

## **Behind the Enchantment: Evaluating Theme Park Visit Motivations, Experiences, and Post-Visit Outcomes at Enchanted Kingdom, Philippines**

**Jomari Patrick M. Guzman<sup>1,2\*</sup> Nappy L. Navarra<sup>3</sup>**

*\*Corresponding Author*

<sup>1</sup> Master of Tropical Landscape Architecture Student, College of Architecture – Integrated Graduate Program, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines

<sup>2</sup> Faculty, Department of Architecture, Institute of Architecture and Fine Arts, Far Eastern University, Manila, Philippines

<sup>3</sup> Faculty, College of Architecture – Integrated Graduate Program, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines

Email of All Authors: [jmguzman1@up.edu.ph](mailto:jmguzman1@up.edu.ph), [nlnavarra@up.edu.ph](mailto:nlnavarra@up.edu.ph)  
Tel: +639268291518

---

### **Abstract**

Hedonic landscapes such as theme parks serve as important places for leisure and entertainment. In the Philippines, these places evolved from pre-colonial ritual sites into colonial plazas and fairgrounds—the imprints of contemporary Philippine amusement parks. While most literature examines theme parks in Western contexts, local recreational experiences remain underexplored. This study evaluated the motivations, experiences, and post-visit outcomes among Filipino visitors at Enchanted Kingdom. Findings revealed that theme parks remain as spaces for escape, novelty, entertainment, celebration, and intergenerational social bonding, enhancing overall well-being. Future research should examine other underexplored geographical settings to allow comparative analyses across diverse contexts.

**Keywords:** hedonic landscapes, theme parks, tourist motivation, enchanted kingdom

eISSN: 2398-4287 © 2026. The Authors. Published for AMER by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers). DOI:

---

### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **1.1 Background of the Study**

The global theme park industry is currently valued at over \$70 billion and is projected to reach \$100 billion, driven by a compound annual growth rate of approximately 8.3% (Research and Markets, 2026). Recently, the industry's growth center has steadily shifted toward emerging markets in the Asia-Pacific region, propelled by the expanding middle class, increasing disposable income, and growing domestic tourism (Fortune Business Insights, 2026). Moreover, these contemporary entertainment venues have transitioned from attraction-based venues into immersive, narrative-driven, and experience-focused leisure environments. As theme parks are hyper-realistic spaces engineered to deliver intense emotional, sensory, and psychological escape from everyday life, they remain relevant to fulfill fundamental human needs for pleasure and recreation.

Historically, theme parks originated from medieval pleasure gardens, world fairs, and amusement parks. The opening of Disneyland in Anaheim, California, in 1955 revolutionized the industry by introducing narrative-driven themed environments (Freitag et al., 2023). In the Philippines, the roots of theme parks can be traced back to pre-colonial spiritual and ritualized agricultural harvest celebrations, which were later assimilated during the Spanish colonial period into religious fiestas and subsequently into fairground carnivals during the American colonial period (Castro, 2008). Over time, following contemporary urban carnivals and amusement centers, modern theme parks pioneered by Enchanted Kingdom emerged in line with global leisure trends (Bloopool, 2016).

eISSN: 2398-4287 © 2026. The Authors. Published for AMER by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers). DOI:

Besides their role in the leisure and tourism industry as primary tourist destinations, theme park visits function as a mechanism for stress recovery, psychological restoration, and overall subjective well-being (Durrant et al., 2011). Driven by desires to reward oneself, vacationing, and curiosity for extraordinary experiences, visiting theme parks allows visitors to temporarily escape from the mundane realities of daily life (Freitag et al., 2023). Consequently, theme parks serve as hedonic spaces that promote personal well-being through the accumulation of pleasurable moments. This hedonic value extends beyond individual self-gratification as it offers essential opportunities for shared social connectedness among families and friends (Ong et al., 2024; Halbwachs, 1950/1992).

This study examines tourist motivation theories by Dann (1977, 1981) and Crompton (1979) on Push factors (internal psychological drivers, such as stress relief or social bonding) and Pull factors (external destination attributes, such as rides and attractions or themed environments). Moreover, Pine and Gilmore's (1999) experience economy framework, which covers four realms of experience (Entertainment, Educational, Esthetic, and Escapist), was also used to identify how these experience realms form lasting post-visit outcomes, specifically Satisfaction, Memory, Emotion, and Revisit Intention.

While theme park literature has extensively examined consumer behavior in Western contexts, predominantly focusing on well-known sites like Disneyland and Universal Studios, empirical research grounded in emerging environments remains underexplored (Freitag et al., 2023). Situating this investigation at Enchanted Kingdom (EK) theme park, considered as the Philippines' premier world-class theme park, presents a valuable opportunity to broaden the empirical literature beyond Western paradigms and provide comparative insights.

### 1.2 Problem Setting

The main goal of the study is to evaluate the relationships among visitor motivations, experience, and post-visit outcomes among Filipino visitors of Enchanted Kingdom.

Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How do different push and pull factors shape first-time and repeat visitor motivation at Enchanted Kingdom?

