The loyalty of rural tourism destination: A perspective of destination quality perception, satisfaction, and behavior intention in Indonesia

Syahmardi Yacob ^{(a)*} Erida ^(b) Ade Perdana Siregar ^(c)

^(a)Associate Professor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jambi, Kampus Unja Mendalo Darat, Jambi, Indonesia

^(b)Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jambi, Kampus Unja Mendalo Darat, Jambi, Indonesia

^(c)Lecturer, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia, Kampus Unja Mendalo Darat, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 September 2021

Received in rev. form 23 Oct. 2021

Accepted 28 October 2021

Keywords:

Tourism Destination Loyalty,
Perception of Destination Quality,
Tourist Satisfaction, Behavioral
Intention

JEL Classification:
M30

ABSTRACT

The tourism sector is currently developing rapidly, thereby aiding in the significant boost of Indonesia's economy. Tourist villages are among the natural tourism product portfolios provided to tourists, which the government adequately develops to become a new and attractive alternative tourist destination. The research purpose is examined the loyalty of tourist village destinations as a perspective destination quality, satisfaction, and intentions of practice in Kerinci Regency, Jambi Province, Indonesia. The research intent to increase the rural tourism destinations' loyalty in Jambi Province. Three objects selected villages as research location namely, Lempur, Pendung Talang Genting, and Jernih Jaya, Kerinci Regency, Jambi Province. The research finding concluded that tourist satisfaction influences tourist destination loyalty and behavioral intention. Meanwhile, the perceptions of the quality of tourism destinations influence tourists' loyalty and urge to return to the village. Tourism satisfaction also affects the loyalty of tourist village destinations. However, its perception in terms of quality can influence tourist loyalty.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

During the first tenure of the present administration, there was a significant growth on the national tourism industry. This decreased production rate in the traditional agricultural sector, hence various tourism stakeholders, such as local communities, government, and industry players, started focusing on rural tourism, as an alternative means of generating income (Ruiz-Molina, Gil-Saura and Moliner-Velázquez, 2010; Moric, 2014). Rural tourism is an important tool for enhancing local welfare and living standards (Peptenatu, Drăghici and Stoian, 2009; Pröbstl-Haider, Melzer and Jiricka, 2014; Aliman *et al.*, 2016). This industry has experienced rapid growth and development over the last few years, irrespective of the several challenges as tourist destinations. Previous studies reported that these tourist destinations are highly competitive to attract more international and domestic tourists (Zainuddin, Radzi and Zahari, 2013; Gursoy, Chen and Chi, 2014; Ramseook-Munhurrin, P., Naidoo, P., Seebaluck, V. N., & Pillai, 2016). Furthermore, Adeyinka-Ojo *et al.* (2014) stated that it is vital to compare these destinations to maintain their market position. Consequently, studies on rural tourism are getting increased attention from tourism stakeholders (I, I and I, 2015). Various previous studies have assessed and identified the main attractiveness factors of tourist destinations in rural areas.

The broad potentials of rural tourism, which serves as a significant pull factor for attracting tourists to specific destinations has led to an intensive review based on some factors, such as an understanding of previous experiences (Chen and Chen, 2010; Rajaratnam *et al.*, 2014; Nair *et al.*, 2015), service quality (Albacete-Sáez, Mar Fuentes-Fuentes and Javier Lloréns-Montes, 2007; Martínez Caro and Martínez García, 2008; Butnaru and Miller, 2012), visitors' motivation (Devesa, Laguna and Palacios, 2010) and tourist ratings (Weiermair and Fuchs, 1999). Irrespective of the essential need to understand the various attributes of service quality and tourist satisfaction, the study on behavioral intentions in line with rural tourism is still limited. Furthermore, previous studies stated that

