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Abstract: The purpose of this study is to define destination social responsibility as a multidimensional construct and examine the relationships among DSR, tourists’ emotions, and their satisfaction through the lens of corporate social responsibility. A model was empirically tested with a sample of 359 random foreign tourists caught in Hoi An, Vietnam. The results indicate that all DSR dimensions, including economic, environmental, legal-ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities significantly enhance tourists’ emotions while only legal-ethical and philanthropic responsibilities directly affect tourists’ satisfaction. The findings also confirm the mediating effect of emotions between destination social responsibility and tourists’ overall satisfaction.
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1. Introduction

Most of the countries are making great efforts to allure tourists. However, the over-exploitation of natural resources and over-development of tourism can pose negative impacts on the destination’s environment, economy and society, as a consequence, can harm its long-term health. Given the need to tackle these challenges, or at least diminish undesirable impacts, and continue to attract tourists, social responsibility practices are acknowledged as one of the most effective solutions for tourism-based organizations [1]. Social responsibility was first introduced in business by Bowen [2] under the term "Corporate Social Responsibility” (CSR) which refers that a corporation should take responsibilities to contribute to the community where it operates since it exists as a legal entity in society. Most of the extant CSR literature has traditionally concentrated on the responsibility of business firms or organizations as an individual entity, but not paying much attention to the combined effects of socially responsible behaviours conducted by interrelated entities in the context of a tourist destination [3, 4, 5].

A destination is a holistic construct in which tourists often depend on the overall perceptions of the destination image to form their behavioural intentions [6]. The collective behaviours related to the social responsibility of all stakeholders can be perceived by tourists, which in turn, form their attitudes about destination image and potentially behavioural intentions. Therefore, it is necessary to study social responsibility based activities from a total destination perspective. From this
comprehensive perspective, Su et al. [5] define the term “Destination Social Responsibility” (DSR) which refers to all stakeholders’ activities that protect and enhance the social and environmental aspects of an entire destination, beyond the economic interests of the individual organizations. Since there is still a limited understanding of DSR, scholars have called energetically for more research efforts to study this subject. By responding to this, the current study extends the previous works by developing DSR construct as a multidimensional construct based on the multidimensional nature of CSR rather than as a one-dimensional construct and further explores its outcomes.

Many extant marketing studies have confirmed that socially responsible initiatives have a positive influence on several customer-related outcomes, for example, satisfaction. According to Smith and Ong [7], customers are not willing to consume the goods or services of companies with no or poor socially responsible practices. In line with this understanding, it can be inferred that tourists seemed not to be pleased with tourist sites or travel destinations which are not environmentally friendly or have socially irresponsible behaviours with local residents. Thus, it is essential to explore the effects of socially responsible activities in the destination on tourists’ satisfaction since the last one is the main factor directly influencing to the success of a destination. To illuminate this relationship, this study integrates the results of prior research by using emotions as mediating variable between destination social responsibility and tourists’ satisfaction. Emotions are confirmed to mediate the relationship between perceived destination social responsibility and environmentally behaviour intention of tourists [3]; between DSR and satisfaction [8]. Besides, as the nature of tourism is hedonic, the quest for determinants of tourists’ emotions has been still a challenge for all researchers and practitioners. For this reason, this study adopts emotions as an examined variable to investigate the effects of destination social responsibility on tourists’ emotions. Simultaneously examining the influences of destination social responsibility on both emotions and overall satisfaction is expected to elucidate the research question and propose more useful theoretical and managerial implications for both scholars and destination managers.

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Destination Social Responsibility

Recently, researchers have extended and adopted the main principles of CSR in other various contexts beyond the scope of the corporations such as museums, heritage [9], and tourist sites [10]. Similarly, the extant CSR works have also been utilized and modified to examine DSR [4, 5].

