Assessing Actual Visit Behavior through Antecedents of Tourists Satisfaction among International Tourists in Jordan: A Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Approach
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Jordan tourism industry is facing fluctuating tourist visit provoked by dissatisfaction, high visit risk, low hotel service, or negative Jordan image. This study aims to examine the relationships between the antecedents of tourist satisfaction and actual visit behavior in tourism of Jordan, and the mediating effect of tourist satisfaction (SAT) in the relationship between Jordan image (JOM), service climate (SER) and actual visit behavior (ACT). A total of 850 international tourists completed a survey that were conducted at southern sites in Jordan. Using structural equation modeling (SEM) technique, confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed to examine the reliability and validity of the measurement, and the structural equation modeling techniques (Amos 6.0) were used to evaluate the casual model. Results of the study demonstrate the strong predictive power and explain of international tourists’ behavior in Jordan. The findings highlighted that the relationship between Jordan image and service climate are significant and positive on actual visit behavior.
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Industri pariwisata Jordania menghadapi jumlah kunjungan turis yang naik turun yang disebabkan oleh ketidakpuasan, resiko kunjungan yang tinggi, rendahnya kualitas pelayanan hotel, atau pencitraan Jordan yang negatif. Studi ini bertujuan untuk mempelajari hubungan antara hal-hal yang menentukan kepuasan (SAT) turis Jordan dan perilaku kunjungan mereka yang sebenarnya (actual visit behavior- ACT), serta menguji efek mediasi kepuasan (SAT) pada hubungan pencitraan Jordan (Jordan Image-JOM) dengan iklim pelayanan (service climate-SER) dan actual visit behavior (ACT). Survei dilakukan terhadap 850 turis manca negara yang dilakukan di daerah selatan Jordan. Teknik structural equation modeling (SEM), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) digunakan untuk menguji reliabilitas dan validitas pengukuran. Structural equation modeling techniques (Amos 6.0) digunakan untuk menguji model kausal. Hasil studi ini memperlihatkan adanya kekuatan prediksi dan menjelaskan perilaku turis manca negara di Jordan. Temuan juga memperjelas bahwa terdapat hubungan yang positif dan signifikan antara JOM dan ACT, serta SER dan ACT.

Introduction

It is recognized that tourism contributes to local economic growth, through the services were provided by employees in Hotels (Woodhall, 1987). Research is needed in the Jordanian travel and tourist situations as agents and law-makers face many problems such as the actual visit behavior, tourists' satisfaction and decrease in the number of international tourists (Hamid, 2007). The decrease in the number of international tourists in Jordan for the year 2006 recorded 6,712,804 and declined gradually to 5,413,919 in year 2009 (MoTA, 2010). Therefore, Jordan
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tourism has been facing the problem of not getting the expected number of international tourists despite extensive marketing efforts from MoTA. However, the factors that effect on actual visit behavior could be improved for increasing the chance of tourist's behavior towards Jordan, that is a complex decision and it involves many interrelated factors (such as tourist's satisfaction, image, service climate, perceived risk, and so on). Thus, predicting behavior of tourists remains an important aspect in the international tourism market. In order to achieve the objectives of the present research, the researcher believes that there are a good number of important related relationships that should be discussed with actual behavior as shown in the following section.

Literature Review

Actual visit behavior

Tourists are considered as the principal factor of the tourism industry. It is important to know more information about international tourist behavior, and what they expect during their travels out of their countries (Cook, Yale, and Marqua, 1999). Therefore, tourist behavior is the act through which the tourists make purchasing decisions (Boone & Kurtz, 1998). In this study, the definition by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) is used as the operational definition. This is based on many previous studies (Shih & Fang, 2004; Raman, Stephanus, Alam and Kuppusamy, 2008; Kotler & Armstrong, 2009). Therefore, this study focuses on understanding tourist visit behavior regarding a visit to Jordan among international tourists. In this study the researcher defines the actual visit behavior as a tourist's willingness to visit a certain destination.

Research Framework

The framework of the study addresses independent variables that include: antecedents of tourists' satisfaction (Jordan image, perceived risk and service climate. Furthermore, the framework also selects tourist satisfaction as a mediating factor and actual visit behavior as dependent variable. Moreover, the importance of adopting this new model lies in the ability to examine the effect of Jordan image, service climate provided by hotels, tourist satisfaction, the level of perceived risk and antecedents of revisit intention and actual visit behavior.

