

Attractiveness, Motivation, Image, and Quality on Loyalty

Usep Suteja, Dyah Sugandini, Yuni Istanto

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Yogyakarta
Email address usepsuteja20@gmail.com; Email address dini@upnyk.ac.id; Email address yuni.istanto@upnyk.ac.id

Abstract

The loyalty model on this study proposed to explore the relationship of Attractiveness, motivation, destination image, destination quality, positive attitude, intention to revisit, intention to recommend, and word of mouth communication. This study uses a survey of 250 respondents of domestic tourists and international tourists who visit heritage tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Data analysis techniques use Structural Equation Modeling. The results of this study indicate that the initial model proposed has not been accepted because the model fit test was not fulfilled. Furthermore, the model is modified by adding a path from the motivation to revisit intention and eliminating the two paths that are not significant. The result is that the model is acceptable. So that the modified loyalty model can be accepted, the modification model is showing by the relationship between motivation, destination quality, attitude, revisit intention, intention to recommend, and word of mouth.

Keywords: Attractiveness, image, motivation, quality, and Loyalty



This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license.

I. INTRODUCTION

One indicator that illustrates the movement of tourism activities in a destination is a large number of tourist visits. The number of tourist visits to the Special Region of Yogyakarta has increased significantly since 2012-2017 (Tourism statistics in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2018). Unfortunately, the increase in the number of tourists has not been able to attract tourists to be loyal. Yogyakarta is not yet a single destination; travelers who have visited Yogyakarta rarely return to visit Yogyakarta.

This study aims to examine tourist loyalty models on heritage tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The factors that influence the Loyalty proposed in this study are Attractiveness, motivation, destination image, destination quality, attitude toward the destination. Tourist loyalty was analyzed from three divisions, namely intention to revisit, intention to recommend, and word of mouth communication. This research contributes, among others: (1) Increased generalization of findings from several studies that analyze the antecedents of Loyalty in the tourism industry.

According to Um et al. (2006), there is still a lot of theoretical and empirical evidence that explores the antecedents of tourist loyalty and how the responses of tourist visits show different results. This research is because tourist behavior in aggregate and satisfaction in each destination has different attributes (Sukanthasirikul and Trongpanich, 2016). Customers who are not satisfied are still loyal to the company (Suhartanto et al., 2018; Susilowati and Sugandini, 2018). This is due to the lack of available alternative service providers, and otherwise satisfied customers can also move to other companies because he hopes to be more confident with the services offered. Research conducted by Suhartanto et al. (2018) shows that attitudes shown by tourist satisfaction do not influence Loyalty. This research is expected to justify the positive influence of attitudes towards tourist loyalty. (2) This research is designed to fill the gap that occurs in the relationship between motivation to Loyalty. This is shown by Hsieh (2010) and Parisi (2018), which state that although some studies have focused on exploring the influence of factors on Loyalty, the influence of motivation and attitudes towards tourist loyalty is less satisfactory (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Parisi, 2018). Huang & Hsu (2009) also showed that there was still a lack of studies that focused on exploring pre-visit, post-visit, and satisfaction motivational relationships. (3). This research provides a practical contribution to the direction of the marketing strategy that is right for tourism managers, the government, and the public to increase tourist loyalty, especially in heritage tourism.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1. Loyalty

The dimensions of behavioral Loyalty, according to Zeithaml et al. (1996), include: talking positive things about the company, revisit intention, recommending destinations to other people; encourage others to do business with the company; consider the company as the first choice in the future. Other factors involved in evaluating behavioral intentions include the intention to recommend to others and positive words (Sukanthasirikul & Trongpanich, 2016). Different have explored the influence of travel motivation on vacation satisfaction and the impact of the image as for another determinant of Loyalty.

II.2. Attractiveness

There are five important elements in tourism objects, namely objects that attract tourists' attention, needed facilities, tourist infrastructure, transportation, and hospitality services (Um et al., 2006). Attitudes towards tourist destinations are psychological evaluations and evaluations conveyed by tourists (both positive and negative) from their visiting destinations (Lee, 2009). Lee et al. 2010 state that the Attractiveness of tourist destination influences tourists' perceptions of the purpose and ability of tourist destinations to meet their needs. The results of research conducted by Reitsamer, Sperdin & Sauer (2017) show that the Attractiveness of destinations perceived by tourists has a positive effect on their attitude towards the destination.

