Determinates of Tourist Loyalty: an extended structural equation model from post-war tourism development context in Sri Lanka
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Abstract
Tourists’ destination loyalty (TDL) has been well researched in tourism literature. Yet an extended model that can incorporate various concerned constructs for TDL i.e. image, quality, satisfaction and complaints has been an absence. This study endeavours to bridge this gap by modelling TDL through destination image, tourist expectation, perceived quality, perceived value, satisfaction and tourists’ complaints. Post-war tourism booming circumstance of Sri Lanka found a fertile ground to test the proposed theoretical model. A self-administered questionnaire was fielded and 570 responses were generated for the study. The refined measurement model with 33 items to explain the above constructs elucidated determines of TDL together with their relative significance. The structural model showed strong path coefficients and R² values indicating the model’s fitness in explaining the relationships. Theoretical and empirical implications are discussed in support of tourist destination marketing literature and national tourism marketing efforts in the post-war tourism booming scenario in Sri Lanka.

Introduction
Tourism has grown as one of the largest industries and sources of income generation in recent years among the countries in Asia. Sri Lanka has proved to be one of the fastest growing tourist destinations (National Strategic Plan 2017-2020). In 2016, the tourism sector continued to perform well and was able to retain its rank in the third level as one of the main sources of foreign exchange earner of the national economy. Foreign Remittances (RS. 1,054.48 Billion) and textiles and Garments (RS.710.76 Billion) were the first two highest sources of foreign exchange. The portion of tourism’s contribution to total FE earnings in 2016 amounted to 14.2 % (Annual Statistical Report, 2016). Destination loyalty plays a pivotal role in destination marketing which could direct sustainable tourism development in its post-war tourism development efforts of Sri Lanka. Research on destination loyalty is a critical need to ensure successful destination management (Ranasinghe et al, 2017). Similarly, why and how tourists are emotionally attached to a destination are of primary concerns to destination managers and academics, since it directly influences word of mouth publicity and the revisit behaviour of tourists (Weaver, Weber and Mc Cleary, 2007).

According to Hernández-Lobato et al. (2006) and Žabkar, Brenčič and Dmitrović (2010) tourist satisfaction at a destination is pivotal in destination loyalty. Further, observing trip quality, suggest that destination attractiveness indirectly influences tourist attribute satisfaction (Chen and Tsai 2007). In the model tested by Chi and Qu (2008), overall satisfaction of tourists showed a direct positive influence on their destination loyalty. Further, Prayag and Ryan (2012) confirmed direct positive relationship between tourists’ overall satisfaction and future behavioural intentions. Tourists’ destination loyalty has been well researched in tourism literature. Yet an extended model that can incorporate various concerned constructs for TDL i.e. image, quality, satisfaction and complaints has been an absence in literature. This study endeavours to bridge this gap by modelling TDL through destination image, tourist expectation, perceived quality, perceived value, satisfaction and tourists’ complaints. Post-war tourism booming circumstance of Sri Lanka found a fertile ground to test the proposed theoretical model. A self-administered questionnaire was fielded and 570 responses were generated for the study. The refined measurement model with 33 items to explain the above constructs elucidated determines of TDL together with their relative significance. The structural model showed strong path coefficients and R² values indicating the model’s fitness in explaining the relationships. Theoretical and empirical implications are discussed in support of tourist destination marketing literature and national tourism marketing efforts in the post-war tourism booming scenario in Sri Lanka.
Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