Since a travel destination is a complicated unit including many tourism-related sectors, the effects of socially responsible initiatives in a destination should be considered as the combined CSR effects of all stakeholders operating in there [5]. To illuminate this collective CSR effects, Su et al. [5] first introduced the term “destination social responsibility” and conceptualized it as the collective ideology and efforts of destination stakeholders to engage in socially responsible activities. They explain that DSR indicates the obligations for all stakeholders in the destination to diminish negative influences on the economy, environment, and society; enhance prosperity for a community; and improve the wellbeing of local people. A travel destination could be recognized as a socially responsible destination if all stakeholders of both public and private segments fully engage in socially responsible activities supporting the tourism industry. In a subsequent study, Su et al. [3] suggest that DSR is about awareness of responsibilities and obligations of all stakeholders, including government, tourism corporates, organizations, tourists, and community residents to perform socially oriented practices. Su and Swanson [4] define DSR as activities of stakeholders that protect and improve the social and environmental interests of an entire destination, besides the economic interests of the individual organizations. Sharing the same concept, Ma et al. [11] describe DSR as the status and activities applied to all its stakeholders (including governments, investors, suppliers, competitors, local residents, tourists, and employees) in terms with the perception of its social responsibilities.

As mentioned by Su et al. [5], the subject of responsibility in the concept of CSR is obvious, that is, the focal corporation or organization under consideration while the identity of the responsibility
subject is vague in the destination settings. Nevertheless, the accumulation level and performance of the stakeholders’ socially responsible behaviours can be theorized and evaluated by relevant stakeholders, for example, tourists as main evaluators of the destination. Based on this, this study focuses on the evaluation of tourists about the socially responsible behaviours in a destination on their emotions, and overall satisfaction.

Su and Swanson [4] point out that destination social responsibility includes environmental, social, economic, stakeholders’ ethical, legal responsibilities. Ma et al. [11] and Su et al. [3] state that destination social responsibility contains environmental, social, economic, stakeholders and voluntary responsibilities. In another study, Su et al. [5] examined DSR with economic, social, environmental, and stakeholder responsibilities. All of these extant studies defined DSR as a one-dimensional construct. However, prior works in CSR literature have confirmed the multidimensional nature of social responsibility. Therefore, relying on the dimensions of CSR, this study extends DSR as a multidimensional construct to examine the effect levels of each dimension. Economic, philanthropic, environment, legal, and ethical dimensions are selected to examine because these dimensions are frequently adopted in studies related to social responsibility.

2.2 Tourist Emotions

Bagozzi, Gopinath, and Nyer [12] conceptualize emotions as “a mental state of readiness that arises from cognitive appraisals of events or thoughts …. and may result in specific action to affirm or cope with the emotion, depending on its nature and meaning for the person having it”. As noted by Westbrook and Oliver [13], customers’ emotional responses associated with their consumption experiences can be called consumption emotions. In this current study, the perceived responsible activities in a destination evoke the tourists’ emotions related to consumption experience and form their behavioural intentions. According to Hosany and Prayag [14], prior literatures propose two main theoretical approaches to examine emotions: dimensional (valence based) and categorical (emotion specificity). Dimensional approaches theorize emotions as a limited number of fundamental dimensions, for instance, the pleasure, arousal and dominance scale [15], or the Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scales [16]. Categorical approaches conceptualize emotions using a group of discrete emotions, for example, the Differential Emotion Scale of Izard [17], the Consumption Emotion Set of Richins [18], the Destination Emotion Scale of Hosany and Gilbert [19]. A coherent body of prior research determines the influence of emotional responses to the tourism experience on post-consumption behaviours. Y.K. Lee, C.K, Lee, S. K. Lee and Babin [20] demonstrate that environmental factors of festivals such as the information, program contents, facilities, and food have positive influences on emotions of visitors, which then enhance the tourists’ overall satisfaction about the festival. Hosany et al. [21] examined three patterns of emotion, including joy, love, and positive surprise in the relationship with behavioural intentions. Their findings confirm that all investigated types of emotions are important antecedents of tourists’ favourable behavioural intentions.

