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Abstract:

This research aims to examine the interrelationship among the experiential quality, tourism site image and experiential satisfaction toward the revisit intention of the tourism site visitors. The number of respondents in this research were 160 tourists that have visited the Muara Beting tourism site in Bekasi District.

The research is based on a confirmatory model. The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the help of AMOS statistic program was used to test the validity and the realibility of the instruments, goodness of fit model and the interrelationship that were hypothesized in the proposed theoretical model. The structural model proved that almost all of the hypothesized relationship were proven to be confirmed. The results revealed that there are positive impact of experiential quality towards the experiential satisfaction and Muara Beting image.

Experiential satisfaction is affected by experiential quality and tourism site image. The revisit intention is affected by the experiential satisfaction, but the tourism site image is not statistically proven affecting the revisit intention.
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1. Introduction

The tourism sector has been recognized as a mean to decrease the poverty level of a society and to facilitate the development in several new and under development areas (International Labor Organization). In Indonesia the tourism sector and the creative economy sector have generated high foreign exchange income. For example in 2013 the tourism sector and the creative economy sector have contributed US$ 10,054 billion, this number has increased from US$ 9,12 billion in 2012. The enhancement of the foreign exchange earnings were not only coming from the growth of the number of tourists, from 8 million tourists in 2010 to 8,8 million in 2011, but also from the increase in average spending from US$ 1,133 in 2012 to US$ 142 in 2013.

The increase of tourism foreign exchange income quantity was followed by the improvement of quality, whereas the economy sector contributed higher export values than the import values. Creative economy has recorded a surplus in trading during 2010 to 2013 with the surplus values Rp 118 trillion, which means the foreign exchange income contribution from the creative economy sector has reached US$ 11,89 billion, so in total the tourism sector and the creative economy sector have contributed to the foreign exchange income US$ 21,95. It can be stated that the the tourism and the creative economy have contributed 11,04% of the foreign exchange income for Indonesia (Kemenparekraf, 2014).

The above data shows that the availability of local tourism site will be very helpful to increase the productivity of the local society. The increase of productivity in relation to tourism is through the level of happiness. People who have vacation usually are happier than those who don’t (Liu, 2013), and happiness will bring positive impact increasing of society’s productivity (Cropanzano and Wright, 2001), because from the psychology point of view, by having vacation will increase the happiness and also will lower the stress of the society. In the research by Andereck and Nyaupane (2013), touring in outdoor environment will increase the quality of life of a person which will naturally will affect his productivity. A lot of nations and regions have serious concerns about the development of the profitable tourism site (Deng, 2011). Consumer spending in tourism site is expected to rise, especially with the emerge of the asian market as a profitable market to the tourism industry (Milman, 2009).

According to Yuan and Wu (2008), there were evidence showing that both negative and positive experience were results that cannot be avoided from consuming product/service even though their needs and wants are different. Experience, or more specific Experiential Consumption, refers to “Total results that are perceived by customer which are a combination of environment, product and service purchased” (Lewis and Chambers, 2000). Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) defined experiential consumption, as an alternative which can be referred to as hedonic consumption, as “various aspects of consumer behaviour that related to emotional aspect, fantasy and multi-sensory of someone’s experience to a product”. The nature of these
experiences are important to the tourism industry because the intangible experience is the essence of the product/service that are offered by this business (Yuan and Wu, 2008). According to Titz (2008), experiential consumption or hedonic consumption are the centre of the whole comprehension of the consumer behaviour in tourism and hospitality sector. The intangibility of hospitality product must be viewed from various side to be able to fully understand this whole phenomenon. A research about the hedonic aspect from experiential consumption is closely related with this intangibility. All products of tourism and hospitality industry are always in form of experience (Williams, 2000) and can be classified as total experience (Lewis and Chambers, 2000). In addition, Schmitt (1999) suggested that various experience that are given by an organization to their customers are very important to the success of the organization. To create a memorable experience is the critical point to maintain old customer and to gain new customers (Yelkul, 2000).

