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ABSTRACT
This study discovered (1) the effect of destination images on destination loyalty (2) the effect of destination images on destination loyalty with tourists’ satisfaction as mediating variable. Respondents in this study were the tourists in the Bukittinggi City. This study utilized primary data which were obtained through the questionnaire with control questions that tourists had visited Bukittinggi City at least twice. Total respondents were 384 determined by using Lemeshow formula. Data was analyzed using Path Analysis performed by SPSS 25 software. The result showed: (1) destination image had positive and significant effect on destination loyalty (2) destination image had positive and significant effect on destination loyalty with tourists’ satisfaction as mediating variable.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Tourism is becoming more important for the Indonesian government today. As a proof, the government has built some infrastructures and airports in several provinces in Indonesia. Therefore, the constructions of new airports and airport renovations are expected to increase the number of local and international tourists.

Bukittinggi is a popular tourist destination located in West Sumatra. West Sumatra is an Indonesian province located on the island of Sumatra. The Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) of West Sumatra shows the arrival of tourists to this province, which grew in July 2016. There were 4,094 foreign tourists in West Sumatra during that month, while in August it increased by 3.14 percent, or 4,224 people in total. Based on that number, Malaysia became the country with most foreign tourist who came to West Sumatra as many as 2898 people. West Sumatra won the Halal Tourism National Competition 2016 in four categories: Best Halal Travel Destination, Best Culinary Destinations, Best Travel Agents and Best Halal Restaurants.

Loyalty research is very popular in marketing, but the analysis and concepts are relatively recent in tourism research. Loyalty is a word commonly used to describe fidelity to someone or something [15]. Several previous studies have shown that satisfaction is the most important factor to improve loyalty. A very satisfied customer, he/she will sincerely share positive news to others by word-of-mouth both directly and by using social media. Otherwise, disappointment allows customers to share negative things that have bad effect on the firms in the future.

[10] stated that loyalty is defined as non-random purchase expressed over time by some decision-making unit. So, it means that loyalty is the purchase, which is not random, expressed over time by performing a series of decision-making. Based on such definition, it seems that loyalty is more addressed to a behavior expressed by routine purchases based on a decision-making unit. [15] stated that loyalty has been used in business context to describe a customer’s willingness to continue subscribing a product, firm or brand over the long-term, saying positive things, and recommending the firm’s products to friends and family. Customer loyalty extends beyond behavior and includes preference, liking, and future intentions. Destination loyalty can be considered as places that tourists can visit them again or recommend them to other potential tourists such as friends or family. In tourism marketing, [6] operationally defined destination loyalty as the level of tourists’ perception of a destination as a good place, the one they would recommend to others.

Traditional literature about consumer behavior pinpoints that customer satisfaction is the result or the final step of a psychological process from the need of recognition to evaluation of experienced products [18]. Tourist satisfaction is perceived the same as the common satisfaction literature, namely customer intentions to revisit, say positive and word-of-mouth communication. Studies also showed the opposite relationship (tourist dissatisfaction will lead to negative words, and tourists may decide other destinations.). [14] stated that customer satisfaction is a person’s feelings of pleasure or disappointment that result from comparing perceived performance (or outcome) to expectations. If the performance is not as expected, then a customer is not satisfied. If it matches or exceeds expectations, then a customer is very satisfied or happy.

In the field of tourism marketing, we must also observe variables that affect the tourist’s satisfaction, which one of them is image. [19] stated that place identity is the strongest
construct defining place attachment thereby suggesting that tourists are able to develop more emotional than functional attachment, because of the satisfaction with image attributes and personal involvement. [19] stated that the images of overall goals (ie attractions, accessibility, accommodation, facilities, activities, local communities, and shopping) have impacts on tourist’s satisfaction. [4] found a directly positive relationship between destination image and tourist’s satisfaction. Destination image can enhance the intensity of the tourists to return. [2] found that a positive image of the destination enhances both immediate and future intentions to return. [5] stated that destination image appears to have the most important effect on behavioral intentions (i.e. intention to revisit and willingness to recommend). Destination image influences behavioral intentions in two ways: directly and indirectly. Destination image not only influences the decision-making process, but also the conditions after decision-making behaviors of tourists. In other words, the influence of destination image is not only limited to the stage of selecting the destination, but also affects the behavior of tourists in general.

