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ABSTRACT

Purpose – Local food and tourism are the main components that determine tourist behavior. Key attributes of local food such as taste, quality, appearance, environment and employee behavior may vary from country to country. Local food plays an important role in determining the overall tourist experience of the destination. The purpose of this research is to develop a conceptual model to determine the loyalty of tourists in choosing local culinary.

Methodology/approach – The population of this research is tourists who come to culinary tourism destinations in Palembang City at the time the survey was conducted. Convenience sampling method was used to determine the research sample. The sample in this study were 168 respondents. On researchdata analysis technique using SEM AMOS.

Findings – This study explains that the quality of personal interaction and service quality have a positive and significant effect on tourist satisfaction. Tourist satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on tourist loyalty.

Novelty/value – Based on a review of various literatures related to this study, there has been no research in the field of tourism marketing that integrates the concepts of food quality, personal interaction quality, environmental quality, perceived value and service quality that were developed together to measure tourist satisfaction and the concept of tourist satisfaction to measure tourist loyalty.

INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector is considered as one of the most potential and financially attractive income generating sectors. Among other service industries, the tourism sector makes a significant contribution to the world economy (Sharma et al., 2017; Rahman et al., 2018). As a result, the world economy continues to invest in the tourism sector. Poon and Lock-Teng Low (2005) explain that tourist activities depend on features of the tourism industry which can include cultural events, shopping activities, consumption of local food and beverages, new accommodation projects, and other entertainment activities. Yeoman and McMahon-Beatte (2016) argue that tourism is a combination of products and services related to nature, which are mainly...
related to food and destinations. Getz et al., (2014)

Key attributes of local food such as taste, quality, appearance, environment and employee behavior may vary from country to country. Seo and Yun (2015) stated that local food attributes attract foreign tourists to consume local cuisine, while their participation raises awareness for other tourists. On the other hand, economic development is also highly correlated with the tourism sector (Wang et al., 2017). This is because income and sources of employment are generated by tourism activities. In addition, changes in the socio-economical and demographic environment have increased competition and interest in policy makers to suggest strategies that are useful in the tourism sector. Travel and tour operators believe that growth in the tourism sector will benefit their business and enable travel planners to attract tourists to choose a destination. Basically, local food has been identified as an important element for tourist attraction (Robinson and Getz, 2014).

Previous studies reported that local food plays an important role in determining the overall tourist experience of the destination. Many have suggested that food quality, destination image, service quality, heritage and atmospheric environment are considered as significant predictors of tourist satisfaction (Henderson, 2014; Wang et al., 2017; Rahman et al., 2018). Research by Bustan and Setiawan (2019) states that perceived service quality has a positive effect on tourist satisfaction in buying local food. Their findings also suggest that future research should explore additional factors such as word of mouth (WOM) perception to gain more understanding of food-related tourism. Research by Bustan and Setiawan (2019) states that food quality has a significant effect on visitor satisfaction but has no significant effect on chain messages. Ting et al., (2016) stated that consumers are more eager to explore diverse foods with advanced tastes and cultures to satisfy their intentions. This indicates that local food in tourism literature has become a growing trend.

In tourism studies, satisfaction becomes more complex when the research setting is related to tourists’ food choices. Breiby and Slåtten (2018) mention tourist satisfaction as a multifaceted concept. Similarly, Phillips et al., (2013) stated that satisfaction is an evaluation of a person's subjective consumption associated with various factors, namely attractions, accommodations, experiences, food and activities. Heung and Quf (2000) strongly emphasize that satisfaction has strategic importance for the business because it has a strong relationship with future purchases and WOM recommendations. Soutar (2001) identified satisfaction as a post-purchase behavior that increases loyalty and provides WOM recommendations.

Bustan and Setiawan (2019) stated that visitor satisfaction has a significant effect on chain messages. Furthermore, previous research proposed two dominant loyalty concepts such as behavioral and attitude loyalty (Belanche et al., 2012). Behavioral loyalty refers to the continuous purchase of a particular brand, product or service (Yi and Jeon, 2003). On the other hand, attitudinal loyalty not only refers to repeat purchases, but also indicates positive feelings and future dispositions by individuals or to generate recommendations (Silva and Goncalves, 2016). However, research by Sobihah et al., (2015); Chang and Chen (2008) stated that the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty is quite complex because satisfaction is not directly related to loyalty.

