

The Assessment of Factors Influencing Heritage Tourist's Revisit Intention

Article history

Rohaizat bin Baharun¹, Hendrikus Kadang^{1,2,*}, Umar Haiyat bin Abdul Kohar¹

Received:
6 Nov 2019

Received in revised form:
15 Nov 2019

¹*Azman Hashim International Business School
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
Jalan Sultan Yahya Petra, 54100, Kuala Lumpur*

Accepted:
4 Dec 2019

Published online:
20 Dec 2019

²*Universitas Atma Jaya Makassar*

hkadang71@gmail.com

*Corresponding author:
hkadang71@gmail.com

Abstract

Study on heritage tourist's revisit intention by using exploratory design stills becomes an interesting due to the persistent determination to stipulate the factors that influenced. Moreover, the effort to provide an assessment of the factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention becomes an important part for testifying the instrument. This paper aims to assess the instrument of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention in the context of Toraja heritage site, South Sulawesi Province of Indonesia. The convenience sampling technique is carried out to ensure the proper sampling of quantitative approaches. Distributed questionnaires to 60 tourists are used to ensure the instrument working. The assessment of this instrument uses Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The result of validity testing specified that all item played an essential role as a measurement for each factor influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention. Meanwhile, reliability testing through Statistical Package for the Social Science and the entire construct provided a level of CA's value more than 0.700. Indeed, the instrument was properly equipped to practice. Based on the findings, the required consideration on factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention should be adept to all heritage tourists

Keywords: *Assessment of instrument, Factors influencing, Heritage tourist, Revisit intention, EFA.*

1. Introduction

This paper is an enhancement of the research results regarding the heritage tourist's revisit intention to a destination through a qualitative approach [1]. The tourist destination referred to the heritage site that is specifically about culture and natural destinations. Exploratory research was conducted to ascertain the factors influencing heritage tourists revisit intention. This study was conducted on the surroundings of the favoured high land destination of Toraja which expected to attract tourists to visit in large numbers. However, there has been a regular decline in the number of visitors' arrivals from year to year until 2008 by only 13.000 visitors. Next after couple of years until 2012, the number of visitors' arrivals were dramatically increased by 55,915 visitors and followed over an extreme fluctuated number of visitors' arrivals until 2017 by 285,566 visitors [2]. The phenomenon of tourist arrival in Toraja become the reason to conduct an exploratory research particularly the factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention and emerged nine factors [3]. The factors were cultural uniqueness,

* Corresponding author: *hkadang71@gmail.com*

promotion, service quality, destination image, experience quality, monuments, motivation, perceived value and satisfaction.

This paper adopts some of the factors such cultural uniqueness, promotion, experience quality, monuments, satisfaction and heritage tourists' revisit intention to be testified. These factors influencing heritage tourists revisit intention become an interesting to provide a further testifying instrument particularly how to provide the valid and reliable instrument for advance research. This paper enlightens to deliver a testifying instrument of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention. This testifying instrument is expected to propose an alternative option for further research particularly the used of this instrument in the quantitative study. Therefore, this paper attempts to test whether the items in the instrument meet the criteria as a data collection tool in other studies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Heritage Tourist's Revisit Intention

Previous studies have shown that there are nine factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention in the context of cultural and natural heritage destinations [3]. The nine factors influencing heritage tourists' revisit intention will have more meaningful sense if confirmed through further study. The effort to follow up on the previous study results needs to start with testing of the instruments involved to each factor.

Some of the nine factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention have been investigated in the previous studies. For instant, Chen and Chen [4], mentioned the influence of experience quality, satisfaction and perceived value on behavioural intention to revisit. In addition, the effect of service quality and satisfaction on further behavioural intention such revisit, recommended and say positive thing have been testified by Canny and Hidayat [5]. Meanwhile, Mat Som *et al.* [6] successfully confirmed the role of demographic characteristics, destinations characteristics, travel characteristic, and destination attributes on tourists revisit behavioural intention. Whereas Thiumsak and Ruangkanjanases [7] found that tourist's perceived satisfaction, tourist's overall satisfaction, tourist's perceived attractiveness, tourist's overall image, and tourist's motives significantly affected tourists' revisit intention.

Sekaran [8] specified that items of each variables become an instrument were generated from the concept and theory [9]. Moreover, Creswell [10] confirmed that instrument could be developed from the literature and procreated from the exploratory study. This paper adopted the instrument from the research result of the exploratory study by Kadang, Baharun, and Kohar [3].