The theoretical framework was determined by literature review; so the model of [12]; [19]; [20]; [4] were meant for destination image and tourist’s satisfaction. Model of [2]; [5] were meant for destination image and destination loyalty. Model of [21]; [1] were meant for tourist’s satisfaction and destination loyalty. According to previous studies and the definitions presented above, the following conceptual model is presented to examine the impact of destination image on tourist’s satisfaction and destination loyalty in Bukittinggi City, West Sumatra, as described in Figure 1 below:

![Figure 1: The conceptual model](image)

The conceptual model above generates three hypotheses that will be tested in this study. Therefore, the hypotheses can be developed as follows:

H1: Destination image has significant effect on destination loyalty

H2: Destination image has significant effect on tourist’s satisfaction

H3: Tourist’s satisfaction has significant effect on destination loyalty

2. METHODS

This study used quantitative approach. Quantitative methods explain the phenomena by gathering numerical data and then analyze them using mathematical-based methods [16]. The quantitative approach is used when one begins with a theory (or hypothesis) and tests for the confirmation or disconfirmation of that hypothesis [17]. This study focused on four famous recreation areas in Bukittinggi City: they are “jam gadang” (a large-clock tower), “fort de kock” (dutch sconce fortification), “ngarai sianok” (sianok canyon) and “lubang japang” (japanese cave). The data used in this study was obtained from questionnaire method. The respondents were the tourists determined by convenience sampling. The number of samples was determined by the Lemeshow method of 384 respondents, or in other word, the samples as many as 96 questionnaires were distributed in each area.

In the present model, the destination image was the exogenous variable. Tourist’s satisfaction and destination loyalty were the endogenous variables. The major content of data collection by questionnaire was based on: Three dimensions for destination image: natural scenery, social-cultural aspects and recreational activities [9]; [4]; [13]. Three dimensions for tourist’s satisfaction: general experiences, intention to return and positive words-of-mouth [3]; [8]; [22].

To determine the degree of which participants agreed with the statements, a five-point Likert Scale consisting of: 1) Strongly disagree 2) Disagree 3) Neutral 4) Agree 5) Strongly agree, were used in the answer section. The observed data was then analyzed by using SPSS software. Before being administered, the questionnaire was firstly tested using 30 post-graduate students studying in a Faculty of Economics in a University in West Sumatra. The validity instrument was tested by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The instrument has high validity if the correlation coefficient of each indicator to total correlation is more than 0.30 or r-value > 0.30 [7]. The instrument was tested for reliability by using Cronbach’s Alpha. The instrument is considered reliable if it has Cronbach’s Alpha > 0.6 [11]. The results of validity and reliability test are described in Table 1 below.
Table 1. The Result of Validity and Reliability Test

| No | Variables/ Indicators     | Corrected-item-total-correlation | Cronbach’s alpha | Description |
|----|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
|    |                           | Min | Max      |                        |             |
| 1  | Destination Image (X)     | 0.312 | 0.610 | 0.851                 | Valid Reliable |
| 2  | Tourist’s Satisfaction(Y1)| 0.363 | 0.817 | 0.953                 | Valid Reliable |
| 3  | Destination Loyalty (Y2)  | 0.493 | 0.787 | 0.933                 | Valid Reliable |

