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Abstract
Virtual tour is an emerging phenomenon in the tourism industry. During the COVID-19 pandemic, this technology is accelerated and utilized as media to market tourism sites that are mainly closed to contain the Coronavirus spread. This study aims to investigate the relationship between virtual tour experience economy dimensions and outcome of the experience, particularly satisfaction, followed by intention to visit the actual site. Utilizing the PLS-SEM method, this research found that three of the four experience constructs, namely entertainment, esthetics, and escapism positively relate to satisfaction, which leads to participants’ intention to visit the destinations. This finding further supports the role of virtual tour as a strategy to market tourism destinations, as well as emphasizing the significance of immersion and entertainment effect in a virtual content. The result can be of assistance to virtual tour providers or tourism marketers in understanding customer perspective.
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1. Introduction
Since its official confirmation as a pandemic, the large-scale effect of the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in all aspects is unprecedented. One of the sectors that got severely affected globally is the tourism industry (Sarkady, Neuburger, & Egger, 2021). According to UNWTO in 2020, international tourism had shown loss up to $730 billion ($730bn) in export profits, more than eight times the loss happened during the 2009 global economic and financial crisis. Furthermore, national tourism revenues also shown decline at around $5.87 billion ($5.87bn) (Akhlas, 2020).

COVID-19 circumstances such as staying at home and social distancing induce the needs for accelerated use of technologies by tourists and businesses (Sigala, 2020). In order to maintain existence and keep the tourism destination alive while mobility is restricted, many travel agencies and countries resorted to the alternative of virtual tours, which began to gain public interests after COVID-19 lockdown measure was attempted in many countries, including Indonesia. Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy (Kemenparekraf) also implemented virtual tour initiative as a mitigation step of tourism sector loss to promote national tourism destinations (Darmadi, Bataha, & Fauziah, 2021).

However, virtual tours may not be adequate substitute of actual tourism. The primary objective of this type of tourism is to maintain tourists’ interest in a destination during travel restrictions (Aminy, 2020), not to replace conventional tourism entirely. In addition to supplementing real-world travel with information, it is also intended to inspire future tourists to travel once the pandemic situation improves. As stated by (Cho, Wang, & Fesenmaier, 2002), virtual tours can translate experiential attributes into searchable attributes, making it a medium for individuals to preview locations for better decision-making process in actual visitation. It is
then imperative to understand how virtual tour relates to the intention to visit the actual tourism site, especially with widespread adoption of virtual tours during the COVID-19 pandemic (El-Said & Aziz, 2021).

On the other hand, virtual tour itself can be considered an experience to the individuals who participate in it, which was staged by the virtual tour providers, reflective of the experience economy model. According to this model, there are four dimensions in an experience: education, entertainment, esthetics, and escapism. This experience model has been applied in various settings in the field of tourism such as B&Bs (Oh, Fiore, & Jeoung, 2007), cruises (Hosany & Witham, 2010), music festivals (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011), museums (Radder & Han, 2015), and theme parks (S. Lee, Jeong, & Qu, 2020). However, the virtual tour experience has gained scant attention in the experience economy model, even with the emerging phenomenon of virtual tourism during COVID-19 pandemic, where enjoyment and satisfaction gained from the experience have positive correlation with individuals’ tendency to visit the actual tourism site (Li & Chen, 2019) (An, Choi, & Lee, 2021).

Whereas plenty of studies involving virtual tour focus on flow theory (see (W. Lee & Kim, 2021); (An et al., 2021); (Kim & Hall, 2019)), apply technology acceptance model (see (Disztinger, Schlögl, & Groth, 2017); (Kim & Hall, 2019); (Schiopu, Hornoiu, Padurean, & Nica, 2021); (El-Said & Aziz, 2021)), or emphasize on immersive virtual reality-type imagery tours, this research takes a broader approach in analyzing experiential aspect. Adapting the lens of experience economy construct as previously stated, this research seeks to investigate the relationship between virtual tour experience dimensions and participant satisfaction, and ultimately the intention to visit the destination depicted in the tour. The study contributes to empirically test the economy experience concept on a contemporary context of virtual tour, extending the applicability of this theory in terms of cross-culture and subject of study (H. Lee, Jung, tom Dieck, & Chung, 2020a). In addition, it may provide tourism destination managers and virtual tour providers with insight of virtual tour experience on consumers’ behalf.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Virtual Tour
The integration of ICT in the tourism field has reshaped the business environment, where increasingly rapid technology development now being able to provide high quality information regarding the previously intangible nature of tourism service (Hassani & Bastenegar, 2020). Especially with the widespread use of internet, most people can access content of travel and tourism in the form of texts, pictures, and videos, with low cost and high efficiency. One implication arising from ease of online media delivery is virtual tour.

