

Shopping Destination Image and Loyalty: Do Tourist and Resident Perceive Differently?

Erik Hendriks^a, Zurinawati Mohi^b, and Lusianus Kusdiby^{c*}

^aSenior Lecturer, Faculty of Business Finance and Law, InHolland University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands

^bAssociate Professor, Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia

^cAssociate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Politeknik Negeri Bandung, Indonesia

Received 09 January 2021; accepted 26 April 2021

ABSTRACT

Research shows that shopping is a must activity of tourist and resident, and there is intense competition between shopping destinations. However, literature often gives a little attention to how a shopping destination's image impacts customer loyalty. Thus, the current study examines the shopping destination image model that incorporates the affective, cognitive, and overall images in predicting shopping loyalty of both tourist and resident. The results from 408 survey data verify the shopping destination image model's relevance in predicting both tourist and resident loyalty towards shopping destinations. The affective and cognitive image elements are the key drivers of overall image and loyalty towards tourist and resident shopping destinations. Further, this study shows a significant variation between how tourists and residents regard the effect of cognitive image on their loyalty towards a shopping destination.

KEYWORDS

Shopping destination
image
Loyalty
Tourist
Resident

INTRODUCTION

The current tourism development shows that shopping is an important tourist activity (Choi, Lee, & Seo, 2018). In contrast to other sub-sectors such as performance and accommodation, shopping contributes significantly to the tourism industry (Choi, Law, & Heo, 2016). Its development simultaneously encourages the development of destination economy (Tosun, Temizkan, Timothy, & Fyall, 2007; Yeung, Wong, & Ko, 2004), positively affects destination image (Tosun et al., 2007), and shapes tourist experience when visiting the destination (Chi, 2011). Accordingly, tourist destinations make an effort to improve their region or city to entice customers to visit their destination and shop. As a result, there is currently fierce competition among places to lure shoppers, both tourists and residents (Choi et al., 2016) since in this very competitive market, developing a distinct and favourable image is a crucial approach for enduring and succeeding (Qi & Chen, 2019; Souiden, Ladhari, & Chiadmi, 2017; Vinyals-Mirabent, 2019).

*Corresponding Author: lusianus.kusdiby@polban.ac.id; doi: 10.35313/ijabr.v3i2.159

Because of its influences on tourist behaviour, the destination image is thoroughly investigated, especially in the tourism marketing field. Past studies highlight the importance of having a distinct and positive destination image because image affects customer behaviour in choosing the destination, in comparing expectations and experience with the destination, and more importantly, in developing loyalty towards the destination (Alrawadieh, Alrawadieh, & Kozak, 2019; Suhartanto, Lu, Hussein, & Chen, 2018; Zhang, Fu, Cai, & Lu, 2014). Although the connection between destination image and customer loyalty is well reported in the tourism context (San Martín, Herrero, & García de los Salmones, 2019), literature seems to be silent in exploring this relationship in the shopping destination context. Thus, how shopping destination image influences customer loyalty is not well understood. For this reason, scholars (Choi et al., 2016; Suhartanto et al., 2018) suggest further exploration on the impact of shopper perception toward a shopping destination on their future behaviour.

Another issue with image study is that most studies on destination image predominantly emphasize the tourist and lack care for the other stockholders (Fu, Ye, & Xiang, 2016). Due to the effect of image on one's behaviour, the stakeholders' image of the destination should be taken into account to shape the image of the destination (Byrd, Bosley, & Dronberger, 2009). Thus, scholars (Agapito, Mendes, & Valle, 2010; Styliadis, Shani, & Belhassen, 2017) suggest assessing destination image by integrating stakeholders other than tourists. In the shopping destination context, resident is another key stakeholder besides tourist shopper, as a result of their deep ties to the destination due to their life experiences. They are also customers of the retail businesses in the destination. Thus, understanding tourist and resident image of a shopping destination is important as their shopping activities and behaviour is different (Lloyd, Yip, & Luk, 2011).

