Article

Structural relationships between workation attachment, workationer power, workation relationship quality, and workation intention

Hung-Che Wu¹, Haonan Xu²*

¹ Global Village English School, Kaohsiung 800, China
² Nanfang college, Guangzhou 510970, China
* Corresponding author: Haonan Xu, haonan_xu_nfsysu@163.com

Abstract: This research aims to examine the structural relationships between the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, workation relationship quality, and workation intention. It demonstrates that the proposed model aligns well with the collected data based on a convenience sample comprising 494 workationers in Bangkok using structural equation modeling. The analysis outcomes contribute to the tourism marketing theory by providing additional insights into the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, the dimensions of workation relationship quality, and workation intention. The findings from this study can aid workation managers in formulating and executing market-oriented service strategies to enhance the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, and the dimensions of workation relationship quality, and foster workation intention.
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1. Introduction

Since the outbreak of COVID-19, “workation” has been becoming increasingly a new type of remote work which plays an important role in increasing digitalization and flexibilization of work (Voll et al., 2023). Vogl and Micek (2023) define workation as an amalgamation of work and vacation. This concept is characterized as a hybrid form of vacation (Werther, 2021) emerging at the crossroads of work and leisure (Voll et al., 2023), typically occurring in tourist destinations with well-developed infrastructure (Werther, 2021). Workation is also considered to work not only at a typically vacation destination, but also from a hotel, apartment, Airbnb or cottage (Voll et al., 2023). Likewise, workation is seen as a work style that involves staying in a resort area and working at a local coworking space on a weekly or monthly basis (Matsushita, 2021). It is an increasing developing trend that is increasingly focused after a lockdown is lifted (Gowtham and Vinitha, 2022). Behavioral intention is dependent on subjective norms, perceived behavioral control and attitude (Ajzen, 1985). It is related to a workationer’s willingness to go on workation. It is also related to workationers’ actual behavior, displaying a high correlation between workationers’ intention and their actual behavior. Accordingly, investigation drivers of workationers’ workation intention may play an important role in predicting their actual behaviors in terms of the notion that workation intention is a variable which can be used to expect their future behaviors (Quelette and Wood, 1998; Voll et al., 2023).

Place attachment is considered a multi-dimensional construct consisting of place expectation, place social bonding, place memory, place identity, place dependence and
place affect (Chen et al., 2014b; Huang et al., 2022). In addition, it can bring benefits for workationers and contribute to their activities while working on holiday. Therefore, the processes of place attachment are impacted and experienced not only by workationers, but also by their wider communities (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Florek, 2011). Recently, several researchers (Matsushita, 2021; Shin et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022) consider the concept of workation attachment as a way to extend the scope of place attachment. Workation attachment is an emotional bond or an affective relationship between workationers and their workation (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Han et al., 2019; Shin et al., 2023). However, there has been little research on identifying or developing the dimensions of workation attachment including workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, workation identity, workation dependence, and workation affect.

Perceptions of consumer power influences the workationer’s value-creation behaviors in which he or she engages in the workation job (Lee and Kim, 2019). Although consumer power boosts in the hands of the individual workationer based on the types of workation jobs provided and the places where they go on workation, few empirical studies focus on workationers from competing perspectives of power (Denegri-Knott et al., 2006; Perkins and Grace, 2009; Voll et al., 2023). In this study, workationer power focuses on psychological experience of power—a sense of power workationers have possessed while going on workation (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Fan and Jia, 2023). The dimensions of place attachment represent important emotional, cognitive, and functional role in influencing consumer power (Fan and Jia, 2023; Reitsamer and Brunner-Sperdin, 2021). To the best of our knowledge, there is little research to justify whether the effects of the dimensions of workation attachment on workationer power in the context of workation.

Relationship quality consists of satisfaction, trust, and commitment (Tsao and Hsieh, 2012). Equity plays an important role in forming one of the dimensions of relationship quality (Waldron and Kelley, 2008; Williams, 2017). Relationship quality is a dynamic construct, which tends to focus on the interaction between workationers and their work (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Roberts et al., 2003; Shin et al., 2023). Workation influences relationship satisfaction, trust, commitment and equity (Aborumman et al., 2011; Tsao and Hsieh, 2012; Voll et al., 2023; Williams, 2017). Satisfaction, trust, equity, and commitment are the main bases for perceived workation relationship quality (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Moliner et al., 2007; Williams, 2017). However, little research focuses on the dimensions of relationship quality from the perspective of workation. Namely, workation relationship quality including workation satisfaction, workation trust, workation equity, and workation commitment has received very little attention in the context of workation.

According to Hunter and Garnefeld (2008), consumer power plays a role in increasing satisfaction. Equity is considered as an antecedent variable to both satisfaction and trust (Olsen and Johnson, 2003). Tourists who have more trust in tour guide services will be inclined to feel satisfied to shop during the tour activities (Chang, 2014). Satisfaction, trust and equity are considered as drivers of commitment (Erçiş et al., 2012; Šerić et al., 2018). However, there is little work investigating the relationships among workation satisfaction, workation trust, workation equity, and workation commitment in terms of the existing research.
Yoshida (2021) proposes that workation is heavily influenced by people’s behavioral intention. Matsushita (2022) shows that workation plays a critical role in influencing tourists’ behavioral intention to change their work style. Paul and Roy (2023) present that workation may always result in tourists’ behavioral intention. Although investigators have found workation which is related to tourists’ behavioral intention, few studies have examined workation intention from workationers’ perspectives. Rather et al. (2019) describe that commitment has been found to influence the development of people’s behavioral intention. However, the effect of workation commitment on workation intention remains sparse based on the existing literature.