Virtual tours can be defined as the ‘presence in digital web and viewing audio, text and video data of the physical world that enables virtual and unrealistic trips to destinations such as natural attractions, historical sites, or museums for users who wish to visit these sites or those who are deprived of visiting opportunity’ (Hassani & Bastenegar, 2020). In other words, individuals can transport themselves to a location physically far from their current location by utilizing existing technology. A definition by (Cho et al., 2002) additionally mentions virtual tour being a computer-mediated experience in which sense of ‘being there’ is evoked or commonly referred to as telepresence. Telepresence is a significant variable in the study of virtual tourism, mainly attributed to virtual reality-type experience. It indicates a high degree of involvement on the users’ part since they become totally immersed in the virtual destination experience. As potential tourists are enabled to preview the experiential attributes of a tourism destination, more vivid destination image is ensured, and it can serve as an information that makes them more confident about future trips to the aforementioned place.
2.2 Experience Economy Model

Experience economy is a term proposed by Pine and Gilmore (1999) stating its emergence as the next phase of economic stages following commodities, goods, and services. Experience can be described as ‘events that engage the individual in a personal way’ (Joseph & H., 1999). Nowadays, plenty industries have evolved from only delivering products or services to staging experience for customers. This implication of improved economy and increased individual freedom allows customers to take more central stage in their experience creation. Tourism is a particular field where application of this concept is apparent, with industries competing in providing tourists with memorable moments, in which no two experiences are the same instead of simply offering standardized products (Oh et al., 2007).

According to the experience economy framework, customer experiences can be derived into four dimensions: entertainment, education, esthetic, and escapism. Entertainment is defined as activity that provides amusement and pleasure. In this experience dimension the customer undergoes absorption process of the activity happening in passive manner, such as watching a movie or listening to music. Education dimension can be inferred as the experience where customer absorbs the activity carried out with active participation through mind or physical engagement (Oh et al., 2007). Reflected in example such as diving or chess playing, this generally result in the customer’s increase of skill and knowledge. Esthetics can be defined as ‘the beauty that can be expressed through elements like color, photographs, font style, and layout’ (H. Lee, Chung, & Jung, 2015). There is a degree of passive participation apparent in this dimension, but with greater immersion depth, allowing customers to enjoy just being in the experience destination. This can be related to the notion of atmosphere or of servicescape in service marketing (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2011). Escapism requires highest form of immersion and active participation, implying that their participation will change how the experience turns out. This dimension is considered highly intense and involving that it causes customers temporarily escape their daily lives (Ponsignon & Derbaix, 2020).

Although the experience is categorized as such, boundaries between the dimensions are often fluid, meaning an experience is not merely related to one of the four dimensions and it can have the elements of other dimensions (Oh et al., 2007) (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). Pine and Gilmore (1999) refers to the optimal effect that comprises the combination of all four dimensions as the sweet spot that provides the richest experiences. Therefore, it is imperative for businesses, especially tourism, to create experience that cater towards this sweet spot, and satisfy customers’ needs and demands.

The concept of experience economy dimensions has been widely discussed in the field of tourism study. There have been previous studies investigating the outcome of the experience dimensions such as satisfaction or behavioral intentions. (Oh et al., 2007) developed the scale for the four dimension through the case of the bed and breakfast hospitality industry, while (Hosany & Witham, 2010) used cruise tourism context. (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011) conducted a study to determine satisfaction of Ice Music Festival and Maihaugen Museum tourists by using the four experience dimensions constructs and concluded that the two different tourism context are affected by different dimensions. (Song, Lee, Park, Hwang, & Reisinger, 2015) also examined the relationship between the four dimensions towards satisfaction with tourist attraction, while (Quadri-Felitti & Fiore, 2012) investigated destination loyalty.