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6827-277X

service quality attributes affect loyalty either directly or indirectly (Shawn Jang & Feng, 2007; Bowen & Shoemaker, 2003; J. S. Chen, 2001; Chi & Qu, 2008; Hosany et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2007; Martina G. Gallarza, Irene Gil Saura, Haydée Calderón García, 2002; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). It was also reported that the overall image influences the destination selection process and tourists' behavioral intention (Qu et al., 2011; Bigne et al., 2001). Fitriani, (2019) reported that the tourism sector became the largest contributor to Indonesia's GDP in 2019, displacing the oil and gas sector, which has been experiencing a continuous decline. Indonesia has a foreign exchange reserve of approximately Rp. 280 trillion, and visited by 20 million foreign tourists yearly. The labor absorption in this sector reaches 12.6 million people, and in accordance with the tourism competitiveness index, Indonesia was ranked 30th globally. This has led to the development of this sector, particularly rural tourism. According to tourism providers, rural tourism products include homestays, nature, environmental tourism, agro-tourism, and cultural heritage tourism. This diversification plays a massive role in increasing tourism output and contributes both nationally and locally.

Preliminary studies stated that there is an established relationship between service quality and customer loyalty. However, it has never been thoroughly investigated in tourist destinations (Vinh & Long, 2013; Yang et al., 2014). Besides, the environment is in constant change and overlap, thereby prompting intense investigation and analysis (Najdic, 2011; Vinh & Long, 2013). In accordance with the statement mentioned above, tourism destination loyalties are the central concept and one of the main results of the outstanding transmission of service quality in tourist destinations (Moon et al., 2011; Demir, 2013). This empirical research focuses mainly on tourism destination loyalty. According to recent studies, this phenomenon needs to be adequately approached by understanding various local and international tourism concepts. One of the provinces with a developed tourism sector is Jambi. Recently, there have been notable increase in the number of tourist visits. Conversely, in 2019, the data obtained from the Jambi Province Tourism and Culture Office reported that in 2017 and 2018, the total number of tourists recorded was 2,162,155, and 2,399,560, respectively. There is an increase by in tourist visits by 11 percent from the previous year. Furthermore, in 2017, the number of visits increased to 5,378 foreign tourists. In 2018, 10,887 people were reported, thereby leading to an increase of 102 percent.

Furthermore, in 2017 and 2018, the number of domestic tourists rose to 2,156,777 and 2,388,673, respectively, with an increase of 11 percent. Meanwhile, in the past two years, a significant increase has been recorded in the number of tourist visits to Kerinci Regency. This is shown in the data regarding the number of visits by foreign and domestic tourists. Based on the data obtained in 2017, the numbers of foreign and domestic tourists were 8,000, and 221,287 respectively. However, in 2018, the numbers increased to 10,000 and 265,544, respectively, increasing by 20 percent from the previous year. A tourist village is a rural area consisting of exclusive and distinguished characteristics (Ariani, 2017). This area makes use of elements in the community that function as attributes of tourism products that are integrated into a numerous activities and specific themes in accordance with village characteristics (Murdiyanto, 2011). The perceptions of the quality of destinations that affect tourists serve as a reference for rural tourism services actors. It starts with the local government, tourism service providers, and managers of tourist attractions to determine policies and decisions based on their wants and needs, using the market approach (either driven or product-driven) in a tourist village (Batti and Baiquni, 2013).

This study adopts the term tourist experience to characterize this research from a visitor's perspective, examine their views, which are regarded as essential factors for developing tourism destination loyalty.

Therefore, in accordance with this explanation, it is essential to carry out a research entitled "Loyalty of Rural Tourism Destination: A Perception of Destination Quality, Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intention in Kerinci Regency, Jambi Province, Indonesia." This research examines visitors' perceptions of rural tourism based on destination quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions that affect tourist loyalty.