Perceived Quality

There are various scholars defining the concept of perceived quality and it has been of utmost consideration in the relationship marketing. According to Aaker and Joachimsthaler, (2000), perceived quality is a special type of association. Further, it influences brand associations in many contexts and profitability. Zeithaml, (1988) mentioned perceived quality is the consumer’s judgment about a product’s overall excellence or superiority. Further, he explained, perceived quality is different from objective or actual quality, a higher-level abstraction rather that a specific attribute of a product, a global assessment that in some cases resemble attitude and a judgment usually made within a consumer’s evoked set. According to Hernández-Lobato et al. (2006) perceived quality is associated with tourists’ satisfaction. Accordingly, Kim, Lee and Prideaux (2014) observed similar results observing a positive relationship between PQ and satisfaction confirmed by Bajs (2015), Ramseeok-Munhurrum et al. (2015), Ranasinghe (2015), Wu (2016). Žabkar, Brenčič and Dmitrovć, (2010) mentioned perceived destination quality is a key determinant of tourist satisfaction and the relationship is mixed and inconsistent.

Perceived Value

Perceived value is a customer’s opinion of a product’s value to him or her. Consequently, it may have little or nothing to do with the market price and depends on the product’s ability to satisfy his or her needs or requirements. According to Jamal and Muhammad, (2011) and Rasoolimanesh, Dahalan and Jaafar, (2016), consumer behaviour theories suggest attitudes of consumers in recognizing their propensity to consume a certain product or service as perceived value. Further, it is a by-product of consumer’s realized costs and benefits (Bajs, 2015). Cheng, Kim and Petrick (2008) categorized consumers’ perceived value into five dimensions as monetary, behavioural, emotional, quality and reputation. Moreover, Jamal et al. (2011) proposed comprehensive scale to measure tourist perceived value which constituted functional, experiential and emotional values. Similar scales were applied by Andronikidis et al. (2016). Subsequently, applying an integrated scale to measure perceived value of homestay tourists confirms a positive relationship between tourists’ perceived value and satisfaction (Rasoolimanesh, Dahalan and Jaafar, 2016). Chen and Tsai (2007), mentioned that perceived value and tourists’ satisfaction are positively related and higher the value perception, higher the satisfaction. Further, price value, service value and value of overall experience used to measure perceived value. Bajs, (2015) concluded that tourists’ perceived value is directly associated with satisfaction, and satisfaction has a direct positive impact on tourists’ destination loyalty.

Destination Loyalty

Destination loyalty is a longitudinal perspective and looking at lifelong visitation behaviour of travellers rather than just at a cross-sectional perspective. According to Rajesh, (2013) loyalty is repeating frequency of purchasing the same product. In tourist destination context, loyalty categorized as attitudinal loyalty, behavioural loyalty and composite loyalty (Zhang et al. 2014). Further in tourism literature, Destination loyalty is tourists’ intentions to revisit a destination and willingness to recommend the destination (Chen and Tsai, 2007; Prayag and Ryan, 2012; Wu, 2016).

According to Hernández-Lobato et al. (2006) and Žabkar, Brenčič and Dmitrovć (2010) tourist satisfaction at a destination is pivotal in destination loyalty. Further, observing trip quality, suggest that destination attractiveness indirectly influences tourist attribute satisfaction (Chen and Tsai 2007). In the model tested by Chi and Qu (2008), overall satisfaction of tourists showed a direct positive influence on their destination loyalty. Further, Prayag and Ryan (2012) confirmed direct positive relationship between tourists’ overall satisfaction and future behavioural intentions.

Ryan (1995) mentioned that multiple repeat vacationers also expressed a high level of identification with the destination, an attitudinal dimension. Further, proponents of the attitudinal or composite measure would argue that it is important what attitude a person has about a destination and that those with a positive attitude toward a destination, even though they may not be visiting it, will provide positive word-of-mouth. On the other hand, a person who may have a less positive attitude toward the destination but returns year after year provides the demand and turnover needed. In addition, whereas for many products and services that requires a low-involved decision, but high repeats purchase is quite widespread.

The behavioural dimension of loyalty inherently acknowledges that previous experience is influential on todays and tomorrow’s travel decisions and destination choice. There are at least two different types of tourists based on their destination choice as history continuous repeaters and continuous switchers (Schmidhauser 1976, Woodside and MacDonald 1994). Moreover, Brown’s (1952) categorized loyalty into individed loyalty and no loyalty.