RQ2: How do visitor evaluations of the four realms of experience (entertainment, educational, esthetic, escapist) influence post-visit outcomes (satisfaction, memory, emotion, and revisit intention)?

RQ3: How do post-experience evaluations of overall experience, recommendation intention, and intergenerational revisit intention differ across various visitor demographic profiles?

Based on the research questions, the following hypotheses are tested:

H1: Demographic profile characteristics are significantly associated with post-experience evaluations of overall experience, recommendation intention, and intergenerational revisit intention.

H2: Theme park experience realms significantly influence overall visitor Satisfaction.

H3: Theme park experience realms significantly influence visitor Memory.

H4: Theme park experience realms significantly influence visitor Emotion.

H5: Theme park experience realms significantly influence visitor Revisit Intention.

## 2.0 Literature Review

Past studies on tourism motivation anchor their theoretical foundations on Dann's (1977, 1981) and Crompton's (1979) Push-Pull Motivation Framework, which demonstrates that "push factors" drive individuals to seek out a destination, while "pull factors" attract them to specific attributes of the destination. Bakir and Baxter (2011) explored the motivational factors driving family visits to Legoland Windsor. They revealed that while novelty, nostalgia, and family bonding served as primary internal motivators, the decision for adults to visit was heavily driven by the desire to please their children and their familiarity with the Lego brand. Similarly, Duong et al. (2023) investigated the decision-making process of domestic visitors in Vietnam's Central Highlands, demonstrating that personal demographic factors, escapism, knowledge, and cultural experiences act as internal motivators, whereas destination information, accessibility, unique image, and personal demographic factors serve as attractive features of the destination. Luvsandavaajav and Narantuya's (2021) study confirmed that travel motivations, comprising both push and pull factors, serve as significant antecedents of visitors' behavioral intentions.

Pine and Gilmore's (1999) experience economy model suggested that businesses can create memorable experiences for customers by engaging them in a personal and immersive way. It has been applied to tourist experiences and is relevant to theme park applications since these places are inherently experiential by design. Consumer experiences were categorized into four distinct realms: Entertainment (passive/absorption) pertains to activities like watching performances; Educational (active/absorption) refers to activities like learning about cultural themes, historical narratives, or ride mechanisms; Esthetic (passive/immersion) includes immersion in themed environments and atmosphere; and Escapist involves participating in thrill rides and attractions to temporarily detach from reality.

Literature evaluating theme park environments indicates that the experience realms do not contribute equally to all outcomes. Matiza et al. (2026) demonstrated that Escapism served as the strongest predictor of visitors' place attachment in a music festival. Dieck et al. (2018) similarly confirmed that all four realms of experience significantly influence satisfaction, memory, and intention for visitor engagement with science research in the context of science festivals. Bondoc and Ytturalde (2023) established that theme park experience, theme park satisfaction, and theme park loyalty have a significant relationship to respondents' assessments when visiting theme parks. Lee et al. (2019) emphasized that applying the experience economy model in theme park contexts provides a framework for understanding how multi-faceted experiences affect behavior. Kasalak et al. (2025) reinforced this consensus through a netnographic approach, affirming that the holistic tourism experience directly dictates long-term behavioral intentions.

Through the literature review, it is evident that theme park visitation is driven by a complex interplay of internal desires and external attributes, visitor experience across four experience realms, which then shape psychological responses. While these relationships are studied extensively in Western contexts, this study addresses a gap by investigating these dynamics in a domestic theme park setting, synthesizing motivations, experiential realms, and post-visit outcomes at Enchanted Kingdom.

### 3.0 Methodology

#### 3.1 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative research design to examine Filipino theme park visitor motivations, experiences, and memories at Enchanted Kingdom, Philippines. An online survey questionnaire was created and distributed through Google Forms over a one-month period, from January 5, 2026, to February 5, 2026. A non-probability convenience sampling approach was used as respondents were recruited based on their availability, and participation was voluntary (Ahmed, 2024). Snowball sampling was also used since participants were encouraged to share the survey within their networks to obtain as many responses as possible (Parker et al., 2019). The required sample size was determined using Cochran's formula, which is appropriate for large populations. At a 95 percent confidence level, with the desired margin of error of 5 percent and the estimated population proportion of 50 percent (rule of thumb if the true population proportion is unknown), Cochran's formula suggests a sample size of at least 385 respondents. A total of 412 valid responses were collected ( $n=412$ ).

#### 3.2 Research Instrument

The online survey began with an informed consent that by choosing to continue answering the survey, they were agreeing to the collection and use of their data. The questions provided were evaluated using a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from "1" (Strongly Disagree) to "5" (Strongly Agree). The online survey questionnaire was divided into five parts: (1) Demographic information was collected, such as gender, age group, civil status, number of children, highest level of education, employment status, household size, and monthly household income band; (2) Assessment of awareness of Enchanted Kingdom (EK) was conducted. Those who are not aware and those who have not been to EK were categorized as "first-time visitors", while those who have been to EK at least once were categorized as "repeat visitors". Respondents were asked about their post-experience evaluations on overall satisfaction, recommendation, and if they would take their children or future children to EK in the future. (3) Assessment of Push and Pull Factors (Dann 1977, 1981; Crompton, 1979) was conducted by adapting questions from the study of Bakir & Baxter (2011). For first-time visitors, the survey questionnaire ended here and were directed to the closing page. For repeat visitors, the survey continues to the succeeding part; (4) Assessment on visitor experiences across four core realms of Pine and Gilmore's (1999) experience economy model (Entertainment, Education, Esthetics, and Escapism), utilizing items adapted from Oh et al. (2007) and Lee et al. (2019); (5) Assessment on post-visit outcomes on Satisfaction, Memory, Emotion, and Revisit Intention were adapted from Karagoz & Ramkissoon (2023), Lee et al., (2019) and Oh et al. (2007). Lastly, the survey ended with closing remarks and an option to request for a summary of research findings, and an open-ended section for comments and suggestions.