H1: Attractiveness affects the attitude toward the destination.

II.3. Motivation

Motivation can be defined as a person's direction to behave or what causes someone to want to repeat a behavior (Elliot, Gable & Mapes, 2006). Tourist motivation represents what drives a person or group of people to travel, both consciously and unconsciously, and both stable and

transitional needs. The motive has been identified as a significant determinant of behavioral intention in visiting tourism destinations (Hsieh, 2010). Parisi (2018) testing the model to test motivation on tourist loyalty shows that travel motivation is a predictor of Loyalty. Tourist motivation is a combination of needs and desires that affect a person's tendency to travel and influence the attitude and intention to revisit tourist destinations (Jeong et al., 2018).

H2: Motivation affects the attitude toward the destination.

II.4. Destination Image

Destination image does not only consist of cognitive and affective, but also the process of forming a destination image by the interaction of cognitive and emotional components. Also, the relationship between destination image and Loyalty reveals that affective imagery has a direct influence on tourist loyalty. Although the cognitive image does not directly correlate with tourist loyalty, the authors find that cognitive image has an indirect influence on tourist loyalty through affective and satisfaction images. Suhartanto et al. (2018) show that behavioral Loyalty is usually evaluated by the number of visits to tourist destinations. Chenini and Touaiti (2018) stated that destination images could positively affect tourist destinations and the intention to revisit.

H3: Destination image affects attitude toward the destination.

II.5. Destination Quality

Destination quality is defined as the place or location of attractions, facilities, and services that can be enjoyed by tourists (Suhartanto et al., 2018). Destination quality is also a combination of tourism product features in each tourist destination (Zabkar et al., 2010). Destination quality is a group of attractions, facilities, and tourist services. Perception of destination quality is a tourist facility, and services meet the requirements or expectations of tourists (Cong, 2016). Therefore, the quality of destinations affects the overall performance of tourist attractions, services, facilities, infrastructure offered and will have an impact on tourist attitudes towards tourist destinations.

H4: Destination quality affects attitude toward the destination

II.6. Attitude and Loyalty

Destination loyalty, according to Jraisat et al. (2015), is defined as a strong possibility to revisit tourist destinations with or without a positive attitude to service providers. Repeat visitors are a stable market for a tourist destination because they provide free advertising in the form of word of mouth recommendations for family members and friends (Jraisat et al., 2015). The studies conducted by Jamaludin & Sam (2018) show that the positive attitude of tourists has a positive effect on the possibility of revisiting a tourist destination. So it is appropriate to explain positive attitudes with complex concepts, based on perceptions of tourism from various aspects of tourist destinations.

H5: Attitude toward the destination affects the intention to revisit.

H6: Attitude toward the destination affects the intention to recommend.

H7: Attitude toward the destination affects word of mouth communication.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Explanatory research is a study that explains the causal relationship between variables through testing hypotheses (Sekaran, 2003). This study uses a questionnaire as a basic data collection tool, and the analysis unit is an individual. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling, with the criteria of tourists who had visited heritage tourism and had the motivation to study history/heritage and culture. The sample range in this study includes 250 tourists who have visited heritage tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Eight constructs consisting of 40 question items were measured using a 5-point Likert scale. The data analysis technique uses structural equation models (SEM) with the AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structure) program.

IV.FINDING AND DISCUSSION

IV.1. Characteristic Respondents

Primary data that has been collected from 250 international tourists and domestic tourists are shown in table 1.

Tabel 1. Profile of respondents

| Profile of respondents | Category | % |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------|
| Gender | Male | 34 |
| | Female | 66 |
| Age (years) | 17 – 26 | 43.4 |
| | 27 – 36 | 26.4 |
| | 37 – 46 | 10.6 |
| | 47 – 56 | 12 |
| | ≥ 57 | 7.6 |
| Occupation | Private employees | 28 |
| | Student | 35 |
| | Entrepreneur | 33 |
| | Government employees | 4 |
| Origin of tourists | International | 45 |
| | Domestic | 55 |
| Number of visits (times) | 2 | 67.7 |
| | 3 | 20.6 |
| | > 3 | 11.7 |
| Length of stay (days) | 1 | 19.8 |
| | 2 | 45.2 |
| | 3 | 35 |
| | > 3 | 9.6 |

IV.2. Data analysis results.