Exogenous construct or variable that "acts only as a predictor or (cause) for other constructs or variables in the model" (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson and Tatham, 2006, p. 580), and endogenous construct or variable that is dependent or outcome variable in at least one causal relationship (Hair et al., 2006, p. 580).

Hypothesis Development

This section discusses how actual visit behavior is related to its predictors; antecedents of tourist satisfaction (Jordan image, perceived risk and service climate) and how these antecedent variables are associated with belief constructs. Next sections discuss definitions of constructs and hypotheses of this study as following.

Jordan image and satisfaction

Jordan image define as the visitors’ perceptions about Jordan as the host nation for the festivals and as a tourist destination (Schneider and Sonmez, 1999). The researcher defines the ‘Jordan image’ as tourists' beliefs, ideas, and impressions that tourists have of Jordan as a destination. However, Jordan image have a significant direct impact on satisfaction (Bigne, Sanchez and Sanchez, 2001; Ryu, Han and Kim, 2007; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Xia, Jie, Chaolin and Feng, 2009). In contrast, there are few studies focused in the relationship between country image and satisfaction (Ryu et al, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008; Xia et al, 2009). Additionally, there are limited studies that have been conducted in Middle East in general and in Jordanian tourism settings in particular, Thus, the first hypothesis formulated is:

H1: Jordan Image is related positively with tourist satisfaction

Perceived risk and satisfaction

Perceived risk is defined as the fear of any terrorist attack, disease or infection, political
or social problems during the trip (Gallarza & Saura, 2006). Furthermore, the researcher defines perceived risk as tourist's perceptions of uncertainty and damage as expected for their destination. Perceived risk and tourist's satisfaction are important components in tourism industry whether at the international or regional arena. However, the main issue to study this linkage, there are few studies that examined the relationship between perceived risk and tourist satisfaction in tourism settings (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2007). Similarly, there are limited studies in Jordanian tourism settings. Empirical findings for this relationship suggest equivocal and inconsistency results (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2007; Amoroso and Hunsinger, 2008; Quintal, Lee and Soutar, 2009). In contrast, study by Udo, Bagchi and Kirs (2008) found that there is an insignificant negative relationship. Hence, the second hypothesis formulated is:

\[ H_2: \text{Perceived risk is related negatively with tourist satisfaction.} \]

Service climate and satisfaction

Service climate define by Martin, Kennedy and Stocks (2006) as the degree to which customers feel that an organization has a great interest in their needs and desires. Therefore, the researcher suggests defining service climate as an activity or achievement or benefits provided by a party (employee) to another party (tourist). the main reason for studying this linkage is the fact that there are inconsistent results, some of these studies have found a positive and significant impact (Andreassen & Lindestad, 1998; Choi & Chu, 2000; Solnet, 2006; Um et al., 2006; Little & Dean, 2006; Yoo & Park, 2007; Udo et al., 2008; Rodriguez et al., 2009) while some studies found that there was a insignificant relationship (Alhroot, 2007). Additionally, there are many past studies that were conducted in different tourism settings, while few studies were conducted in Jordanian tourism settings (Alhroot, 2007). Furthermore, this study includes service climate as another important predictor for tourist satisfaction. Hence, the third hypothesis formulated is:

\[ H_3: \text{Service climate is related positively with tourist satisfaction.} \]

Jordan image and actual visit behavior

Previous studies asserted that there are influence between destination’s image and future behavior of tourists (Ashworth & Goodall, 1998; Bigne et al., 2001; Chen & Gursoy, 2001). Therefore, the past experiences of the tourist will create image about the destination. Limited studies examined the relationship between image and actual visit behavior, one of these studies by Castro, Armarrio and Ruiz (2007), found that there is a significant direct impact between image and future behavior. Thus, the four hypothesis formulated is:

\[ H_4: \text{Jordan Image is related positively with actual visit behavior} \]