A survey pretest was conducted with five respondents to ensure the clarity and brevity of the statements (Ruel et al., 2016), as well as to assess the time required to complete the questionnaire. Participants were also asked to provide general feedback on the overall feel and usability of the survey. Based on their feedback, minor revisions were made, after which the final version of the survey was disseminated to the public.

#### 3.3 Data analysis

Collected survey data were processed and analyzed using Microsoft Excel, IBM SPSS Statistics Version 27, and Python to model the logistic regression analysis. All analyses were conducted using statistical software, and hypotheses were tested at a 95 percent confidence level (5 percent significance level), unless otherwise stated. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated to summarize demographic profiles, push and pull factors, four realms of experience, post-visit outcomes, and post-experience evaluation scores. The chi-square test of independence was used to determine whether a significant association exists between demographic variables and post-experience evaluations. The Pearson correlation coefficient was employed to measure the strength and direction of linear relationships between continuous variables of experience realms against the post-visit outcomes and to check the existence of multicollinearity among input variables for the linear regression, that is, that there is a high correlation between input variables and will make some variables in the regression analysis redundant. The author considers relationships as highly correlated if their  $|p_{\text{cont}}| > 0.9$ . Linear regression analysis was used to determine the relationship between continuous variables and the interaction of experience realms and the post-visit outcomes.

### 4.0 Findings

Table 1 presents the respondents ( $n=412$ ) exhibit demographic characteristics indicative of a predominantly young, unmarried, and educated population. Most respondents are female (60.2%) and fall within the 20 to 29 age bracket (55.8%), which aligns with the remarkably high proportion of single individuals (86.7%) observed in the sample. Educationally, the respondents are well represented by those with some college experience or completed undergraduate degrees (a combined 60.2%), correlating with a divided employment status primarily split between employed individuals (33.3%) and those currently not in the labor force, including students (32.0%).

Table 1. Demographics of the respondents.

| Demographics                            | Items                         | Respondents (n=412) |               |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
|                                         |                               | n                   | Frequency (%) |
| Gender                                  | Female                        | 248                 | 60.2          |
|                                         | Male                          | 164                 | 39.8          |
| Age Group                               | 19 and below                  | 67                  | 16.3          |
|                                         | 20 - 29 years old             | 230                 | 55.8          |
|                                         | 30 - 39 years old             | 80                  | 19.4          |
|                                         | 40 - 49 years old             | 21                  | 5.1           |
|                                         | 50 and above                  | 14                  | 3.4           |
| Civil Status                            | Single                        | 357                 | 86.7          |
|                                         | Married                       | 43                  | 10.4          |
|                                         | Others                        | 12                  | 2.9           |
| Highest Level of Education              | Some High School              | 3                   | 0.7           |
|                                         | High School Graduate          | 86                  | 20.9          |
|                                         | Some College                  | 138                 | 33.5          |
|                                         | College Graduate              | 110                 | 26.7          |
|                                         | Some Post Graduate            | 34                  | 8.3           |
| Employment Status                       | Post Graduate                 | 41                  | 10.0          |
|                                         | Employed                      | 137                 | 33.3          |
|                                         | Self-Employed/Freelancer      | 41                  | 10.0          |
|                                         | Underemployed                 | 9                   | 2.2           |
|                                         | Unemployed                    | 93                  | 22.6          |
| Household Size                          | Person Not in the Labor Force | 132                 | 32.0          |
|                                         | 1 person                      | 15                  | 3.6           |
|                                         | 2 people                      | 32                  | 7.8           |
|                                         | 3 people                      | 56                  | 13.6          |
|                                         | 4 people                      | 103                 | 25.0          |
|                                         | 5 people                      | 106                 | 25.7          |
|                                         | 6 people                      | 46                  | 11.2          |
|                                         | 7 or more                     | 54                  | 13.1          |
| Monthly Household Income Band           | Less than PHP 12,030          | 27                  | 6.6           |
|                                         | Php 12,030 - Php 24,060       | 39                  | 9.5           |
|                                         | Php 24,061 - Php 48,120       | 76                  | 18.4          |
|                                         | Php 48,121 - Php 84,210       | 83                  | 20.1          |
|                                         | Php 84,211 - Php 144,360      | 74                  | 18.0          |
|                                         | Php 144,361 - Php 240,600     | 62                  | 15.0          |
|                                         | At least Php 240,601          | 51                  | 12.4          |
| Frequency of Visit to Enchanted Kingdom | Once                          | 68                  | 16.5          |
|                                         | 2-3 times                     | 155                 | 37.6          |
|                                         | 4-5 times                     | 71                  | 17.2          |
|                                         | 6 or more times               | 50                  | 12.1          |
|                                         | I have never visited EK       | 61                  | 14.8          |
|                                         | I have never heard of EK      | 7                   | 1.7           |

(Source: Author)

Furthermore, the typical respondent resides in a mid-sized household of four to five members and reports a middle-range household income, peaking at the PHP 48,121 to PHP 84,210 bracket, with the majority (37.6%) having visited Enchanted Kingdom two to three times.