While previous research has focused on examining the relevant dimensions of place attachment (place expectation, place social bonding, place memory, place identity, place dependence, and place affect), consumer power, the dimensions of relationship quality (satisfaction, trust, equity, and commitment), and behavioral intention, very few studies concentrate on them from the workationer’s perspective while working on holiday. Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) believe that using the workationer term is helpful to cover up people who determine to work away from home for dual (leisure and business) purposes but do not behave or identify themselves as digital nomads. In general, workationers are considered as well-paid and (highly) skilled professionals who perform the same job in different environments; therefore, they remain labor markets like migrant tourism workers (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023). As a consequence, this paper attempts to fill the research gap and proposes 12 new and novel constructs, namely, the dimensions of workation attachment (workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, workation identity, workation dependence, and workation affect), workationer power, the dimensions of workation relationship quality (workation satisfaction, workation trust, workation equity, and workation commitment), and workation intention in addition to examining their relationships. A better understanding of these relationships can provide travel managers insights into knowing how workationers become attached to their workation and their intention to go on workation in order to strengthen their workation power and relationship quality from their perspectives.

This research contributes to both academic and managerial perspectives in the fields of workation management and marketing. It offers fresh insights into the factors that workationers deem significant when evaluating workation attachment dimensions. Moreover, it explores the influence of workationer power on the dimensions of workation relationship quality, ultimately shaping workation intentions. Notably, this study introduces a novel conceptual research model that synthesizes the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, the dimensions of workation relationship quality and workation intention within a cohesive path model. Unlike previous studies, this approach provides a comprehensive understanding of workationer experiences. The findings can empower tourism marketers and administrators by offering valuable information for the development and implementation of service marketing strategies, ensuring a high-quality workation experience for workationers.
2. Literature review and hypothesis development

2.1. Place attachment

Place attachment is referred to as individuals’ feelings of comfort, which they can benefit from their living places (Brown et al., 2023). It is related with community people’s participation and their sustainable behavior (Pol and Castrechini, 2002). According to several researchers (Bowlby, 1980; Brown and Raymond, 2007; Jorgenson and Stedman, 2001), place attachment is defined as an emotional relationship between people and their environments, which is a basic human demand for security. Chen et al. (2014b) and Huang et al. (2022) consider place attachment as a multi-dimensional construct comprising of place expectation, place social bonding, place memory, place identity, place dependence, and place affect. Place expectation is defined as how much the future experiences perceived by people are likely to take place in a place (Chen et al., 2014a). It is about people’s experiences rather than the evaluation of the place (Chen and Dwyer, 2018). Place social bonding is referred to as the strength of social relations between people and their emotional connections in terms of the shared experiences, interests, and concerns (Raymond et al., 2010; Scannell and Gifford, 2010; Wahyudie et al., 2021). It is a symbol representing a social group of people within a place (Ramkissoon et al., 2012). Place memory is referred to as how strong the memories of stories perceived by people are related with a place (Milligan, 1998). It focuses on the retrieved memory reflecting people’s attachment to a place based on their experiences (Dwyer et al., 2019). Place identity is referred to as a system of references about the definition of a particular place over time (Woods, 2006). It is considered as one important aspect that is able to assist people in defining their social identity (Chen et al., 2014b). Place dependence is referred to as functional attachment to a place (Stokols and Shumaker, 1981). It is the perceived strength of the bond between people and places (Lu et al., 2022). Place affect is defined as the emotional bond people share with environmental settings (Ramkissoon, 2016), fosterage of psychological restorativeness (Ramkissoon, 2020), and a good feeling factor (Ramkissoon, 2021). It is considered as positive emotions and feelings that people develop with particular places (Brocato, 2006).

2.2. Workation attachment

Workation is considered as one of the great opportunities of remote work (Hagen, 2016). It is a vacation stay combining with additional work phases (Werther, 2021). Place attachment arises and transforms a place into someone’s home or place as a function of experience. In this sense, these movements of mobile work are transforming places into workplaces (Matsushita, 2022). New workplaces have the potential to improve tourists’ place attachment (Lange et al., 2022). In general, tourists develop place attachment by savoring their workation experiences supported by the ‘broaden-and-build’ processes (Yan and Halpenny, 2022). Lee and Jeong (2021) suggest that workation is a direct determinant of place attachment. The concept of place attachment also seeks to explain differences in behavior among workationers doing work-related activities with enjoying exotic or foreign tourist destinations substantially depending on the acceptance of the employer to loosen control and
physical presence at the office (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Nouza et al., 2018).

This study proposes the concept of workation attachment as a way to extend the scope of place attachment. Adapted from several researchers (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Chen et al., 2014b; Huang et al., 2022), this study focuses on six dimensions of workation attachment: workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, workation identity, workation dependence, and workation affect. Referring to several studies (Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001; Moore and Graefe, 1994; Voll et al., 2023), the workation attachment in this paper is defined as the development of an affective relationship between workationers and workations. Workation expectation is as workationers’ future cognitive experiences that are assumed to take place somewhere in the future based on long-term expectancies between workationers and the location, which are influenced by a few characteristics of working on holiday (Chen et al., 2014a; Zakaria and Yusrie, 2021; Voll et al., 2023). It is about a workationer’s experiences as opposed to the evaluation of the workation (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Chen and Dwyer, 2018). Workation social bonding refers to the emotional reflection or affective relationship between workationers and workations (Almuzaini, 2017; Voll et al., 2023). It plays a key role in focusing on workationers’ experiences originating from social interactions through workations (Scannell and Gifford, 2010; Voll et al., 2023). Workation memory is referred to as memories of workationers’ interactions with workations (Chen et al., 2015; Voll et al., 2023). It is kept in and related with workations as a trace and memory (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Park and Sung, 2012). Workation identity refers to the workation attributes contributing to a workationer’s self-concept (Voll et al., 2023; Wahyudie et al., 2021). It is related with meanings and perceptions held in workationers’ minds in relation to their workations (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Ujang, 2012). Workation dependence is referred to as workationers’ strength perceptions of the relationship between themselves and their workations (Stokols and Shumaker, 1981; Voll et al., 2023). It is conceptualized by a workationer’s positive evaluations of workations to offer necessary amenities to satisfy his or her demands (Stokols and Shumacker, 1981; Voll et al., 2023; Williams et al., 1992). Workation affect is referred as the emotional relationship workationers develop with environmental settings (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Halpenny, 2010) by establishing their sentiments about the workation (Tuan, 1977; Voll et al., 2023). The emotional relationship plays a crucial role in workationers and their workations (Altman and Low, 1992; Voll et al., 2023) and it has been found that workation affect can stand independently in the dimensional structure of workation attachment in work-related activities combining with vacation (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Ramkissoon et al., 2013; Yuksel et al., 2010). Based on the aforementioned review, the dimensions of workation attachment (workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, workation identity, workation dependence, and workation affect) remain sparse in the tourism industry.