Service climate and actual visit behavior

Most of previous studies on tourist loyalty come from studies of tourist's behavior in service settings (Riley, Niininen, Szivas and Willis, 2001). Few studies found that there is a significant relationship between service quality and actual behavior (Bigne et al., 2001; Lin, 2008). Additionally, Choi, Liu, Pang and Chow (2008; Divisekera, 2009) point out that there is important relationship between goods, services and consumption behavior. Thus, the hypothesis formulated is:

\[ H_5: \text{Service climate is related positively with actual visit behavior} \]

Tourist satisfaction and actual visit behavior

Satisfaction felt by the consumer through the match or mismatch between expectations and performance of the services that are provided by the organization (Chitty, Ward and Chua, 2007). Additionally, the researcher defines the tourist satisfaction as the degree to which tourists feel their needs and desires are met at the same time they needed a service or any help at tourist sites. However, there are few studies that examined the actual behavior of visitors such as (Castro et al, 2007; Ryu et al, 2007; Um, Chon, and Ro, 2006; Valle, Silva, Mendes, and Guariento, 2006; Hong, Lee, Lee, and Jang, 2009). Furthermore, but there is not much research has been done to
examine the path between satisfaction and actual behavior in Jordan. Alhroot (2007) conducted a study in Jordan and found out that, tourists were dissatisfied with the services provided by Jordanian hotels by employees. Thus, the hypothesis formulated is:

**H6:** Tourist Satisfaction related positively with Actual Visit Behavior.

**Mediating effect of tourist satisfaction**

Baron and Kenny (1986, p. 1) define the mediator as "the mediating function of a third variable, which represents the generative mechanism through which the focal independent variable is able to influence the dependent variable of interest". In this study in order to test for mediation, structural equation models (SEM) using AMOS 6.0 were developed and a comparison done between indirect effects and direct effects. Customer satisfaction is confirmed as a mediator in the relationship between automated service quality and financial performance (Al-Hawari and Ward, 2006). However, customer satisfaction does play a mediating role in the relationship between service quality and service loyalty (Caruana and Malta, 2002). A study conducted by Ryu et al. (2007) found that the customer satisfaction is a partial mediator in the relationship between restaurant image, perceived value and behavior intention. In addition, Olorunniwo, Hsu, and Udo (2006) examine the mediating effect of satisfaction in the relationship between service quality and behavior intention, results showed that satisfaction played a mediating role. In contrast, another study conducted by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) examine the mediating effect of satisfaction in the relationship between perceived justice and word-of-mouth (WOM) intent. This study showed that satisfaction does not mediate. Thus, there is a lack in previous studies of mediating effects in the service industry; as discussed above there are a few studies on the mediating effect of intention and satisfaction. In contrast, there are many studies that have a direct relationship on actual behavior. This study focused on reducing the gap of these previous studies in the service industry. Thus, the hypotheses formulated are:

**H7:** Tourist Satisfaction mediates the relationship between Jordan Image and Actual Visit Behavior.

**H8:** Tourist Satisfaction mediates the relationship between Service Climate and Actual Visit Behavior.

**Methodology**

This study chose a systematic random sample in which 850 respondents were identified from 55 hotels in the southern region of Jordan. The sampling frame for this study consisted of international tourists, who stayed in hotels during their visit to Jordan in the period from December 20, 2008 and until March 20, 2009. Out of 850 questionnaires distributed, 200 were undelivered, and 146 questionnaires were incomplete (missing responses). However, The 504 dataset were coded and saved into SPSS version 14.0 during the process of data screening for outliers. Outlier results show that there were 10 dataset were deleted due to Z-score value more than +3 or less than -3 (Coakes & Steed, 2003). Thus, a total of 494 responses were usable and used for subsequent analysis, giving a response rate of 58 %.

Many studies has been used SERVQUAL to measure service quality in the marketing field (Wang et al. 2004; Iglesias & Guillem, 2004; Aydin & Ozer, 2005; Ismail et al, 2006; Yoo & Park, 2007). However, in 1992, Cronin and Taylor suggested that SERVQUAL is not suitable to examine service quality and developed SERVPERF as best to examine service climate or quality. The main difference between SERVPERF and SERVQUAL is that SERVPERF was not focused on customers' expectation. Initially, Cronin and Taylor (1992) concluded that it was not necessary to measure customers' expectation in service quality research. Given that, there is an alternative method of operationalizing perceived service quality, to reexamine service quality based on new method called SERVPERF instrument, this instrument focused on performance perceptions of services (Cronin and Taylor, 1992)

The questionnaire is divided into five parts: (1) demographic variables (12 items); (2) Jordan image (11 items) adapted by Schneider and
Sonmez (1999), (3) perceived risk (7 items) by Gallarza and Saura (2006), (4) service climate (10 items) by Schneider et al., 1998; Martin et al., 2006), (5) tourist satisfaction (10 items) by (Olorunniwo et al, 2006; chitty et al, 2007), and (6) actual visit behavior (5 items) by Shih and Fang (2004) and Raman et al (2008).