Palembang is one of the historical cities in South Sumatra which has a rich history and culinary heritage. Local food in Palembang is well known globally for its taste, presentation and uniqueness. Currently, the people who live in Palembang City are not only natives but also immigrants from various regions outside the city of Palembang. Each region has its own traditions which are reflected in the food dishes. Oftentimes, local culinary dishes in Palembang City also reflect Malay culture, and the diverse cooking styles create
added value to the food. In particular, the most common local food dish in Palembang City is a dish combined with rice by having a number of variations which include, Nasi Samin, Pindang Bone, Pindang Fish, Pindang Tempeyak. Besides that, Palembang city is known to have a variety of famous traditional foods such as pempek, kemolang crackers, lakso, laksan, burgo, yeast, otak-otak. Overall, the local food in Palembang City is also delicious and healthy, and some dishes have been proven to reduce various diseases. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish. This is because when preparing food using healthy spices, namely ginger, clove seeds, cumin seeds and turmeric powder. In addition, most local foods use fresh tomatoes, garlic and onions, eggplant, and seasonal crops to enhance the nutritional features of the food dish.

Based on the literature review, it is still found that the results of research on tourist loyalty in the selection of local culinary are contradictory so that it still creates a research gap, and there is still little research that explains tourist satisfaction and WOM in the selection of local food in Indonesia, especially in South Sumatra. In addition, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the behavior of tourists visiting culinary tourism destinations is suspected to have undergone a significant change. Therefore, this study is an attempt to determine the factors that determine tourist satisfaction, loyalty and WOM behavior in choosing local food in Palembang City.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Self Concept
The idea of self-concept is well established in social psychology. According to Ross (1971), self-concept explains the personality of customers when they choose different brands, products and services. It is generally accepted that an individual's perception of oneself (self-concept) will have a greater influence on the selection of products, brands and services (Shamah et al., 2018). Therefore, previous studies have explored several dimensions of self-concept (Abel et al., 2013; Shamah et al., 2018). Overall, consumer psychology research has introduced four key dimensions of self-concept, namely actual self-concept, ideal self-concept, social self-concept, and ideal social self-concept. The true self-concept refers to how consumers perceive themselves, while the ideal self-concept describes how consumers want to see themselves. Similarly, the social self-concept defines how consumers think other people perceive them, while the ideal social self-concept describes how consumers want to be perceived by others. Abel et al., (2013) and Shamah et al., (2018) suggest that among the four dimensions of self-concept, many researchers focus primarily on the dimensions of actual and ideal self-concept. To join the mainstream of research, we used the dimensions of actual and ideal self-concept (Hosany and Martin, 2012; Shamah et al., 2018). In addition, Hosany and Martin (2012) show that previous studies have mostly focused on consumers' self-concepts in the context of pre-purchase perceptions. In contrast, our study setting focuses on consumer post-consumption attributes by examining the impact of various customer satisfaction factors (i.e. food quality, interpersonal interaction quality, perceived environmental quality, perceived value and service quality) on key customer outcomes such as satisfaction, loyalty and WOM. In this debate, Confente (2015) and Matzler et al., (2019) stated that satisfaction, loyalty and WOM relationships are more prominent among researchers in tourism management. Previous studies focused on a simple and straightforward chain of arguments: tourist satisfaction leads to loyalty and loyalty results in WOM. However, our study also
examines the satisfaction-loyalty-WOM chain, while satisfaction antecedents are also integrated in the model.