2.3. Workationer power

Consumer power is referred to as the effect of a customer’s perceived ability on
an organization, and in the recovery process, in a way that he or she will find advantageous (Grégoire et al., 2010). Such power may come from various sources (e.g., French Jr. and Raven, 1959), such as information access, threats generated by one’s ability and creation of interdependencies by provision of business (Grégoire et al., 2010). Power can be an important attribute in vacationer relationships (Mitchell et al., 1997). The power of consumers’ attitudes including value, concern, and knowledge may play a critical role in predicting workationers’ workation intentions. (Li and Wu, 2020; Voll et al., 2023). Understanding the power relationships between workationers helps to improve their workation and its characteristics and how it is managed now and in the future (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Hazra et al., 2017). Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Grbac and Milohanovic (2008) show that the great consumer power in the workationers’ world quality is the priority that is required to fulfill. To better understand power structure and distribution, this paper extends and redefines consumer power by exploring the concept of workationer power in workations. This paper attempts to apply the concept of consumer power to vacation power. Referring to several studies (Portuese, 2006; Lv et al., 2008; Voll et al., 2023), the workation power in this paper is defined as the relationship between workationers and workation, and the workationer’s ability to understand, control, and potentially change his or her workation. The workationer power in this study focuses on a workationer’s psychological experience of power, namely, a sense of power he or she has while going on workation (Fan and Jia, 2023; Voll et al., 2023).

The dimensions of people’s perceived place attachment positively influence consumer power (Horakova et al., 2022). Consumers’ emotional attachment dimensions play an important role in increasing the power that bond consumers with the organization (Qadri et al., 2020). The dimensions of place attachment are intrinsic to human conditions and determinants of consumer power (Diener and Hagen, 2022). The dimensions of place attachment can change nature of consumer power which plays a key role in ensuring the success of relationship building (Fletcher, 2003; Zhe et al., 2023). Therefore, it is expected that the dimensions of workation attachment contribute to workationer power as follows:

H1: Workation expectation (H1a), workation social bonding (H1b), workation memory (H1c), workation identity (H1d), workation dependence (H1e), and workation affect (H1f) positively influence workationer power.

2.4. Relationship quality

Relationship quality is defined as by the excellence of the interaction between a customer and a supplier (Gummesson, 1987). Broadly speaking, relationship quality is a multi-dimensional construct encompassing dimensions such as satisfaction, trust, and commitment, as acknowledged by various scholars (Beatson et al., 2008; Chung and Shin, 2010; Tsao and Hsieh, 2012; Ulaga and Eggert, 2006). Waldron and Kelley (2008) and Williams (2017) propose that equity is an important dimension of relationship quality because it is a critical variable considered as a commitment to ensure that every person receives what he or she needs to succeed. Equity is becoming increasingly important, and attracting increasing interest to focus on its effective measurement in the tourism field (Frias et al., 2020). Therefore, based on the review
above, this paper proposes that relationship quality is made up of satisfaction, trust, equity, and commitment. First, satisfaction is defined as satisfaction with products or services provided by organizations and is related with particular purchased products or services (Öztürk, 2015). In general, satisfaction is an overall assessment of consumption experience (Johnson et al., 1995; Oliver, 1997). Second, trust refers to an expectation that is associated with the agent’s decision to act (Dumouchel, 2005). It is a conception deeply combined with satisfaction; therefore, trustful people attempt to display their high levels of attainment regardless of the concept (Jebbouri et al., 2022). Third, equity is defined as the overall assessment of what an individual is receiving equal and relative gains from the relationship (Walster et al., 1978). Swan and Mercer (1982) indicate that equity focuses on the bond between the marketer’s and the customer’s net gains, which strike a balance. Fourth, commitment is referred to as a lasting desire or intentions to develop and keep a stable relationship (Sargeant and Woodliffe, 2007). It is considered a necessary component to form a successful long-term relationship (Walter et al., 2000). In general, people prefer to improve and last an affective relationship with the product and/or service that make people feel warm and enjoyable. Meanwhile, people with high product and/or service commitment would have stronger affective attachment to the product and/or service (Sarkar et al., 2012).

2.5. Workation relationship quality

Workation is related with increased levels of relationship quality (Leutwiler-Lee et al., 2023; Shin et al., 2023). Relationship quality plays a crucial role in enhancing workationers’ perceptions of workations (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Lai, 2014). Workation with relationship quality may be impacted by the quality of the workation that workationers experience (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Lai, 2014). Higher relationship quality is related with positive workationer-work relationship quality (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Loureiro et al., 2021). Based on the aforementioned review, therefore, we consider relationship quality as a major factor influencing workation. Referring to several researchers (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Shin et al., 2023; Skarmeas and Robson, 2008), the workation relationship quality in this paper is defined as a workationer’s perception of lower levels of conflict in the workationer-work relationship and greater levels of satisfaction with, trust in, commitment to, and equity in the workation. In this paper, workation relationship quality is conceptualized and operationalized as a rich and multidimensional construct consisting of workation satisfaction, workation trust, workation commitment, and workation equity (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Beatson et al., 2008; Frias et al., 2020; Tsao and Hsieh, 2012). First, workation satisfaction is referred to as a workationer’s perception of the performance of the workation related to his or her expectations (Dobrota et al., 2012; Shin et al., 2023). Satisfaction levels and willingness to go on workation will increase if workationers make positive evaluations of their workation experiences (Bassiyouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Jani and Han, 2013). Second, workation trust is defined as a workationer expectation that the workation can be trusted or relied on in fulfilling his or her promises (Shin et al., 2023; Siagian and Cahyono, 2014). It is considered as an important role in maintaining
a long-term relationship between employers and workationers (Bassyiony and Wilkesmann, 2023; Chiu et al., 2012; Han and Hyun, 2013). Third, workation equity is referred to as the value that workationers associate with a workation (Aaker, 1991; Bassyiony and Wilkesmann, 2023). It primarily involves a workationer’s psychological reaction to the value of workation that an organization provides (Bassyiony and Wilkesmann, 2023; Olsen and Johnson, 2003). Fourth, worktion commitment is defined as an enduring attitude or desire for workations (Bassyiony and Wilkesmann, 2023; Moorman et al., 1992). Committed workationers are encouraged to keep the relationship between workatoners and their work owing to feeling of attachment and sincerity in their own attitudes (Lacey, 2007; Shin et al., 2023).