The results of the analysis of unmodified structural models are presented in table 2. The results of testing the structural models in table 2 show that not all hypotheses are supported, and the model is less fit. So it needs to be modified.

Table 2. Results of structural testing models

| Type of Goodness of fit model | Indeks Goodness of fit model | Recommended value | Result | Information |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|-------------|
| Absolute fit measures | p | ≥ 0.05 | 0.000 | Moderate |
| | GFI | ≥ 0.90 | 0.871 | Moderate |
| | RMSEA | ≤ 0.08 | 0.179 | Moderate |
| Incremental fit measures | TLI | ≥ 0.90 | 0.875 | Moderate |
| | CFI | ≥ 0.94 | 0.900 | Moderate |
| Parsimonious fit measures | Normed χ^2 (CMIN/DF) | $1 \leq \text{Normed } \chi^2 \leq 5$ | 4.235 | Good |

Table 3 shows that two paths are not significant, so the next step is to analyze the model by eliminating two insignificant paths and observing the value of the modification index.

Table 3. Path coefficient

| Path | Estimate | p-value | CR | Standard Error |
|--|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Attitude \leftarrow Destination Quality | 0.450 | *** | 9.175 | 0.049 |
| Attitude \leftarrow Attraction | 0.077 | 0.128 | 1.520 | 0.051 |
| Attitude \leftarrow Destination image | 0.053 | 0.299 | 1.039 | 0.051 |
| Attitude \leftarrow Motivation | 0.431 | *** | 7.628 | 0.056 |
| Intention to Recommend \leftarrow Attitude | 0.768 | *** | 7.271 | 0.106 |
| Intention to Revisit \leftarrow Attitude | 0.559 | *** | 7.399 | 0.075 |
| WOM \leftarrow Attitude | 0.491 | *** | 6.525 | 0.077 |

The results of testing the structural model after modification can be seen in table 4. The structural model is stated to be fit, and all hypotheses are supported. Table 5 shows all significant paths.

Table 4. Results of structural models testing after modification

| Type of Goodness of fit model | Indeks Goodness of fit model | Recommended value | Result | Information |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|-------------|
| Absolute fit measures | p | ≥ 0.05 | 0.051 | Good |
| | GFI | ≥ 0.90 | 0.977 | Good |
| | RMSEA | ≤ 0.08 | 0.012 | Good |
| Incremental fit measures | TLI | ≥ 0.90 | 0.947 | Good |
| | CFI | ≥ 0.94 | 0.972 | Good |
| Parsimonious fit measures | Normed χ^2 (CMIN/DF) | $1 \leq \text{Normed } \chi^2 \leq 5$ | 4.131 | Good |

Table 5. Path coefficient after modification

| Path | Estimate | p-value | CR | Standard Error |
|--|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Attitude \leftarrow Destination Quality | 0.517 | *** | 6.912 | 0.070 |
| Attitude \leftarrow Motivation | 0.414 | *** | 5.549 | 0.082 |
| Intention to Recommend \leftarrow Attitude | 0.724 | *** | 9.387 | 0.077 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|
| Intention to Revisit | ← | Attitude | 0.355 | *** | 3.299 | 0.090 |
| WOM | ← | Attitude | 0.560 | *** | 8.147 | 0.054 |
| Revisit Intention | ← | Motivation | 0.424 | *** | 3.980 | 0.090 |

V. DISCUSSION

V.1. Results of an exploratory study

Exploratory studies were conducted using two methods, namely, in-depth interviews and focused group discussions. In-depth interviews were held with 20 respondents. The first focused group discussion group is ten international tourists, and the second group consists of 10 domestic tourists. The preliminary studies conducted indicate that heritage tourism in Yogyakarta is quite impressive, but some places tend to be less organized and not clean. The lack of public facilities such as toilets has made the image of heritage tourism destinations in Yogyakarta not excellent. Complaints that could reduce the level of tourist satisfaction, namely the lack of information on screens in each diorama and officers, are also not stand-by in each diorama in the heritage destination. As a result, tourist satisfaction is reduced by getting comprehensive information on heritage. There are still many tourists who intend to revisit because they have not yet finished studying the history that exists in every heritage tourism destination. Some tourists also stated that they visited heritage tourism because of the desire to let go of boredom and find new findings by looking directly at a heritage.