2.3 Overall Satisfaction

Tourists’ overall satisfaction is conceptualized as “the extent of overall pleasure or contentment felt by the visitor, resulting from the ability of the trip experience to realize their desires, expectations and needs in relation to the trip” [22]. Chon [23] determine that tourist satisfaction is formed on the connection between his/her early expectations about the destination before traveling and the perceived value of the experience at the destination. Hosany and Prayag [14] define tourist satisfaction as a summative overall construct related to tourists’ overall evaluation of a destination and their experience in the destination. The mainstream of prior works on tourists’ satisfaction relates to its antecedents and later behavioural intentions. Um, Chon, and Ro [24] support the results that perceived attractiveness, perceived quality of service, and perceived value for money are powerful predictors of tourists’ overall satisfaction. Kozak and Rimmington [25] determine that tourists who are satisfied with their travel experiences in Mallorca, Spain will tend to come back and recommend
the destination to others. Besides, satisfied visitors were more willing to recommend their holidays than to revisit the destination.

3. Research Model & Hypothesis Development

3.1 Research Model

Research model is depicted in figure 1. DSR is conceptually categorized into five dimensions and each has supposed to have the direct and indirect relationship with emotions and overall satisfaction. Emotions are introduced as mediating variable and designed to show indirect effect of DSR on overall satisfaction.

![Research Model Diagram](image)

3.2 Hypothesis Development

3.2.1 Destination Social Responsibility and Tourists’ Emotions

According to the Hierarchy of Effects Model, under the effects of advertisement, customer behaviour undergoes 3 stages: (1) the cognitive stage, which indicates customers’ perceptions and thoughts, (2) the affective stage, denoting the changes of emotions and (3) the conative stage which refers to intentions and behaviours. From the viewpoint of marketing, social responsible activities of a company can be regarded as “image advertisement”, which concentrates on originating attitudes and feelings for customers [26]. A good corporate image from SCR can help consumers have a good impression of the enterprise and feelings, resulting in a good experience. The same principle could be applied in the destination settings. Socially responsible activities perceived in the destination could enhance a tourist image for destination. Tourists who have a favourable image of a location would perceive their onsite experiences positively, including both cognitive and affective experiences (happy, good, pleased, etc.) [27].

Su, Swanson, and Chen [28] note that customers could receive benefits when they see a company’s responsible activities supporting their ethical views and goals. Here, the benefits can be understood as symbolic benefits that help customers to satisfy their self-improvement and personal uniqueness needs [29]. By receiving symbolic benefits they expect, as a consequence, positive emotions can be evoked. Su and Swanson [4] consider that “tourists might construe an overall destination’s attention to socially responsible issues as facilitating their own moral interests”.

Similarly, tourists can receive the symbolic benefits by regarding DSR practices as supporting their society goals [4]. As a result, positive emotions can be elicited.

Relying on the Stimulus-Organism-Response (S-O-R) framework [15], Su and Swanson [4] consider perceived socially responsible behaviours in the destination as stimuli (S) and emotional
responses associated with consumption experiences as internal states (O), which then lead to behavioural intentions of tourists (R). From what have discussed above, it is hypothesized:

H1. Destination social responsibility has a positive effect on tourists' emotions.

3.2.2 Destination Social Responsibility and Overall Satisfaction

CSR can significantly promote consumers’ evaluations of and attitudes toward the enterprises [30]. Particularly, some recent studies explored that CSR practices stimulate customers to develop a close relationship with the company that lately can form customer-company identification [8, 31]. Undoubtedly, customers who have a positive attitudes with the company are likely to be satisfied with a firm’s offerings [29, 32]. In the context of destination, Su and Swanson [4] explored that DSR has positive effect on tourist-destination identification. Thus, it can be inferred that tourists who identify with destination will be more satisfied with the destination.

As mentioned above, socially responsible activities can generate the perceptions of a good destination image. Many prior works have confirmed that destination image can affect tourists’ overall satisfaction [33-35]. Therefore, it can be believed that socially responsible activities in the destination can have influences on tourists’ satisfaction. At the destination level, DSR practices can boost the residents’ overall satisfaction with the destination [3]. Thus, it is hypothesized that:

H2. Destination social responsibility has a positive effect on tourists’ overall satisfaction.