Result and Discussion

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The summaries of respondents demographic characteristics, the respondents’ ages ranged from 20 to more than 50 years old. About (66.6%) were male while (33.4%) were female. The majorities were married (64.4%), and 26.7% are singles. The tourists came from the European countries (37.9%), followed by Africa (25.7%), Asia (17.6%), Australia (3.4%), and Russia (0.8%). Most of the respondents (39.7%) have been working in public sector, whilst 21.9% work in private sectors. The majority of income level is less than 1000 USD. Most tourists spent less than USD100 (63.6%), followed by between USD101 to 200 (32.6%) and more than USD 200 (3.8%). The main reason for visiting Jordan is for relaxation (68.2%), medical treatment (11.3%), and others (20.5%). Most of them stayed in hotels (53.2 %) within the duration period between 2 to 10 days (84.2 %). Most of tourists they came to Jordan via air (50.6%), sea (26.1) and land route (23.3%), either by using tourists’ coaches (25.7%), rental car (25.1%), taxi (20.6%), public transportation (10.7%) and others (17.8%).

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Descriptive analysis was conducted in subsequent to the validity and reliability processes to ascertain the main score and standard deviation for the constructs. However, the researcher used seven-point Likert scales for measuring all variables in this study, based on 494 valid cases being analyzed of mean and standard deviation for all the variables. Jordan image is represented by 11 items. Apparently, as shown in Table 1 the mean scores of them are considered very high (6.23). In addition, the results in Table 1 shows that the perceived risk is relatively moderate with mean score (3.70), respondents given more attention to relationship between perceived risk and tourist satisfaction. Mean score for service climate (4.89), and the mean score of tourist satisfaction (6.18) is higher. Finally, mean score for Actual Visit Behavior (5.33).

Reliability Test and normality

The research framework consists of three exogenous (Jordan image, perceived risk, and service climate), mediating effect of (tourist satisfaction) and one endogenous variable (Actual Visit Behavior) as shown in Table 1. Each construct shows Cronbach alpha readings of acceptable values of above 0.60 (Nunnally, 1970). Reliability values for all constructs are range from .64 to .88. This indices that all constructs have internal consistency acceptable. In addition, 21 items remaining after confirmatory factor analysis CFA. However, some of construct have high skewness values. Therefore, normality was detected by using critical ratio (c.r) of skewness (Hair et al., 2006). Those that are above +/-3 were transforming using Cdfnorm function in SPSS resulting in new variable name with (T) as shown in Table 1.4 (Coakes & Steed, 2003). Another test is the composite reliability of each measure was developed by Werts et al (1974), measures the reliability of a construct in the measurement model. (see Table 1). This was assessed using Nunnally (1970) guideline for assessing reliability coefficients.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variables

| Construct             | Original Items | Total Mean | Standard Deviation | Items after CFA | Cronbach Alpha after CFA | Composite Reliability |
|-----------------------|----------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Jordan Image          | 11             | 6.23       | .532               | 5               | .85                      | .87                   |
| Perceived Risk        | 7              | 3.70       | 1.708              | 4               | .90                      | .88                   |
| Service Climate       | 10             | 4.89       | .798               | 4               | .74                      | .64                   |
| Tourist Satisfaction  | 10             | 6.18       | .616               | 4               | .82                      | .87                   |
| Actual Visit Behavior | 5              | 5.33       | .772               | 4               | .61                      | .74                   |
| Total                 | 43             | 5.33       | .772               | 21              |                          |                       |
The second test is the composite reliability of each measure (see Table 1). This was assessed using Nunnally (1970) guideline for assessing reliability coefficients. Composite reliability developed by Werts et al (1974), measures the reliability of a construct in the measurement model. The summary of the composite reliability based on the standardized factor loadings obtained from the final revised structural model, all construct are have acceptable value above 0.60 (Nunnally, 1970). In addition, a composite reliability index that exceeds 0.70 indicates satisfactory internal consistency (Hair et al., 1998). Composite reliability results, indicates that all the measurement observed variables can be considered as reliable and acceptable, most of the constructs have value more than .86, this results providing strong support for the construct components.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results**