**Self-Concept Theory in Tourism Literature**

Sirgy (2015) describes self-concept as the degree of differentiation between customer perceptions of a product or brand, and the perceptions they have of themselves. The idea of self-concept assumes that the similarity between the two concepts will increase consumers’ preference for a brand or product because it validates and strengthens their self-perception (Swann et al., 1992). In the past literature, Chon’s (1992) study initially introduced the theory of self-concept in tourism-related studies. He used a sample of 225 individuals who had recently visited Virginia and Norfolk. A survey-based questionnaire was distributed to respondents via email asking about their travel satisfaction and how they perceived them as similar to frequent visitors to Norfolk and Virginia. The results show that self-concept and customer satisfaction have a positive relationship. Thus, this indicates that customers who perceive themselves as similar to those who frequent Norfolk show greater satisfaction. Since Chon’s (1992) research on self-concept in tourism, many studies have been conducted to validate the self-concept model in tourism literature. Litvin and Kar (2004) replicated Chon’s (1992) research in Singapore. They investigated the relationship between actual, ideal self-concept, and tourist satisfaction. Many studies were conducted to validate the self-concept model in the tourism literature. Litvin and Kar (2004) replicated Chon’s (1992) research in Singapore. They investigated the relationship between actual, ideal self-concept, and tourist satisfaction. Many studies were conducted to validate the self-concept model in the tourism literature. Litvin and Kar (2004) replicated Chon’s (1992) research in Singapore. They investigated the relationship between actual, ideal self-concept, and tourist satisfaction.

Sirgy and Su (2000) presented an integrated model of self-concept and tourist behavior. Their findings report that travel behavior does not only depend on the individual’s self-concept, but various other factors also influence tourist behavior. Beerli et al., (2007) empirically tested the concept of self-concept in Spain against destination choice. The findings reveal that there is a strong relationship between ideal and actual self-concepts and destination image, which in turn leads to greater intention of travelers to visit a destination. Ekinci and Riley (2003) suggest that self-concept is closely related to personality attributes. Their investigation used eight personality traits in the service industry. The results of the study concluded that the individual’s self-concept increased due to the level of satisfaction with the service provider. In this context, Kressmann et al., (2006) consider personality congruence as a significant predictor of satisfaction. Another study by Litvin and Kar (2004) examined the relationship between destination interest, self-image and tourists’ choices about destinations. They conclude that further investigation is needed to build consensus on self-concept theory as an effective tool for tourism studies.

Boksberger et al., (2011) explain the theory of self-concept in the tourism industry on Swiss travel big data. Their work highlights three important questions relating to self-concept theory in tourism studies: the extent to which self-concept theory can be applied in tourism; the extent to which personal factors and goals determine the level of self-concept; and whether or not self-concept theory applies in tourism-related studies. Luna-Cortes et al., (2019) empirically investigated the theory of self-concept in generation Y travelers. Using a sample of 444 Spanish trips, they concluded that self-concept plays an important role in explaining tourist satisfaction, loyalty and positive WOM. As a result, positive WOM is increasingly influencing Generation Y travelers to use virtual social networks during their trip.

Sop and Kozak (2019) use the functional and self-concept of Turkish tourists on hotel brand loyalty. They collected data on a sample of 732 tourists who used the services of five-star hotels. The results of the study concluded that the functional concept has a greater influence on hotel brand loyalty compared to the tourist self-concept. Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that the self-concept theory provides the basis for the study of tourism. Boksberger et al., (2011) suggest that self-concept theory demands more study, especially in tourism-related studies. In addition, Muscat et al., (2019) stated that food choices and tourist destinations are more complex to understand. This indicates that fine dining is associated with the intellectual and cognitive aspects of tourists. Goolaup et al., (2018) highlight the importance of in-depth
knowledge for tourists and their frequent exposure to the dining experience. Bausch and Unseld (2018) also emphasize the need for more evidence against food tourism. Therefore, we undertook this study to understand the demand for existing literature on tourist behavior in local food selection.

Hypothesis Development

Culinary Quality Relationship with Tourist Satisfaction

People’s eating out routines change due to changes in lifestyle behavior (Jalilvand et al., 2017). This has given rise to more dine-out habits of foodies to sample new flavors, comfortable restaurant environments, and explore places of quality food. In this context, the overall dining experience plays an important role in predicting customer preferences about food. Restaurant operators must be aware of customer evaluations of food and restaurant quality to understand customer satisfaction. This can be done by paying attention to quality features, such as service reliability, nutrition, food quality and environmental cleanliness (Liu and Jang, 2009a). Ryu and Han (2010) suggest that customers’ perceptions of satisfying food quality may include nutritious ingredients, attractive presentation, and quality taste. Ha and Jang (2010) found a positive and significant relationship between food quality and customer satisfaction. Mattila (2001), on the other hand, argues that food quality is more important than comfort, restaurant cleanliness, price and value. Previous studies have also reported that food quality is a significant determinant of customer choice of restaurants (Mattila, 2001). In addition, Sulek and Hensley (2004) report that food quality is a fundamental element of customer satisfaction in the overall restaurant experience. As well as, Peri (2006) highlights food quality as a major determinant of customer expectations. Jalilvand et al., (2017) and Susskind and Chan (2000) consider food quality as an important factor for assessing customer satisfaction in restaurants. Recently, Muscat et al., (2019) showed a positive and significant relationship between food quality and tourist satisfaction. Based on the discussion of the literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1. Culinary quality has a positive and significant effect on tourist satisfaction.