3.2.3 Tourists’ Emotions and Overall Satisfaction

Emotions appearing from consumption experiences may affect “memory traces which consumers process and integrate to form consumption evaluations of satisfaction” [36]. Ladhari [37] confirm that emotional states pose the positive impacts on customers’ satisfaction in consumption experience which then leads to positive word of mouth intention. A. Yuksel and F. Yuksel [38] point out that pleasure and arousal experiencing while shopping in the destination can positively influence tourists’ shopping satisfaction. Jung and Yoon [40] investigated that positive emotions such as entertainment, happiness, pleasure, and delight lead to customer satisfaction in a restaurant. Io [39] states that emotional experience in casino-hotel such as light pleasure and intensive fun can enhance visitors’ satisfaction. It is shown in Prayag, Hosany, and Odeh [36] study that joy, love, and positive surprise have a significant impact on satisfaction in the context of heritage tourism. Positive emotions are associated with the generation of satisfaction in tourist services, for example, theme parks [41]. In Hosany and Prayag’s [21] study, tourist’s emotional experiences are acknowledged as significant determinants of satisfaction. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H3. Tourists’ emotions have a positive effect on tourists’ overall satisfaction.

4. Methodology

4.1 Operational Definitions

The definition of DSR follows the study of Su et al. [5]. Dimensions of DSR are defined based on the prior works of Carroll [42, 43], Dahlsrud [44], Jang [45], and Su et al. [5]. Economic responsibility is the efforts of destination stakeholders to be profitable and share the economic benefits with society [5, 42-43]. Environmental responsibility is the efforts of destination stakeholders to perform environmentally friendly practices and protect the environment along with business operation [5, 44-45]. Philanthropic responsibility is the efforts of destination stakeholders to use the revenue generated through business for social activities or donations [5, 42]. Legal responsibility is the efforts of destination stakeholders to have obligations to observe customers-related regulations, law and government regulations [5, 42, 45]. Ethical responsibility is the efforts of destination stakeholders to prevent ethical norms from being compromised to achieve a company’s goals and circumventing
social harm as well as acting ethically to stakeholders [5, 42, 45]. Emotions are defined based on the study of Bagozzi et al. [12]. Both the definition of satisfaction is also grounded in the study of Chen and Tsai [22].

### 4.2 Measurement Items

The questionnaire was originally developed in English (Table 1). Then it was translated into Korean and Chinese by bilingual speakers due to the increasing number of Korean and Chinese tourists to Vietnam in recent years. The questionnaires were also carefully checked by different native speakers of Korean and Chinese to eliminate errors and ensure the meanings of the original questionnaire. Finally, all three of versions, including English, Korean and Chinese were used for this study. All the measurement items were adopted from prior works and modified to match the research model and context of the present study. All the constructs employed in the present study were assessed with 5-point Likert-type scales, anchored by Strongly Disagree (1) and Strongly Agree (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measurement items</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Responsibility</td>
<td>“I thought that local authority, service providers and companies in Hoi An...” 1. tried to generate tourism profits. 2. improved the quality of their services and products. 3. made contributions to the national and local economy through their businesses. 4. tried to generate employment through their operations. 5. established long-term plans for their businesses. 6. tried to attract more tourists. 7. encouraged tourists to consume/use local products.</td>
<td>[45, 46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Responsibility</td>
<td>1. were concerned with protecting the environment. 2. used energy efficiently to protect the environment. 3. recycled waste. 4. used environmentally friendly products 5. offered environment-friendly products and travel programs. 6. encouraged tourists to be environmentally friendly in nature. 7. communicated to tourists about their environmental practices.</td>
<td>[45-47]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Responsibility</td>
<td>1. protected consumers and take responsibility for their products/services. 2. resolved service problems promptly. 3. observed legal responsibility and standards. 4. treated customers honestly and ethically.</td>
<td>[45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Responsibility</td>
<td>1. did not practice exaggerated and false advertisements. 2. provided full and accurate information about products/services to customers. 3. tourists’ satisfaction was highly important for them. 4. established ethical guidelines for business activities. 5. tried to become the ethically trustworthy service providers. 6. provided a healthy and safe working environment for employees.</td>
<td>[26, 45]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philanthropic Responsibility
1. did charity activities.
2. played a role in society that goes beyond mere profit generation.
3. tried to fulfill its social responsibility.
4. actively participated in social and cultural events.