On the other side, several researchers (Clemes, Cohen and Wang, 2013; Clemes, Shu and Gan, 2014; Clemes, Wu, Hu and Gan, 2009; Jin, Lee and Lee, 2013a; Wu, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014) have found that experiential quality are the antecedent of image. Dobni and Zinkhan (1990) and Wu and Li (2014), showed that image also is a critical concept in the consumer behaviour research because image also affects the experiential satisfaction and the revisit intention simultaneously. The research of the interrelationship among experiential quality, experiential satisfaction and the revisit intention have been an issue of argument. Several models have been proposed and empirically tested in the industry, including tourism (Aziz, Ariffin, Osmar and Evin, 2012). Aziz et al. (2012) proposed two variables – experiential quality and experiential satisfaction – that affect the revisit intention of visitors. However, the experiential quality affect the revisit intention through the experiential satisfaction (Jin et al., 2013a; Li and Wu, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014). According to several studies (Aziz et al., 2012; Jin et al., 2013; Li, 2014; Li and Wu, 2013; Wu, Cheng and Hsu, 2014a; Wu and Li, 2014; Yuan and Wu, 2008; Dasanayaka and Sardana, 2015; Liapis et al., 2013; Keisiou et al., 2013; Srimuk and Choibamroong, 2014), the experiential quality in tourism site, includes several different physical and psychological aspects, and simultaneous interrelation among experiential quality, experiential value, experiential satisfaction, tourism site image and revisit intention.

This research aims to examine the interrelationship among the experiential quality, tourism site image and revisit intention that affect the visitors of the Muara Beting site.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1 Experiential Quality

Experiential quality of a customer has been a critical concept in consumer behaviour research (Chen and Chen, 2010; Grove, Fisk and Bitner, 1992; Kao et al., 2008; Otto and Ritchie, 1996). Conceptualization of experiential quality includes visitor affective respond to psychological benefit they want from a visiting experience (Chan
and Baum, 2007). Crompton and Love (1995) defined the experiential quality as “not only the attributes provided by the supplier, but also the attributes that were brought to the site by the visitor”. The evaluation of experiential quality is focused on the reflection of the customer attitude and cognitive towards the technical and functional benefit of the external service environment that were given by the service provider (Brady, Cronin and Brand, 2002; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; 1994; Dabhokar et al., 2000; Parasuraman et al., 1988). However, the measurement of experiential quality is subjective and depend on the feeling perceived by a visitor during this experience (Chen and Chen, 2010).

The evaluation of experiential quality tend to be holistic/gestalt compare to the evaluation based on attributes, and the focus of the evaluation is in the internal factor rather than the service environment (external). In addition, the coverage of experience is more general than specific, the nature of benefit is more beneficial/hedonic/symbolic rather than functional/attitudinal (Chen and Chen, 2010). In the context of tourism, experiential quality refers to the quality performance in the attribute level, where the experiential quality refers to the psychological results that is generated from the visitor participation in the tourism activity (Chen and Chen, 2010; Cole and Scott, 2004; Crompton and Love, 1995; MacKay and Crompton, 1988). Before, the quality of service attributes were under the control of the provider, where now not only from the attributes controled by the provider, but also from the attributes that were brought to the occasion by the visitors (Chen and Chen, 2010; MacKay and Crompton, 1988).

Several researchers (Ko, Zhang, Cattani and Pastore, 2011; Moon, Kim, Ko, Connaughton and Lee, 2011) have tried to modify the concept of experiential quality with the goal to define and create an experiential quality construct instead of using the more general category of experiential quality from every sector. On the other side, because the tourism service is naturally hedonic and based on consumer experience (Otto and Ritchie, 1996; Ryan, 1997), the research of consumer experience on tourism industry is for the practical and theoretical importance (Gine, Andreu and Gnoth, 2005). Generally, the quality perceived by the visitors were more related to their experience during the visiting process compare to the service provided by the tourism site itself. However, not like the service quality and its measurement, there were still a few research that give full attention to the experiential quality of spesific tourism participation such as the visit to tourism site (Chen and Chen, 2010; Li and Wu, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014).

The perception of experiential quality is subjective (Graefe and Fedler, 1986) and a product of individual sociodemography (Fedler and Ditton, 1986) and psychological perspective (Driver and Cooksey, 1977). The previous research (Brian, 1977; Fedler and Ditton, 1986) has revealed that individuals have series of thoughts about what made the experiential quality. According to Otto and Ritchie (1996), the experiential quality are made of 4 factors (hedonic, the peace of mind, envolvement and recognition) through the consumer survey data that obtained from three tourism
service sectors including hotels, airlines and tours and attractions. Cole and Scott (2004) used three factors – entertainment, education and community – to estimate the experiential quality perceived by the zoo visitors. Cole and Chancellor (2008) insisted that the experiential quality should consist of program, facility and entertainment. Jin et al. (2013a) and Kao et al. (2008) stated that the experiential quality is made of immersion, surprise, participation and fun. Lemke, Clark and Wilson (2011) showed that the measurement of experiential quality should based on the hedonism of product category, involvement, product complexity and connectivity. De Rojas and Camerero (2008) and Suryanto (2016) stated that the experiential quality perceived by the visitors consists of interaction quality, physical environment quality and output quality. Therefore, several researchers (Rojas and Camerero, 2008; Jin et al., 2013a; Kao et al., 2008; Li and Wu, 2013) stated that the experiential quality should be measured based on hierarchical model and multidimensional model to be able to accurately measure the experiential quality perceived by the visitors in a tourism site.