Relationship Quality of Interpersonal Interaction with Tourist Satisfaction

Relational marketing mainly focuses on interpersonal interactions between buyers and sellers (Harker and Egan, 2006). Long term relationships with customers are necessary for a successful business. Previous studies have shown that tourists enjoy hospitality when service providers direct quality interactions with them (Scanlan and McPhail, 2000). This quality interaction shows a significant positive impact in building relationships, which results in satisfied customers (Jalilvand et al., 2017). Furthermore, Jayachandran et al. (2005) stated that relationship building is a process by which customers feel comfortable communicating easily with service organizations (registering complaints and providing feedback). Claycomb and Martin (2001) also highlight the importance of quality interpersonal interactions with customers. They argue that customers should be contacted regularly to increase their level of satisfaction. The more contact between the service provider and the customer, the greater the opportunity for the service provider to meet customer needs. Parsons (2002) also emphasizes the importance of communication between organizations and customers to increase trust and cooperation, especially during the relationship building process. Mustelier-Puig et al., (2019) focuses on the relationship between interaction quality and tourist satisfaction. The results show that the quality of interaction is influenced by tourist satisfaction with tourism destinations and services. In short, it is expected that there is a significant positive relationship between the quality of interpersonal relationships and customer satisfaction. Based on the discussion of the literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2. Quality of interpersonal interaction has a positive and significant effect on tourist satisfaction.

Relationship between Physical Environment Quality and Tourist Satisfaction

Bitner (1992) describes a direct relationship between a firm’s servicescape and cognitive responses (eg perceptions, satisfaction and beliefs). In the restaurant business, the physical environment refers to non-
human elements that support service quality. These elements include comfortable seating, interior/exterior decor, furniture and ambient conditions. Mattila (2001) argues that business travel satisfaction is associated with the hotel servicescape. This argument is also supported by Han and Ryu (2009). They argue that the physical environment of the restaurant has a significant positive effect on customer satisfaction. Similarly, Liu and Jang (2009b) investigated the impact of a restaurant's physical environment on the behavioral intentions of customers in Chinese restaurants. The findings revealed that eating mood was a significant predictor of behavioral intention. Tuzunkan and Albayrak (2016) reported that the physical environment of a restaurant depends on the demographic characteristics of customers. In addition, many studies establish a close relationship between the physical environment and overall customer satisfaction (Muskat et al., 2019; Jalilvand et al., 2017). The research shows that the level of customer satisfaction is influenced by the physical environment of the restaurant. Thus, customers who are satisfied with the relaxed physical environment are expected to revisit restaurant services. Based on the discussion above, this study proposes the following hypothesis: many studies establish a close relationship between the physical environment and overall customer satisfaction (Muskat et al., 2019; Jalilvand et al., 2017). The research shows that the level of customer satisfaction is influenced by the physical environment of the restaurant. Thus, customers who are satisfied with the relaxed physical environment are expected to revisit restaurant services. Based on the discussion above, this study proposes the following hypothesis: many studies establish a close relationship between the physical environment and overall customer satisfaction (Muskat et al., 2019; Jalilvand et al., 2017). The research shows that the level of customer satisfaction is influenced by the physical environment of the restaurant. Thus, customers who are satisfied with the relaxed physical environment are expected to revisit restaurant services. Based on the discussion above, this study proposes the following hypothesis: H3. The physical environment has a positive and significant effect on satisfaction.