Table 2 show that the confirmatory factor analysis results, we observed that the factor loadings of all observed variables or items are adequate ranging from 0.50 to 0.98. This indicates that all the constructs conform to the construct validity test as suggested by (Hair et al. 2006). As shown in Table 2, the remaining numbers of items for each construct are as follows: Jordan image (5 items), Perceived risk (4 items), service climate (4 items), and tourist satisfaction (4 items), and actual visit behavior (4 items), the total of items are 21.

**Discriminant Validity of Constructs**

Discriminant validity is another major type of construct validity, refers to observed of constructs that should not be related to each other. However, observed to not be related to each other (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). It represents the degree to which items differentiate among constructs or measure distinct concepts. Discriminant validity is assessed by examining the correlations between the observed of potentially overlapping constructs. Observed should be load more strongly on their own construct but not load on other constructs. Table 3 shows the result of the calculated variance extracted (VE) to support discriminant validity of constructs. Average variance extracted (AVE) is the average VE values of two constructs (Table 4).

To substantiate discriminant validity, average extracted (AVE) is compared to correlation square of the interrelated variables of concerned (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). However, Gaski (1984) recommended for assessing discriminant validity in data analysis to increase the validity.
The difference between table 4 and table 5 are table 4 shows the variance between tow variable and table 5 confirm that the correlation must less than 0.8 (Hair et al., 2006). Both of tables confirm that there is no multicollinearity between exogenous variables.

### Goodness of Fit Indices

As showed in Table 2 confirmatory factor analysis was tested on every construct and measurement models. Bagozzi and Yi (1988) pointed out that the measurement model has a good fit with the data based on assessment criteria such as GFI, CFI, TLI, and RMSEA. Table 6 shows that the goodness of fit of generated model is better compared to the hypothesized model. However, Hair et al (2006) point out that All CFAs of constructs produced a relatively good fit an indicated by the goodness of fit indices such as CMIN/DF ratio (< 2); goodness of fit Index (GFI) of (> 0.90); P-value (> 0.05); and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of values less than 0.08.

| Variable Name | Jordan Image | Risk | Service Climate |
|---------------|--------------|------|-----------------|
| Jordan Image  | 1            | .80  |                 |
| Risk          |              |      |                 |
| Service Climate | .66          | .66  | 1               |

Table 6. Goodness of fit analysis-confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (N =494)

| Variables | Jordan Image | Risk | Service Climate | Tourist Satisfaction | Endogenous: Actual Visit Behavior | Hypothesized Model | Generating Model |
|-----------|---------------|------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Items Remain | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 3.085 | 19.187 | 17129.865 | 30.790 |
| CMIN    | 10.135 | 6.044 | 12.553 | 48.033 | 3.085 | 19.187 | 17129.865 | 30.790 |
| DF      | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 851 | 26 | \ | 
| CMIN/DF | 2.027 | 3.022 | 6.276 | 1.172 | 1.542 | 9.594 | 20.129 | 1.184 |
| P-value | .072 | .049 | .002 | .209 | .214 | .000 | .000 | .236 |
| GFI     | 0.992 | 0.994 | 0.987 | 0.983 | 0.997 | 0.982 | 0.654 | 0.988 |
| CFI     | 0.995 | 0.998 | 0.990 | 0.999 | 0.998 | 0.931 | 0.426 | 0.996 |
| TLI     | 0.990 | 0.995 | 0.971 | 0.998 | 0.995 | 0.974 | 0.390 | 0.993 |
| NFI     | 0.990 | 0.998 | 0.988 | 0.991 | 0.996 | 0.925 | 0.414 | 0.976 |
| RMSEA   | .046 | .064 | .1103 | .019 | .033 | .132 | .197 | .019 |

The difference between table 4 and table 5 are table 4 shows the variance between tow variable and table 5 confirm that the correlation must less than 0.8 (Hair et al., 2006). Both of tables confirm that there is no multicollinearity between exogenous variables.