Several researchers (Chen & Chen, 2010; Chen and Tsai, 2007; Jin, Line and Gog, 2013b; Kao et al., 2008) showed that experiential quality positively affected the experiential value and experiential satisfaction. As an alternative, several researchers (Jin et al., 2013a, 2013b; Kao et al., 2008; Li and Wu, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014) indicate that additional proposal is the visitor perception of the experiential quality is an important prediction to the creation of experiential value, experiential satisfaction and tourism site image. Jin et al. (2013a, 2013b) found that the experiential quality can be seen as the antecedent of the experiential value, experiential satisfaction and image. Although the experiential quality affected the experiential value, experiential satisfaction and image, a small number of research concentrate on the experiential quality is opposite with the general experiential quality in tourism site (Jin et al., 2013a, 2013b; Kao et al., 2008; Li and Wu, 2013).

Several previous research (Dabholkar et al., 2000; Jarvis, MacKenzie and Podsakoff, 2003; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Malhotra, 2005) proposed that experiential quality should be measured by using a formative approach because the dimensions can lead the perception of the experiential quality. Specifically, the dimensions are the antecedents of quality using the formative approach (Brady and Cronin, 2001) and the changes of the indicators were assumed causing variation on the construct, rather than the changes in the construct cause changes in all indicators that consist of a multidimensional scale through reflective approach (Diamantopoulos, 2008). For example, a formative approach can assume that the visitor of a tourism site can evaluate two quality attributes in a different way. Visitors can evaluate a tangible (a subdimension of physical environment quality) and this evaluation may slightly correlate with their evaluation about the service provider capability (a subdimension of interaction quality). In the same context, the interaction quality (a primary dimension) should be evaluate by the visitors separately from the physical environment quality (a primary dimension).
Several researchers (Clemes et al., 2009; Dagger, Sweeney and Johnson, 2007; Wu, Wong and Cheng, 2014b; Wu, Lin and Hsu, 2011) stated that to make model for experiential quality as a formative construct through a hierarchical and multidimensional model, rather than using a more traditional reflective way, emphasize the effect of dimensions in experiential quality construct. As an alternative, Dagger et al. (2007) and Diamantopoulos (2006) proposed to make quality model using a formative measurement contribute to a better construct spesification. According to Jarvi et al. (2003), the existing literature suggested several studies are focused on the formative indicator measurement model, although they supposed to be like that. However, a hierarchical and multidimensional model of experiential quality has not been developed in an application framework to identify quality primary dimensions and subdimensions, and to analyze the interrelationship among quality primary dimensions and subdimensions spesifically around tourism site (Chin and Wu, 2009; Jin et al., 2013a; Kao et al., 2008; Li, 2014; Li and Wu, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014).

2.2 Experiential Satisfaction
The previous literature about satisfaction often focused on the satisfaction of product or service. The fact is, satisfaction is also an important variable in experience (Oliver, 1980; Westbrook and Oliver, 1991). Customer satisfaction from certain transaction was the first evaluation after purchasing or the positive feeling of the latest transaction experience (Oliver, 1993). Customers use personal experience to form cognitive and effective evaluation on the service relation and then form the satisfaction level (Storbacka, Standvik and Gronroos, 1994). Anderson, Fornell and Lehmann (1994) proposed that the overall evaluation of a purchased product or service based on previous experience. Mano and Oliver (1993) suggested that post purchase experience, the effect caused by the product very correlated to satisfaction.