Power driven relationships can positively influence supplier satisfaction (Benton et al., 2005). Referent power has a direct and positive effect on satisfaction with supervision (Rahim and Buntzman, 1989). Expert power coming from digital influencers is a predictor of most of people’s economic satisfaction (Wang et al., 2021). Reward power plays a key role in influencing job satisfaction (Richmond et al., 1986). Based on the theoretical backgrounds above, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

H2: Workationer power has a direct and positive influence on workation satisfaction.

Loureiro and González (2008) present that satisfaction has a direct positive influence on trust, displaying that a tourist’s trust on rural tourism lodging increases when he or she feel satisfied with it. Kostynets et al. (2021) and Shim et al. (2008) indicate that satisfaction positively and significantly affects tourists’ trust in workation. Olsen and Johnson (2003) present that equity plays a very different role in influencing satisfaction. Hutchinson and Wang (2009) show that equity has a direct influence on satisfaction. Hao and Chon (2022) propose that equity is an antecedent of trust, implying that higher perceived equity leads to higher perceived trust. Ha (2022) describes that green equity has a direct and positive effect on green brand trust. Ha (2022) presents that brand equity changes based on perceptions levels of satisfaction and trust. Bassyiony and Wilkesmann (2023) and Caceres and Paparoidamis (2007) argue that satisfaction and trust are key variables in influencing workationer commitment in successful relational exchanges. Sanchez-Franco (2009) and Voll et al. (2023) show that satisfaction and trust are significant precondition to workation commitment. Chai et al. (2020) propose that equity can influence organizational commitment directly. N’Goala (2007) and Shin et al. (2023) suggest that perceived equity has a positive effect on commitment to workation. However, the relationships between the dimensions of relationship quality (satisfaction, trust, equity, and commitment) remain sparse in the context of workation. Therefore, we put forward the following hypotheses:

H3: Workation satisfaction has a direct and positive influence on workation trust.

H4: Workation equity has a direct and positive influence on workation satisfaction.

H5: Workation equity has a positive direct and influence on workation trust.

H6: Workation satisfaction has a direct and positive influence on workation commitment.
H7: Workation trust has a direct and positive influence on workation commitment.
H8: Workation equity has a direct and positive influence on workation commitment.

2.6. Workation intention

Behavioral intention is referred to as a certain likelihood of performing a given behavior (Cham et al., 2016; Douglass, 1977; Hwang et al., 2023). It is considered as an antecedent to a workationer’s actual behavior (Leonard et al., 2004; Shin et al., 2023). It is also related to workationers’ efforts in reaching goals, which predict their behavior (Anfossi, 2023; Battour et al., 2022). Likewise, it may be related to the tendency of a workationer to travel or vacation with the likelihood of exploring and enjoying different people, places, and cultures (Ra, 2022; Shin et al., 2023). Workationers’ behavioral intention is a proportion that relates to actions to go on workation (Karsana and Murhadi, 2021; Voll et al., 2023). Referring to Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Cham et al. (2016), this study creates a new construct, workation intention, and defines it as workationers’ tendency to adopt or engage in the certain behavior, namely, their intention to go on workation. Workation intention is considered the whole behavior that displays whether a workationer will go on workation in the future (Shin et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2011). Workation intention has been seen as a preliminary indicator of actual workation behavior even though it varies from time to time (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Yu et al., 2014).

Workationers’ commitment has a direct and positive influence on behavioral intention (Hsu et al., 2010; Shin et al., 2023). Commitment can be considered as a key attitudinal factor that explains workation intention (Agyeiwaah et al., 2022; Voll et al., 2023). It can significantly increase the level of workation intention (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Lai, 2015). Based on the aforementioned review, it is meaningful to examine the effect of workation commitment on workation intention. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is suggested:

H9: Workation commitment has a direct and positive influence on workation intention.

3. Methodology

3.1. Measurement

The key variables including the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, the dimensions of workation relationship quality and workation intention were measured from well-established five-point Likert scale; 1 to 7 presented the options from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The research team applied two-way translation to convert original English scale to Thai and translate Thai scale to English, in order to ensure the understanding and readability of the items. To confirm the comprehensibility and translation equivalence of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted with the participation of 40 respondents who worked on holiday. The pilot test displayed that all items were easily understood by the participants. Accordingly, the researchers believed that the questionnaire was suitable to be used in its current status.
The measures for workation expectation (four items), workation social bonding (three items), workaton memory (four items), workation identity (four items) and workation dependence (three items) were adopted from Chen et al. (2014b, 2015) and Huang et al. (2022). Four items used to measure workation affect were drawn from Zhan et al. (2020). Workationer power was measured based on five items from several researchers (Kucuk, 2012; Lee and Kim, 2019; Wang and Head, 2007). Workation satisfaction was measured employing four items from Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003) and Rather et al. (2019). Workation trust included three items drawn from Martinez and Del Bosque (2013) and Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003). Workation equity was measured with four items used by Omar et al. (2011). Workation commitment was measured with eight items adapted from Dagger et al. (2010). Four items were designed to assess workation intention (Rather et al., 2019).

3.2. Research site

Bangkok, the dynamic capital of Thailand, claimed the top spot on the global workation cities list for 2021 (Expats in Bangkok, 2023; Holidu, 2024). With a harmonious blend of contemporary infrastructure, affordable living expenses, and a rich cultural heritage, Bangkok presents an ideal fusion of work and leisure for digital nomads, freelancers and remote workers. Engaging in remote work in Bangkok provides workationers with a distinctive work-life balance that sets it apart from other cities. The city’s lively pace seamlessly integrates work commitments with the opportunity to relax and rejuvenate. Whether a workationer prefers a leisurely stroll along the Chao Phraya River or seeks tranquility in one of the numerous serene parks, Bangkok offers an ideal escape from the daily routine (Expats in Bangkok, 2023).