Destination Image

Studies on destination image began in the early 1970s, when Hunt’s (1975) influential work examined the role of image in tourism development. Since then, destination image has become one of the dominant areas of tourism research. According to Crompton, (1979), Destination image is defined as an attitudinal concept consisting of the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a tourist holds of a destination.

Various specialized academics in tourism have presented various definitions about what Destination Image means.

The study of destination image is a relatively recent addition to the field of tourism research. However, several studies have illustrated that destination images do, indeed, influence tourist behaviour (Hunt, 1975; Pearce, 1982). In essence, the research suggests that those destinations with strong, positive images are more likely to be considered and chosen in the travel decision process (Goodrich, 1978; Woodside & Lyonski, 1989). As a result, destination image has an important role in the various models of travel decision making developed to date (Schmoll, 1977; Moutinho, 1984; Woodside & Lyonski, 1989).

According to Hunt, (1975) to measure the images of four states; “Perceptions held by potential visitors about Utah, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming an area” Further, Crompton, (1977) measure the image of Mexico “Organized representations of a destination in a cognitive system” and measure the image of Mexico in “Sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that different States of the United States a person has of a destination” (1979). Destination image is a multidimensional construct comprising of two primary dimensions: cognitive and affective (Lawson and Band-Bovy; 1977). The cognitive component can be interpreted as beliefs and knowledge about the physical attributes of a destination and affective component refers to the appraisal of the affective quality of feelings towards the attributes and the surrounding environments (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999).

According to Chon, (1990) satisfaction largely depends upon a comparison of expectations based on previously held images and the actual reality encountered at the destination. Consequently, important role of destination image emphasizes the need to develop methodologies to comprehensively and accurately measure this concept. To accomplish this task, tourism researchers have the benefit of accessing the methodologies which have been developed to measure product image in general. However, because of the more complicated and diverse nature of the tourism product, it may be necessary to develop more specific and more complex conceptual frameworks and methodologies in order to reliably and validly measure destination image. Moreover, various studies have already been undertaken to measure the images of destinations as states, regions, and countries. But, there has been no serious effort to critically examine the effectiveness in defining and measuring the concept of destination image.

Tourist Complaints

Consumer complaints are an important factor for service providers; effective handling of consumer complaints can be a key to acquiring loyal customers. Any unresolved complaint could not only stop repeat visits but also bring negative word-of-mouth communication (Lewis, 1983; Richins, 1983). In the tourism industry, as in all industries, tourist destinations face the problem of customer...
dissatisfaction with and complaints about particular products or services at one time or another (Kozak, 2004). Service providers are expected to improve their products or services as a result of dissatisfaction and complaints, which may prevent other customers from experiencing similar dissatisfaction with those products or services (Richins, 1979).

Poor quality of products and services are accepted to be among the root causes of customer dissatisfaction. Problems in quality are reflected as those experienced during vacation consumption. Customers with more complaints are found to be more likely to be dissatisfied and to report their complaints to suppliers more explicitly. Furthermore, customer complaints are believed to directly relate to customer dissatisfaction, namely, complaints arise depending upon the level of dissatisfaction.

Tourist complaints can be used productively as part of the visitor evaluations exercise and benefit the company, industry and thus country economy. In deed for several reasons complaints should be regarded as gifts. First, if dissatisfied customers do not complain, company loses the opportunity to remedy the problem and retain a customer (Hirschman, 1970). Besides, this loss is not only the current business but also the future businesses from that particular customer. Second, the company’s reputation can be harmed by negative word-of-mouth (WOM) actions taken by dissatisfied customers, resulting in the loss of current and potential customers (Susskind, 2002). Third, if a customer leaves the company without complaining, then company is deprived of valuable feedback about the quality of its product or service (Fornell and Wernerfelt, 1988), also hindering its capability to identify problems that may, and most probably will, affect other customers. Among other things, customer complaints allow an organization to pursue service recovery attempts and an opportunity to reduce customer turnover (Bodey and Grace, 2006; Tax et al., 1998). For these reasons, consumer complaints should be seen as necessary step to fix the failed services.