### Goodness of Fit Indices

As showed in Table 2 confirmatory factor analysis was tested on every construct and measurement models. Bagozzi and Yi (1988) pointed out that the measurement model has a good fit with the data based on assessment criteria such as GFI, CFI, TLI, and RMSEA. Table 6 shows that the goodness of fit of generated model is better compared to the hypothesized model. However, Hair et al (2006) point out that All CFAs of constructs produced a relatively good fit an indicated by the goodness of fit indices such as CMIN/DF ratio (< 2); goodness of fit Index (GFI) of (> 0.90); P-value (> 0.05); and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of values less than 0.08.

### Table 3. Variance extracted of variables

| Observed Variables | SMC | SMC Measurement Error | Variance Extracted |
|--------------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------|
| JOM5               | .67 | .45                    | .11                |
| JOM8               | .44 | .19                    | .06                |
| Jordan image (total) | 1.11 | .64                    | .17                |
| TRISK 1            | .47 | .22                    | .07                |
| TRISK 6            | .70 | .49                    | .11                |
| Perceived Risk (total) | .117 | .71                    | .18                |
| TSER2              | .46 | .21                    | .07                |
| SERV 8             | .59 | .35                    | .52                |
| Service Climate (total) | 1.04 | .56                    | .59                |
| TSAT 8             | .60 | .36                    | .09                |
| TSAT 9             | .61 | .37                    | .09                |
| Tourist Satisfaction (total) | 1.21 | .73                    | .18                |
| ACT 2              | .36 | .13                    | .13                |
| ACT 4              | .36 | .13                    | .12                |
| Actual Visit Behavior (total) | .72 | .26                    | .25                |
Hypotheses Results

As shown in Figure 1 hypothesized model did not achieve model fit (p<.000), hence, the explanation of hypotheses result is based on Generating Model (GM). the researcher choose GM after deleted the weak items and removed them from hypothesis model, GM become more clear and stronger for hypothesis result. (Table 7 and Figure 3). Based on the finding, according to Table 7 found that there are four hypotheses significant through C.R. values and acceptable because it is above than +/-1.96 C.R (H1, H4, H5 and H6). In contrast there are two hypotheses (H2 and H3) did not have significant direct effects (critical ratio (CR) <-1.96; p>.05).this results shows that the Jordan image, service climate and tourist satisfaction are an important factors for actual visit behavior from tourists perceptions, these factors add to the marketing and tourism a big contribution in Middle East in general and Jordan specifically. Furthermore, tourists when plan to visit Jordan will collect more information of these factors before decision to visit.

Mediating Effect Analysis of Generating Model (GM)

A mediating effect is created when a third variable/construct intervenes between two other related constructs. Regarding to Generating Model (GM) there is no mediating effect of tourist satisfaction, as show in Table 8, we tested the mediating effects of tourist satisfaction in the relationship between (Jordan image and service climate) and actual visit behavior.

Table 8 shows the indirect effect estimates to test the mediating effects of tourist satisfaction on each hypothesized paths. Researcher found that tourist satisfaction does not mediating effect in the relationship between Jordan image, service climate and actual visit behavior (H7

| Hypothesis | Regression Weights | Estimate | SE | C.R | P | Hypothesis support |
|------------|-------------------|---------|----|-----|---|-------------------|
| H1 JOM SAT | .633 | .115 | 4.800 | *** | Yes |
| H2 RISK SAT | -.064 | .100 | -5.60 | .575 | NO |
| H3 SER SAT | .012 | .028 | .199 | .842 | NO |
| H4 JOM ACT | .337 | .247 | 3.670 | *** | YES |
| H5 SER ACT | .230 | .108 | 2.995 | .003 | YES |
| H6 SAT ACT | .387 | .285 | 4.184 | *** | YES |

Figure 1. Hypothesized Models (SC)
and H8), as shown in Table 8 whereby direct effect is more than indirect effect. According to many researchers if indirect effect less than direct effect, and also if more than relationship not significant that means not mediate effect (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Byrne, 2001). This result is supported by Maxham and Netemeyer (2002) who examined satisfaction as the mediating, results of their study asserted that the satisfaction does not have mediating effect.