3.3. Sampling and data collection

An onsite survey was conducted in Bangkok between 3 October to 2 December, 2023. Two researchers contacted potential workationers who were working on holiday in Bangkok. Participants were informed about the study’s purpose and guaranteed anonymity before responding to the questionnaire. Once they gave their consent to partake in the research, a self-administered survey questionnaire was distributed. The choice of convenience sampling was made to efficiently gather a substantial number of respondents while saving costs and time in data collection (Sinclair-Maragh, 2017). Also, this approach has been employed in similar contexts with comparable samples (De Rojas and Camarero, 2008). To mitigate common method variance (CMV), the recommendations of Podsakoff et al. (2003) were followed.

The questionnaire was initially developed in English, then, it was translated into Thai and back-translated into English to ensure the consistency and correctness of the content. An English professor and an editor, who edits the questionnaire from English into Thai and vice versa, both of whom were native Thai, reviewed the content of both copies to ensure the correctness of the translation. The English version was used with international workationers while the Thai version was used with domestic Thai workationers. After being completed by workationers, the surveys were collected by the researchers. Overall, 530 questionnaires were administered, out of which 494 were found useful for analysis.
4. Analysis and results

4.1. Demographic profiles of respondents

Table 1 shows the demographic profiles of respondents. Most respondents were male (51%), single (57%), and between 25 and 34 years old (27%). Also, most of them held a bachelor’s degree (43%) and drew monthly income between 35,000 baht and 49,999 baht (roughly USD$994 and USD$1,420) (30%). In addition, the majority of them came to Bangkok to work on holiday (58%).

Table 1. Respondents’ demographic information (N = 494).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>51.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>48.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>56.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>43.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 or over</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>42.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or higher</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income/per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 9999 baht</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–19,000 baht</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000–34,999 baht</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000–49,999 baht</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 baht or above</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time to go on workation in Bangkok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>58.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>41.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 35.20 baht is equivalent to $1 USD (in January, 2024).

4.2. Common method bias (CMB)

The problem caused by CMV was checked through the Harman’s single factor test. The analysis results display that the first common factor’s overall variance was achieved 47.25%, which was less than 50% criterion proposed by Podsakoff (2003). Moreover, the researchers conducted the CMV measurement model that consistently loads on a common methodological latent factor. The measurement result display that some significant improvements do not generate in the fit indices of the CMV measurement model. Accordingly, the absence of CMB problems is confirmed in this paper.

4.3. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)
### Table 2. Model measurement and confirmatory analysis of factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workation expectation</td>
<td>WE1. I will be enjoying workation in the future more than now.</td>
<td>0.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2014b, 2015)</td>
<td>WE2. In the future workation continues creating unique experiences for me.</td>
<td>0.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE3. In the future workation is better than now.</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE4. I feel connected to workation due to my experiences here.</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WSB1. I have friends/family who go on workation.</td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WSB2. If I were to go on workation, I would lose contact with a number of friends.</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WSB3. My friends/family would be disappointed if I were to go on workation.</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation social bonding</td>
<td>WM1. My experiences with workation are unique.</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2014b, 2015)</td>
<td>WM2. My experiences with workation are unforgettable.</td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2022)</td>
<td>WM3. My experiences with workation make me feel loving workation more.</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WM4. I feel connected to workation due to my experiences here.</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation identity</td>
<td>WI1. I identify strongly with workation.</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2014b, 2015)</td>
<td>WI2. I feel commitment to workation.</td>
<td>0.93***</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI3. I feel that that I can really be myself in workation.</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI4. Workation is very special to me.</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation dependence</td>
<td>WD1. I prefer workation over others for the activities that I enjoy.</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2014b, 2015)</td>
<td>WD2. Workation is my favorite type of job I love to do.</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WD3. I really miss workation when I am away from it for too long.</td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation affect</td>
<td>WA1. I am very attached to workation.</td>
<td>0.87***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhan et al. (2020)</td>
<td>WA2. The workation means a lot to me.</td>
<td>0.89***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA3. The workation is a very special work pattern for me.</td>
<td>0.90***</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA4. I am charmed and enjoyed going on workation.</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workationer power</td>
<td>WP1. Going on workation makes me feel that I have social power over other people.</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucuk (2012)</td>
<td>WP2. Going on workation makes me feel that I have more authority than other people.</td>
<td>0.90***</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>−0.44</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee and Kim (2019)</td>
<td>WP3. Going on workation makes me feel more influential over others.</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang and Head (2007)</td>
<td>WP4. I feel I have the power to influence the workation environment.</td>
<td>0.92***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation satisfaction</td>
<td>WS1. Overall, I am happy with workation.</td>
<td>0.90***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003)</td>
<td>WS2. The workation satisfies my expectations.</td>
<td>0.93***</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>−0.36</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather et al. (2019)</td>
<td>WS3. I really enjoy going on workation.</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loadings</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workation trust</td>
<td>WT1. The workation make me feel a sense of security.</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WT2. I trust on the quality of the workation.</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WT3. The workation can be counted to do what is right.</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WT4. The workation can be trusted at times.</td>
<td>0.72***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation equity</td>
<td>WEQ1. The workation always tries to treat me right.</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEQ2. The workation’s outcomes and earnings are fair when compared to</td>
<td>0.83***</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cost that I have made to support this workation.</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEQ3. The workation’s outcomes and benefits are fair when compared to</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what other workation has offered.</td>
<td>0.88***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation commitment</td>
<td>WC1. My relationship with workation is something that I am very</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>committed to.</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC2. My relationship with workation is very important to me.</td>
<td>0.82***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC3. My relationship with workation is something I really care about.</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC4. My relationship with workation deserves my maximum effort to</td>
<td>0.75***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintain.</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC5. I believe that I am committed to the relationship with workation.</td>
<td>0.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WC6. I have a strong sense of loyalty to workation.</td>
<td>0.86***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workation intention</td>
<td>WIN1. I intend to keep going on workation.</td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIN2. I would recommend this workation to someone who seeks my advice.</td>
<td>0.94***</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIN3. I would encourage friends and relatives to go on workation.</td>
<td>0.91***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WIN4. I would say positive things about this workation to other people.</td>
<td>0.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p < 0.001, α = Cronbach’s alpha, CR = composite reliability, AVE = average variance extracted, VIF = variance inflation factor, M = mean, and SD = standard deviation.
EFA was applied to the captured responses corresponding to attributes. Before establishing the factor structure, initially the correlation matrix was checked to find its suitability for factor analysis. The sample size adequacy for factor analysis was determined by The Kasier-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy value, which was found to be more than 0.91 (Kaiser, 1974). Also, the test statistic for Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (BTS) (Bartlett, 1954) value was found to be big enough. The BTS was also significant at low significance level (0.000). To extract the factors, principal axis factoring method was used by applying the constraint of higher than one eigenvalue for each factor (Malhotra and Birks, 2007). Moreover, only variables with loadings of more than 0.50 were included in the analysis. After EFA was conducted, a total of 47 items loaded properly on the factors. One item (i.e. “I think I can easily communicate with or influence other workationers in the workation environment”) from workationer power, one item (i.e. “I think I did the right thing when I went on worktion”) from workation satisfaction, one item (i.e. “the workation has high integrity”) from workation trust, and two items (i.e. “the workation is prepared to make short term sacrifices to maintain our relationship” and “I believe that I view my relationship with workation as a long-term partnership”) from workation commitment were removed from this study respectively since they did not load on any of the factors and their factor loading values were under 0.50. At the final stage, the identified factors were named as followings according to the related literature and professional experience of authors. As recommended by Ford et al. (1986), the factors with eigenvalues exceeding one were retained, and these factors accounted for 64.75% of the cumulative total variance. Put differently, with less than 50% of the total variability attributed to randomness, these factors could serve as a suitable foundation for EFA. Moreover, only factor loadings greater than 0.50 were included in this study (see Table 2). Following the execution of EFA, the identified factors were named as followings according to the related literature and professional experience of authors, (1) workation expectation (four items), (2) workation social bonding (three items), (3) workation memory (four items), (4) workation identity (four items), (5) workation dependence (three items), (6) workation affect (four items), (7) workationer power (four items), (8) workation satisfaction (three items), (9) workation trust (four items), (10) workation equity (four items), (11) workation commitment (six items), and (12) workation intention (four items).