**Relationship between Value Perception and Tourist Satisfaction**

The consumer's overall assessment of utility about a particular product or service (what is promised and what is delivered) is known as perceived value (Zeithaml, 1988). Previous studies confirmed that customer satisfaction and perceived value have a strong positive relationship especially in the service industry (Jalilvand et al., 2017; McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Ryu et al., 2008; Ryu and Han, 2010). In a separate study setting, Chiou (2004) stated that customer satisfaction has a strong positive relationship with customers' perceived value. Similarly, Andreassen and Lindestad (1998) show that perceived value is a key predictor of customer satisfaction in service industries. Patterson and Spreng (1997) further report a positive relationship between perceived customer value and satisfaction. Jalilvand et al., (2017) found that customer perceived value was significantly related to customer satisfaction at Chinese restaurants located in the USA. In the same section Vein, McDougall and Levesque (2000) found that customer perceived value is a significant predictor of customer satisfaction in four service industries: hairdressing, restaurant, dental and automotive services. Ryu et al., (2008) highlight the importance of the relationship file between customer perceived value and satisfaction. The results show that the customer's perceived value is influenced by the fast casual restaurant image and subsequently has an impact on customer satisfaction. Suhartanto et al. (2019) also found that perceived value and satisfaction were significant predictors of tourist behavior. Therefore, this study proposes the following hypothesis: H4. Value perception has a positive and significant effect on tourist satisfaction.

**Relationship between Service Quality and Tourist Satisfaction**

Service quality refers to the difference between service expectations and actual service performance (Parasuraman et al., 1985). More precisely, service quality is a tool for determining the general expectations of customers about the services provided (Parasuraman et al., 1988). In the food industry, most hotels have similar facilities but their survival depends on delivering quality services to customers (Mohsin and Lockyer, 2010). Han and Hyun (2017) show that service quality directly affects the level of customer satisfaction in
Korean restaurants. Chang (2006) emphasizes the role of service quality and customer satisfaction. The results of the study reveal that guest perceptions of service quality are highly correlated with the personality traits of hotel employees. Similarly, Ineson et al. (2011) reported that employee trust and honesty play an important role to achieve high service quality. Vijayadurai (2008) also recommends that hotel managers should ensure friendly customer service to improve the overall restaurant service quality. Furthermore, the findings of Al Khattab and Aldehayyat (2011) show that customers expect dimensions that are more real than other expectations. This indicates that the aspect of physical service quality is more relevant to previous customer expectations. According to Oliver (1980) excellent service quality results in customer satisfaction, which motivates customers to consume more products in the future. Besides that, the findings of Ali and Raza (2017) show that compliance with service quality will increase the level of customer satisfaction in the service industry. Muscat et al., (2019) reported that higher levels of service quality result in higher levels of customer satisfaction. Therefore, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

H5. Quality of service has a positive and significant influence on tourist satisfaction.

### Relationship of Tourist Satisfaction with Tourist Loyalty

The level of customer satisfaction plays an important role to retain more customers. It also helps managers to develop products and services according to customer needs (Tan and Khatijah, 2014; Yooshik and Muzaffer, 2005). Tourist satisfaction is generally based on past and present experiences along with comparisons between past and present travel destinations (Yoon and Uysal, 2005). According to Hunt (1975), satisfaction is a combination of travel experience and evaluation of services received by an individual. This means that satisfaction is determined when consumers compare their perceptions with their initial expectations. In this context, Yuksel and Yuksel (2001) state that consumers will feel satisfied when the perceived experience matches or is higher than expectations. Besides that, Satisfied customers generally show commitment and perform loyalty behaviors (Chen et al., 2016; Li et al., 2015). On the other hand, some researchers argue that the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty is quite complex because satisfaction is not directly related to loyalty (Sobihah et al., 2015). On the other hand, Chang and Chen (2008) stated that dissatisfied customers can still show loyal behavior. However, particularly in tourism studies, Parra-Lopez et al. (2018) and Alrawadieh et al. (2019) found a positive and significant relationship between satisfaction and loyalty. Based on the arguments above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

some researchers argue that the relationship between satisfaction and loyalty is quite complex because satisfaction is not directly related to loyalty (Sobihah et al., 2015). On the other hand, Chang and Chen (2008) stated that dissatisfied customers can still show loyal behavior. However, particularly in tourism studies, Parra-Lopez et al. (2018) and Alrawadieh et al. (2019) found a positive and significant relationship between satisfaction and loyalty. Based on the arguments above, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H6. Satisfaction tourists have a positive and significant effect on tourist loyalty.