Table 2 illustrates the descriptive statistics of internal push factors motivating visitation to Enchanted Kingdom, evaluated by first-time ( $n = 68$ ) and repeat ( $n = 344$ ) visitors on a 5-point Likert scale. Both groups prominently prioritize interpersonal connections; however, repeat visitors report a higher mean agreement and tighter consensus for Bonding ( $M = 4.53$ ,  $SD = 0.68$ ) and Shared Experiences ( $M = 4.34$ ,  $SD = 0.86$ ) compared to first-time visitors ( $M = 4.16$ ,  $SD = 0.86$  and  $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ , respectively). The most substantial divergence between the two groups manifests in Nostalgia, which functions as a strong motivator for repeat visitors ( $M = 4.24$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ) but yields the lowest mean and highest variance among first-time visitors ( $M = 3.57$ ,  $SD = 1.29$ ). Conversely, Novelty exhibits a marginally stronger pull for first-time visitors ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) than for repeat visitors ( $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ). The data suggest that first-time visitors are stimulated primarily by the pursuit of new experiences alongside baseline social interaction, whereas repeat visitors are heavily anchored in relational deepening, nostalgic attachments, and a Sense of Happiness ( $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = 0.93$  for repeat;  $M = 4.04$ ,  $SD = 1.06$  for first-time).

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics regarding external pull factors motivating attendance at Enchanted Kingdom, assessed on a 5-point Likert scale for first-time ( $n = 68$ ) and repeat ( $n = 344$ ) visitors. The core amusement product, Rides and Attractions, serves as the dominant and universally compelling pull factor for both first-time ( $M = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) and repeat visitors ( $M = 4.27$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ). However, first-time visitors are demonstrably more responsive to Seasonal Attractions ( $M = 4.15$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ) compared to repeat visitors ( $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ), suggesting that temporal events, concerts, and fireworks promote initial market penetration. Conversely, repeat visitors exhibit a significantly stronger reliance on New Additions and Upgrades ( $M = 4.13$ ,  $SD = 0.97$ ) than first-time visitors ( $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ). It is also noteworthy that explicit Marketing and Advertising yields the lowest mean agreement across both groups (First-time:  $M = 3.62$ ,  $SD = 0.96$ ; Repeat:  $M = 3.47$ ,  $SD = 1.13$ ). The data indicate that while rides and attractions anchor the park's baseline appeal, potential first-time visitors rely heavily on seasonal events; in contrast, sustaining guest loyalty and stimulating revisit intentions necessitate continuous capital investment in new physical rides and attractions to effectively counter product fatigue.

Table 2. Internal motivators (Push Factors) between first-time visitors and repeat visitors.

| Push Factors       | Items                                                                        | First-time Visitors (n=68) |         | Repeat Visitors (n=344) |         |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
|                    |                                                                              | Mean                       | SD      | Mean                    | SD      |
|                    | Going to Enchanted Kingdom...                                                |                            |         |                         |         |
| Bonding            | allows me to spend quality time with my family or friends.                   | 4.1618                     | 0.85711 | 4.5262                  | 0.67820 |
| Treating Myself    | is a way to treat or reward myself.                                          | 3.8529                     | 1.18781 | 3.9186                  | 1.16274 |
| Nostalgia          | allows me to relive the memories of my childhood amusement park experiences. | 3.5735                     | 1.28500 | 4.2413                  | 1.05667 |
| See Children Happy | lets me see the joy and excitement in children.                              | 3.8529                     | 1.09633 | 3.9738                  | 1.16904 |
| Escaping Routine   | allows me to take a break from everyday life and responsibilities.           | 4.0735                     | 1.05542 | 4.1395                  | 1.00044 |
| Sense of Happiness | makes me feel happy.                                                         | 4.0441                     | 1.05708 | 4.2238                  | 0.92545 |
| Novelty            | lets me experience something new and exciting.                               | 4.1471                     | 0.96606 | 4.0436                  | 1.00196 |
| Shared Experiences | lets me share experiences with other people.                                 | 4.1471                     | 0.98139 | 4.3401                  | 0.85919 |

(Source: Author)

Table 3. External motivators (Pull Factors) between first-time visitors and repeat visitors.