4.4. Convergent and discriminant validity of the measures

As proposed by Hair et al. (2010), the presence of multi-collinearity becomes problematic when the variance inflation factor (VIF) exceeds 10. In this study, the VIF values for all extracted variables fell within the range of 1.91 to 6.90, well below the acceptable threshold. Thus, none of the VIF values surpassed the critical limit of 10, indicating an absence of multi-collinearity issues. Also, the skewness and kurtosis values adhered to the range between −2 and +2, signifying a normal univariate distribution as recommended by George and Mallery (2016). Nunnally (1978) asserts that a variable demonstrates internal consistency if its Cronbach’s alpha (α) value is equal to or exceeds 0.70. The α values for all variables in this study are detailed in Table 2. Furthermore, in line with previous research, which suggests that the factor
loadings of questionnaire items should be 0.50 or higher, the measurements for these items in this paper can be deemed appropriate (Hair et al., 2010). The composite reliability values in this work surpassed the specified cutoff of 0.70 as recommended by Hair et al. (2010). As presented in Table 2, the average variance extracted (AVE) values exceeded 0.50, as proposed by Fornell and Larcker (1981). As a result, the results indicate that the measurement model satisfies the criteria for convergent validity and reliability. Table 3 illustrates that the AVE value surpassed the correlation coefficient of other constructs, confirming the achievement of discriminant validity and validating the model’s reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Workation expectation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workation social bonding</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workation memory</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workation identity</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Workation dependence</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Workation affect</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workationer power</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workation satisfaction</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Workation trust</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Workation equity</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Workation commitment</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Workation intention</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Squared correlations of paired constructs are on the off-diagonal.

4.5. The measurement model test

To evaluate the performance of the measurement model, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the 12 measured constructs using AMOS, employing maximum likelihood estimation. The collected data underwent scrutiny through a two-step structural equation modeling (SEM) approach (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). As displayed in Table 2, the comprehensive goodness-of-fit indices for the CFA were deemed satisfactory, meeting established criteria (CFI, GFI, IFI, NFI, and AGFI > 0.90; RMSEA < 0.08; Bentler and Bonnett, 1980). The overall CFA measurement model demonstrated an excellent fit. \( \chi^2 = 1071.38, df = 459.82, \chi^2/df = 2.33, p < 0.0001, \) CFI = 0.98, GFI = 0.94, IFI = 0.98, NFI = 0.98, AGFI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.06, and SRMR = 0.07).

4.6. Findings and the structural model test

The hypothesis-testing results using the SEM involves the 12 constructs of this
paper outlined in Figure 1. The analysis of the structural model indicates a favorable fit, with overall model fitness indices as follows: $\chi^2 = 1061.98$, $df = 442.49$, $\chi^2/df = 2.40$, CFI = 0.98, GFI = 0.92, IFI = 0.97, NFI = 0.98, AGFI = 0.91, RMSEA = 0.05, and SRMR = 0.06.

![Figure 1. A path model.](image)

Significant ———— Non-significant ————
Standardized path coefficient

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Statistically significant findings, accompanied by large effect sizes, were observed for the positive impacts of workation expectation ($\beta = 0.37$, $t = 7.52$, $p < 0.001$), workation social bonding ($\beta = 0.56$, $t = 18.43$, $p < 0.001$), workation memory ($\beta = 0.10$, $t = 2.31$, $p < 0.05$), and workation identity ($\beta = 0.44$, $t = 15.31$, $p < 0.001$) on workationer power, providing support for H1a, H1b, H1c, and H1d. However, workation dependence ($\beta = 0.04$, $t = 1.15$, $p = \text{n.s.}$) and workation affect ($\beta = 0.09$, $t = 1.74$, $p = \text{n.s.}$) did not exhibit any influences on workationer power, leading to the rejection of H1e and H1f.