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 9 indicate that the three exogenous variables (Jordan image, perceived risk and service climate), jointly explained 34.8% variance in tourist satisfaction and tourist satisfaction explained 54.0% variance in actual visit behavior.

**Overall Comparison between structural models**

As showed earlier, results revealed that the hypothesized model does not achieve model fit (p value=.000, p <.001). This indicates that hypothesized model was not supported.

Even though hypothesized model produced four significant direct impact, it could not be generalized due to non-achievement of p-value (p<.05). Table 10 shows that hypothesized model supports four significant direct impacts. Similar, Generating Model (GM) achieved fit model, and supported also four direct impacts. Conversely, the path from perceived risk and service climate to tourist satisfaction is consistently insignificant in hypothesized model and Generating Model (GM).

Among the structural models, Generating Model (GM) achieved the higher square multiple correlation (SMC). Table 11 shows that the Generating Model (GM) explains 34.8 % variance in tourist satisfaction and explains 54.0% variance in actual visit behavior. Conversely, the hypothesis model explains 30.5 % variance in tourist satisfaction and explains 40.4% variance in actual visit behavior.

As mentioned earlier, the results of this study attempts to examine the goodness of fit of the hypothesized structural model by integrating Jordan image, perceived risk and service climate.
climate. As showed in Figure 1 and Table 7, the hypothesized model does not achieve model fit (p-value=0.000, p<0.001). This implies that hypothesized model is not supported. However, the Generating Model (GM) accomplished model fits and supports four (4) direct effects.

From Jordan image was found to have a direct significant impact on tourist satisfaction, past studies have obtained similar result (Andreassen and Lindestad, 1998; Bigne et al, 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008; Xia et al, 2009) Thus, a positive relationship between Jordan image and tourist satisfaction means that the tourists have positive satisfied towards visit Jordan in future. Furthermore, image of Jordan considered very important for tourists to visit Jordan, if tourists have positive image about Jordan that will be satisfied and become one of visitors in future.

Third, a significant and positive relationship between service climate and actual visit behavior, this result supported by previous studies (Bigne, 2001; Raman et al, 2008; Lin, 2009), this mean that the services very important of tourists behavior and positive service will lead to actual visit to Jordan. Fourth, tourist satisfaction was found to have a significant and positive impact on actual visit behavior. (Nyer, 1998; Allard & Van Riel, 2004) have found similar finding. This could imply that if tourist satisfied with services that provided by hotels' employees that will lead to actual visit to Jordan.

In contrast, there are two insignificant direct effects. Firstly, perceived risk have a direct negative effect on tourist satisfaction, past studies have obtained similar result (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2007; Celik, 2008; Amoroso & Hunsinger, 2008; Udo et al, 2008; Quintal et al, 2009; Wong & Yeh, 2009). The negative relationship between perceived risk and tourist satisfaction means that the risk not much important for tourists when they plan to visit Jordan, because most of them have one chance to visit religions sites in Jordan, specially a Christiania people. In addition, Table 2 shows that the perceived risk has mean score (3.70), respondents given more

Table 10. Comparison between Hypothesized Model and Generating Model (M)

| Hypothesis | From | Mediation | To |
|------------|------|-----------|----|
| H1         | JOM  | SAT       |    |
| H2         | RISK | SAT       |    |
| H3         | SER  | SAT       |    |
| H4         | JOM  | ACT       |    |
| H5         | SER  | ACT       |    |
| H6         | SAT  | ACT       |    |
| H7         | JOM  | SAT ACT   |    |
| H8         | SER  | SAT ACT   |    |

| Hypothesis model | Generating Model (GM) |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Estimate | P | Hypothesis | Estimate | P |
| Asserted | Asserted |

| Hypothesis | From | Mediation | To |
|------------|------|-----------|----|
| H1         | JOM  | SAT       | ACT |
| H2         | RISK | SAT       |    |
| H3         | SER  | SAT       |    |
| H4         | JOM  | ACT       |    |
| H5         | SER  | ACT       |    |
| H6         | SAT  | ACT       |    |
| H7         | JOM  | SAT ACT   | ACT |
| H8         | SER  | SAT ACT   | ACT |

| Hypothesis | From | Mediation | To |
|------------|------|-----------|----|
| H1         | JOM  | SAT       | ACT |
| H2         | RISK | SAT       |    |
| H3         | SER  | SAT       |    |
| H4         | JOM  | ACT       |    |
| H5         | SER  | ACT       |    |
| H6         | SAT  | ACT       |    |
| H7         | JOM  | SAT ACT   | ACT |
| H8         | SER  | SAT ACT   | ACT |