### Research Framework
Based on the literature review related to the concepts used in this research, it can be described the conceptual framework of this research. The conceptual framework is described as follows:

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**Figure 1. Research Concept Framework**

### METHOD

**Research Approach**

To conduct an empirical analysis, this study uses a quantitative method that refers to the research of Björk and Kaupinnen-Räisänen (2014). Statistical methods are applied to analyze the model of tourist loyalty in choosing local culinary in Palembang City. The city of Palembang was chosen as the research location for two main reasons. First, the large number of local culinary establishments located in the city of Palembang allows researchers to reach a large number of tourists. Second, the city of Palembang is a widely known culinary tourism destination by domestic tourists in South Sumatra.

**Population and Sample**

The research population is domestic tourists who have enjoyed culinary delights in culinary tourism destinations in the city of Palembang. The survey was carried out continuously for approximately one month. Convenience sampling method is used to get research respondents and data will be collected using a
questionnaire approach. Data was collected using a google form that was sent to tourists who had visited culinary tourism destinations to enjoy local culinary delights. In total, 168 questionnaires will be distributed to respondents with the following calculation:

\[
\text{Total sample} = \frac{5}{6} \times \text{number of research variables/indicators} = 6 \times 28 = 168 \text{ respondents}
\]

**Measurement Instrument**

The final survey instrument was designed with 7 variables covering 28 items. The research survey instrument was developed using concepts from Namkung and Jang (2007), Vesel and Zabkar (2009), Jalilvand et al., (2012) and Meng and Elliott (2008) to describe three food quality items, three interpersonal interaction quality items and three food quality items. environmental quality perception items. Six satisfaction items were adopted from Walsh et al., (2010) and Ali and Raza (2017). Four items of perceived value and four items of perceived value of service quality were adapted from the studies of Chen (2012) and Ali and Raza (2017). In addition, five loyalty items were adapted from Sirdeshmukh et al. (2002) and Zeithaml et al., (1996). A five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree, was used to measure respondents’ preferences.

**Measurement Model Rating**

After the items to measure the construct were determined, validity and reliability tests were carried out using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). This study uses reliability, convergent and discriminant validity tests (Hair et al., 2010). This study also calculates the reliability value with Cronbach’s approach and composite reliability (CR). Average Variance Extracted (AVE) was used to assess convergent validity. The recommended AVE limit value is 0.5 (Hair et al., 2014). When the square root value of the AVE of each construct is greater than its correlation value with all other constructs, the construct is considered to show sufficient discriminant validity.

**Structural Model Assessment**

The fit index indicates that the model represents a good fit to the data. The relative index (CFI, NFI and GFI) and absolute fit indicator (RMSEA) show that the proposed model is reasonable. An explanation of the observed covariance among study constructs (Chou and Lu, 2009). There is a consensus that the cut-off value of this index should be slightly tight (NFI>0.95, CFI>0.95, GFI>0.95 and RMSEA <0.06) as suggested by Hair et al., (2010). The structural equation formula used is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KW} & = \beta_1 \text{KM} + 2 \text{KIP} + 3 \text{PKL} + 4 \text{PN} + 5 \text{KL} \\
\text{LW} & = \beta_2 \text{KW}
\end{align*}
\]

Information:

- \(\text{KW}\) = tourist satisfaction
- \(\text{LW}\) = tourist loyalty
- \(\text{KM}\) = food quality
- \(\text{KIP}\) = quality of interpersonal interaction
street vendors = perception of environmental quality
PN = Perceived value
KL = service quality

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Validity Test and Reliability Test

Validity test is useful to determine the feasibility of research questions made based on theoretical references or previous research. The decision criterion is to compare the Pearson correlation product moment value compared to the r table value with a level of (α) 0.05, which is 0.1428. If the value of the Pearson correlation product moment is greater than the value of r table, the indicator or question item is declared feasible and vice versa (Ghozali, 2005). After being tested for validity, the next step is reliability testing, which is related to the problem of the accuracy of a data, while for reliability testing, the alpha coefficient value is compared to 0.60. A construct or variable is said to be reliable if it has an alpha value above 0.60 and vice versa (Ghozali, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Items (indicator)</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Reliability (Cronbach)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td>KK1</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK2</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KK3</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of personal interaction</td>
<td>KIP1</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>0.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIP2</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIP3</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality Perception</td>
<td>street vendors1</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street vendors2</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>street vendors3</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value perception</td>
<td>PN1</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PN2</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PN3</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PN4</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>KL1</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KL2</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KL3</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KL4</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>KW1</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>0.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KW2</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KW3</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KW4</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KW5</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KW6</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist loyalty</td>
<td>LW1</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>0.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LW2</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LW3</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 4.5, it is known that all indicators (observed) are valid by looking at the Pearson Correlation product moment value \( r > r \text{table} 0.1428 \). This explains that all research instruments are feasible to use. The alpha coefficient (cronbach alpha) has a value above 0.60 so it can be explained that all research variables are: perception of experience value, destination personality, destination image, and intention to visit again reliable, so it has high accuracy to be used as a variable (construct) in this study.