2.2 Instruments of Factors Influencing Heritage Tourist Revisit Intention

Sekaran [8] specified that items of each variables become an instrument were generated from the concept and theory [9]. Moreover, Creswell [10] confirmed that instrument could be developed from the literature and procreated from the

exploratory study. This paper adopted the instrument from the research result of the exploratory study by Kadang, Baharun, and Kohar [3]. The instruments:

a. Cultural Uniqueness

Based on previous study has indicated that cultural uniqueness referred to the distinctiveness, indigenous and local customs in each destination such Toraja heritage site especially the culture if we compare to other heritage site. Cultural uniqueness was a potential factor to encourage the tourists to visit a destination such Toraja heritage site and others destination. This factor consists of five (5) indicators such as: different from other destinations, have a magical attractiveness that triggers emotional feelings of tourists such awe or wonder or excitement or admiration, unique and natural, have an interesting and unique result of cultural civilization, have a ritual or habit that is unique and not possessed in other destinations [1].

b. Monuments

Novelli [11] indicated that monuments refer to a building or an area or a site or a megalith around the destination and interested to the public for its historical significance, or could be a great nature beauty, etc. Baharun *et al*, [1] specified that a monuments consists of five (5) indicators that become a measurement: uniqueness of buildings, uniqueness and beautiful delineation of destination, old status or park that provide a history of generations, a beautiful and wonderful of natural scenery that preserved by the community and government, and other things that become a symbol of the destination.

c. Experience Quality

Experience quality refers to all things that provide a value for beneficiary heritage tourist during the involvement in the activities around the destination [4]. According to Baharun *et al*. [1] that tourist faces the level quality of experiences based on the values of the activities or programs around the tourism area. The indicators of experience quality are be participated or be experienced in the tourism area, directly involved in the attractiveness and uniqueness of activities, feel surprised to be participated in the activities, feel enjoy and happy to involve in the activities or programs entire the sites.

d. Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction

The satisfaction of tourist refers to the result of comparison between expectation and experience quality of the visitor. The satisfaction of tourist appears when the expectation of destination is equal to the visit experiences and in vice versa [12]. The indicators of this factor are refined from seven (7) indicators by Kang and James [13] such as: the heritage site carried out services as visitors expected, satisfied to make decision for visiting the heritage site, have mixed feelings about the heritage site the decision to visit the heritage site was a wise decision, need to choose the heritage site for the next trip, visiting the heritage site has been a good experience, feel happy to visit the heritage site.

e. Promotion

Some of the most popular promotional activities are regional travel or visitor guide development, regional tourism website development, regional festival or event promotion, and others type of promotions [14]. Baharun *et al.* [3] formulated the indicators of promotion regarding heritage site based on the qualitative approach and the previous study of Dudensing *et al* [14] as follows: the heritage site offers a travel or visitor guide, the heritage site provide a tourism website development to blow up the adequate information, the heritage site collaborates with travel agencies or other agencies to offer tourism packages to visitors, the heritage site establishes a relationship with the mass-media to promote the destination, the heritage site delivers a festival or other activities for promotion requirement, the heritage site provides an adequate and comfortable accommodations around the destination, the heritage site provides brochures that include a destination map for tourist attractions.

f. Heritage Tourist's Revisit Intention

Heritage tourist's revisit intention refers to a willingness of the tourists to visit again the heritage site, recommended to the people to visit the heritage site [4]. Furthermore, Osti, Disegna, and Brida [15] and Thiumsak & Ruangkanjanases [7] specified the same indicators of heritage tourist revisit intention such the willingness to repeat visit and promise to recommend the destination to others. In relatedly, Baharun *et al.* [3] emerges the related indicator that participants provided in the qualitative study such as the heritage tourist willingness to revisit, their promise to recommend and some even said that although people accused the Toraja heritage site, they will revisit. Therefore, this paper propose three (3) indicators of heritage tourist's revisit intention such as willingness to repeat visit the heritage site in the future, promised to recommend to somebody to visit the heritage site, and even others accused of something regarding the heritage site, the tourist would make the same opportunity to visit again.

3. Method

This paper provides a pilot study to gather the data for testing the instrument of the factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention. Respondents of this pilot study are people near by the Makassar City who have visited cultural and natural destinations around Toraja, South Sulawesi Province of Indonesia that have been nominated as a world heritage sites in Southeast Countries. Around 60 respondents involved in this pilot study to be selected for testing the instrument. Screening data before the testing process was important to provide due to ensure that all of the items have been fulfilled by the respondents and tabulated in the worksheet of excel. The following process is the running data for testing the instrument through the exploratory factor analysis particularly the validity and reliability test.