| Pull Factors                    | Items                                                                   | First-time Visitors (n=68) |         | Repeat Visitors (n=344) |         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
|                                 |                                                                         | Mean                       | SD      | Mean                    | SD      |
|                                 | I want to go to Enchanted Kingdom because...                            |                            |         |                         |         |
| Rides and Attractions           | of the rides and attractions.                                           | 4.2059                     | 0.97059 | 4.2733                  | 0.97238 |
| Brand and Theming               | of its reputation, branding, and themed zones.                          | 3.8824                     | 0.92283 | 3.8663                  | 1.02142 |
| Cleanliness and Safety          | it provides a clean, safe, and well-maintained environment.             | 3.7353                     | 0.92426 | 3.7413                  | 1.00433 |
| Professional and Friendly Staff | I believe that it has helpful and friendly staff.                       | 3.8529                     | 0.79672 | 3.9709                  | 0.87350 |
| Seasonal Attractions            | of seasonal events like performances, concerts, and fireworks displays. | 4.1471                     | 0.81524 | 3.7965                  | 1.08764 |
| Marketing and Advertising       | I believe that it has effective ad or media campaigns.                  | 3.6176                     | 0.96242 | 3.4738                  | 1.13230 |
| Verbal Recommendations          | because of positive endorsements from family or friends.                | 3.7500                     | 1.05625 | 3.9012                  | 1.06992 |
| New Additions and Upgrades      | of the new rides or experiences that I haven't tried before.            | 3.9265                     | 1.11055 | 4.1308                  | 0.96757 |

(Source: Author)

Table 4 outlines post-visit evaluations and behavioral intentions among repeat visitors ( $n = 344$ ) using a 5-point Likert scale. The respondents demonstrate exceptionally high behavioral loyalty and advocacy, as shown in the peak mean scores in Recommendation Intention ( $M = 4.53$ ,  $SD = 0.69$ ) and Intergenerational Revisit Intention ( $M = 4.46$ ,  $SD = 0.81$ ), indicating a strong desire to continue the park experience across familial and social networks. This attribute is structurally supported by the Memory construct, where respondents strongly affirmed holding "wonderful and pleasant memories" of the park ( $M = 4.22$ ,  $SD = 0.78$ ). Conversely, the lowest evaluations manifest in the Educational dimension, specifically regarding the dual entertainment-educational value of the experience ( $M = 3.49$ ,  $SD = 0.96$ ), as well as in specific Satisfaction metrics concerning food and beverage options ( $M = 3.45$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ) and retail merchandise ( $M = 3.51$ ,  $SD = 0.98$ ). Taken together, these outcomes suggest that Enchanted Kingdom's enduring appeal to repeat visitors relies heavily on affective, nostalgic, and socially binding experiential dimensions rather than educational engagement. Furthermore, while the core experiential product successfully drives revisit intention and intergenerational continuity, the comparatively lower means and elevated variance in food and retail satisfaction indicate operational vulnerabilities, highlighting a critical area for managerial intervention to elevate the holistic guest experience and maximize secondary revenue capture through these aspects.

In Table 5, these findings were obtained using the Chi-squared characteristics testing the independence between each demographic to their post-experience evaluation after experiencing Enchanted Kingdom theme park. Demographically, Gender acts as an even stronger predictor of positive experiential outcomes within EK, wherein females are more appreciative of the experience and would recommend it more to others. Furthermore, Educational Attainment and Household Income explicitly dictate family-oriented advocacy. Higher income and education levels directly correlate with a consumer's propensity to state they will bring their children to EK. This highlights EK's positioning as an aspirational, resource-dependent family milestone, as larger family size tends to have a more enjoyable overall EK experience. A borderline significant relationship also emerged between household size and overall experience, showing that larger companion groups amplify the perceived joy of the EK landscape. Overall experience is independent of any demographics. No intuitive relationship can be made between household income and likelihood that the person will take its children to EK.

Using Pine and Gilmore's Experience Economy model (Entertainment, Educational, Esthetic, and Escapist), the study evaluated what builds deep post-visit outcomes (Satisfaction, Memory, Emotion, Revisit Intention). Initial Univariate Pearson Correlations (see Table 6) revealed that the four realms of experience features maintain an exceptionally high correlation ( $>50$  percent). Piecewise correlation matrix evaluation (see Table 7) confirmed the absence of multicollinearity, with no variables exceeding the conservative  $>0.75$  threshold, justifying their inclusion in a multiple linear regression model. All experience aspects considerably correlates with each post-visit outcome aspects.

The resulting linear regression models (see Table 8) delivered a profound insight that momentary, curated experience matters infinitely when forging long-term post-visit outcomes. The isolated experiences within EK strongly and comprehensively predict an individual's satisfaction, memory, emotion, and revisit intention, wherein all experiences affect the post-visit outcome aspects of going to EK.