Emotions
“Through experience in Hoi An, …”
1. I felt happy.
2. I felt relaxed.
3. I felt excited.

Overall Satisfaction
1. Overall, I was satisfied with this destination.
2. Overall, my experience in Hoi An was much better than my expectations.
3. All things considered (e.g., time, effort, money), I was satisfied with my visit to Hoi An.
4. This was one of the best destinations I had visited.

4.3 Data Collection and Sampling
This study carried out in Hoi An, Vietnam. Hoi An has an ancient town which was recognized as a World Heritage Site in 1999 by UNESCO and the Cham islands, a World Biosphere Reserve. Along with the rapid tourism development in Hoi An, the local government has encouraged the enterprises engaging in socially responsible actions and made heavy investments in protecting the natural environment and heritage areas. Thus Hoi An, well-known for its traditional assets and natural beauty, brings an appropriate context for our study to examine how DSR can perform to help preserve the natural environment, and heritage sites and hence, continue to draw tourists.

The convenience sampling technique and a self–administered questionnaire method were applied to collect data from August 23rd to September 8th, 2017. The target subject for this study was international tourists visiting Hoi An. The respondents were given a small gift after completing the questionnaire. A total of 371 questionnaires were received, and 359 valid ones could be finally used in this study. The sample characteristics of the sample are shown in table 2.

Table 2- Demographic characteristics of respondents (N=359)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>America</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60 and older</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Annual Income Level (USD)</td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$10,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 to $69,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than $100,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/University</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Empirical Results

The surveyed data was analyzed through three steps. First, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to assess the validity of measurement scales. Next, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine how well the manifest variables expressed the constructs and to identify the goodness of fit for the proposed model. Finally, the hypothesized relationships among destination social responsibility, emotional responses, and satisfaction were examined utilizing a structural equation model (SEM).

5.1 Validation and Reliability

First of all, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was carried out to evaluate whether the data was appropriate for Factor Analysis. The KMO measure was 0.914 and Bartlett’s Test of sphericity was significant (p<0.001), confirming that the surveyed data was totally suitable for using factor analysis.

The results of exploratory factor analysis using the principal component method with VARIMAX rotation are presented in table 3. The eigenvalues greater than 1 and the proportion of variance criterion indicated that seven factors could be extracted from data which captured 76.14% of the total variance. As noted by Hair et al. [52], factor loadings should be greater than 0.50. Among 28 items of DSR, 6 items were eliminated because of low factors loadings (<0.50). In particular, ethical responsibility and legal responsibility merged into one construct through the factor analysis process. Since tourists may consider ethical responsibility and legal responsibility as the same concept, the author decided to rename this dimension “Ethical-legal responsibility” and used this construct for further analysis. In the study of Lee and Son [53], ethical-legal responsibility was examined as one dimension of CSR. They explained that there may have the correlations between dimensions of CSR. Next, the scale reliability of each factor was investigated with the Cronbach’s alpha value. All seven factors exceeded the threshold of 0.70, ranging from 0.838 to 0.952, that indicated the high-reliability coefficients of factors.

Confirmatory factor analysis was then undertaken to confirm the goodness of fit for the measurement model and test discriminant validity and convergent validity of constructs. The analysis results were as follows: \( \chi^2=541.801, \) CMIN/df=1.497, p=0.000, GFI=0.909, AGFI= 0.891, NFI=0.936, CFI=0.978, RMR=0.029, RMSEA=0.037. This indicates the model gets the acceptable fit.