Utilization of experience economy perspective in the field of virtual tourism is still scarce, although there has been attempts. (tom Dieck, Jung, & Rauschnabel, 2018) analyzed visitor engagement followed by satisfaction in the context of AR in science festivals using the experience dimensions. Moreover, (H. Lee, Jung, tom Dieck, & Chung, 2020b) tested the experience economy theory in the VR museum context by positioning absorption as antecedent
of immersion and concluded the VR experience to have positive effect on the museum visit intention.

2.3 Proposed Research Hypotheses

In the case of hedonic experience such as tourism, factors of amusement and pleasure, which constitute entertainment dimension, are crucial to consider. (Radder & Han, 2015) found edutainment aspect, or combination of education and entertainment, to be most significant predictor of satisfaction in museum tourism context, while (Park, Oh, & Park, 2010) concluded this in film festival context. Meanwhile, in the field of virtual tourism, Lee et al. (2019) and tom Dieck et al. (2018) found that entertainment factor affects AR experience in science festival and VR experience in museum, respectively. It can be said that virtual tours that are interesting to spectate can positively influence the satisfaction of the experience. Thus, the research proposed the following hypothesis:

**H1**: Entertainment experience dimension in virtual tours is positively related to virtual tour satisfaction.

Esthetics are related to atmospheric aspect of the tourism experience. (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011) found esthetics to be significantly affecting visitor satisfaction for music festival and museum visits. (Quadri-Feliti & Fiore, 2012) concluded esthetics as the most significant dimension in memorable experiences and behavioral intention. In terms of virtual tourism, esthetics may be represented by interface design or view of the virtual environment. (tom Dieck et al., 2018) even argued to the extent that when esthetics experience is low, other experience dimensions are more likely to suffer. Virtual tour participants who are exposed to more pleasant, immersive view can lead to more satisfying experience. Therefore, it is proposed that:

**H2**: Esthetics experience dimension in virtual tours is positively related to virtual tour satisfaction.

Education is found to be an important factor in tourism field, especially cultural tourism such as museum visits. Studies have examined the significance of education dimension in overall tourism experience (Jung, Tom Dieck, Lee, & Chung, 2016) (Radder & Han, 2015) (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). In virtual tourism, other than learning about the destination itself, the experience can be a way for future travel decision-making process (Cho et al., 2002) (Rainoldi et al., 2018). Nevertheless, it is imperative for participants to learn new things in virtual tours since it indicates their active mental participation and absorption of the activity, leading them to more satisfying experience. Therefore:

**H3**: Education experience dimension in virtual tours is positively related to virtual tour satisfaction.

Another factor which is substantial in tourism field is escapism. This study examines how escapism dimension is reflected in virtual tour participants’ temporary feel of escape from their daily lives. Previous studies have found escapism as significant factor towards satisfaction in Ice Music festival (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). In the context of virtual reality tourism, it relates to the concept of telepresence and flow, where the enjoyment of the activity is totally immersing participants’ mental state that it causes loss of time and space (W. Lee & Kim, 2021). There have been findings on the immersion effect towards VR experience in tourism (Vishwakarma, Mukherjee, & Datta, 2020) (Beck, Rainoldi, & Egger, 2019). Thus, this research proposes:

**H4**: Escapism experience dimension in virtual tours is positively related to virtual tour satisfaction.

Satisfaction is the degree of customer perception upon the delivery of product or service meeting their needs (Cengiz, 2010). Numerous studies have examined it being a significant
determinant to behavioral intention such as purchase intention, product recommendation, customer loyalty, willingness to pay premium prices. In the case of virtual tours, satisfaction can affect behavioral intention such as intention to use virtual tour (El-Said & Aziz, 2021), continued use or future virtual tour intention (Kim & Hall, 2019), willingness to pay (Wen & Leung, 2021) (Nanni & Ulqinaku, 2021), or actual destination visit intention (El-Said & Aziz, 2021) (An et al., 2021) (W. Lee & Kim, 2021) as the most relevant. The antecedents of satisfaction are different for each models and investigated using various perspectives, but most findings agree on the positive outcomes of virtual tours towards visit intentions. Therefore, this research proposes satisfaction as the intervening variable.