Literature Review

Perception of Destination Quality

Kim & Brown (2012) defined destination as an area with attractive tourist facilities, and services. Zabkar et al. (2010) reported that the process of combining various features produces a significant tourism product. Zabkar further highlighted the existence of two frameworks used to group the attributes of a destination, namely "four A" (Access, Attractions, Facilities, and Additional Services) and "six A" (Attractions, Facilities, Access, Available Packages, Activities, and Services). Besides these general classifications, the features a destination comprise a highly contextual, and assessed quality needs used to reflect the specific attributes (Zabkar et al., 2010). Preliminary studies used variety of essential attributes to assess destination quality (Lopez-Toro et al., 2010; Eusebio & Vieira, 2013; Chen et al., 2011; Moutinho et al., 2012). There are limited research on this area, despite the growth on rural tourism destinations in many developed and developing countries. Loureiro and Gonzalez, (2008) carried out a research on the quality of rural accommodation, while Rozman et al. (2009) researched on livestock tourism. Therefore, this study determined the relevant attributes for measuring rural tourism destinations' quality.

Tourist Satisfaction

According to Heung & Cheng (2000) tourist satisfaction is the process of examining a product or service performance. Subsequently, when the performance surpasses expectations, it leads to tourist satisfaction, which is dissatisfactory. Furthermore, tourist satisfaction

is essential in destination marketing because it affects choice, number of repeated visits, loyalty, consumed goods and services, and publicity through word of mouth (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Kozak, Bigne, & Andreu, 2004). It is also determined by comparing tourists' expectations of a destination and its perceptions of evaluative experiences (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Understanding tourist satisfaction is an essential tool for evaluating destination products and services (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Therefore, destination authorities or planners need to monitor tourists' satisfaction level to obtain feedback and detect problems causing dissatisfaction which tend to affect future visits (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Travellers' satisfaction assessments associated with island destinations, which help managers to ameliorate their efforts in enhancing tourist travel experiences and in developing effective destination marketing strategies (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

In accordance with preliminary studies a collection of destination attributes were used to evaluate tourist satisfaction level in ranking scale (Dmitrovic et al., 2009). These attributes "comprise all the elements of a 'non-home' place that keeps tourists away from their homes" (Lew, 1987) and is perceived as a "pull factor" that directs a person to select one destination over another once the tourists decide to travel (Dann, 1977). Cooper et al. (1993) defined destination as the focus of facilities and services designed to meet tourists' needs. Most destinations consist of the following core attributes, a four-A framework, including Attractions, Access, Facilities, and additional services. Buhalis (2000) further modified tourist destinations' attributes into 6 A, which is an extension of the four A framework proposed by Cooper et al. (1993). These are Accessibility, Attractions, Facilities, Activities, Packages available, and additional services. On the other hand, due to the multidimensional nature of the objectives, tourist satisfaction needs to be operated at the global and attribute levels (Chi & Qu, 2009; Chung & Petrick, 2013; Kozak, 2003). Most times, tourists tend to have mixed feelings regarding a destination. Furthermore, they also tend to feel satisfied or unsatisfied with various aspects of the destination. The combined perceptions regarding the various goals and attributes increase their satisfaction level. Preliminary studies have analyzed tourist satisfaction from various contexts. Furthermore, most assessments performed at the destination level are usually in accordance with the application of general attributes in all cases without referring to a particular type of destination (Song et al., 2011).

Some attributes of a destination appear to be agreeable and universally important. On the contrary, some others tend not to and are only necessary for certain destination types (Lin et al., 2007). Hence, there is an important need to examine sector-specific destination, because it leads to minimum tourist satisfaction levels in line with industrial tourism. Furthermore, the various levels of attributes have an impact on the overall satisfaction rate and the recommended and reviewed intention (Chi & Qu, 2009; Kozak, 2003).