Motivated by the identified research gaps, the current study seeks to explore the relationship between shopping destination image and destination loyalty of both tourists and residents. Specifically, the goals of this research are (1) to examine the shopping destination image by incorporating cognitive, affective, and overall image in predicting customer loyalty and (2) to compare the relationships between destination images and loyalty of both tourists and residents. The subsequent section highlights the conceptual model of shopping destination image, loyalty toward shopping destination, and the distinction between two shoppers: tourists and residents.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Shopping Destination Image

The destination image concept is multifaceted, thus described variously by scholars. In spite of different definitions, it is commonly understood as a summation of impressions, beliefs, and ideas a person has toward a destination (Alrawadieh et al., 2019). Referring to this definition, therefore, the shopping destination image can be seen as a person's entire perception and belief about the characteristics and values sought of a shopping destination. The person's beliefs and feelings are refined from the knowledge he obtains from various marketing communication sources and the direct contact with the destination (Vinyals-Mirabent, 2019). The facts and experience accumulated over time result in a psychological portrayal of the destination's qualities and benefits. The most important factor of the image of a shopping destination is the experience of visiting and shopping at the destination (Choi et al., 2018; Qi & Chen, 2019).

The definition indicates the construct's complexity, ensuing in numerous ways to studying the destination image. The first method states that destination image encompasses three components:

cognitive, affective, and conative. Researches have observed and strengthened these three dimensions (Stylidis et al., 2017). In contrast, recent studies in the tourism context (Choi, Tkachenko, Sil, & Cohen, 2011) and shopping context (Suhartanto et al., 2018) treat destination image as a single dimension. Although they claim that a single dimension is not significantly different from multiple dimensions in terms of its validity, this approach has a drawback for determining the destination image's underlying construct. Other researchers believe that a destination's image comprises two factors, cognitive image and affective image (Stylidis et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2014). In this approach, the destination image is formed according to people's perspectives of the destination's affective and cognitive features. Furthermore, the bi-dimensional image model suggests that the cognitive element is the determining factor of the affective element. Compared to other approaches, this two-dimensional approach has a solid conceptual background in the Reason Action Theory and is commonly used (Chew & Jahari, 2014). As a result, this study also uses this method to assess the image of the shopping destination.

The image's cognitive component signifies one's understanding and trust about a destination's characteristics, which simultaneously develops the destination's depiction. The cognitive image provides information and beliefs about a destination, with a focus on its physical characteristics (Lin, Morais, Kerstetter, & Hou, 2007). Scholars argue that cognitive image is made up of features that match the destination's resources (Zhang et al., 2014). Those attributes cover the retailers' aspect of the product, process, service, promotion, and shopping environment (Choi et al., 2016; LeHew & Wesley, 2007). These elements can influence a customer's decision (both tourist and resident) to shop in a specific destination (Choi et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2018).

Meanwhile, the image's affective component represents one's emotional reactions to the destination. The affective image takes place in the assessment and choice of the destination. In different contexts, containing in tourism studies, affective and cognitive components are frequently evaluated autonomously (Stylidis et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2014). However, Lin et al. (2007) argue that both cognitive and affective components need to be integrated to assess the destination image. The affective image is the phase of reaction to a destination, and this response leads the following behaviour towards the destination. A study by Rollero and De Piccoli (2010) in the field of environmental psychology reveals that the level of affection has a beneficial impact on cognitive evaluations of the destination's features. Yet, most studies reveal that evaluating the affective component is the consequence of the destination's comprehension (Stylidis et al., 2017; Wang & Hsu, 2010).