Table 11. Comparison between Hypothesized Model and Generating Model (GM)

| Goodness-of-fit | Hypothesized Model | Generating Model (GM) |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| CMIN            | 17129.865          | 30.790                |
| CMIN change     | 26                 | 26                    |
| Df              | 851                | 825                   |
| Df change       | 20.129             | 1.184                 |
| GFI             | 0.654              | 0.988                 |
| RMSEA           | 0.197              | 0.996                 |
| TLI             | 0.426              | 0.993                 |
| CFI             | 0.390              | 0.976                 |
| P-value         | 0.000              | 0.019                 |
| SMC (R²)        | 0.305              | 0.348                 |
| Actual Visit Behavior | 0.404 | 0.540 |
attention to relationship between perceived risk and tourist satisfaction. Secondly, the relationship between service climate and tourist satisfaction, result found out that there is a positive relationship which has similar findings as in previous studies (Choi & Chu, 2000; Wang et al, 2004; Aydin & Ozer, 2005; Solnet, 2006; Um et al., 2006; Rodriguez et al, 2009). Thus, a positive relationship between service climate and tourist satisfaction, this result asserted that the service climate an important variable when tourists plan to visit Jordan. Study asserted that the behavior intention does not mediate the relationship. The study confirmed antecedents of tourist satisfaction through the examination of the model fit as an interaction to help better explain, analyze and understand international tourists' satisfaction and actual visit behavior among international tourists. Additionally, In the Generating model (GM), satisfaction was not a mediator between Jordan image, service climate and actual visit behavior, this result is supported by previous studies (Maxham & Netemeyer, 2002; Ryu et al, 2007). Thus, this means that in most cases international tourists are likely to visit directly once they have the opportunity to visit Jordan.

The researcher found out that some findings corresponded with a cluster of other studies and they were sometimes inconsistent with others. These agreements and disagreements were based on whether these studies were applicable or not in his context. Furthermore, the application of SEM can be considered a methodological contribution because it promoted better quality of research, especially in modeling multivariate relations; Researchers in Arab countries have not used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) yet. Perceived risk could be a main variable contribution in this study, has not been do before, specific in tourism of Jordan. Additionally, Jordan image, perceived risk and service climate has not been tested together in previous studies. Moreover, this study also found that tourist's satisfaction has a positive and significant direct impact on actual visit behavior which means that international tourists prefer visit Jordan in future. Therefore, In order to reduce tourists' perceptions of risk in Jordanian tourism, we must increase safety and security in tourist sites, which have been increasing actual visit behavior to Jordan (Harahsheh, 2010). Therefore, it is clear that steps to reduce perceived risk play a key role in future tourism policy, such as encouraging the government and police to reduce levels of violence and crime in the country as a whole.

Conclusion

The research examined the antecedents of satisfaction/actual visit behavior. Several direct paths are found to be significantly related to either satisfaction or behavior. Four direct paths are found to be significantly related, from Jordan image to actual visit behavior, from service climate to actual visit behavior, from tourist satisfaction to actual visit behavior and from Jordan image to tourist satisfaction. The results showed that the Generating Model (GM) is the best model to explain the international tourists' satisfaction as compared to the Hypothesized Models. Additionally, the result implicates that tourist satisfaction does not have any mediating effect in the relationship between Jordan image, service climate and actual visit behavior.

Future research should investigate the model in a different setting in the southern region of Jordan, such as in middle region or northern region. Therefore, more research needs to be done on these areas in order to measure and investigate the international tourists' behavior in different countries. Other determinant factors need to be considered in future research such as technological factors (i.e. Internet), services and products prices, environment factors, and infrastructures factors. More importantly, the Ministry of Jordan should focus more on the safety of tourists, availability of modern facilities, development of better transportation avenues that could help tourists to have a faster access to all tourist sites, and tourist destinations. Subsequently, it will lead to the augmentation of tourists' satisfactions to the destination.
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