Data analysis used both descriptive statistics and path analysis. Descriptive statistical analysis aims to describe respondent in demographic aspects i.e. age, gender, education, nationality, salary, purpose of visit and past experience. Path analysis is used to test the hypotheses. One of the advantages of path analysis compared to multiple regression analysis is that path analysis can acquire more complete information. In this study, we also evaluated the direct and indirect effects [11].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The respondents of this research had quite different characteristics. Diversity could be seen from the personal data of respondents including gender, age, education, nationality, salary, purpose of visit and past experience. The majority of respondent who participated in this study were: male gender (57.03%), aged between 30 to 35 years (15.10%), having level education bachelor degree (50.26%), having Indonesian nationality (85.94%) having salary from IDR 4,000,001 to 5,000,000 (26.82%), having purpose of holiday (59.37%). Demographics of respondents in table 2 below:

Table 2. Demographics of Respondents

| Gender      | Numbers of Respondents (NR) | Percentage of NR to number of TR* |
|-------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Male        | 219                         | 57.03%                           |
| Female      | 165                         | 42.97%                           |
| age < 20    | 21                          | 5.47%                            |
| 20 ≤ age < 25 | 25                      | 6.51%                            |
| 25 ≤ age < 30 | 47                      | 12.20%                           |
| 30 ≤ age < 35 | 58                      | 15.10%                           |
| 35 ≤ age < 40 | 56                      | 14.58%                           |
| 40 ≤ age < 45 | 54                      | 14.06%                           |
| 45 ≤ age < 50 | 55                      | 14.32%                           |
| 50 ≤ age < 55 | 39                      | 10.56%                           |
| 55 ≥ age    | 29                          | 7.55%                            |
| High School or below | 76              | 19.80%                           |
| Junior College | 58                   | 15.10%                           |
| Bachelor    | 193                         | 50.26%                           |
| Master or above | 57                   | 14.84%                           |
| Indonesian  | 330                         | 85.94%                           |
| Nationality |                             |                                  |
| Malaysian   | 28                          | 7.30%                            |
| Singaporean | 11                          | 2.86%                            |
| Other       | 15                          | 3.90%                            |
| 2,000,000 ≤ | 19                          | 4.95%                            |
| 2,000,000 - 3,000,000 | 40              | 10.42%                           |
| 3,000,000 - 4,000,000 | 87              | 22.66%                           |
| 4,000,001 - 5,000,000 | 103             | 26.82%                           |
| 5,000,001 - 6,000,000 | 71               | 18.49%                           |
| 6,000,001 - 7,000,000 | 43               | 11.20%                           |
| ≥ 7,000,001 | 21                          | 5.47%                            |
| Salary (in IDR) |                             |                                  |
| Holiday     | 228                         | 59.37%                           |
| Purpose of visit |                             |                                  |
| Visiting Friends or Relatives | 67          | 17.45%                           |
| Business    | 46                          | 11.98%                           |
| Honeymoon   | 24                          | 6.25%                            |
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The research variables tested in this study consisted of three variables, which were destination image, tourist’s satisfaction, and destination loyalty. Respondents answered each item on destination image (X), tourist’s satisfaction (Y1), and destination loyalty (Y2) from strongly disagree (scale 1) to strongly agree (scale 5). The result for mean value of research variables / indicators can be seen in Table 2 below.

### Table 3. The Result of Mean Value of Research Variables / Indicators

| No | Variables / Indicators       | Mean | Description     |
|----|------------------------------|------|-----------------|
| 1  | Destination Image (X)        | 4.21 | High            |
|    | Natural scenery              | 4.34 | Very High       |
|    | Social-cultural aspects      | 4.12 | High            |
|    | Recreational activities      | 4.18 | High            |
| 2  | Tourist’s Satisfaction (Y1)  | 4.11 | High            |
|    | General satisfaction         | 4.01 | High            |
|    | Attribute satisfaction       | 4.07 | High            |
|    | Met expectations             | 4.26 | Very High       |
| 3  | Destination Loyalty (Y2)     | 4.18 | High            |
|    | Positive experiences         | 4.27 | Very High       |
|    | Intention to return          | 4.24 | High            |
|    | Positive words-of-mouth      | 4.03 | High            |

According to Table 3, it can be revealed that average value (mean) of destination image variable was placed in high category (4.21), natural scenery was the highest indicator (4.34), and recreational activities was the lowest indicator (4.12). Variable of tourist’s satisfaction was placed in high category (4.11), met expectations was the highest indicator (4.26), and general satisfaction was the lowest indicator. Variable of destination loyalty was placed in high category (4.18), positive experiences was the highest indicator (4.27), and positive words-of-mouth was the lowest indicator (4.03).