H5: Virtual tour satisfaction has a positive effect on the intention to visit actual destination.

Based on the aim of this study to investigate the relationship between experience economy dimensions and the intention to visit destination, mediated by satisfaction level, the research model framework proposed is shown in Figure 1.

3. Results and Discussion

This research adapts a quantitative approach upon the consideration of empirically testing the experience economy framework in the context of virtual tours among Indonesian citizens. Explanatory nature of this research aims to find the relationship between the hypothesized variables; thus, survey method was the chosen data collection technique.

3.1 Data Collection

The data collection for this study is conducted by survey through online questionnaire which is distributed through social media and emails. Other than the advantage of fast response rate, wider participant reach, and cost efficiency (Wright, 2005), it is deemed an appropriate method due to the research being associated to users of virtual environments, namely participants of virtual tours. This study uses purposive random sampling, where criteria for respondents are set according to the research objective. Samples consist of individuals over 18 years old from Indonesia and need to have experience in participating in virtual tours. Participants may acquire the experience from the provided virtual tour links designed by various providers with varying degrees of interactivity. Respondents are to mention their most remarkable virtual tour destination before moving on to experience dimensions measurements.

The measurement items for this research model are adopted from previously validated scales in existing literature. The four experience dimensions—entertainment (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011)(Radder & Han, 2015) esthetics (Radder & Han, 2015) (Park et al., 2010), education (Jung et al., 2016), and escapism (Radder & Han, 2015)(Park et al., 2010)— are adapted
Examine the type of virtual tour destinations, majority of samples answer that places of nature and landscape are the most memorable with 43.27% of total respondent, consisting of destinations such as Gunung Bromo, Bali, Switzerland, Raja Ampat, and Iceland. Cultural or historical sites are the second most popular destination with 25%, where respondents state places such as museums, ancient cities, and castle. City and urban destinations are next with 23.08%, represented by respondents answering with general city destination, such as Hanoi,
London, Times Square, or Venice. Thematic attractions are visited by 4.81% of respondents, citing tours such as International Seafarer tour, Snowfall Nights Korea, and Coffee History tour.

Considering the research framework, collected data are analyzed using partial least square (PLS-SEM) method. The structural equation modeling can assess the cause-and-effect relations of many relationships simultaneously, while PLS approaches the model testing. PLS-SEM provides more robust estimation of the structural model without having to adhere to the strict normal distribution assumption. It is also appropriate for smaller sample sizes compared to its covariance-based counterpart (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). This research analyzes the data using PLS-SEM technique with the aid of SmartPLS statistical software. PLS approach involves the analysis of two components: structural model or inner model of the latent constructs and the measurement model or outer model.

3.3 Measurement Model
Measurement model in PLS-SEM assesses the relationship of latent variables with their respective observed indicators (Kwong & Wong, 2013). A measurement model evaluation is first conducted to ensure the reliability and validity of the questionnaire items to show how representative the questionnaire items are in representing the latent construct that the research aims to observe. Based on the pilot survey using convenience sampling, it was found that some items gained factor loadings less than the required value of 0.5, and therefore were dropped from the analysis (Lockström & Lei, 2013). Other constructs show well-explained factor structures with adequate value of more than 0.708. Meanwhile, consistency reliability estimated that all latent constructs show satisfactory composite reliability value above the recommended value of 0.7 (Hair et al., 2011), confirming the constructs are reliable. Convergent validity, represented by AVE value, showed that the values of all latent construct were higher than the threshold of 0.5 according to (Barclay, Thompson, & Higgins, 1995). Finally, Fornell-Larcker criterion shows adequate values in the matrix where AVE values for each constructs are above the respective squared correlation values, indicating support for the discriminant validity (Lockström & Lei, 2013). Further details of the numbers are disclosed in Table 2 and Table 3.