Behavioral Intention

Prayag et al. (2013) stated that behavioral intention is an essential research area in tourism, because good intentions show tourist loyalty. Recent empirical studies assessed tourists' behavioral intentions or loyalty as their ability to revisit the destination and their willingness to recommend it to others (Eusebio & Vieira, 2013; Ozdemir et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2013). These two indicators are most often used in tourism and were included in this study (Zhang et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2013). Huh et al. (2006) stated that studies on tourists' perceptions as well as their destinations and future behavioral intention are in line with their satisfaction rate, which tends to influence their decisions to return. Furthermore, Ozdemir et al. (2012) reported that word-of-mouth recommendations are another imperative because tourists tend to revisit and recommend a satisfactory destinations to others (Sunet al., 2013). However, this study's results conflict with the satisfaction of either having a complete, partial, or non-meditating effect regarding the relationship between behavioural intention and destination quality (Zabkar et al., 2010). Furthermore, tourists' perceptions of a destination, satisfaction rate, and their loyalty were analyzed to determine their socio-demographic characteristics.

The loyalty of Rural Tourism Destination

Loyalty is generally the intention or behavior of a customer to repurchase or duplicate a particular product or service, thereby causing repeated purchases of the same brand (Hawkins, Best, & Coney, 1995; Oliver, 1999). Loyalty is used to measure the strength of a consumer's affection for a brand (Backman & Crompton, 1991). Furthermore, it is also in accordance with a consumer's preference to purchase a particular brand. Customer's loyalty is based on their experience, service quality, price, and performance, of the brand (Backman & Crompton, 1991; Oliver, 1999). According to Toyama and Yamada (2012), tourist loyalty refers to their intention to revisit a particular destination as well as recommend it to friends or relatives. Several studies have been carried out to develop effective ways to attract more tourists (Kim & Brown, 2012; Toyama & Yamada, 2012; Mechinda, Serirat, & Gulid, 2009). Therefore, it is an imperative indicator used to build a destination's competitive advantage as well as an effective marketing strategy (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). In general, tourism destination loyalty is measured by tourists' intention to revisit a particular destination and recommend it to others (Toyama & Yamada, 2012). Therefore, repeated visits are reliable indicator of future behavior (Mechinda et al., 2009). However, gaining a traveler's loyalty is one of the main challenges of rural tourism destinations (Kim & Brown, 2012). Therefore, having a thorough understanding of the determinants concept helps the managers to properly develop island tourism and increases competitiveness.

Research Framework

A research framework consists of variable constructs, namely perception of destination quality, tourist satisfaction, behavioral intention, and loyalty of rural tourism destinations, is formulated as follows.

Figure 1: Research Model

Hypothesis

In accordance with the literature review and research model, the following hypotheses were formulated.

- H1: Perception of destination quality has a positive effect on tourist behavioral intentions.
- H2: Tourist satisfaction has a positive effect on tourist behavioral intentions.
- H3: Behavioral intention has a positive effect on the loyalty of rural tourism destinations.
- H4: Perception of destination quality has a positive effect on the loyalty of rural tourism destinations.
- H5: Tourist satisfaction has a positive effect on the loyalty of rural tourism destinations.
- H6: Perception of destination quality has a positive effect on rural tourism destinations through behavioral intention.
- H7: Tourist satisfaction has a positive effect on the loyalty of rural tourism destinations through behavioral intention.

Research and Methodology

This study utilized a survey method characterized by an open and closed questionnaire to an identified target population. Furthermore, a quantitative data collection method was used, which was strengthened by a qualitative approach.

Tourists that visit the Kerinci tourism village are the observed unit, while the village is the unit of analysis. Therefore, to meet this criterion, a data collection method with convenience sampling was used. In this study, the number of samples refers to the research carried out by Hair et al. 2010. It is calculated in line with the number of indicators multiplied by 4 to 5 variables. This is because it was difficult to obtain an accurate calculation of the population of tourists that visited the villages in Kerinci Regency. The sample size comprises of $4 \times 37 = 148$ respondents.

The primary data is made up of 1) individuals and 2) groups. Questionnaires were used to obtain individual data (tourists), while in-depth interviews with relevant stakeholders were conducted on groups. The data relates primarily to 1) perceived destination quality, 2) tourism satisfaction, 3) behavioral intentions, and 4) loyalty of rural tourism destinations. Based on this data source, the government tends to directly relate tourism development in Kerinci district and Jambi Province.