Convergent validity is generally examined by factor loading, average variance extracted (AVE) and composite reliability (CR). All standardized item loadings exceeded this threshold. The AVE scores were above the required value of 0.5, ranging from 0.575 to 0.899, showing that the variance generated by the corresponding constructs is greater than the variance due to measurement errors. All values of CR were over the 0.7 thresholds suggested by Hair et al. (2010). Since all the AVE values and the CR indices were satisfactory, the measurement model was confirmed to have good convergent validity.

Table 3- Results of Validation and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loading (EFA)</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
<th>Std. loading (CFA)</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the table 4, all the squared value of correlations between constructs ranged from 0.04 to 0.236, which was lower than the smallest AVE value of 0.574. This means that the discriminant validity of all constructs was satisfactory.

Table 4-Means, standard deviation and correlations of all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Res.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-Ethical</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.282**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.273**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.486**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. †<0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01
fit of the model as follows $x^2=541.801$, CMIN/df=1.497, $p=0.000$, GFI=0.909, AGFI=0.891, NFI=0.936, CFI=0.978, RMR=0.029, RMSEA=0.037. Therefore, the proposed model was reliable and appropriate to test the relationships among the variables. Table 5 illustrates the results for hypotheses. The first hypothesis proposed that destination social responsibility has a positive impact on tourists’ emotions. From the table 5, it was revealed that tourists’ perceptions of all four dimensions of social responsibility in the destination (economic, environmental, legal-ethical, philanthropic) had significant effects on emotions. The legal-ethical responsibility had the greatest influence with $\beta=0.364$ ($p < 0.01$), followed by economic responsibility with $\beta=0.206$ ($p<0.01$). The philanthropic responsibility and environmental responsibility also positively affected emotional responses with $\beta=0.174$ ($p<0.01$) and $\beta=0.120$ ($p < 0.05$) respectively. Hypothesis 2, DSR has a positive effect on tourists’ satisfaction, was partially supported. Only legal-ethical and philanthropic dimension significantly influenced satisfaction ($\beta=0.258$, $\beta=0.355$, respectively; $p < 0.01$) while there was no relationship between economic responsibility, environmental responsibility, and satisfaction. The relationship between emotions and satisfaction was supported with $\beta=0.153$ ($p < 0.05$). Hypothesis 3 was supported.

The direct, indirect, and total effects in the structural model are reported in table 6. Both philanthropic responsibility and legal-ethical responsibility had significant direct influences on satisfaction; whereas, economic responsibility and environmental responsibility did not directly affect tourists’ overall satisfaction. However, all examined responsibilities were found to have considerable indirect impacts on satisfaction, due to the mediating effect of emotions. To be specific, legal-ethical responsibility had the most influential indirect effect on tourists’ overall satisfaction via emotions with $\beta=0.056$ ($p < 0.01$), subsequently followed by economic responsibility ($\beta=0.032$, $p < 0.01$), philanthropic responsibility ($\beta=0.027$, $p < 0.01$) and environmental responsibility ($\beta=0.018$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, the mediating role of emotions between destination social responsibility and satisfaction was verified through empirical results. In other words, the positive link of “DSR → tourists’ emotions → satisfaction” was confirmed. This also means that economic responsibility and environmental responsibility will not influence tourists’ satisfaction without the mediation effect of emotions. In terms of total effects, philanthropic responsibility has the greatest effect on satisfaction ($\beta=0.382$, $p < 0.01$), in comparison with legal-ethical responsibility ($\beta=0.313$, $p < 0.01$) and environmental responsibility ($\beta=0.102$, $p < 0.01$). Meanwhile, there was no total effect between economic responsibility and satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5 – Hypotheses testing results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Res. → Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Res. → Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-Ethical Res. → Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Res. → Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Res. → Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Res. → Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal-Ethical Res. → Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Res. → Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions → Overall Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. a: Standard path loadings b: Standard error.
Table 6. Results of total effects, direct effects, and indirect effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Total effects</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Res. → Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.032**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Res. →</td>
<td>0.102**</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.018**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal./Ethical Res. →</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.056**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Res. →</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
<td>0.355**</td>
<td>0.027**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. † p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