| Items   | Items Description                                 | Loading | α   | CR   | AVE  |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|------|------|
| Education |                                                    |         |     |      |      |
| EDU1    | I learned something new during virtual tour        | 0.811   | 0.829| 0.886| 0.661|
| EDU2    | The experience made me more knowledgeable         | 0.857   |      |      |      |
| EDU3    | Virtual tour stimulated my curiosity to learn new things | 0.861   |      |      |      |
| EDU4    | Virtual tour provided good learning experience     | 0.715   |      |      |      |
| Entertainment |                                                | 0.781   | 0.873| 0.696|      |
| ENT1    | The virtual tour was entertaining                  | 0.887   |      |      |      |
| ENT2    | I enjoyed listening to the stories / seeing the virtual tour | 0.826   |      |      |      |
| ENT3    | I had unusual experience with virtual tour        | 0.787   |      |      |      |
Table 2. Result of measurement model analysis (cont’)

| Items        | Items Description                                      | Loading | α   | CR   | AVE   |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------|-----|------|-------|
| Escapism     |                                                        |         |     |      |       |
| ESC1         | I was completely immersed in virtual tour              | 0.854   |     |      |       |
| ESC2         | I felt like at a different place and time               | 0.876   |     |      |       |
| ESC3         | Virtual tour made me feel being in a different world   | 0.818   |     |      |       |
| ESC4         | I feel escape from reality                             | 0.844   |     |      |       |
| ESC5         | I feel I can be someone else in this virtual tour      | 0.870   |     |      |       |
| Esthetics    |                                                        |         |     |      |       |
| EST1         | Virtual tour setting offered good experience           | 0.832   |     |      |       |
| EST2         | Virtual tour setting was elaborate and meticulous      | 0.829   |     |      |       |
| EST3         | Virtual tour setting was attractive                    | 0.801   |     |      |       |
| EST4         | The virtual environment was pleasing                   | 0.683   |     |      |       |
| EST5         | Virtual tour setting paid close attention to detail    | 0.690   |     |      |       |
| Satisfaction |                                                        | 0.890   | 0.920 | 0.700 |
| SAT1         | I am happy with my decision to join virtual tour        | 0.835   |     |      |       |
| SAT2         | My experience exceeded my expectations                 | 0.865   |     |      |       |
| SAT3         | Overall, I am satisfied with the virtual tour          | 0.864   |     |      |       |
| SAT4         | I am satisfied with the way virtual tour was managed    | 0.905   |     |      |       |
| SAT5         | This virtual tour needs to continue in the future      | 0.697   |     |      |       |
| Intention to visit |                                                       | 0.801   | 0.865 | 0.617 |
| INT1         | After participating in virtual tour, I want to find more information about the destination | 0.794   |     |      |       |
| INT2         | After participating in virtual tour, I gained interest in visiting the actual destination in person | 0.791   |     |      |       |
| INT3         | Given the opportunity, I intend to visit the destination in the virtual tour | 0.766   |     |      |       |
| INT4         | It is very likely I will actually visit the destination in the virtual tour | 0.789   |     |      |       |

Table 3. Fornell-Larcker criterion of the constructs

|              | Education | Entertainment | Escapism | Esthetics | Intention to Visit | Satisfaction |
|--------------|-----------|---------------|----------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|
| Education    | 0.813     |               |          |           |                    |              |
| Entertainment| 0.619     | 0.834         |          |           |                    |              |
| Escapism     | 0.536     | 0.649         | 0.853    |           |                    |              |
| Esthetics    | 0.514     | 0.718         | 0.588    | 0.770     |                    |              |
| Intention to Visit | 0.425   | 0.577         | 0.461    | 0.584     | 0.785              |              |
| Satisfaction | 0.621     | 0.792         | 0.741    | 0.768     | 0.582              | 0.836        |
3.4 Structural Model

Structural model evaluation establishes the causal relationship between latent constructs and tests the proposed hypotheses (Kwong & Wong, 2013). The p-values representing statistical significance showed that all proposed hypotheses are supported except for education to satisfaction relationship. Meanwhile, the T-statistics value of relationships above 1.96 are also shown by all path other than education to satisfaction. According to (Hair et al., 2011), this value above 1.96 implies significance level of five percent, which indicates that the dimensions of entertainment, esthetics and escapism positively affect the satisfaction of virtual tour. These variables lead the intention to visit the depicted tourism destination. On the other hand, the dimension of education does not directly affect virtual tour satisfaction, making four out of five hypotheses are supported (See Table 4).