The secondary data includes developing the tourism sector in Kerinci Regency and Jambi Province, the number of lodgings, tour guides, and tourist objects, domestic and foreign tourism, and other relevant information.

The main variables consist of 1) Perception of destination quality (X1), 2) Tourist satisfaction (X2), 3) Behavioral intention (Z), and 4) Loyalty to rural tourism destinations (Y). Furthermore, two data analysis types were used, 1) Qualitative analysis, which involves data obtained with in-depth authority, FGD, and observation. In general, two approaches were used, namely the content and triangulation analyses. The qualitative analysis in line with the field notes reported in each of the studies. 2) Quantitative Analysis involves the use of Partial Least Square (PLS) version 3.0 application.

Result and Discussion

Overview of Respondent

The respondents' characteristics in this study are based on gender, age, most recent educational level, occupation, monthly income, selected rural tourism destinations, tourist aim, frequency of travel, lodging in tourist villages, information about rural tourism destinations in Kerinci, duration of stay in the Tourism Village and Average Expenditures during the Tour. Table 1 described the respondents' characteristics

Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Criteria	Amount	Percentage(%)
Gender	Male	87	58,78
	Female	61	41,22
Total		148	100
Age (Years)	17 – 20	28	18,92
	21 – 30	39	26,35
	31 – 40	45	30,41
	> 40	36	24,32
Total		148	100
Educational Level	SD / equivalent	4	2,70
	Junior high school/equivalent	8	5,41
	SMA / equivalent	21	14,19
	Diploma	31	20,95
	Bachelor degree)	58	39,19
	Postgraduate	26	17,57
Total		148	100
Profession	Government employees	29	19,59
	Private employees	38	25,68
	TNI / POLRI	12	8,11
	Entrepreneur	22	14,86
	Student / Student	27	18,24
	Not yet working	17	11,49
	Others	3	2,03
Total		148	100
The income per month (IDR)	< 2.000.000	4	2,70
	2.000.000 – 4.000.000	19	12,84
	4.000.000 – 6.000.000	42	28,38
	6.000.000 – 8.000.000	51	34,46
	8.000.000 – 10.000.000	24	16,22
	> 10.000.000	8	5,41
Total		148	100
Selected Rural Tourism Destinations	Desa Wisata lempur	51	34,46
	Desa Wisata Pendung Tanah Genting	44	29,73
	Desa Wisata Jernih Jaya (Rawa Bento)	48	32,43
	Desa wisata lainnya	5	3,38
Total		148	100
Tourist Aim	Holiday	111	75,00
	Research	12	8,11
	Business	17	11,49
	Etc	8	5,41
Total		148	100
Travel Frequency	Sometimes	27	18,24
	Very often	59	39,86
	Always traveling at all times	62	41,89
Total		148	100
the Tourist Trip embarked on alone or in groups	Alone	39	26,35
	Together	109	73,65
Total		148	100
Information about rural tourism destinations in Kerinci	Newspapers, Magazines	8	5,41
	Radio, Television	7	4,73
	Website / social media / Internet	129	87,16
	Others	4	2,70
Total		148	100
Lodging in the Tourism Village	Home residents	37	25,00
	Inn	29	19,59
	Homestay	43	29,05
	Budget hotel	28	18,92
	Two or three-star hotel	11	7,43
Total		148	100
Duration of Stay in the Tourism Village	One night	21	14,19
	Two to three nights	48	32,43
	Three to four nights	39	26,35
	Five to six nights	24	16,22
	More than six nights	16	10,81
Total		148	100
Average Expenditure During Tour	Less than Rp. 750,000	11	7,43
	Rp. 751,000 - Rp. 1,000,000	28	18,92

Table Cont'd	Rp. 1,001,000 - Rp. 1,250,000	37	25,00
	Rp. 1,251,000 - Rp. 1,500,000	32	21,62
	Rp. 1,501,000 - Rp. 1,750,000	26	17,57
	More than Rp. 1,751,000	14	9,46
Total		148	100