Experiential satisfaction that was discussed in this research are the repercussion of the experiential satisfaction concept, which explore the service satisfaction and customer influence in certain situation (Kao, Huang and Yang, 2007). Although experiential satisfaction is the repercussion of the experiential satisfaction concept, experiential satisfaction focused on the customer overall evaluation on the experience after consumption (Kao et al., 2007). From the experience perspective, experiential satisfaction reflects the satisfaction perceived from the service content associated with certain transaction. Customers compare their experience with their previous hopes, which cause negative or positive disconfirmation (Kao et al., 2008). Emotional responses generated from negative or positive disconfirmation form the basic of customer’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Bigne et al., 2005). The concept of experiential satisfaction is proposed based on the experiential perspective and is defined as “the result of customer evaluation” about the content provided by the service provider (Kao et al., 2008).

Customer evaluation of quality indicates the important factor in their satisfaction (Anderson et al., 1994). Previous research tend to exclusively focused on the
product or service quality (Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha and Bryant, 1996), where the experiential quality result in experiential satisfaction (Kao et al., 2008). The revisit intention is directly affected by satisfaction (LaBarbera and Mazursky, 1983), and satisfaction is more influential in forming the revisit intention of someone than the quality (Cronin and Taylor, 1994). However, several researchers (Bigne et al., 2005; Kao et al., 2008; Li and Wu, 2013) stated that the interrelationship among experiential satisfaction, experiential quality and the revisit intention on a tourism object context is quite rare.

2.3 Tourism Site Image
The concept of image is a factor that can be explain in the behaviour knowledge theory (Myers, 1960) and can be seen as a significant competitive strategic component to marketers (Keller, 2003). Keller (1993) defined image as a perception of an organization which reflected in the associations that is stored in the customer memory. Barich and Kolter (1991) identified image as the whole image that is restored in public mind which is linked with an organization. An image also is a critical concept in the research of consumer behaviour because image also affected the customer personality, subjective perception, customer value, satisfaction and the revisit intention (Dobni and Zinkhan, 1990). Image has been used as an important factor in assessing customer perception, quality, satisfaction and revisit intention (Andreassen and Lindestad, 1998; Bloemer and De Ruyter, 1998; Castro, Armario and Ruiz, 2007; Chen, 2008; Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2000). For example, Andreassen dan Lindestad (1998) stated that an image of tourism company resulted from the quality significantly affected customer satisfaction and loyalty of a certain service context. Bloemer dan De Ruyter (1998) found that a department image can only affect store loyalty through satisfaction with the store, and loyalty anticipation of the store is placed in the revisit intention of the customers.

Several researchers (Gardial, Clemons, Woodruff, Schumann and Burns, 1994; Gutman, 1982; Zeithaml, 1988) showed that various emotional factor can affect the relationship between customer experience and behaviour by expanding the means-end theory. In this research, a tourism site image refers to the entire customer perception of the tourism site, specially the one resulted from emotional response and is affected by previous experience or information from other people about the tourism site (Haathi and Yavas, 2004; Jin et al., 2013a, 2013b; Li and Wu, 2013). In addition, the theory about attitude recommend that service evaluation affect image and direct experience is the main cause of the revisit intention (Lai, Griffin and Babin, 2009). Li, Cai, Lehto, and Huang (2010) showed that customers who are satisfied with the image they perceived from the pedestrian tourism site will most likely come again to visit the site. Although there was a demonstration of relationship between the image perceived with the customer experience in different sectors, degrading the logic to connect all these segments is quite difficult. Therefore, this research is expanding and adopting the concept of means-end theory through the demonstration of interrelationship among experiential quality, perceived image, revisit intention, specially for tourism site segment.
2.4 The Revisit Intention

The concept of revisit intention is derived from the behavioural intention. Oliver (1997) defined the behavioural intention (among them, repurchase and word-of-mouth intention) as “a situation where everything is connected in a behaviour. From vacation and recreation point of view, behavioural intention is an intention from a visitor to revisit the site in a year and his intention to frequently come to the destination (Baker and Crompton, 2000). Another factor involved in the evaluation of behavioural intention includes a desire to recommend to other people and positive word-of-mouth (Bigne, Sanchez and Sanchez, 2001). The revisit intention of visitors to a certain destination can be affected by the destination performance itself, such as the promotion effort and news that spread about the new attractions in the destination (Aziz et al., 2012). The revisit intention can be seen as the extension of satisfaction rather than an initiator from decision-making process to revisit (Um, Chon and Ro, 2006). Agreed with Han, Back and Barret (2009), the revisit intention can be described as a powerful possibility to revisit a restaurant with or without the positive attitude to the service provider.