Besides cognitive and affective elements, scholars (Zhang et al., 2014) recommend considering the overall image when interacting with tourism destinations. Whang et al. (2016) define the overall image as an all-encompassing impression of a specific destination, comprising evaluating the affective and cognitive aspects of a destination image. This perception, either real or unreal, ascertains an individual's attitudes towards a destination and is linked with favourable or unfavourable notions. The discussion on shopping destination image leads to hypotheses on the association amongst image components as follows:

H₁: Shopping destination cognitive image significantly impacts its affective image

H₂: Shopping destination cognitive image significantly impacts its overall image

H₃: Shopping destination affective image significantly impacts its overall image

Loyalty towards Shopping Destination

Customer loyalty, in the context of shopping destination, refers to customers' visits and shopping in a particular shopping destination. Their loyalty is seen from their intention to revisit, re-shop, and recommend the shopping destination to others (Moliner-Velázquez, Fuentes-Blasco, Servera-Francés, & Gil-Saura, 2019; Suhartanto et al., 2018). In a competitive and challenging shopping environment, customer contentment is not enough to assure a company's survival, let alone boost its success (Calvo-Porrá & Levy-Mangin, 2016). Similar to other tourism destinations, a tourist shopper will only visit the destination once in their life, having once displeased, he might not wish to re-visit the destination (Suhartanto, 2018). While the loyalty literature claims that loyal customers are less aware of the product or service price changes, the literature reports that retaining a favourable relationship with customers will help the business create loyal customers (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Calvo-Porrá & Levy-Mangin, 2016). However, developing loyalty needs time, and it is something that shoppers frequently do not have a lot of. Consequently, altering a shopper to a loyal customer towards a shopping destination is going to be challenging. Fandos and Flavián (2006) propose that in receiving the challenge of turning a one-time customer into a loyal one, managers must understand customer expectations and deliver a unique product that surpasses those expectations. Thus, the shopping destination, which is an amalgamation of products and services offered, retailers, and shopping environment, needs to be well designed and exceeds the shopper's expectations.

There are three methods for assessing customer loyalty toward a product or service (Pahlevi & Suhartanto, 2020; Suhartanto, Brien, Primiana, Wibisono, & Triyuni2020). The first approach is behavioural, which theorizes customer loyalty as a behaviour. Using this method, only shoppers who visit and purchase a product/service systematically from a shopping destination are judged as loyal customers. The second approach is attitudinal, which labels loyalty as an emotional manifestation of a customer's intention to repurchase and recommend other potential customers to purchase (Gursoy, Chen, & Chi, 2014; San Martín et al., 2019). Because both behavioural and attitudinal approaches bear limitations in describing customer loyalty, other scholars suggest a third approach, an amalgamation of the behavioural and psychological, called composite loyalty (Gursoy et al., 2014). The composite approach suggests that shoppers' loyalty toward a shopping destination is assessed using their shopping activity and intention to shop and recommend the shopping destination. This composite method helps a researcher to comprehend both existing and future loyalty. Thus, the current study considers customer loyalty toward a shopping destination as composite loyalty.

The association between destination image and customer loyalty is well-represented in the literature. However, it shows divergent results regarding the direction of the association between these variables. Some scholars report that destination image directly impacts revisit intentions and word-of-mouth communication, the indicators of loyalty (Li, Cai, Lehto, & Huang, 2010). In contrast, Zhang et al. (2014) reveal direct and indirect consequences of destination image on visitor's willingness to revisit and recommend the destination. More recently, a study conducted by Souiden et al. (2017) discloses a direct consequence of destination image on behavioural intention and an indirect effect via satisfaction. Studies also report that both cognitive and affective images significantly affect travellers' intention to revisit, recommend, and inform good things about the destination (Chi, 2011). Further, studies conducted by Wang and Hsu (2010) and Qu et al. (2011) exhibit the positive impact of both dimensions on the overall destination image, which positively impacts behavioural intention. Finally, a recent study in the shopping context by Suhartanto et al. (2018) reports that overall destination image significantly affects shopper loyalty toward a shopping destination. Therefore, the need to assess the link between shopping destination image and customer

loyalty is apparent. Three hypotheses that relate shopping destination image to customer loyalty can be formulated as follows:

H₄: Shopping destination overall image significantly impacts customer loyalty

H₅: Shopping destination cognitive image significantly impacts customer loyalty

H₆: Shopping destination affective image significantly impacts customer loyalty

Tourist and Resident as Destination Stakeholders

Previous studies report that tourists and residents have distinct expectations and attitudes towards the product or service they purchased, which results in different behaviours (Lloyd et al., 2011; Su, Spierings, Dijst, & Tong, 2019). Shopping destinations classify tourists and residents into two different groups with distinct explanations for each group for shopping. Tourists buy a product to consume when visiting a tourist attraction and take it home as a memento. For them, a souvenir from a destination is linked to the characteristics and culture of that location; thus, they buy and consume it in order to get a sense of the product and mentally engage with it (Suhartanto, 2018). On the other hand, for residents, the need for a product in a shopping destination is mainly driven by utilitarian needs, i.e., fulfilling their daily necessities. Besides, for more affluent residents, shopping is also a means of self-expression (Calvo-Porrall & Levy-Mangin, 2016). While many customers are hesitant or unable to purchase a premium product, wealthy customers will purchase high-priced items for emotional sense and for setting themselves apart from others. The differences in shopping will, certainly, influence the dissimilarities in the expectations and attitudes of tourists and residents toward a shopping destination. Thus, a hypothesis to be proposed is:

H₇: The associations between the constructs tested are significantly dissimilar between tourists and residents

RESEARCH METHOD

The measurement of a shopping destination's cognitive image was built on the characteristics documented in the shopping literature as depicted in Table 1.

To adapt the measuring scales to the current research situation, interviews with shoppers, both tourists and residents, were carried out. The specialists on retail scholars' views regarding the scales were also requested. On the basis of this procedure, 10 indicators (see Table 3) reflecting shopping destination components were selected to measure a shopping destination's cognitive image. The overall image was measured with one item (Stylidis et al., 2017). Three items measured loyalty towards a shopping destination: intention to purchase, suggest, and favourably inform about the shopping destination (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Suhartanto et al., 2018). All indicators of the cognitive image, overall image, and loyalty were measured with a 5-point Likert scale, from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). Following scholars (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997), the affective image element was assessed with: boring-exciting, distressing-relaxing, sleepy-lively, and unpleasant-pleasant. All of these semantic differential scales were anchored with a 5-point scale.

The proposed shopping destination image model was examined on tourists and residents in Bandung, Indonesia. This selection was due to some motives. Firstly, the research on shopping destinations is sparse, and Bandung is a popular shopping location in the region. Secondly, Bandung experiences high repeat visits by travelers. Thus, an understanding of tourists' and residents' image

of Bandung as a shopping destination is imperative to conserve the high rate of visits. Finally, as a tourist destination for shopping, the city is competing against some tough competitors, such as Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, and Surabaya. Hence, it is vital to examine how the image of tourists and residents is structured and prepared for the growth of the shopping destination's competitive positioning.

Table 1. Cognitive shopping image measurement scale

Attributes	Source
Offering competitive price	(Moliner-Velázquez et al., 2019; Suhartanto et al., 2018; Tosun et al., 2007)
Interesting store display	(LeHew & Wesley, 2007; Yeung et al., 2004)
Attractive sale	(Suhartanto et al., 2018; Yeung et al., 2004)
Excellent staff services	(Suhartanto et al., 2018; Wong & Wan, 2013)
Excellent shopping location	(Chi, 2011; Choi et al., 2016; Tosun et al., 2007)
Convenience shopping centers	(LeHew & Wesley, 2007; Yeung et al., 2004)
Offering good quality products	(Suhartanto et al., 2018; Tosun et al., 2007; Yeung et al., 2004)
Offering a variety of brands	(Choi et al., 2016; Suhartanto et al., 2018; Wong & Wan, 2013)
Interesting packaging	(Choi et al., 2016; Moliner-Velázquez et al., 2019; Suhartanto et al., 2018)
Traffic	(Fandos & Flavián, 2006; Suhartanto et al., 2018)

Using Partial Least Squares (PLS)-based SEM, this study investigated construct validity and reliability. The PLS was also used to ensure the suggested model. The rationale for PLS is that it allows researchers to analyze latent constructs with small and medium sample sizes and non-normally distributed data (Chin, Peterson, & Brown, 2008). Further, SEM-PLS is widely used to evaluate the structural coefficient path model (Hair et al., 2017). Following Kock and Lynn's (2012) recommendation, PLS was employed to test full collinearity VIFs resulting in the value of 3.901. As the value is less than 5, the standard method variance is not an issue in the study (Hair et al., 2017).