Table 4. Post-visit evaluations on experiences, post-visit outcomes, and post-experience evaluations among repeat visitors.

| Variables                           | Items                                                                                                    | Repeat Visitors (n=344) |         |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
|                                     |                                                                                                          | Mean                    | S.D.    |
| Entertainment                       | I enjoyed the rides, attractions, and activities in Enchanted Kingdom, even when I wasn't participating. | 3.9826                  | 0.85696 |
|                                     | I found the shows and performances in Enchanted Kingdom highly entertaining.                             | 3.7965                  | 0.86351 |
|                                     | I laughed or smiled a lot during my visit in Enchanted Kingdom.                                          | 4.1773                  | 0.81563 |
| Educational                         | I felt continuously entertained throughout my time in Enchanted Kingdom.                                 | 4.0523                  | 0.85894 |
|                                     | I learned something new during my visit in Enchanted Kingdom.                                            | 3.5116                  | 0.89696 |
|                                     | I was mentally engaged by the attractions and activities in Enchanted Kingdom.                           | 3.7907                  | 0.85872 |
| Escapist                            | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom helped me appreciate how ride mechanisms work.                        | 3.7587                  | 0.90185 |
|                                     | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom was not only entertaining but also educational.                       | 3.4913                  | 0.95675 |
|                                     | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom made me feel like I was in a different world, time, or place.         | 3.8547                  | 0.84123 |
| Esthetic                            | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom let me feel free and forget about my everyday responsibilities.       | 3.7616                  | 0.91705 |
|                                     | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom made me feel like I lost track of time.                               | 3.8052                  | 0.91625 |
|                                     | My experience in Enchanted Kingdom allowed me to escape from my daily routine.                           | 3.9128                  | 0.91215 |
| Satisfaction                        | The themed zones of Enchanted Kingdom were easily identifiable.                                          | 3.6541                  | 0.96262 |
|                                     | The park's themed zones feel believable within their imagined worlds.                                    | 3.8372                  | 0.93035 |
|                                     | Each themed zone maintains a consistent theme across its rides, shops, food outlets, and staff.          | 3.8343                  | 0.95611 |
| Memory                              | The background music, sounds, and lighting enhance and support the theme in each themed zone.            | 3.9302                  | 0.92947 |
|                                     | I am satisfied with the rides and attractions available in Enchanted Kingdom.                            | 3.9738                  | 0.90474 |
|                                     | I am satisfied with my experience of the themed environments in Enchanted Kingdom.                       | 3.9273                  | 0.91820 |
| Emotion                             | I am satisfied with the food and beverage options available in Enchanted Kingdom.                        | 3.4477                  | 1.03448 |
|                                     | I am satisfied with the retail and merchandise options in Enchanted Kingdom.                             | 3.5087                  | 0.98083 |
|                                     | I had wonderful and pleasant memories about Enchanted Kingdom.                                           | 4.2209                  | 0.78471 |
| Revisit Intention                   | Being in Enchanted Kingdom reminded me of happy moments from my childhood.                               | 4.1192                  | 0.88741 |
|                                     | My memories of Enchanted Kingdom enhanced my overall appreciation of the park.                           | 4.0930                  | 0.86564 |
|                                     | I will share my experiences at Enchanted Kingdom with others.                                            | 4.1395                  | 0.84568 |
| Overall Experience                  | Being in Enchanted Kingdom made me feel like a child again.                                              | 4.0436                  | 0.89434 |
|                                     | Being in Enchanted Kingdom made me feel thrilled and energized.                                          | 4.1221                  | 0.84838 |
|                                     | I have experienced one of the happiest moments of my life at Enchanted Kingdom.                          | 3.8459                  | 0.99684 |
| Recommendation Intention            | I have experienced a sense of wonder and amazement while visiting Enchanted Kingdom.                     | 4.0116                  | 0.86721 |
|                                     | I will visit Enchanted Kingdom again in the future.                                                      | 4.1628                  | 0.84840 |
|                                     | I will try other or new rides and attractions when I visit Enchanted Kingdom again.                      | 4.1860                  | 0.88738 |
| Intergenerational Revisit Intention | I plan to visit Enchanted Kingdom again because I believe the rides are safe.                            | 4.0203                  | 0.86536 |
|                                     | I will bring someone with me when I visit Enchanted Kingdom again.                                       | 4.3372                  | 0.78411 |
|                                     | I had a pleasant overall experience during my most recent visit to Enchanted Kingdom.                    | 4.1308                  | 0.77330 |
| Intention                           | I would recommend anyone to visit Enchanted Kingdom at least once in their lifetime.                     | 4.5320                  | 0.69073 |
|                                     | I would take my current and/or future children to Enchanted Kingdom in the future.                       | 4.4622                  | 0.81443 |

(Source: Author)

Table 5. Chi-squared characteristics testing the independence between each demographic to their post-experience evaluations among repeat visitors.

| Demographics                  | Rating of overall experience | Rating of recommendation intention | Rating of intergenerational revisit intention |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Gender                        | 6.01 (0.05)                  | 16.80 (0.00)                       | 14.48 (0.00)                                  |
| Age Group                     | 8.93 (0.35)                  | 15.70 (0.05)                       | 7.32 (0.50)                                   |
| Civil Status                  | 1.85 (0.40)                  | 5.74 (0.06)                        | 1.04 (0.59)                                   |
| Highest Level of Education    | 9.09 (0.33)                  | 14.83 (0.06)                       | 15.98 (0.04)                                  |
| Employment Status             | 6.13 (0.41)                  | 7.85 (0.25)                        | 8.81 (0.18)                                   |
| Household Size                | 19.93 (0.07)                 | 11.93 (0.45)                       | 12.32 (0.42)                                  |
| Monthly Household Income Band | 14.00 (0.30)                 | 17.28 (0.14)                       | 23.56 (0.02)                                  |