Table 1 shows that the majority of approximately 58 percent of the respondents are males, with 30.41 percent aged between 30 to 40 years on average. Furthermore, in accordance with the educational level, it turns out that over 39 percent have a bachelor's degree while 25.68 percent are private employees, and 34.46 percent earn an average monthly income of relatively 6 to 8 million rupiahs. Subsequently, based on the respondents' chosen rural tourism destinations, the largest number of tourists, relatively 34.46 percent, selected the lempur village, followed by 32.43 percent that chose the Jernih Jaya village (Rawa Bento) and 29.72 percent choosing the pendung tourism village of Isthmus. However, 75 percent of the respondents' stated that their primary purpose of visiting a tourist village was for holidays. It turns out that almost more than 87 percent of respondents acquire information from the website or social media/internet concerning tourist villages in Kerinci. Conversely, as many as 29 percent of tourists prefer homestays around tourist villages, while the rest prefers to stay at family or residents' homes, jasmine, and either two or three-star hotels. The average duration in a tourist village is two or three nights. The number of respondents amounted to over 32 percent of the total number. Furthermore, approximately 25 percent spend an average of 1 million or 1 million two hundred and fifty thousand rupiahs.

Reliability and Validity Test

The reliability and validity test results of each variable construct are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Construct Reliability and Validity

Variable Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	rho_A	Composite Reliability	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
Tourist Satisfaction	0,945	0,946	0,945	0,775
Rural Tourism Destination Loyalty	0,935	0,950	0,937	0,752
Behavioral Intention	0,916	0,918	0,916	0,733
Perceptions of the Quality of Rural Tourism Destinations	0,960	0,962	0,960	0,511

The variables of tourist satisfaction and rural tourism destination loyalty are 0.945, and 0.935 respectively (See Table 2). The variables of tourist behavioral intention and perception of destination quality are 0.916 and 0.960. The results show the accuracy and reliability of all variables because all the scores are above 0.7. Meanwhile, the variables of tourist satisfaction, rural tourism destination loyalty, tourist behavioral intention, and the perception of destination quality were 0.945, 0.937, 0.916, and 0.960, respectively. The results show that the overall variable is declared reliable because the scores are above 0.7

Overall, it is explained that the tourist satisfaction, rural tourism destination loyalty, tourist behavioral intention, and the perception of tourism destination quality variables are 0.775, 0.752, 0.733, and 0.511, respectively. The results show that the overall variables were declared to be valid because their scores are above 0.5

Furthermore, statistical testing results were obtained using the R square value to determine its influence on the research model. The results of the R Square value is described in Table 3.

Table 3: R Square Value

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted
The loyalty of rural tourism destination	0.777	0.770
Behavior Intention	0.501	0.487

The R Square value for the loyalty of rural tourism destinations obtained a value of 0.777 with a criterion of 0.3, which means that the quality of tourist destinations and satisfaction contributes or influences 0.777 on tourist loyalty to village destinations (See Table 3. Meanwhile, the R Square value for the behavioral intention was 0.501 with a criterion of 0.3, which means that the tourist destinations quality and tourist satisfaction have 0.501 contributions or influence on tourist behavior.

Furthermore, Fig. 2 show the measurement results were described using the Smart PLS version 3.0 and the full model.

Figure 2: Full Model

Path Coefficients

The research hypothesis was tested using the path coefficient value, processed with the Smart PLS version 3.0 application, shown in table 4.