4. Results

This paper enlightens to provide the assessed instruments of factors influencing heritage tourist revisit intention by using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Hair *et al.* [16] indicated that EFA is accurate for testing the instrument of variable that

appear from the exploratory study particularly how to categorise a valid items as measurement of the variable. Furthermore, a valid instrument indicates that all of the items of construct has a value of factor loading more than .40 and appear in the construct column [10],[16]. However, the valid instrument needs an advance testing of reliability test to clarify the consistency of the instrument for further implementation. The process of testing instrument by using EFA is starting with the justification of sample adequacy ratio where by the value is $\geq .500$ points of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and should be the significant value $\leq \alpha (.05)$ of Bartlett test[16]. This KMO and Bartlett test become a requirement for validity and reliability test.

4.1 Validity Test

Table 1 displayed that KMO measure of sampling adequacy ratio was .513 and Bartlett test is significant by .000 which indicated that the sampling adequacy was required to apply for this factor analysis. Meanwhile, factor loading analysis results indicated that all of items in the constructs column based on the rotated component matrix. However, there were two items did not required such as Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 3 (Hts3) and Promotion 5 (Pro5). For more details, item Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 3 (Hts3) and Promotion 5 (Pro5) did not performed in the column construct due to the ineligible value or less than .40 point (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010)[16]. Subsequently, in order to perform the repair instrument then these two items must be drop out and provided a second validity test.

Table 1. Results of KMO and Bartlett's Test and Rotated Component Matrix before Dropped Out the Invalid Items

KMO and Bartlett's Test							
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy by 0.513							
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity by significant value of 0.000							
Rotated Component Matrix ^a							
	Component						Statement
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Cultural uniqueness 1 (Cu1)				0.712			Required
Cultural uniqueness 2 (Cu2)				0.876			Required
Cultural uniqueness 3 (Cu3)				0.710			Required
Cultural uniqueness 4 (Cu4)				0.773			Required
Cultural uniqueness 5 (Cu5)				0.763			Required
Monuments 1 (Mon1)		0.857					Required
Monuments 2 (Mon2)		0.772					Required
Monuments 3 (Mon3)		0.797					Required
Monuments 4 (Mon4)		0.708					Required
Monuments 5 (Mon5)		0.751					Required
Experience Quality 1 (Eq1)					0.844		Required
Experience Quality 2 (Eq2)					0.808		Required
Experience Quality 3 (Eq3)					0.705		Required
Experience Quality 4 (Eq4)					0.877		Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 1 (Hts1)			0.697				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 2 (Hts2)			0.874				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 3 (Hts3)			0.789				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 4 (Hts4)			0.694				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 5 (Hts5)							Not required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 6 (Hts6)			0.554				Required

Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 7 (Hts7)	0.672	Required
Promotion 1 (Pro1)	0.777	Required
Promotion 2 (Pro2)	0.877	Required
Promotion 3 (Pro3)		Not required
Promotion 4 (Pro4)	0.590	Required
Promotion 5 (Pro5)	0.783	Required
Promotion 6 (Pro6)	0.544	Required
Promotion 7 (Pro7)	0.865	Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 1 (Hts1)		0.890 Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 2 (Hts2)		0.899 Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 3 (Hts3)		0.871 Required

Source: Output of Data Analysis

Table 1 specifies that one item of heritage tourist's satisfaction was ineligible because the value of factor loading did not appeared in the column construct. The following part is conducted for the second validity testing to provide the valid items of each construct before reliability test. Meanwhile, Table 2 showed the result of KMO test by 0.541 that has increased than the first test of 0.513 and Bartlett test was in the significant level of 0.000. This result indicated that the sampling adequacy ratio was required to perform further testing instrument.

Table 2. Results of KMO and Bartlett's Test and Rotated Component Matrix after Dropped Out the Invalid Items

KMO and Bartlett's Test							
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy by 0.541							
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity by significant value of 0.000							
Rotated Component Matrix ^a							
Items	Component						Statement
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Cultural Uniqueness 1 (Cu1)				0.713			Required
Cultural Uniqueness 2 (Cu2)				0.875			Required
Cultural uniqueness 3 (Cu3)				0.700			Required
Cultural uniqueness 4 (Cu4)				0.775			Required
Cultural uniqueness 5 (Cu5)				0.763			Required
Experience Quality 1 (Eq1)					0.851		Required
Experience Quality 2 (Eq2)					0.814		Required
Experience Quality 3 (Eq3)					0.718		Required
Experience Quality 4 (Eq4)					0.875		Required
Monuments 1 (Mon1)		0.850					Required
Monuments 2 (Mon2)		0.776					Required
Monuments 3 (Mon3)		0.797					Required
Monuments 4 (Mon4)		0.706					Required
Monuments 5 (Mon5)		0.756					Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 1 (Hts1)			0.708				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 2 (Hts2)			0.857				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 3 (Hts3)			0.765				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 4 (Hts4)			0.720				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 6 (Hts6)			0.544				Required
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction 7 (Hts7)			0.670				Required
Promotion 1 (Pro1)	0.773						Required
Promotion 2 (Pro2)	0.892						Required
Promotion 4 (Pro4)	0.613						Required
Promotion 5 (Pro5)	0.785						Required
Promotion 6 (Pro6)	0.520						Required
Promotion 7 (Pro7)	0.875						Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 1 (Htbi1)					0.894		Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 2 (Htbi2)					0.908		Required
Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention 3 (Htbi3)					0.866		Required