Workationer power ($\beta = 0.14$, $t = 3.26$, $p < 0.01$) and workation equity ($\beta = 0.59$, $t = 17.82$, $p < 0.001$) demonstrated statistically significant positive effects on workation satisfaction, thereby supporting H2 and H4. Similarly, workation satisfaction ($\beta = 0.43$, $t = 5.37$, $p < 0.001$) and workation equity ($\beta = 0.38$, $t = 7.89$, $p < 0.001$) were found to exert statistically significant impacts on workation trust, providing support for H3 and H5. Furthermore, workation satisfaction ($\beta = 0.16$, $t = 3.76$, $p < 0.001$), workation trust ($\beta = 0.20$, $t = 4.59$, $p < 0.001$), and workation equity ($\beta = 0.47$, $t = 16.11$, $p < 0.001$) were identified as having positive influences on workation commitment, thereby supporting H6, H7, and H8.

The results from the path model indicated that workation commitment positively influenced workation intention ($\beta = 0.64$, $t = 120.90$, $p < 0.001$), providing strong support for H9.
5. Discussion and conclusions

The existing literature lacks a definitive understanding of how workation intention can be established and sustained within a comprehensive framework in the context of workation. Consequently, this paper proposes an approach that delineates the dimensions of workation relationship quality to initiate the construction of workation intention within the domain of workation management. The study formulates a research framework for workation intention and explores its associations with the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, and various aspects of workation relationship quality. Empirical validation of the model was undertaken using data obtained from workationers who embarked on workations in Brisbane. The development of a theoretical model encompassing the aforementioned factors was informed by a thorough review of relevant literature.

In conclusion, this study used attachment and relationship quality theories linking workation attachment, workationer power, and workation relationship quality as antecedents of workation intention. The results provide insights into how the dimensions of workation attachment affect workation intention. Therefore, the study extends the workation marketing literature by displaying that workationer power influences the dimensions of workation relationship quality. The results of H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d display that workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, and workation identity influence workationer power. The findings concur with Hashemnezhad et al. (2013), who propose that the dimensions of place attachment (place expectation, place social bonding, place memory, and place identity) developing with people’s positive interaction have direct influences on place power. However, workation dependence (H1e) and workation affect (H1f) have no influences on workationer power. The outcome contradicts Alrobae and Al-Kinani’s (2019) argument that place dependence affects perceptions of attachment power between individuals and the specific place linked to its unique qualities and the qualities of other alternative places in comparison to the intended location. Also, the result is inconsistent with Singh et al. (2022), who propose that play affection plays an essential part in driving the required consumer power. There are two reasons to explain these insignificant hypotheses. One reason is that workation dependence and workation affect are essentials but not sufficient conditions for forming workationer power. The other reason is that higher perceptions of workation dependence and workation affect do not contribute to higher perceptions of workationer power. This variation in results may be explained by several researchers (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Kastenholz et al., 2020; Sánchez-Sánchez et al., 2021), who propose that workation dependence and workation affect have not been selected as innovative factors determining positive tourist power in the context of workation.

Workationer power has a positive effect on workation satisfaction, as predicted by H2, which is supported by the contentions of Brick et al. (2022) and Fan and Jia (2023) that increased perceptions of power result in higher satisfaction within the relationship where decisions are made. Workation trust (H3) and workation equity (H4) can predict workation satisfaction. The result supports Chang (2014) and Shin et al. (2023), who contends that tourists’ perceived trust has a significant and positive effect on tourist satisfaction in the context of workation. Also, the finding agrees with
Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Hutchinson et al. (2009), who contend that the degree of satisfaction among workationers after a purchase transaction is influenced by their perceptions of equity. Workation equity (H5) has a positive influence on workation trust, supporting the propositions of Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Hao and Chon (2022) that higher workatiner equity indicates that the destination possesses distinctive qualities that foster consistency, competence, honesty, and responsibility, thereby resulting in increased trust. Workation satisfaction (H6), workation trust (H7) and workation equity (H8) positively influence workation commitment. The empirical result aligns with Voll et al. (2023) and Zhong et al. (2017), who contend that satisfaction positively contributes to tourists’ affective commitment in workation. Also, the finding concurs with the proposition of Pesämaa and Hair Jr (2008) and Shin et al. (2023) that commitment can be reinforced through workationer trust. Moreover, the structural result is consistent with several studies (Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann, 2023; Rust et al., 2001; Voll et al., 2023), who propose that workationers who have equity in certain workation destination tend to be fiercely committed to workation. Workation commitment (H9) has a direct influence on workation intention, supporting Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Haery et al. (2014), who contend that commitment is a predictor of intention to go on workation. Building on existing conceptualizations, the main objective of this study was to test a conceptual framework linking perceptions of workation attachment, workationer power, workation relationship quality and workation intention. The theoretical model was tested the context of workation. Findings offer important theoretical and practical implications.