Table 4. Result of Structural Model Analysis.

| Path relationship              | Path coefficient | T Statistics | p-Values | Result     |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|------------|
| H1: Entertainment -> Virtual Tour Satisfaction | 0.301            | 3.774        | 0.000**  | Supported  |
| H2: Esthetics -> Virtual Tour Satisfaction          | 0.319            | 3.632        | 0.000**  | Supported  |
| H3: Education -> Virtual Tour Satisfaction           | 0.110            | 1.543        | 0.062    | Not supported |
| H4: Escapism -> Virtual Tour Satisfaction            | 0.299            | 3.848        | 0.000**  | Supported  |
| H5: Virtual Tour Satisfaction -> Intention to Visit | 0.582            | 8.646        | 0.000**  | Supported  |

Figure 2. Path analysis of the structural model.
In hindsight, this result seems contradictory to previous studies where all four experience dimensions have an effect on the outcome of virtual tour. However, it can be explained by the type of virtual tours the respondents participated in. Most of the virtual tour mentioned are general destinations, which emphasizes more of the landscape and navigational ability in the virtual environment, rather than educational. Majority of respondents visited natural and landscape sites (43.27%), added by large number of city and urban virtual tour participants (23.08%). In visiting these locations, individuals are more inclined to enjoy the environment and experience esthetics dimension to a greater extent than learning new things. Previous studies concluding the effect of all four experience dimensions on virtual tour, including education, are commonly focusing on cultural destinations such as museum (H. Lee et al., 2020b) or educational attraction like science festival (tom Dieck et al., 2018).

Result from this research shows that virtual tour satisfaction is directly affected by participants’ enjoyment and immersion in the virtual environment, but not much of the learning aspect. Thus, satisfaction derived from an experience does not necessarily depend on all four dimensions at the same time (Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011). In line with most previous study, this study shows support that satisfaction positively affects the intention to visit the tourism destination.

This brings upon the practical implication for virtual tour providers and destination marketers to focus on providing enjoyable and immersive tour to attract customers into desire to visit the destination. In terms of tour content creation, factor of entertainment and immersion can be prioritized over education if satisfaction are to be pursued. Hence, result of this study can benefit destination marketers or virtual tour content creators in their attempt to promote tourism attraction or destination. Theoretically, this study also answers the literature call to assess the consequence of virtual tour factors like satisfaction in foreseeing tendency to visit actual tourism site (El-Said & Aziz, 2021) in times of pandemic, in addition to expanding the applicability of experience economy model.

However, this study is not without limitation. The relatively small sample size does not warrant the generalizability of the acquired result to represent the entire Indonesia population. Future studies can utilize this to investigate larger sample size and more diverse participants. Next, since this research did not particularly specify the genre of virtual tours by the participants, further exploration can be conducted to see whether different types of virtual tours affect satisfaction differently. It can also be beneficial to test the effect of experience economy dimensions towards outcomes other than satisfaction, for example attitude towards virtual tour or intention to recommend.

4. Conclusion
This research was conducted with the aim of investigating the role of virtual tour in providing satisfying virtual experience for potential tourists and its effect on the intention to visit the destination. The study utilizes Pine and Gilmore’s (1999) concept of experience economy framework, which states that experience can consist of four dimensions: entertainment, education, esthetics, and escapism.

The result concludes that four out of five hypotheses are supported by the collected data, where entertainment, esthetics and escapism dimensions affect virtual tour satisfaction. This supports the notion of enjoyable tour, immersion in environment esthetics and feelings of temporary escape leading to satisfactory virtual tour. In turn, the virtual tour satisfaction leads to positive effect towards intention to visit the depicted tourism destination. The finding further supports the role of virtual tour as a destination marketing strategy, where satisfactory virtual experience can lead tour participants to attain aspiration to go see the tour destination.
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