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the characteristic of the respondents.

Table 2. Respondents' demographic characteristic

Variable	Description	Tourist	Resident
Gender	Male	90	82
	Female	110	126
Age	17-25 years	8	6
	26-35 years	23	23
	36-45 years	87	89
	>45 years	80	85
	<high Scholl	20	25
Highest education level	High Scholl	84	88
	Bachelor/Diploma	90	89
	Postgraduate	5	5

Measurement Model

This study implemented a two-stage evaluation to assess the proposed model. The measurement model was examined in the first stage by analyzing the average variance extracted (AVE), outer loading, and composite reliability (CR) to examine both the discriminant and convergent validity and the construct reliability. The convergent validity assessment (Table 3) shows that the prerequisite for validity is fulfilled as AVE is higher than 0.5 and factor loadings exceeds 0.6. Further, each item's loading value on its variable construct is more significant than the loading factor compared to other variable constructs. This result satisfies the construct variables' discriminant validity criteria.

Table 3. Measurement Model Indicators

	Tourist			Resident				
	Loading ¹	α	CR	AVE	Loading ¹	α	CR	AVE
Cognitive Image		0.861	0.891	0.613		0.712	0.734	0.617
Competitive price	0.653				0.717			
Interesting store display	0.745				0.663			
Attractive sale	0.649				0.679			
Excellent staff services	0.721				0.756			
Excellent shopping location	0.645				0.619			
Convenience shopping centres	0.732				0.633			
Offering good quality product	0.751				0.729			
Offering a variety of brands	0.639				0.628			
Interesting packaging	0.799				0.614			
Good traffic	0.726				0.719			
Affective Image		0.717	0.879	0.643		0.752	0.718	0.646
Distressing-relaxing	0.771				0.713			
Unpleasant-pleasant	0.769				0.743			
Boring-exciting	0.771				0.758			
Sleepy-lively	0.728				0.811			
Overall Image	1				1			
Loyalty		0.781	0.821	0.621		0.768	0.879	0.654
Intention to purchase	0.718				0.711			
Intention to recommend	0.832				0.832			
Intention to inform a good thing	0.867				0.791			

Note: Significant at $p < 0.01$

Henseler and colleagues (2015) suggest the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) to evaluate construct discriminant validity. The HTMT check results show that the requirement of discriminant validity among the constructs is satisfied as none of the values of HTMT is higher than 0.9 (Henseler et al., 2015). The reliability test specifies that the constructs are consistent with the composite reliability values, and Cronbach Alpha is over the advocated level of 0.7.

Structural Model

SmartPLS 3.0 was used to investigate the hypotheses of this study. In evaluating the structural model, this study employed bootstrapping procedure with 5000 repetitions to test the significance of items and the path's coefficient (Chin et al., 2008). The R^2 , as well as average geometric mean,

were implemented to evaluate the model fit. The GOF of the model has a value of 0.56 (tourist) and 0.56 (resident), indicating that the tourist and resident fit model is satisfactory, above the suggested level of 0.36. R^2 indicates the explanation power of the independent variables toward the dependent variable. The cognitive explains the affective of 37% (tourist) and 28% (resident). The image's cognitive and affective components explain the overall image of 52% (tourist) and 47% (resident). Further, all image components (cognitive and affective) and overall image explain 59% (tourist) and 46% (resident) loyalty. Chin (2008) classify the R^2 into three groups, weak ($R^2 = 0.19$), moderate ($R^2 = 0.33$), and substantial ($R^2 = 0.76$). Using this contention, it can be concluded that the R^2 of tourists and residents are between moderate and substantial.