**Tourist Satisfaction**

Simply tourism satisfaction is a person’s feeling of pleasure or disappointed results from comparing a product are perceived performance in relation to this or her expectations. Meng et al. (2006) Measuring tourist satisfaction is important to successful destination marketing since it is directly link to destination marketing since it is directly link to tourist satisfaction, customer satisfaction can be estimated with a single item, which measures the overall satisfaction. Additionally, satisfaction is the result or the final step of a psychological process from needs to satisfaction.

Satisfaction is an essential component of an integrated management program (Latu and Everett, 2000). Baker and Crompton (2000) define satisfaction as “the tourist’s emotional state after experiencing the trip”. According to that, simply the idea of customer satisfaction is the result or the final step of a psychological process from need recognition to evaluation of experienced products. The satisfaction is an evaluation of the surprise inherent in a product acquisition and or consumption experience. In essence, the summary psychological state resulting when the emotion surrounding disconfirmed expectations is coupled with the consumer’s prior feelings about the consumption experience. According to Chaudhary, M and Aggarwal (2012), tourist satisfaction is pulling power an attraction possess and is main element of tourist behaviour. If a developer is to produce successful tourism development context was at very low level during war time which led to reduce contribution gain from tourism industry in the country development. However, the three decades war ended in May 2009 in Sri Lanka and it was a remarkable point in the development of the tourism industry. The war ended and tourism demand of destinations in Sri Lanka has increased, especially in the Northern and Eastern parts of the country.

Tourist satisfaction, coupled with tourist retention, has been one of the most important concerns to hospitality and tourism market. It is generally emphasized that the generation of satisfaction, and hence tourist loyalty and repeat business, is a cost-effective approach to maintaining business. Recent studies have revealed that it is highly likely that dissatisfied tourist never returns, and repeated purchase is directly related to company cash flow, as getting a new customer costs more than keeping and existing one.

Chon and Olsen (1991) discovered a goodness of fit correlation between tourists’ expectation about their destination and tourists’ satisfaction. Then after tourists have bought the travel service and products, if the evaluation of their experience of travel product is better than their expectation, they will be satisfied with their travel experience.

**Post War in Sri Lanka**

Sri Lanka has been faced with the bad image due to war. Tourism attraction and tourism development context was at very low level during war time which led to reduce contribution gain from tourism industry in the country development. However, the three decades war ended in May 2009 in Sri Lanka and it was a remarkable point in the development of the tourism industry. The war ended and tourism demand of destinations in Sri Lanka has increased, especially in the Northern and Eastern parts of the country.

Sri Lanka implemented marketing and management strategies to rebuild its image as an attractive and safe tourist destination after decades of negative international publicity highlighting the on-going political violence, the war and persistent acts of terrorism prior to 2009 as well as concerns about alleged human rights abuses in the final stages of the war. In addition, Sri Lanka has launched a massive marketing campaign under the tourism branding slogan of “Wonder of Asia”. This strategy is important for Sri Lanka considering its effort to recreate its image and the competition it faces from other destinations in terms of attracting international tourists (S.Fernando, 2017). As the results of these influences, Sri Lanka Tourism has surged to a new high record of 2.050,832 arrivals in 2016, transcending all time high hits in the history. As a result, the experience of the short history of the post-war period shows that the tourism sector has now become a main driver of the Sri Lankan economy in terms of foreign exchange earnings, employment generation and attracting foreign direct investment. In 2016, tourism generated 335,659 both direct and indirect
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employment opportunities and Rs. 512,293 million (US$ 3,518.5 million) foreign exchange earnings in the Sri Lankan economy (SLTDA, 2016).

