes demonstrated a favorable interrelationship between cognitive image, perceived value, satisfaction, and destination loyalty. However, this research failed to establish a favorable relationship between cognitive image and destination loyalty, consistent with prior research (Bosque & Martin, 2008), and Cox’s Bazar’s cognitive image, on the other hand, has a favorable influence on perceived value, which is further corroborated by (Jin et al., 2013). This implies that the destination should have a favorable image since visitors think they are receiving exceptional value for their money from their offerings (Tavitiyaman & Qu, 2017). In addition, Cox’s Bazar cognitive picture has a considerable influence on visitor satisfaction, which is consistent with previous research (Wang & Hsu, 2010; Tilaki et al., 2016; Javad et al., 2016, Chiu et al., 2016).

Furthermore, according to a previous study, perceived value influences tourist satisfaction (McDougall et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2017; Chen & Tsai, 2007) and destination loyalty (Kim et al., 2013). Moreover, as prior research has shown, satisfaction significantly influences destination loyalty (Chiu et al., 2016; Petrick, 2004; Prayag & Ryan, 2012).

Another important contribution of this study is to reveal the mediating role of perceived value and satisfaction between cognitive image and destination loyalty. Previously, various studies developed a conceptual framework proving that several factors influence visitor satisfaction, fostering destination loyalty. Yet, insufficient attention has been paid to the impact of perceived...
value and tourist satisfaction on cognitive image and loyalty. According to the findings of this study, perceived value and satisfaction serve as bridges between cognitive image and loyalty. As a result of the research, perceived value and satisfaction appear to be crucial determinants in determining destination loyalty. Furthermore, we analyzed multiple mediation effects and affirmed the paths of perceived value and tourist satisfaction on destination loyalty. We validated the path of cognitive image-perceived value-satisfaction and destination loyalty through parallel mediation, which extended the image-satisfaction-loyalty framework and value-satisfaction and loyalty framework.

This research focused on the tourist sector in a growing nation like Cox’s Bazar. As a result, it adds to and broadens the existing information about the tourism industry in a contextual setting. The majority of early tourist research used developed economies as their sample. Because of ethnic diversity, outcomes from one country may not be comparable to another, which may have different tastes and expectations based on common cultural or socioeconomic norms.

**Managerial Implications**

Identifying the cognitive image that impacts perceived value, satisfaction, and destination loyalty can help us comprehend Cox’s Bazar’s Image. The findings have major implications for the industry’s knowledge of tourist behavior and destination marketing. These findings will likely provide valuable information to destination marketers, tour operators, and policymakers as they adjust current marketing methods and improve new products.

**CONCLUSION & FURTHER RESEARCH**

The findings revealed that the cognitive Image of Cox’s Bazar has a significant impact on perceived value and satisfaction. Furthermore, perceived value influences satisfaction and loyalty to a destination. Additionally, perceived value and visitor satisfaction mediate the impact of a cognitive image of Cox’s Bazar on destination loyalty. However, no direct association was found between the cognitive Image and destination loyalty of Cox’s Bazar. This resembles that as long as visitors are happy, the image would influence destination loyalty. Tourist satisfaction will also be generated if tourist items are deemed high quality. As a result, Cox’s Bazar as a tourism capital, and the longest sea beach in Bangladesh, need to create an appealing cognitive image since perceived value and satisfaction are the significant drivers of travel and improve destination loyalty.

**Limitations and Future Research Direction**

We used a convenient sampling method during Cox’s Bazar’s peak season to conduct the study. As a result, the outcomes have certain restrictions. Future research should be conducted at other times, in different places, and during the off-peak season to generalize the research findings.
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APPENDIX

Appendix 1. Demographic characteristics and percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-35</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 65</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ISSN 2722-2152 (online)
### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University diploma</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Secondary Certificate</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Certificate</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Time</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Times</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Times</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Times or More</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N:B: n=608;Spss output)