Table 4. Structural Estimates

Hypothesis/Path	Tourist		Resident		Multi-Group Analysis	
	β	t-values	β	t-values	β Differences	p-value
H ₁ : Cognitive image → Affective image	0.644	9.765**	0.523	9.919**	0.121	0.067
H ₂ : Cognitive image → Overall image	0.281	4.112**	0.276	4.332**	0.005	0.451
H ₃ : Affective image → Overall image	0.431	6.712**	0.412	4.125**	0.019	0.343
H ₄ : Overall image → Loyalty	0.133	1.671	0.119	1.568	0.014	0.549
H ₅ : Cognitive → Loyalty	0.519	8.462**	0.365	5.216**	0.154	0.020*
H ₆ : Affective → Loyalty	0.248	4.215**	0.373	4.213**	0.125	0.659

Note: *) Significant at $p < 0.05$; **) Significant at $p < 0.01$

Table 4 presents the associations between the performance of the tested variable as hypothesized. The results show that among those tested, only the relationship between the overall image and loyalty (H₄) is not supported as β (0.133 for tourists and 0.119 for residents) is significant at $p > 0.05$. While the β for other paths (range from 0.248 to 0.644 for tourists and from 0.276 to 0.523 for residents) are significant at $p < 0.01$. Thus, for both tourist and resident sample, there is support for the positive associations between cognitive and affective components of the image (H₁), cognitive image and overall image (H₂), affective image and overall image (H₃), cognitive image and loyalty (H₅), and affective image and loyalty (H₆), but not for the relationship between overall image and loyalty (H₄).

A Multi-Group Analysis test was carried out to evaluate the differences between the relationships of the construct among the two samples (H₇), as suggested by Henseler et al. (2015). The result (Table 4) indicates that β differences between the path across samples are too small, excluding the path between cognitive image and loyalty (0.154), which is significant at $p < 0.05$. The result demonstrates no significant variations between the relationships tested across tourists and residents, except for the link between cognitive image and loyalty. Thus, hypothesis H₇ is supported only for the relationship between cognitive image and loyalty.

DISCUSSION

First, this study discloses that the model on the association between the shopping destination image and loyalty is satisfactory for both tourists and residents' samples. This finding proposes that the shopping destination image model consisting of the cognitive image, affective image, and overall image can all be utilized to predict both tourist and resident loyalty towards a shopping destination.

Whereas previous studies on tourist image exclusively focus on the cognitive image, affective image, and overall image (Lin et al., 2007; Styliadis et al., 2017), the proposed model enhances our knowledge of the process of how those images predict tourists and residents loyalty towards a shopping destination. Further, the evidence revealed from this study advocates that although the association between the variable constructs is diverse in the tourist and resident samples, the Multi-group Analysis suggests that the difference is not substantial, except for the relationship between cognitive image and loyalty. Hence, this finding helps scholars recognize how an inclusive image for a shopping destination and future loyalty is formed for tourists and residents.

Second, this study reveals a distinct difference between the effect of tourists' and residents' cognitive image on their loyalty. Although in both samples, cognitive image significantly affects loyalty, the magnitude of the influence varies. The impact of cognitive image on tourist loyalty is significantly more prominent than that of the resident sample. This finding suggests that, compared to residents, tourist loyalty toward a shopping destination is more driven by the destination's tangible aspects. The possible explanation of this finding is that tourists, as visitors, have lack interaction and information about the shopping destination. For this type of shoppers, a decision regarding the visit and shop will rely on the destination's tangible aspects (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Lloyd et al., 2011; Yeung et al., 2004). For residents, as they are frequently exposed to both tangible and intangible aspects of the shopping destination where they live, this tangible aspect of a shopping destination will not become a dominant consideration when making decisions on shopping.

Third, studies in shopping destination loyalty report a positive relationship between the overall image and customer loyalty (Suhartanto et al., 2018). Other scholars (Chew & Jahari, 2014) suggest a direct relationship between cognitive and affective images on customer future behaviour. Conversely, this study results reveal that only cognitive and affective, but not overall image, influence loyalty for both residents and tourists. The insignificant relationship between the overall image and loyalty is parallel with Wang and Hsu's (2010) study in China, suggesting no significant link between tourists' intention to revisit as well as recommend and the overall destination image. As previous studies report a direct critical impact of the overall image on behavioural intention and its indirect impact on customer satisfaction (Wang & Hsu, 2010), the insignificant association between overall image and loyalty in this study is almost certainly because of the impact of overall image on loyalty through satisfaction.