**Theoretical Model Specification**

![Theoretical Model Specification Diagram](image)

*Source: Author Compiled based on Literature Review*

This study intended to see the determinants of tourist loyalty; an extended structural equation model from post-war Sri Lanka. Based on the above theoretical framework, the following hypotheses are proposed for the purpose of this study.

H1 – There is a positive relationship between destination image and tourist experience

H2 - There is a positive relationship between tourist experience and perceived quality

H3 - There is a positive relationship between destination image and perceived value

H4 - There is a positive relationship between destination image and satisfaction

H5 - There is a positive relationship between tourist experience and satisfaction

H6 - There is a positive relationship between tourist experience and perceived value

H7 - There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and satisfaction

H8 - There is a positive relationship between perceived quality and perceived value

H9 - There is a positive relationship between perceived value and satisfaction

H10 - There is a positive relationship between perceived value and tourist complaints

H11 - There is a positive relationship between satisfaction and tourist complaints

H12 - There is a positive relationship between satisfaction and destination loyalty

H13 - There is a negative relationship between tourist complaints and destination loyalty

**Methodology**

After rigorous review of tourist destination marketing literature, the theoretical model with thirteen hypotheses was proposed to be tested empirically. The self-administered questionnaire was designed with two sections to collect primary data for the study. The tool was on a 5-point Likert scale where respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree).

**Measures**

The study adapts Gartner (1989) and Tasci and Gartner (2007) to measure the constructs identified in the literature review. Destination Image: Natural attractions, entertainment and events, historical and cultural attractions, accessibility of the destination, level of service quality; Tourist Expectation: the experience was as what I expected, the visit made me happy, exotic experience, choice to visit SL was a wise one; Perceived Quality: infrastructure, accommodation, activities, services, attractions, food and beverage; Perceived Value: had a relaxing time in SL, the trip gave me greater social approval, gave me great pleasure, trip was of good value, I enjoyed the stay with a value for money; Satisfaction: the visit was exactly what I wanted, the visit did not work our as I expected, I was satisfied to visit SL, I truly enjoyed the visit to SL, happy with the services and amenities; Tourist Complaints: likely to make a complaint on facilities, complain about services, likely to complain on overall experience; Destination Loyalty: I would recommend other to visit SL, I’ll visit SL again in future, SL is my first choice among competitive destinations, I’ll spread positive words about SL.

**Sample, Data Collection and Analytical Approach**

Pilot survey was conducted in Kandy UNESCO World Heritage City with 47 foreign tourists and the instrument was further refined based on the implications of responses. The instrument was cross validated for phase validity through five tourism professors and was reworded. The final survey was conducted at Bandaranaike International Airport (BIA) from 23rd March to 29th April using accidental sampling method. Out of 700 questionnaires 570 were qualified for final analysis with an 81 percent effective rate. Partial Least Square (PLS) path modeling approach (Hair et al., 2013) was used to test the proposed model applying tool SmartPLS3 (Ringle, Wende, & Will, 2005). PLS as opposed to covariance-based SEM techniques was preferred given its robust component-based approach which avoids estimation and identification issues. PLS handles comparatively smaller samples and it has less restrictive assumptions on normality of data distribution which is suitable for theory building, theory extension and predictive applications (Hair et al. 2013; Hair, Ringle & Sarstedt, 2015).

**Results and Discussion**

In order to handle potential measurement problems preliminary analysis of data was performed to confirm the reliability and unidimensionality of scale. Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) value was (KMO=0.823), confirming sampling adequacy for the test. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant (X² = 1341.367, p<0.001) conforming item correlation requisite to perform Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Commonalities of extraction were 0.96, 0.98, 0.96, 0.94, 0.98, 0.99 and 0.97 for destination image; tourist loyalty, perceived quality, perceived value, satisfaction, tourist complaints and tourist expectation exceeded Keiser’s critical value criterion (0.60).