One of the most important factor that affected the revisit intention from a customer is probably satisfaction (Bigne et al., 2001; Bowen, 2001; Kozak, 2001; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Oh, 1999). Satisfying customers is very important because it has an impact on expectation and intention of customer repurchase decision to revisit the site (Fuchs and Weirmair, 2004). Bigne et al. (2001) showed that satisfaction has an impact on revisit intention. However, there are lack of theoretical and empirical evidence that can link the antecedent of revisit intention on a tourism site (Aziz et al., 2012; Li and Wu, 2013).

3. Research Model And Hypothesis

Otrowski, O’Brien and Gordon (1993) studied the quality of airlines, argued that “positive experience over time (followed by several good experience) will lead to a positive image”. Image is resulted from all the experience consumed by visitors, and quality is the representative of all these experiential consumption. Therefore, the perception of experiential quality directly affected the perception of image (Aydin and Ozer, 2005). Jin et al., (2013a) showed that experiential quality significantly affected the perceived image. The additional proposal is that visitor perception about experiential quality is a important prediction to create perceived image of a tourism site context. As an addition, this research employs perceived image as another significant variable, closely associated with other variables: experiential satisfaction and revisit intention. As mentioned in the previous literature, a perceived image is a critical factor to better understand the quality of customer experience along with other variables “experiential satisfaction and revisit intention (Jin et al., 2013a). Therefore, these hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1 : Experiential quality positively affect the tourism site image;
Hypothesis 2 : Tourism site image positively affect the tourism site satisfaction;
Hypothesis 3: Tourism site image positively affect the revisit intention.

Customer evaluation of the quality show an important factor to their satisfaction (Anderson et al., 1994). Previous research lead the focus exclusively on the quality of a product or service (Fornell et al., 1996), where the research considered the experience and proposed that experiential quality will result in experiential satisfaction. Therefor, this hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 4: Experiential quality positively affect the experiential satisfaction.

The research in marketing field showed that the intention to repurchase depend on the level of customer satisfaction of their experience of the product or service (Sim and Lee, 2013). If customers are satisfied, most likely they will keep buying. In reverse, if they are not satisfied, most likely they will buy other alternatives (Oliver and Swan, 1989). In accordance with the empirical research by Juaneda (1996), the positive opinion of tourists about their vacation will rise the probability of their revisit intention and desire. Like wise, when the tourists have experience more fun than what they expected, most liket they will come back in the future rather than visit another tourism site (Ross, 1993). Therefore, this hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 5: Experiential satisfaction positively affect the revisit intention.

4. Proposed Research Model

Below is the picture of the research model used in this research.

Figure 1. The Research Model of The Interrelationship among the Experiential Quality, Experiential Satisfaction, Tourism Site Image and Revisit Intention.

4.2 Sample and Data Collection

This research is based on a survey method. This research was done with distributing questionnaires to respondents. Data collection was using convinience method. Respondents in this research were the tourists that were 18 years and older who have
visited the Muara Beting tourism site in Bekasi district. Data were collected from the questionnaires. The number of questionnaires that have been analyzed were 160.

**Table 1. Respondent Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profil</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Monthly Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Rp 1.000.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp 1.000.000 – Rp 2.000.000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp 2.001.000 – Rp 3.000.000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp 3.001.000 – Rp 4.000.000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Rp 4.000.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3 Validity Test Result**

Convergent validity test based on the AVE value is fulfilled if the AVE value result is ≥ 0.5 and this value can prove that there was enough convergency (Hair et al., 2010). In this research, the AVE value result to construct Experiential Quality, Tourism Site Image, Experiential Satisfaction and Revisit Intention were above 0.5. This means the convergent validity test based on AVE value is fulfilled.

**Table 2. Convergent Validity Test Result based on AVE value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>AVE value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Quality</td>
<td>0.5070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muara Beting Image</td>
<td>0.6184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.5203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit Intention</td>
<td>0.5468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4 Realibility Test Result**

Realitibility of an evaluation shows how far an evaluation is without any bias and therefore it guaranteed the evaluation is consistent through time and various item in the instrument (Sekaran, 2006). The reability test result in this research showed that
all constructs assessed were reliable because they all had *cronbach alpha* and construct reliability above 0.7.

### Table 3. Construct Reliability and Cronbach Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Quality</td>
<td>0.7098</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muara Beting Image</td>
<td>0.7806</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.7142</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit Intention</td>
<td>0.7333</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5 Goodness of Fit Model (GOF Model)

GOF shows how good an assessed model result back the covarian matrix among indicator variables (Hair et al., 2010, h.664). According Hair et al., (2010), researcher must report at least one *incremental* index and one *absolute* index, with two additional $\chi^2$ values and linked with the degree of freedom, and at least have one of the badness-of-fit index. Table 5 presents the conformity size index with the reference value for each index and value resulted from each index.