The conceptual model illustrated in Figure 1 has three hypothesized relationship among the variables of destination image, tourist’s satisfaction, and destination loyalty. Figure 2 and Table 4 display the path diagram resulting from the path analysis by using SPSS for windows.

![Figure 2. Results of the Path Model](image)

*) Significant at: $\alpha \leq 0.05$; $t$-table = 1.960

Figure 2 shows the path analysis results. This figure presented the path coefficient and t-statistic value. Table 4 shows more about the direct and indirect effects.
Hypotheses 1 stated that destination image has significant effect on destination loyalty. The result of path analysis was also presented in Table 4 indicating that there were supports for all hypotheses. Source: Primary data processed by using SPSS software.

| Hypothesis | Relations | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Total Effect | Description |
|------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|
| H1         | DI→DL    | 0.285         | 0.170           | 0.455        | Supported   |
|            | (4.467)  |               |                 |              |             |
| H2         | DI→TS    | 0.250         | 0.125           | 0.375        | Supported   |
|            | (2.512)  |               |                 |              |             |
| H3         | TS→DL    | 0.681         | 0.455           | 1.136        | Supported   |
|            | (10.467) |               |                 |              |             |

The result of path analysis was also presented in Table 4 indicating that there were supports for all hypotheses. Hypotheses 1 stated that destination image has significant effect on destination loyalty. The standardized coefficient is 0.285, which is statistically significant at prob. < 0.05 (t-statistic = 4.67). The statistical significance of hypotheses 1 confirms that destination image directly influences destination loyalty.

Hypotheses 2 stated that destination image has significant effect on tourist’s satisfaction. The standardized coefficient is 0.250, which is statistically significant at prob < 0.05 (t-statistic = 2.512). The statistical significance of hypotheses 2 confirms destination image directly influences tourist’s satisfaction.

This result also indicated that tourist’s satisfaction had significant effect on destination loyalty, hence hypothesis 3 in this research was also supported. The standardized coefficient is 0.681, which is statistically significant at prob. < 0.05 (t-statistic = 10.467).

The standardized coefficient of the indirect effect of destination image on destination loyalty is 0.170, which is significant at prob. < 0.05. The analysis from Table 4 indicated that destination image had direct and positive effect on destination loyalty as well as having indirect one through tourist’s satisfaction.

The result showed that destination loyalty is more influenced by tourist’s satisfaction than by destination image. This result indicated that destination image influenced tourist’s satisfaction at first, and then tourist’s satisfaction would influence destination loyalty.

The result of this study supported destination image as a key aspect of tourist’s decisions [4]. This research also supported the relationship between destination image and tourist’s satisfaction that had been well established [3]; [8]; [19]. The result also supported the thinking that satisfaction would significantly affect future behavior [12]. Support was also found in the positive relationship between destination image and loyalty mediated by tourist’s satisfaction [20]. This study provided a sustainable proof of the relationship between overall satisfaction and the possibility of recommending and returning intentions. Therefore, as the level of satisfaction increases, the tendency to return and recommend also increases. Therefore, the word-of-mouth recommendation is essential for loyalty.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this research was to discover the impact of destination image on tourist’s satisfaction and destination loyalty in Bukittinggi City, West Sumatra Province, Indonesia. Destination image had positive and significant effect on destination loyalty and tourist’s satisfaction. Tourist’s satisfaction had positive and significant effect on destination loyalty. Destination image was a key to influence destination loyalty through tourist’s satisfaction dimensions such as general satisfaction, attribute satisfaction and met expectations.
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