**Demographic Profile of the Respondents (N=570)**

Descriptive statistics related to tourists’ demography are illustrated in Table 1. Out of 570 respondents’ 47.8 percent were male and 52.2 percent were female. Respondents were in varying age groups, representing 18.9 percent from 26-35 age group, 28.4 percent from 36-45 age group and 35.8 from 46-55 age group. Nearly, 37 percent respondents attend college while 28 percent are graduates. In terms of occupation nearly 36 percent respondents were from private sector while almost 25 percent run on their own business. Majority of the respondents belonged to middle income range representing 29.3 percent from 2001-3000 USD monthly income group while another 24 percent were from upper middle-income range.

| Trip Characteristics of Foreign Tourists in Sri Lanka (N=570) |
|-----------------|----------|--------|
| Variable          | Frequency | Percent |
| No. of times visited |        267 | 46.8   |
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The table above illustrates the trip characteristics of foreign tourists in Sri Lanka
and accordingly, 47 percent of visitors are first time visitors and the balance 53
percent is repeat visitors. Nearly 10 percent of the visitors have visited Sri Lanka
more than 7 times as per the above table. Nearly 44 percent visited for pleasure
while 22.3 percent represent business purposes to travel in Sri Lanka. Majority
of visitors (31%) stay less than five days while another 28.2 percent stay over a
period of 6 to 8 days and nearly 14 percent of the visitors stay over 15 days in
Sri Lanka during their tour. 28 percent of visitors travel in a small group while
in a medium group represented a quarter.

Evaluation of Measurement Model
In order to establish the robustness of reflective measurement models the
composite reliability, indicator reliability, convergent validity and discriminant
validity are use according to Hair, Ringle, Sarstedt, Christian & Marko
(2013, p 97).

High reliability of measures was indicated by all the composite reliability values
of Table 1 (0.71 to 0.91) and all the CR values are above the threshold value of
0.7 as per Hair et al. (2013, p 105) and are well above the critical values.

Out of 39 indicators several were slightly lower than the threshold value for item
outer loading which is 0.708 (Table 3) in a measurement model. However, these
indicators were rigorously observed and given their significance in the overall
model they were spared, given their contribution to retain the composite
reliability of the construct (Hair et al. 2013, p 103). The greater loadings of the
majority of indicators (0.717 to 0.900) indicated high reliability of measures.
The convergent validity of the measures was established through the Average
Variance Extracted (AVE) and the value should be greater than 0.50 according
to Hair et al. (2013 p 103). All the AVE values in the Table 1 (0.57 to 0.81) were
above the threshold value for AVE in a measurement model. In order to test the
discriminant validity, cross loadings of indicators were observed. Hair et al.
(2013, p 105), argue that an indicator’s outer loading on the related construct
should be higher than all of its loadings on the other constructs (Hair et al. 2013, p 105)
in order claim discriminant validity for items. Item loadings were compared
against its loadings on the other constructs and majority of items conformed to
this requirement though few exceptions were observed.

Measurement model Evaluation; Reliability, Discriminant Validity and Convergent Validity

Table 2: Measurement model Evaluation; Reliability, Discriminant Validity and Convergent Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Item</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>t-Statistic</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL1</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>28.750***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL2</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>16.24***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL3</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>17.048***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL4</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>49.667***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL5</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>39.573***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Expectation</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>30.176***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE2</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>40.226***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE3</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>19.076***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE4</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>43.329***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Quality</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ1</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>16.153***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ2</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>19.103***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ3</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>23.014***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ4</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>18.657***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ6</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>32.904***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ7</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>39.140***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV1</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>15.672***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV2</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>13.984***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV3</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>43.023***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV4</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>39.678***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV5</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>28.435***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>33.848***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS2</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>27.292***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS3</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>30.200***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS4</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>13.057***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS5</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>26.785***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS6</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>34.525***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Complaints</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC1</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>39.877***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>40.874***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC2</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>21.632***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Loyalty</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL1</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>28.671***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL2</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>21.164***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL3</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>28.958***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL4</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>24.488***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Level of significance extracted from Bootstrapping Analysis *** Significant at 0.01 level