Table 4: Path Coefficients

Path	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (STDEV)	T Statistics (O/STDEV)	P Values	Result
Tourist Satisfaction -> rural tourism Destination Loyalty	0,468	0,421	0,131	6,015	0,003	Accepted
Tourist Satisfaction -> Behavioral Intention	0,377	0,319	0,293	8,051	0,000	Accepted
Behavioral Intention -> rural tourism Destination Loyalty	0,551	0,497	0,325	11,029	0,007	Accepted
Perceptions of the Quality of rural tourism Destinations -> Tourism Destination Loyalty	0,389	0,370	0,538	7,045	0,004	Accepted
Perceptions of the Quality of rural tourism Destinations -> Behavioral Intention	0,302	0,343	0,473	6,575	0,000	Accepted
Tourist Satisfaction -> Behavioral Intention -> rural tourism Destination Loyalty	0,523	0,508	0,268	7,138	0,000	Accepted
Perceptions of Tourism Destination Quality -> Tourism Behavior Intention -> rural tourism Destination Loyalty	0,611	0,596	0,456	5,546	0,002	Accepted

Statistical T value > 1.96 and P-value with a significant level of 0.05

The P-value in the table showed that all the hypotheses were accepted because their values are close to 0.00 and are below the significant level of 0.05. This shows that all research hypotheses provided similar answers as the initial assumptions in this research. The perceptions of rural tourism destinations' quality and tourist satisfaction positively influence behavioral intention, which also positively influences the loyalty of rural tourism destinations.

Furthermore, the perception of tourist village destinations quality and tourist satisfaction has a positive effect on the loyalty of rural tourism destinations. Based on the research findings, behavioral intentions serve as a mediator between destination quality and rural tourism destinations' loyalty. In addition, it also serves as a mediator between tourist satisfaction and destinations. Ana Ma Castillo Canalejo, Juan Antonio Jimber del Río (2018) reported the presence of a direct and definite relationship between the expected and perceived quality or value and has an impact on customer satisfaction related to customer loyalty. Meanwhile, according to Alves (2019), this relationship (namely trust, attachment, and satisfaction) influences tourist satisfaction and loyalty, specifically in rural tourism destination areas. In connection with these findings, it was discovered that this research also enriches previous studies' results.

Conclusion

In this research, it was concluded that tourist satisfaction influences behavioural intention and tourism destination loyalty. Consequently, behavioral intention also affects rural tourism destinations' loyalty. Meanwhile, the perception of destination quality influences the loyalty of tourists. It also influences tourists' behavior to return to the tourist village or destinations. Tourist satisfaction affects the loyalty of rural tourism destinations through behavioral intention. Likewise, the perception of rural tourism destination quality affects tourists' loyalty through behavioral intention. Then, government are recommended to make policies in the tourism development sector. This is because increasing the interest in tourist visits to villages needs to be considered by tourism service providers to identify and map the area properly by paying attention to the perception of village destinations, tourist satisfaction, and behavior intentions. Furthermore, this study's results can be used in marketing strategic management science, especially in the tourism sector.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the local government, Jambi University postgraduate director, and the Jambi University Master of Management study program head for implementing this research. Furthermore, the authors are also grateful for the research grant from the funding scheme of Jambi University.