Source: Output of Data Analysis

In additional, Table 2 illustrates the result of validity testing after dropped two of ineligible items. The effort to erase the unentitled items affects the Rotated Component Matrix result where the values of all items were required by more than .40. This result indicated that this instrument already perform to employ in the real research. However, Hair *et al* [16] specified that the valid instrument needs to provide a reliability testing for clarifying the consistency of the instrument. The following section assessments the reliability test result.

4.2 Reliability Test

Table 3 shows the result of reliability testing to perform the Cronbach's Alpha value as requirement of the internal consistent of instrument [16]. Further, the required of Cronbach's alpha value was 0.7 for a good reliability even 0.6 value was still available for behavioural studies or exploratory study result. This paper identified the result of the entire reliability test of all constructs. All of the Cronbach's Alpha values presence scores more than .700 as Hair *et al.* [16] required being a reliable instrument.

Table 3. Reliability Test Result

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha Value
Cultural Uniqueness	.846
Monuments	.851
Experience Quality	.857
Heritage Tourist's Satisfaction	.834
Promotion	.853
Heritage Tourist's Revisit Intention	.912

The reliability testing result justifies the instrument was prepared to apply in the real data collection because of the entire of Cronbach's alpha score were more than 0.700. This result indicated that all of the factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention were eligible to apply for further investigation particularly the relationship between factors.

5. Conclusion

This paper delivered five of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention and about twenty six items as an instrument. For instant, cultural uniqueness consists of five items, monument consists of five items, experience quality has four items, satisfaction includes six items and promotion is measured by six items. This paper has been provided a valid and reliable instrument of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention. All of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention have been specialised through EFA to perform the items as a valid measurement. Meanwhile, the reliability test has been clarified the reliable instrument of factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention.

6. Recommendation

This paper only provides five of nine factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention and the other factors are the potential topic for further discussion. Perhaps this valid and reliable instrument could be specified with other method to settle before applying or could be also to combine all of the factors influencing heritage tourist's revisit intention for other challenging discussion.

References

- [1] Baharun, R., Kohar, H. U. A., & Kadang, H. (2018). A Cross-case Analysis Approach on Heritage Tourist's Behavioural Intention to Revisit : Toraja Context .
- [2] Patriatno, H. (2018). Kunjungan Wisatawan di Torut Meningkatkan Tiap Tahun. 2015–2017.
- [3] Kadang, H., Baharun, R., & Abdul Kohar, U. H. (2017). A Conceptual Review on Behavioural Intention to Revisit of Heritage Tourist. *Research Journal of Commerce & Behavioural Science*, 7(1).
- [4] Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29–35.
- [5] Canny, I., & Hidayat, N. (2012). The Influence of Service Quality and Tourist Satisfaction on Future Behavioral Intentions : The Case Study of Borobudur Temple as a UNESCO World Culture Heritage Destination. 89–97. <https://doi.org/10.7763/IPEDR>.
- [6] Mat Som, A. P., Marzuki, A., Yousefi, M., & AbuKhalifeh, A. N. (2012). Factors Influencing Visitors' Revisit Behavioral Intentions: A Case Study of Sabah, Malaysia. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v4n4p39>
- [7] Thiumsak, T., & Ruangkanjanases, A. (2016). Factors Influencing International Visitors to Revisit Bangkok, Thailand. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.7763/JOEBM.2016.V4.394>
- [8] Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* (Fourth Ed).
- [9] Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business research methods*. McGraw-Hill / Irwin.
- [10] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design_ Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. Sage Publications, Inc. California.
- [11] Novelli, M. (2005). *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends and Cases*. Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- [12] Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2006). *Marketing Management*. Pearson Princtice Hall, New Jersey.
- [13] Kang, G.-D., & James, J. (2004). Service quality dimensions: an examination of Grönroos's service quality model. *Managing Service Quality*, 14(4), 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604520410546806>
- [14] Dudensing, R. M., Hughes, D. W., & Shields, M. (2011). Perceptions of tourism promotion and business challenges: A survey-based comparison of tourism businesses and promotion organizations. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1453–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.10.008>
- [15] Osti, L., Disegna, M., & Brida, J. G. (2016). Repeat visits and intentions to revisit a sporting event and its nearby destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 18(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766711428803>
- [16] Hair, J. F. J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Seventh Ed). Pearson Prentice Hall.