AVE= Average Variance Extracted

Source: Empirical survey April, 2018
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Evaluation of Structural Model and Hypothesis Testing

The structural equation model (Figure. 1) was assessed by coefficient of determination ($R^2$) of endogenous latent variables. According to Hair et al (2013, p-186), $R^2$ values 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 represent weak, moderate and substantial predictive power of endogenous latent variables respectively. Model explains 79 percent of variance of tourist expectations, 83 percent variance of perceived quality of tourists, 69 percent of the variance of perceived value, 88 percent of the variance of tourist satisfaction, 87 percent of the variance of tourist complaints and finally 76 percent of the variance of tourists’ destination loyalty in the proposed model. In order to assess the model further, authors implemented PLS iterative bootstrapping procedure by generating 5000 sub samples with 570 cases (Hair et al, 2013, p-191).

All the relationships proposed in the theoretical model were statistically significant. However, destination image with perceived value, perceived value with tourists’ complaints and satisfaction and tourists’ complaints showed negative relationships as opposed to what is available in literature. Table below (Table 4) exhibits standardized path coefficients and relevant $t$-statistic with reference to hypothesized relationships established in the conceptual model of this study. Consequently, out of the 13 hypotheses proposed 10 were significant and supported with the final PLS model. The relevant standardized coefficients and $t$-statistics are exhibited in the table 4 below for each hypothesized relationship.

### Table 3: Results of Proposed Model (using PLS-SEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>$t$-statistic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Destination image</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>102.55***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Tourist expectation</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>6.83***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Destination satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>2.34***</td>
<td>Not-Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Destination image</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>3.65***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Tourist expectation</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>10.32***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Tourist expectation</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>12.28***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Perceived satisfaction</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>6.96***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Perceived satisfaction</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>2.17***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Perceived satisfaction</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>1.17***</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hypotheses

- **H1**: Perceived value-tourist complaints
- **H2**: Satisfaction-tourist complaints
- **H3**: Satisfaction-destination loyalty
- **H4**: Tourist complaints-destination loyalty

Note: The Predictive Relevance ($Q^2$) of Model is Determined through blindfolding (Hair et al, 2013)

Tourism industry is expanding and growing into relationship-based marketing where loyalty is becoming crucial in securing adequate market share. Sri Lanka as a booming tourist destination in the region needs to strongly focus on building tourist loyalty to face the above challenge. The extended model incorporating tourists’ complaints in the SEM model to predict TDL has been statistically significant in explaining the thesis. Further, strong path coefficients and $R^2$ values showed the strength of the proposed model. The model explained has been significant in explaining tourists’ destination loyalty where destination image, perceived value, perceived quality, satisfaction and tourists’ expectation playing a significant role in determining TDL. According to the findings of Rasoolimanesh et al. (2016); Sarra, (2015) satisfaction of tourists has a strong relationship with TDL where this study further confirmed this claim.

### Conclusions and Contributions

#### Conclusions

The present study propositions an extended approach to explain tourists’ destination loyalty and investigate the empirical evidence on the relationships among destination image, consumer expectation, perceived value, perceived...
image, tourist complaints and destination loyalty. The SEM model tested in this study provides a comprehensive basis for integrating global tourist destination marketing strategy model in the tourism context while extending tourist destination marketing literature. The model estimated indicates that tourists’ satisfaction and complaints play a significant role in modelling their destination loyalty while it established insights into deeper details of the items contribute in shaping the constructs underlined in this thesis. According to the findings of this study, it provides strong empirical evidence that destination image, tourist expectation, perceived value, high destination satisfaction, and good consumer experience play essential roles in achieving the loyalty of foreign tourists, and that satisfaction needs proactive handling to develop a long-term relationship. The extended tourism marketing model perspective in this study has several implications for theory development in the future research.