References

- Adeyinka-Ojo, S. F., Khoo-Lattimore, C. and Nair, V. (2014). A Framework for Rural Tourism Destination Management and Marketing Organisations, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, pp. 151–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.284>.
- Albacete-Sáez, C. A., Mar Fuentes-Fuentes, M. and Javier Lloréns-Montes, F. (2007). Service quality measurement in rural accommodation, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), pp. 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.010>.
- Aliman, N. K. et al. (2016). Tourists' Satisfaction with a Destination: An Investigation on Visitors to Langkawi Island, *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 8(3), p. 173. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v8n3p173>.
- Bowen, J. T. and Shoemaker, S. (2003). Loyalty: A strategic commitment, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(5–6), pp. 31–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804\(03\)90105-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-8804(03)90105-4).
- Butnaru, G. I. and Miller, A. (2012). Conceptual Approaches on Quality and Theory of Tourism Services, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 3(232), pp. 375–380. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671\(12\)00167-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(12)00167-0).
- Chen, C. F. and Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists, *Tourism Management*, 31(1), pp. 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008>.
- Chen, J. S. (2001). An investigation of tourists' destination loyalty and preferences, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(2), pp. 79–85.
- Chi, C. G. Q. and Qu, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach, *Tourism Management*, 29(4), pp. 624–636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.007>.
- Devesa, M., Laguna, M. and Palacios, A. (2010). The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism, *Tourism Management*, 31(4), pp. 547–552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.006>.
- Fitriani (2019). *Pariwisata Sumbang PDB Terbesar*. Available at: <https://investor.id/archive/2019-pariwisata-sumbang-pdb-terbesar>.
- Gursoy, D., Chen, J. S. and Chi, C. G. (2014). Theoretical examination of destination loyalty formation, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(5), pp. 809–827. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2013-0539>.
- Hosany, S., Ekinci, Y. and Uysal, M. (2007). Destination image and destination personality, *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(1), pp. 62–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506180710729619>.
- I, A. B., I, M. C. and I, V. J. (2015). Possibilities For The Development Of Congress Tourism, 65, pp. 83–93.
- Lee, J., Graefe, A. R. and Burns, R. C. (2007). Examining the antecedents of destination loyalty in a forest setting, *Leisure Sciences*, 29(5), pp. 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400701544634>.
- Martina G. Gallarza, Irene Gil Saura, Haydée Calderón García (2002). Destination image: Towards a Conceptual Framework, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), pp. 57–78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00031-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00031-7).
- Martínez Caro, L. and Martínez García, J. A. (2008). Developing a multidimensional and hierarchical service quality model for the travel agency industry, *Tourism Management*, 29(4), pp. 706–720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.014>.
- Moric, I. (2014). Clusters as a Factor of Rural Tourism Competitiveness: Montenegro Experiences, *Business Systems Research*, 4(2), pp. 94–107. <https://doi.org/10.2478/bsrj-2013-0015>.
- Nair, V. et al. (2015). Redefining Rural Tourism in Malaysia: A Conceptual Perspective, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(3), 314–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2014.889026>.
- Peptenatu, D., Drăghici, C. and Stoian, D. (2009). Territorial Disparities Concerning The Distribution Of The Tourist Services Quality In Romania, 4(2).
- Pröbstl-Haider, U., Melzer, V. and Jiricka, A. (2014). Rural tourism opportunities: Strategies and requirements for destination leadership in peripheral areas, *Tourism Review*, 69(3), 216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2013-0038>.

- Rajaratnam, S. D. et al. (2014). Service Quality and Previous Experience as a Moderator in Determining Tourists' Satisfaction with Rural Tourism Destinations in Malaysia: A Partial Least Squares Approach, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, pp. 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.288>.
- Ramseook-Munhurrin, P., Naidoo, P., Seebaluck, V. N., & Pillai, P. (2016). The impact of destination service quality on tourist satisfaction and loyalty: Evidence from Mauritius, in *In Proceedings of the International Academic Research Conference on Marketing & Tourism (MTCI16 Paris Conference)*.
- Ruiz-Molina, M. E., Gil-Saura, I. and Moliner-Velázquez, B. (2010). The role of information technology in relationships between travel agencies and their suppliers, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 1(2), 144–162. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17579881011065047>.
- Shawn Jang, S. C. and Feng, R. (2007). Temporal destination revisit intention: The effects of novelty seeking and satisfaction, *Tourism Management*, 28(2), pp. 580–590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.04.024>.
- Weiermair, K. and Fuchs, M. (1999). Measuring tourist judgment on service quality, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), pp. 1004–1021. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00037-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00037-7).
- Yoon, Y. and Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model, *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016>.
- Zabkar, V., Brencic, M.M. and Dmitrovic, T. (2010). Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioral intentions at the destination level, *Tourism Management*, 31(4). 537-546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.005>
- Zainuddin, Z., Radzi, M. S. and Zahari, M. S. M. (2013). Perceived Destination Competitiveness of Langkawi Island, Malaysia: A preliminary finding, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 105, pp. 801–810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.11.083>.

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.