6. Implications

6.1. Theoretical implications

This study offers theoretical contributions to existing research on workation marketing. First, this study highlights the simultaneous roles of workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory and workation identity to workationer power. While prior studies have investigated how place expectation, place social bonding, place memory, and place identity are related to consumer power (Chen et al., 2014b; Huang et al., 2022; Li and Wu, 2020), this study attempts to investigate those variables from the perspectives of workation and its workationers. Namely, this paper finds that workation expectation, workation social bonding, workation memory, and workation identity play important roles in increasing workationer power while going on workation. Although workation identity and workation dependence are not antecedents of workationer power, workation identity and workation dependence stemming from the affective aspects of workationers’ understanding of the workation, need to be cultivated. Second, this paper focuses on relationship quality consisting of satisfaction, trust, equity, and commitment based on several studies (Chung and Shin, 2010; Tsao and Hsieh, 2012; Waldron and Kelley, 2008; Williams, 2017). Despite numerous studies on the dimensions of relationship quality in the tourism industry, studies of the dimensions of relationship quality from the perspective of workation still remain sparse. Therefore, this study creates workation relationship quality consisting of workation satisfaction, workation trust, workation equity, and workation commitment. The finding displays that workationer power, workation trust, and
workation equity are determinants of workation satisfaction. Without one of the determinants of workation satisfaction, workationers’ perceptions satisfaction while going on workation cannot increase. Also, the study result shows that workation equity plays a critical role in triggering perceptions of trust in workation. Moreover, with evidence from workationers working on holiday in Bangkok, this study empirically testifies that workation satisfaction, workation trust, and workation equity can be a function of workation commitment in this marketplace. Namely, workation satisfaction, workation trust, and workation equity can be considered as the workationers’ internationzation of the workation experience, which means only when workationers attend and experience the workation can they evaluation or not a variety of facilities, conditions, or the environment increase their commitment to workation. Finally, behavioral intention has been widely conducted in the tourism and hospitality industries, it has not been examined in the workation context. Therefore, this paper creates workation intention and finds that it is influenced by workation commitment. This means that only workationers who are strongly committed towards their workation are willing to have intention to work on holiday.

6.2. Practical implications

The workation context explored in this paper also presents interesting practical implications. This study thoroughly considers the psychological scenarios of workationers during their travel and constructs a comprehensive research model based on the collaborative effects of Workation expectation, Workation social bonding, Workation memory, Workation identity, Workation dependence, and Workation affect. This study comprehensively explores the formation mechanism of Workation intention, providing valuable information for both work managers and workation destinations. For employers, this research can assist in better understanding the needs and expectations of workationers, thereby enabling the formulation of more market-oriented service strategies. By understanding their work environment, needs, and challenges, managers can provide support and services that are more aligned with the actual circumstances. As employers become familiar with the power structure and needs of traveling workers, measures can be taken to enhance their sense of empowerment. In-depth research into the team dynamics of travel work allows managers to identify and address potential work relationship issues. This comprehensive management approach not only contributes to enhancing employee satisfaction and loyalty but also aids in the long-term success and competitiveness of the organization. For workation destinations, workation itself is a unified act of work and travel. A positive work experience enhances the mood and emotional state of workationers, with work satisfaction closely related to destination satisfaction. Furthermore, a positive work experience encourages individuals to engage in workation willingly (Rizky et al., 2022; Amah, 2023). Additionally, the positive experience of a friendly and comfortable work environment may extend to form a positive overall impression of the destination, creating a positive word-of-mouth effect. These factors collectively make a positive workation experience a key element in shaping individuals’ perception of the destination, playing a crucial role in enhancing its attractiveness, reputation, and competitiveness.
The research results indicate that Workation expectation, Workation social bonding, Workation memory, and Workation identity have a significant positive impact on Workationer power. Workation expectation, in particular, may shape workationers’ expectations for work conditions (Sandi et al., 2021; Shin et al., 2023; Voll et al., 2023). When their expectations for a good work environment, facilities, and support are met, it enhances their perception of Workationer power. This suggests that employers and workation destinations can shape expectations before workation starts. From the perspective of Workation social bonding, the research finds that it has a profound impact on Workationer power, explaining the crucial role of social connections in workation behavior (Lee et al., 2021; Woo, 2020; Park et al., 2023). Employers should encourage workationers to maintain social connections with family or friends, as this encouragement significantly influences the shaping of Workationer power. Additionally, Workation memory also has a significant positive impact on Workationer power. Employers should leverage the unique features of Workation destinations, integrating work with local culture and customs, and shaping distinctive Workation memories to enhance the perception of Workationer power. Furthermore, Workation identity also has a significant positive impact on Workationer power, and employers should create a positive atmosphere in work arrangements and management to boost Workation identity (Murrell & G. O., 2022). Interestingly, the research found no significant correlation between Workation dependence and Workationer power, revealing the uniqueness of the workation state and workationers’ purposes. From the perspective of workation status, workation can include domestic or international business trips, short-term business meetings, long-term project work, international collaborations, or market expansion, often requiring frequent movement between different regions with clear work goals. In strong purpose scenarios, this may lead to a conflict relationship between Workation dependence and Workationer power.

Secondly, statistical results show that Workationer power and Workation equity have a significant positive impact on Workation satisfaction. This highlights the importance for employers to safeguard Workationer power and equity, as these protections are crucial for overall workation satisfaction (Afshari, 2023; Shin et al., 2023; Grobelny, 2023). Lastly, the research results indicate that Workation satisfaction, Workation trust, and Workation equity have a significant positive impact on Workation commitment. Managers should strengthen satisfaction, trust, and equity in work arrangements to achieve higher Workation commitment, ultimately deepening Workation intention. Understanding the needs and motivations of travel workers is crucial for establishing flexible work arrangements, enhancing team collaboration, and providing challenging development opportunities, thereby fostering employees’ Workation intention.

7. Limitations and future research avenues

Although this study has both theoretical and practical implications, it is important to acknowledge its limitations, which present various opportunities for future research. Firstly, the data for this paper were gathered from workationers going on workation in Brisbane, Australia, limiting the generalizability of the study findings. Therefore, future studies could validate the results in different regions or countries. Secondly, as
this paper employed a cross-sectional survey-based approach, future research could explore alternative research designs such as experimental or longitudinal studies to enhance the understanding of workation dynamics. Thirdly, this paper does not delve into whether respondents’ demographic information, including factors like sex, marital status, age, race, education, occupation, and income, has varying influences on the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, workation relationship quality, and workation intention. Subsequent studies could examine whether these demographic characteristics significantly and positively impact the dimensions of workation attachment, workationer power, the dimensions of workation relationship quality, and workation intention in the context of workation. Finally, this study only focused on the effect of workation commitment on workation intention. Future studies should investigate more dynamic interaction between pull or push travel motivation and workation intention. For example, Bassyiouny and Wilkesmann (2023) and Khuong and Ha (2014) indicate that both pull and push motivation factors to have positive direct effects on workation intention. Displaying such relationship dynamics through longitudinal studies may be insightful.
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