(Source: Author)

Table 6. Univariate correlation testing (Pearson correlation) between realms of experience (independent variables) and post-visit outcomes (dependent variables).

| Realms of Experience (Input Variables) | Post-Visit Outcomes (Output Variables) |        |         |                   |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------|---------|-------------------|
|                                        | Satisfaction                           | Memory | Emotion | Revisit Intention |
| Entertainment                          | 0.64                                   | 0.72   | 0.72    | 0.70              |
| Educational                            | 0.64                                   | 0.63   | 0.65    | 0.60              |
| Escapist                               | 0.62                                   | 0.69   | 0.71    | 0.63              |
| Esthetic                               | 0.68                                   | 0.65   | 0.67    | 0.62              |

(Source: Author)

Table 7. Piecewise correlation for the realms of experience as input variables.

| Realms of Experience (Input Variables) | Entertainment | Educational | Escapist | Esthetic |
|----------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|----------|
| Entertainment                          | 1.00          | 0.67        | 0.67     | 0.69     |
| Educational                            | 0.67          | 1.00        | 0.65     | 0.71     |
| Escapist                               | 0.67          | 0.65        | 1.00     | 0.70     |
| Esthetic                               | 0.69          | 0.71        | 0.70     | 1.00     |

(Source: Author)

Table 8. Linear regression results for each realm of experience against each post-visit outcome.

| Realms of Experience<br>(Input Variables) | Post-Visit Outcomes (Output Variables) |             |             |                   |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
|                                           | Satisfaction                           | Memory      | Emotion     | Revisit Intention |
| R-squared                                 | 0.9788                                 | 0.6165      | 0.6380      | 0.5537            |
| P-value                                   | 0.0000                                 | 0.0000      | 0.0000      | 0.0000            |
| Intercept                                 | Not Applicable                         | 0.69 (0.00) | 0.34 (0.03) | 0.91 (0.00)       |
| Entertainment                             | 0.28 (0.00)                            | 0.39 (0.00) | 0.37 (0.00) | 0.42 (0.00)       |
| Educational                               | 0.22 (0.00)                            | 0.12 (0.02) | 0.14 (0.01) | 0.12 (0.03)       |
| Escapist                                  | 0.16 (0.00)                            | 0.11 (0.03) | 0.31 (0.00) | 0.19 (0.00)       |
| Esthetic                                  | 0.30 (0.00)                            | 0.25 (0.00) | 0.14 (0.01) | 0.11 (0.06)       |

(Source: Author)

## 5.0 Discussion

The findings underscore a critical evolution in guest behavior across the customer lifecycle at Enchanted Kingdom, where initial visits are catalyzed by novelty and seasonal offerings, whereas sustained loyalty is heavily driven by nostalgic attachment, relational bonding, and continuous physical upgrades. Applying Pine and Gilmore's Experience Economy framework, the linear regression analyses demonstrate that all four experiential realms significantly drive downstream psychological outcomes. Specifically, Esthetics and Entertainment emerge as the strongest predictors of overall Satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.30$  and  $0.28$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and Revisit Intention ( $\beta = 0.42$  for Entertainment,  $p < 0.001$ ). Meanwhile, Escapism functions as a primary engine for deep emotional arousal ( $\beta = 0.31$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting previous literature on theme parks as hedonic spaces for psychological recovery and stress release. Furthermore, demographic cross-tabulations reveal that high-income, highly educated, and female visitors demonstrate significantly higher recommendation and intergenerational revisit intentions, illustrating that domestic theme park patronage in a Philippine, non-Western context serves as a resource-dependent, family-oriented milestone that reinforces social connectedness and collective memory.

## 6.0 Conclusion & Recommendations

In conclusion, Enchanted Kingdom's enduring appeal relies on transforming momentary, curated in-park experiences into long-term emotional loyalty, positive memory retention, and intergenerational advocacy. While the core amusement product and atmospheric elements successfully cultivate repeat visits and high recommendation intentions ( $M = 4.53$ ), the study identifies clear operational vulnerabilities in lower-rated secondary offerings, specifically food, beverage, and retail merchandising ( $M = 3.45$  and  $3.51$ ), as well as lower cognitive engagement in the Educational realm ( $M = 3.49$ ). All five proposed hypotheses (H1 through H5) were fully supported and yielded statistically significant conclusions, as all p-values ( $p = 0.00$ ) were below the 0.05 threshold at a 95% confidence level. To optimize the guest experience and maximize secondary revenue, park management should strategically upgrade food and retail operations to match the high standards of their atmospheric environments. Additionally, park operators should continue investing in dynamic seasonal programming to convert first-time visitors, while introducing continuous physical attraction upgrades and family-focused marketing to engage repeat visitors, leverage nostalgic drivers, sustain long-term brand equity and continuous patronization across generations.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge and express my sincere gratitude to my life partner, Ar. Ruben M. Felizarte Jr., for his unwavering support and overall research guidance; Prof. Franklin S. Fontanoza Jr., for his guidance as my graduate thesis reader; and Mr. Marlon Chris M. Malicsi, for providing expert statistical consultation and analytical support.