**Model Goodness Test (Goodness of Fit)**
To determine the criteria for a good model (Goodness of Fit) used: Absolute Fit Measured (measurement of absolute index), Incremental Fit Measured (measurement of additional index) and Parsimonious Fit Measured (measurement of simplicity index). Test the goodness of this model using AMOS software version 22.0. The following is the goodness of fit index generated after testing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of fit index</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Cut off value</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>49,124</td>
<td>Expected small</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Not good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>&lt; 2.00</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>&lt; 0.08</td>
<td>Well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum Sample Discrepancy Funcion - CMIN/DF is a parsimonious suitability index that measures the relationship between the goodness of fit model and the number of estimated coefficients that are expected to achieve the level of conformity. The result of CMIN/DF is 1.965 which value is smaller than the recommended value of CMIN/DF < 2, thus indicating a good fit model. Based on the analysis of the goodness of fit index (GFI) it reflects the overall level of fit of the model. GFI recommended acceptance rate > 0.90. The results show the GFI value of 0.956 > 0.90, so the model has a good fit. Adjusted Goodness of fit Index (AGFI) as a development of the GFI index, is an index that has been adjusted to the ratio of the proposed degree of freedom model to the null model's degree of freedom. The results showed that the AGFI value was 0.

**Tucker Lewis Index** (TLI) is an alternative incremental fit index that compares the tested model with the baseline. The recommended value as a good level of conformity is > 0.95. The results showed that the TLI value was 0.942 so it could be stated that the level of conformity was in good criteria. Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is an incremental fit index that compares the tested model with the null model. CFI recommended value > 0.95. The test result is 0.968, indicating that the model is good. The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is an index used to compensate for Chi Square Statistics in a large sample. The RMSEA value indicates the goodness of fit that can be expected when the model is estimated in the population. Recommended acceptance value < 0.08,
Based on the results of the Goodness of Fit Index measurement above, it can be concluded that all parameters have met the expected requirements. Judging from the values of Chi Square, CMIN/DF, RMSEA, GFI, AGFI, TLI and CFI have met the goodness of fit requirements, and only the probability parameter is in a marginal position (close to good) so it can be concluded that this research model has a measure of accuracy. good models.

Hypothesis Testing Results
The hypothesis formulated in this study consists of 7 hypotheses. To find out whether the hypothesis is supported by the data or not, the probability value of the Critical Ratio (CR) is compared with $\alpha = 5\%$. If the standardized coefficient parameter is positive and the probability value is less than $\alpha = 5\%$ or the value of the Critical Ratio (CR) is greater than $t_{table}$ (2.0), it can be concluded that the research hypothesis is supported by the data (significantly proven).

Based on statistical analysis using the AMOS version 22.0 program, the results of the hypothesis test were obtained, which is a test of causality of each research variable as presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standard Estimation</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food quality $\rightarrow$ tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of personal interaction $\rightarrow$ tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>4.323</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental quality $\rightarrow$ tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value perception $\rightarrow$ tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality $\rightarrow$ tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist satisfaction $\rightarrow$ tourist loyalty</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
This section will explain in detail the influence of food quality, personal interaction quality, environmental quality, perceived value and service quality on tourist satisfaction and tourist loyalty.

a. Effect of food quality on tourist satisfaction

Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.032, the CR value is 0.356 and the P value is 0.722, so $H_0$ is accepted and $H_1$ is rejected. This means that there is no linear relationship between food quality and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary involvement on tourist satisfaction is 0.032 or 3.2%. This research is different from the research that has been done by Ha and Jang (2010); (Liu and Jang, 2009a); Sulek and Hensley (2004); Jalilvand et al., (2017); Susskind and Chan (2000); Muscat et al., (2019) where the results of the study state that there is a linear relationship between culinary involvement and tourist satisfaction.