6. Conclusion

6.1 Discussion and Implications

This study presented a theoretical model that explored whether tourists’ perceptions towards socially responsible behaviors in a destination affected their emotional responses in order to decide their satisfaction later on. This study is slightly different from other related studies when it comes to conceptualizing DSR as a five-multidimensional construct and examining the different influence levels of these dimensions on tourists’ emotions and overall satisfaction. The findings revealed that all investigated responsibility dimensions had significant impacts on tourists’ emotional experience at the destination. According to Su and Swanson [4], when being less familiar with the destination, the first-time tourists tend to depend more on evaluations of DSR as an important piece of information to develop a sense of relationship with the destination. Since 84% of respondents in this study were the first-time tourists, the survey had received active responses to questions about DSR initiates, helping elicit the emotions of the respondents. Among four significant DSR dimensions, the legal-ethical was pointed to be the most important one that influenced tourists’ emotions. From the perspective of service consumers, the tourists might hope to be treated with respect and equality first and foremost. Interestingly, only legal-ethical responsibility and philanthropic responsibility have a significant influence on overall satisfaction while economic responsibility and environmental responsibility show no relationship with satisfaction. The reason may be that tourists can only feel satisfied when their personal interests or expectations achieved. Because economic responsibilities with a guarantee of business viability and environmental responsibilities with a focus on environmental protection seem not to directly affect benefits and expectations of tourists. In contrast, legally-ethically responsible behaviors such as protecting customers’ laws or not applying false advertisements can directly enhance tourists’ travel experience while the philanthropic responsibility of enterprises can help to fulfill tourists’ vicarious satisfaction. Additionally, this study contributed to tourism theory by identifying the mediating roles of emotions on the relationship between tourists’ perceived destination social responsibility and their satisfaction. Although both economic and environmental responsibilities did not pose a direct impact on tourists’ satisfaction, these two dimensions elicited tourists’ emotional responses, which in turn positively affected their overall satisfaction. To put it differently, the economic and environmental responsibilities had only indirect effects on tourists’ satisfaction through the mediating effect of emotions. The findings confirmed the direct positive relationship between emotions and satisfaction that were consistent with previous empirical works [e.g. 37-40].

Through empirical findings from the present study, several managerial implications could be inferred for those who are responsible for the marketing and management of tourist destinations. Firstly, findings showed that if a destination can create a deep impression of strong social responsibility, it will satisfy their tourists who may be potential future customers. It can be implied that increasing investments in socially responsible conducts can bring useful economic benefits in long-term. Therefore, destination marketing managers should consider DSR activities. Second, since emotions are found to play an important role in mediating the influences of socially responsible
practices on satisfaction, destination marketers should focus on other marketing activities to evoke visitors’ emotions which ultimately increase the satisfaction level of tourists. For example, Taiwan adopts the slogan “touch your heart” to send the feelings of warm-heartedness to their potential tourists or the Netherlands stimulate tourists’ curiosity by the sayings “Surprising Cities”. Thirdly, since the awareness of socially responsible practices in the destination is expected to be relatively low when compared to the CSR of individual corporate, destination planners and marketers should call for the synergy between all stakeholders to encourage DSR activities and set it as a long-term strategic planning. To be effective, it is necessary to have programs for developing long-term partnerships among destination stakeholders.

6.2 Limitations and future research

This study has several limitations that provide directions for future studies. First, this study examined its hypothesized research model in one particular destination, the findings may not be generalizable in the settings of other sites. Second, the DSR dimensions adapted in this study based on the extant literature of corporate social responsibility. In some cases, the theory of CSR may not completely be suitable for the destination. As a newly-developed construct, DSR needs to be refined and improved on both the conceptualization and measurement scales. Third, although emotions associated with tourism experience and social responsibility are very diverse, the present study only used three types of emotions that are excitement, happiness, and relaxation to verify the hypotheses. Future research needs to study different types of emotions such as pleasure, interest, feeling gratitude in relation to providing more insights into the effects of DSR.
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