Furthermore, in-depth interviews with tourists informed that the obstacles experienced by tourists with heritage tourism destinations were the truth of heritage tourism cultural history because there was no accurate data that could be provided by the manager. Information is only based on an explanation of the cultural history of the tour guide.

V.2. Result Of Variable

Effect of Attractiveness to the attitude toward the destination

The **first** hypothesis, which states that Attractiveness has a positive effect on attitude, is not supported. The results showed that the path coefficient was 0.077 in a positive direction and a CR value of 1.520 (positive direction). Thus it can be concluded that at the significance level of 5%, the hypothesis rejected. That is, there is no significant effect of Attractiveness on attitudes. The results of the study show that although heritage tourism is exciting to visit, some tourists say that they find it difficult to obtain physical evidence related to history that exists in every heritage tourism site they visit. The results of this study do not support Zabkar et al. (2010), which states that tourism detention must have complete information to create tourist loyalty. This study also does not help Um et al. (2006), Lee et al. (2010) and Reitsamer, Sperdin & Sauer (2017) which stated that a service could be said to be attractive if it fulfills consumer desires and is free from shortcomings.

Effect of Motivation on the attitude toward the destination

The **second** hypothesis states that motivation has a positive effect on attitude toward the destination supported. The results showed that most tourists visit heritage destinations because they have a strong motivation to learn about the history and culture in Yogyakarta. So, this strong motivation can influence a positive attitude toward heritage tourism. The results of this study support Elliot et al. (2006), Parisi (2018), and Jeong et al. (2018), which state that the motivation to visit heritage tourism influences the attitude of tourists to heritage destinations.

Effect of Destination image to attitude toward the destination

The **third** hypothesis, which states that the image of a destination influences attitude, is not supported. This conditional is because some heritage tourism destinations have not improved their image; there are no promotional programs that support heritage tourism posts. So the results of this study have not supported Suhartanto et al. (2018), and Chenini & Touaiti (2018) stated that destination images could form a positive attitude on heritage tourism.

Effect of Attitude toward the destination to loyalty

The fourth hypothesis, which states that destination quality affects attitude, is supported. The results of the study show that tourists feel safe when visiting heritage tourism. So the results of this study support Suhartanto et al. (2018), Ryglova et al. (2015), Akroush et al. (2016), and Cong (2016), which stated that destination quality affects the attitude toward the destination. The next hypothesis (fifth, sixth, and seventh) states that attitude toward the destination influences tourist loyalty (intention to revisit, intention to recommend, and WOM communication) is supported. Most respondents said that they intend to revisit heritage tourism in Yogyakarta because there is still a lot of information about history and culture collected on previous visits. Tourists also intend to recommend this heritage tour to others because they consider that heritage tourism in Yogyakarta is quite complete and unique. So the results of this study support Jraisat et al. (2015); Jamaludin & Sam (2018); and Cardinale et al. (2015).

VI. CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that the tourist loyalty model consisting of intention to revisit, intention to recommend, and WOM communication is acceptable. This study does not consider the experience of tourists when visiting heritage destinations; factor trust is also not included as a variable that affects tourist loyalty, even though for heritage trust, the truth of information provided by heritage destinations is needed. Tourist satisfaction was also not analyzed in this study. These factors can affect the motivation of tourists to revisit heritage tourism. This study also did not examine the behavior of tourist managers in increasing tourist loyalty. For further research, it is expected that tourist experience, trust, and satisfaction are considered factors in predicting Loyalty. The tourism marketing behavior and strategies applied by a destination also need to be found in marketing tourist destinations, so this factor also needs to be a concern for further research.

REFERENCES

- Akroush, Mamoun N., Jraisat, L. E., Kurdieh, D. J., AL-Faouri, R. N., & Qatu, L. T. (2016). "Tourism service quality and destination loyalty – the mediating role of destination image from international tourists' perspectives." *Tourism Review*. Vol. 71 Iss 1 pp. 18 – 44, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2014-0057>
- Baloglu, S and McCleary, K.W. (1999). "Model of Destination Image Formation." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (4), 11-15.
- Cardinale, S., Nguyen, B., & Melewar, T. C. (2016). "Place-based brand experience, place attachment, and loyalty." *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 34(3).
- Chenini, A., & Touaiti, M. (2018). "Building Destination Loyalty Using Tourist Satisfaction and Destination Image: A Holistic Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*. Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp. 37-43, <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1490491>.