### Table 5. GOF Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity Size Index</th>
<th>Reference Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>$\leq 3$</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.03 – 0.08</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$\geq 0.90$</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.6 SEM Test Result

In this research, the critical ratio value used was $\pm 1.96$ in the level of significant 0.05 and $\pm 2.58$ on significant level 0.01. The hypotheses in this research are supported if the affect of a construct on anothe construct result in estimated parameter value in the form of critical ratio C.R) value above $\pm 1.96$ on significant level 0.05. if the critical ratio value is bigger than $\pm 2.58$, then the casual value between two construct is significant on significant level 0.01. The result of hypotheses evaluation are presented in the table below.
Table 6. Loading Value and Structural Link Significant Among Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Weight</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Quality → Tourism Site Image</td>
<td>4.952**</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kualitas Pengalaman → Experiential Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.310*</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Site Image → Experiential Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.971**</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Satisfaction → Revisit Intention</td>
<td>6.052**</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Site Image → Revisit Intention</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is shown that four hypotheses in this research were proven significant, in other words the four hypotheses were supported.

In this research it is found that hypothesis 1, hypothesis 2, hypothesis 4 and hypothesis 5 were supported. However hypothesis 3 was not supported. Hypothesis 1 (H1) declared that experiential quality positively affect the tourism site image, proven to be supported in this research. The result of this hypothesis evaluation revealed that experiential quality affect on tourism site image is positive and significant. This result is in line with the result of Wu and Li (2014). Wu and Li (2014) found that experiential quality have positive impact on tourism site image.

This result is also in line with Otrowski, O’Brien and Gordon (1993) who have researched the quality of airline services and they argued that “positive experience will over time (followed by several good experience) lead to positive image”. An image of all experience consumed by visitors and quality is the representative of all this consumed experience. Therefore, the perceived experiential quality will directly affect the perceived image (Aydin and Ozer, 2005). Jin et al., (2013a) showed that experiential quality significantly affect the perceived image. Additional proposal is the experiential quality perceived by the visitors is an important prediction to create the perceived image in tourism object context. In addition, this research used image that is perceived as other significant variables, closely associated with other variables: experiential satisfaction and revisit intention. As mentioned in the previous literature, the perceived image is a critical factor to more understand the visitor experiential quality along with other variable results “experiential satisfaction and revisit intention” (Jin et al., 2013a). Li, Cai, Lehto, and Huang (2010) revealed that satisfied customers with the perceived image of the pedestrian tourism destination most likely will visit this site again. In line with the empirical research done by Juaneda (1996), positive opinion of tourists about their vacation will rise the probability of their revisit intention and desire.
Andreassen and Lindestad (1998) showed that the image generated from the tour company significantly affect the satisfaction and loyalty of customers in certain service context. Bloemer and De Ruyter (1998) found that department image can only affect the store loyalty through satisfaction with the store, and anticipated the loyalty to the store lies on the revisit intention of the customers.

This research found the evidence that tourism site image does not affect the revisit intention of visitors to the tourism object in Bekasi District. This result is different with the result of Wu and Li (2014) which revealed that cultural heritage tourism site affected the revisit intention. In this research the revisit intention is affected by experiential quality and tourism site image through experiential satisfaction.

5. Conclusion, Limitation And Implication

In the context of specific service marketing which is cultural heritage tourism site, the tourism site image did not affect the revisit intention directly. It is found empirically that experiential satisfaction is the most influential variable to the revisit intention. This shows that tourists who have high experiential satisfaction to the cultural heritage tourism site will have revisit intention to the site. This research did not evaluate the actual revisit behaviour factor. It has not revealed the factors that can affect the actual revisit behaviour. The object of research was only the product of cultural heritage tourism site, it did not use the tourism site in general. The research used the self-report data so it was possible to cause social desirability bias, because the variables used in this research mostly are normative variables.

The result of this research can be used as reference to improve knowledge about service marketing in the cultural heritage tourism site by using the experiential quality, tourism site image and experiential satisfaction to see the revisit intention of the tourists. The results support several previous works among them the research of Wu and Li (2014); Bigne et al., 2001; Bowen, 2001; Kozak, 2001; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000 and Oh, 1999.
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