b. The influence of the quality of personal interaction on tourist satisfaction
Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.521, the CR value is 4.323 and the P value is 0.000, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. That is, there is a linear relationship between the quality of personal interaction with tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of the quality of personal interaction on tourist satisfaction is 0.521 or 52.1%. This study supports the research that has been carried out by Jalilvand et al., (2017); Jayachandran et al. (2005); Claycomb and Martin (2001); Mustelier-Puig et al., (2019) where the results of the study state that there is a linear relationship between the quality of personal interactions and tourist satisfaction.

c. **The influence of environmental quality on tourist satisfaction**

   Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.202, the CR value is 1.531 and the P value is 0.126, so H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. This means that there is no linear relationship between environmental quality and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of environmental quality on tourist satisfaction is 0.202 or 20.2%. This research is different from the research conducted by Han and Ryu (2009); Liu and Jang (2009b); Tuzunkan and Albayrak (2016); Muscat et al., (2019); Jalilvand et al., (2017) where the results of the study state that there is a linear relationship between environmental quality and tourist satisfaction.

d. **The effect of perceived value on tourist satisfaction**

   Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.077, the CR value is 0.594 and the P value is 0.553, so H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. That is, there is no linear relationship between perceived value and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the effect of perceived value on tourist satisfaction is 0.077 or 7.7%. This study is different from the research conducted by Jalilvand et al., (2017); Vein, McDougall and Levesque (2000); McDougall and Levesque, (2000); Ryu et al., (2008); Ryu and Han (2010); Suhartanto et al (2019) where the results of the study state that there is a linear relationship between perceived value and tourist satisfaction.

e. **The influence of service quality on tourist satisfaction**

   Based on the calculation results obtained the standard estimation value is 0.521, the CR value is 2.172 and the P value is 0.030 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a linear relationship between service quality with tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence service quality on tourist satisfaction is 0.521 or 52.1%. This research supports research conducted by Chang (2006); Ali and Raza (2017); Han and Hyun (2017); Al Khattab and Aldehayyat (2011); which states that there is a relationship between service quality with tourist satisfaction.

f. **The influence of tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty**

   Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.674, the CR value is 3.224 and the P value is 0.001 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. That is, there is a linear relationship between tourist satisfaction and tourist loyalty. The magnitude of the influence of tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty is 0.674 or 67.4%. This research supports the research that has been done by Yuksel and Yuksel (2001); Chen et al., (2016); Li et al., (2015); Parra-Lopez et al. (2018); Alrawadieh et al. (2019) where the research results state that there is a linear relationship between tourist satisfaction and tourist loyalty.
Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.032, the CR value is 0.356 and the P value is 0.722, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is no linear relationship between culinary involvement and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary involvement on tourist satisfaction is 0.032 or 3.2%.

Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.202, the CR value is 0.521 and the P value is 0.000, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a linear relationship between culinary knowledge and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary knowledge on tourist satisfaction is 0.521 or 52.1%. Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 1.531 and the P value is 0.126 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. This means that there is no linear relationship between culinary experience and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of the culinary experience on tourist satisfaction is 0.126 or 12.6%. Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.077, the CR value is 0.594 and the P value is 0.553, so H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. This means that there is no linear relationship between culinary involvement and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary involvement on tourist satisfaction is 0.077 or 7.7%.

Based on the calculation results obtained the standard estimation value is 0.521, the CR value is 2.172 and the P value is 0.030 then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. This means that there is a linear relationship between culinary knowledge with tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary knowledge on tourist satisfaction is 0.521 or 52.1%. Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.674, the CR value is 3.224 and the P value is 0.001 then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. That is, there is a linear relationship between culinary experience and tourist satisfaction. The magnitude of the influence of culinary experience on tourist satisfaction is 0.674 or 67.4%. Based on the calculation results, the standard estimated value is 0.956, the CR value is 4.856 and the P value is 0.000, so H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. That is, there is a linear relationship between tourist satisfaction and tourist loyalty. The magnitude of the influence of tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty is 0.956 or 95.6%.
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