- Cong, L. C. (2016). "A formative model of the relationship between destination quality, tourist satisfaction, and intentional loyalty: An empirical test in Vietnam." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. Vol. 26, pp. 50-62. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/>
- Elliot, A.J., Gable, S.L., & Mapes, R.R. (2006). "Approach and avoidance motivation in the social domain." *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* Vol. 32, pp. 378-391, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205282153>
- Hair Jr, Anderson R.E., Tatham R.L., and Black W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc Hawkins D.I., Best.
- Hsieh, Chi-Ming. (, 2010). "Roles of motivations, past experience, perceptions of service quality, value, and satisfaction in museum visitors' loyalty." *Dissertation*. Michigan State University
- Huang, S and Hsu, C.H.C. (2009). "Effects of Travel Motivation, Past Experience, Perceived Constraint, and Attitude on Revisit Intention." *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 8 (1), pp: 29-44.
- Jamaludin, N. L., & Sam, D. L. (2018). "Destination motivation, cultural orientation, and adaptation: international students destination-loyalty intention. *Journal of International Students*. Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 38–65. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1101030
- Jeong, Yoonjeong., Zielinski, Seweryn., Chang, Ji-soon., Kim, Seong-il. (, 2018). "Comparing motivation-based and motivation-attitude-based segmentation of tourists visiting sensitive destinations." *Sustainability*, DOI: 10, 3615; DOI:10.3390/su10103615
- Jraisat, L.E., Akroush, M.N., Alfaouri, R.J., Qatu, L.T., & Kurdieh, D. J. (2015). "Perceived brand salience and destination brand loyalty from international tourists' perspectives: the case of Dead Sea destination, Jordan." *International Journal of Culture, Tourism, and Hospitality Research*. Vol. 9 Issue. 3, pp. 292 – 315. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-01-2015-0001>
- Juran, J.M (1989). *Leadership for Quality*. An Executive Handbook. New York.
- Lee, C.F., Huang, H.I., & Huery-Ren, Y. (2010). "Developing an evaluation model for destination attractiveness: sustainable forest recreation tourism in Taiwan." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(6): 811–828.
- Lee, T.H. (2009). "A structural model to examine how destination image, attitude, and motivation affect the future behavior of tourists." *Leisure Sciences*, 31: 215–236.
- Parisi, E. D. (2018). "An evaluation of the factors of tourist satisfaction in the Ionian Islands – an analysis." *Issues in Business Management and Economics*. Vol.6 (2), pp.47-55.
- Reitsamer, B. F., Sperdin, A. B., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2016). "Destination attractiveness and destination attachment: The mediating role of tourists' attitude." *Tourism Management Perspectives*, July. DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2016.05.003.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business*, 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Suhartanto, D., Clemes, M. D., Wibisono, N. (2018). "How experiences with cultural attractions affect destination image and destination loyalty." *Tourism, Culture & Communication*. Vol. 18, pp. 177–189.
- Sukanthasirikul, K., & Trongpanich, W. (2016). "Cultural tourism experience on customer satisfaction: evidence from Thailand." *Journal of Economic and Social Development*. Vol. 3, No. 1, 2016. Pp 17-25
- Susilowati, C, and Sugandini, D. (2018). "Perceived Value, e-word-of-Mouth, Traditional Word-of-Mouth, and Perceived Quality to Destination Image of Vacation Tourists," *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research*, Vol. 7(s1), 312-321
- Temizer, L and Turkyilmaz, A. (2012). "Implementation of Student Satisfaction Index Model in Higher Education Institutions." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 46, pp: 3802-3806.
- Tourism statistics in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2018

Um, S., Chon, K and Ro, Y. H. (2006). "Antecedents of Revisit Intention." *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 33(4), pp: 1141-1158.

Zabkar, V., Brenc, M.M, and Dmitrovic, T. (2010). "Modelling Perceived Quality, Visitor Satisfaction, and Behavioural Intentions at The Destination Level." *Tourism Management*. Vol.31(4), pp: 537-546.

Zeithaml, V.A, and Bitner, M.J. (1996). *Services Marketing*. McGraw-Hill, New York, N.Y