Present findings contribute to the literature of tourist destination marketing both in theoretical and empirical aspects. It has opened up a discussion on tourist destination marketing strategies for post-war fast growing economic conditions based on an extended model with several critical determinants of destination loyalty.

**Theoretical Contributions**

Firstly, the overall explanation of satisfaction showed a significant progress through the model’s latent variables namely perceived quality, perceived value, destination image and tourist expectations of the destination. This adds to the exiting tourism literature and draws the attention of future researchers in conceptualizing tourist satisfaction over a visited destination. Secondly, the conceptualization of perceived complaints as an integrated reflective construct which consisted tourists’ perceived potential to make a complain showed adverse effects on tourist destination loyalty. This indicates a communal trend in tourists’ sensitivities towards complaints and implies novel theoretical aspects in conceptualizing destination loyalty. The study conceptualized perceived value of tourists also as an integrated reflective construct. The significant relationship between perceived value and satisfaction and destination loyalty draws the attention of future conceptualizations of destination loyalty incorporating complaints in to the framework. The present study is also noteworthy in terms of its methodological choice for SEM. Authors’ devised component based Partial Least Square (PLS) approach to model the determinants of tourists’ destination loyalty. PLSSEM is a promising, comparatively new approach provides fewer restrictions for path modeling approach (Hair et al. 2013).

**Empirical Contributions**

Given the fierce competition in international tourism market, ensuring tourists’ loyalty destinations draw greater attention due to two reasons. (1) Destination loyalty leads to tourists’ potential word of mouth and recommendation and this will either harm or enhance the destination’s prospective visitors. (2) Retracting a tourist is cheaper than bringing new tourists in terms of marketing cost. Hence, a clear understanding of what drives tourists’ destination loyalty is a prerequisite for a destination. Present study exposed destination loyalty antecedents and their root causes using component based PLS path modeling. The study revealed substantial implications for tourism destination managers and policy makers. Practically, destination marketers need to recognize deemed attractions the destination endowed with. For this context the nightlife, variety of activities, variety of cuisine, cleanliness, attractive environment and outdoor recreational opportunities call for managers’ attention. The quality perception of tourists in Sri Lanka calls for more attention in terms of overall tourism experience, transport and accessibility, hygiene and cleanliness, guiding and information availability as suggested by findings. The government should carefully assess the legal and policy framework to respond to the above claim specially the information availability to promote Sri Lankan tourism product carefully and hesitant to promote Sri Lankan tourism product properly. For instance, friendly and helpful host community, spectacular scenery and natural attractions, distinctive history and heritage were key contributing factors of attractiveness which led tourists’ satisfaction. Therefore, such attractions should be carefully managed and employed in promotional efforts. The tourists’ satisfaction playing the central role in tourists’ destination loyalty draws imperative attention. Tourist attractions and perceived quality level contributed largely to the level of satisfaction drawing due concern. Present higher portion of first time visitors could be turned to repeat clients through high satisfaction and destination loyalty. In conclusion, the tourists’ destination loyalty is determined by satisfaction and their satisfaction in terms of perceived quality, perceived attractiveness, perceived value, and perceived complaints need closer attention to ensure their destination loyalty.

Despite the strengths of this study several limitations worth declaring for future researchers. The proposed model of this study could further be extended to incorporate more variables to explain TDL. The model explained 76 percent of the variance of TDL where other variables are available and incorporation such variables are encouraged to enrich the model. Moderating effects of age, gender, income level, travel experience and level of education may be useful in explaining this thesis further. It is necessary to run such analysis to elucidate moderating effects of such variables. Moreover, enhanced sample sizes over wider geographic extent would enhance the findings of future studies.
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