## Paper Contribution to Related Field of Study

This paper contributes to diversifying empirical insights across non-Western operational environments by applying Pine and Gilmore's (1999) experience economy model alongside Dann's (1977, 1981) and Crompton's (1979) Push-Pull motivation framework in a Philippine theme park setting (Enchanted Kingdom), further refining consumer behavior frameworks in tourism and leisure studies. For local theme park operators and developers, uncovering motivations of first-time versus repeat visitors enables targeted promotions, park programming, and enhanced experience.

## References

- Ahmed, S. K. (2024). How to choose a sampling technique and determine sample size for research: A simplified guide for researchers. *Oral Oncology Reports*, 12, 100662. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oor.2024.100662>
- Bakir, A., & Baxter, S. G. (2011). "Touristic Fun": Motivational factors for visiting Legoland Windsor Theme Park. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20(3–4), 407–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2011.562431>

- Blooloo. (2016, February 17). Leading in Asia: The Philippines' Enchanted Kingdom. Blooloo. <https://blooloo.com/theme-park/in-depth/leading-in-asia-the-philippines-enchanted-kingdom/>
- Bondoc, J., & Ytturalde, C. (2023). The impact of theme park experience on satisfaction and Loyalty. *Academic Society for Appropriate Technology*, 9(3), 202–212. <https://doi.org/10.37675/jat.2023.00353>
- Castro, A. D. (2008, July 16). 2. A man, a plan, a carnival. *Manila Carnivals*. <https://manilacarnivals.blogspot.com/2008/07/2-man-plan-carnival.html>
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408–424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90004-5)
- Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(77\)90037-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(77)90037-8)
- Dann, G. M. S. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187–219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(81\)90082-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(81)90082-7)
- Dieck, M. C. T., Jung, T. H., & Rauschnabel, P. A. (2018). Determining visitor engagement through Augmented Reality at Science Festivals: An experience economy perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 82, 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.043>
- Duong, L. N., Pham, L. H., & Hoang, T. T. P. (2023). Applying push and pull theory to determine domestic visitors' tourism motivations. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 14(27), 136–160. <https://doi.org/10.29036/jots.v14i27.554>
- Durrant, A., Kirk, D. S., Benford, S., & Rodden, T. (2011). Pursuing Leisure: Reflections on theme park visiting. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 21(1), 43–79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10606-011-9151-1>
- Fortune Business Insights. (2026). Theme Park market size, share & industry analysis, by service type (Rides, event & tour, food & beverage, Merchandise & retail, and others), by End-User (Kids and Adults), by Visitor type (Domestic and International), and regional Forecast, 2026-2034. In Fortune Business Insights. <https://www.fortunebusinessinsights.com/theme-park-market-110644>
- Freitag, F., Carla-Uhink, F., & Anton Clave, S. (2023). Key concepts in theme park studies: Understanding tourism and leisure spaces. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11132-7>
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). On collective memory (L. A. Coser, Ed. & Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1950)
- Karagoz, D., & Ramkissoon, H. (2023). Nostalgic emotions, meaning in life, subjective well-being and revisit intentions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 48, 101159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101159>
- Kasalak, M. A., Yorulmazer, S., & Kutlu, D. (2025). Evaluation of theme parks in terms of visitor experience and experience economy: The land of legends theme park example. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research (AHTR)*, 13(3), 304–332. <https://doi.org/10.30519/ahtr.1479167>
- Lee, S., Jeong, E., & Qu, K. (2019). Exploring theme park visitors' experience on satisfaction and revisit intention: A utilization of experience economy model. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(4), 474–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2019.1691702>
- Luvsandavaajav, O., & Narantuya, G. (2021). Understanding of travel motivations of domestic tourists. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 12(22), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.29036/jots.v12i22.253>
- Matiza, T., Kruger, M., & Viljoen, A. (2026). Examining Place Attachment and festival experience: A multi-group analysis of attendee behaviour in a music festival context. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 9(11), 38–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jhti-04-2025-0470>
- Oh, H., Fiore, A. M., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: Tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507304039>
- Ong, A. K. S., Antonio, J. C., Anduyo, D. a. F., Oabel, S. M. L., Miguel, J. F. N. S., Rendon, E. R. A., & Rosete, C. J. M. (2024). Analysis of actual visitation to amusement parks and recreational facilities. *Societies*, 14(9), 160. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14090160>
- Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball sampling. In P. Atkinson, S. Delamont, A. Cernat, J. W. Sakshaug, & R. A. Williams (Eds.), *SAGE research methods foundations*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036831710>
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theatre & every business a stage*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Research and Markets. (2026). Theme Park Market Report 2026. In Research and Markets. <https://www.researchandmarkets.com/reports/6170546/theme-park-market-report#:~:text=The%20theme%20park%20market%20size%20has%20grown,experiential%20attractions%2C%20availability%20of%20advanced%20ride%20technologies.>
- Ruel, E., Wagner, W., & Gillespie, G. (Eds.). (2016b). Pretesting and Pilot Testing. In *The practice of survey research: Theory and applications* (pp. 101–119). <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483391700.n6>