Forth, this study finds that, in both samples, the cognitive image has a higher effect on loyalty than the affective one. San Martin et al.'s (2019) study supports the proposition that the cognitive image is crucial when tourists know the destination. This is particularly true for Bandung, in which most of the tourists are revisiting domestic travellers. These revisit travellers have experienced shopping in the destination, and they perceive that the shopping facilities are at least accepted than other destinations. This study also reveals that the effect of cognitive image on the overall image in both samples is lower than the affective component's influence. Considering the significant effect of cognitive on the overall image, the explanation of this finding suggests that the affective image is a partial mediator between the cognitive and overall image.

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

From a theoretical standpoint, this research makes two important contributions. First, it proves that the cognitive and affective image mechanism is reliable and valid for shopping destination images from the tourist and resident perspective. Because there are only a few studies available regarding shopping destination image, this result is significant. This study is the first empirical research that

ascertains a valid and reliable scale for measuring tourist and resident perceptions of a shopping destination image. Thus, any future research could use the identified measurement scale as the basis for further examining the shopping destination image. Second, this study reveals that resident and tourist conceptual loyalty towards a shopping destination is driven by both cognitive and affective images of the destination. This finding extends the existing theoretical view that loyalty towards a shopping destination is driven by overall image (Alrawadieh et al., 2019; Suhartanto et al., 2018).

From a managerial perspective, this study recommends that the cognitive component is crucial in defining tourist and resident intention to visit and shop, recommend, and inform a positive thing about shopping destination to others. As possessing a positive image and customer loyalty is a key component for the competitiveness of a shopping destination, the cognitive image should focus on destination competitiveness development. To improve the shopping destination's cognitive element, both destination organization officials and retail business managers should manage their activities to articulate a positive cognitive component of destination image by focusing on the shopping destination's tangible elements. Explicitly, they should continuously provide and renew outstanding shopping services, serve the high value of products and services, and provide attractive and safe shopping environments as a whole.

This study also reveals that although cognitive image significantly influences tourist and resident loyalty toward destination image, the magnitude of their effects is different. The effect on the tourist sample is significantly higher than that of the resident sample. This result provides an avenue for the destination manager and the retail manager to draw more tourists to visit and shop at their destination. In regards to attracting tourists, this study suggests the managers provide attractive shopping facilities and promote that their shopping facilities are excellent and better than others. To enable communication to be effective, using multiple messages through offline and online communication channels is recommended.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

First, this study suffers a drawback regarding the samples; shoppers in Bandung, Indonesia. As customer shopping behaviour is formed by culture, the results of this study have limited generalizability. The proposed shopping destination model might be re-examined through more research across tourists and residents in other shopping destinations, regions, or countries. Second, this study measures the shopping destination image using ex-post after the tourists and residents' shop. As image tends to be different before, during, and post-activity, the future study could measure the shopping destination image in these three situations. Measuring and comparing shopping destination image from these three situations can identify the differences and changes in shopping image between these three stages. Last, this study focuses on two shopping destination stakeholders, tourists and residents. There are also other stakeholders in addition to these such as retailers/entrepreneurs and local authorities who have an attention in the shopping destination. To obtain a complete understanding of shopping destination image, testing an extensive model including all of these destination stakeholders is recommended.

REFERENCES

- Agapito, D., Mendes, J., & Valle, P. O. d. (2010). Destination image: perspectives of tourists vs. residents. *Tourism Development and Management: Challenges and Opportunities for Algarve, Portugal*, 1(1), 90-109.

- Alrawadieh, Z., Alrawadieh, Z., & Kozak, M. (2019). Exploring the impact of tourist harassment on destination image, tourist expenditure, and destination loyalty. *Tourism Management*, *73*, 13-20. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2019.01.015
- Baloglu, S., & Brinberg, D. (1997). Affective Images of Tourism Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, *35*(4), 11-15. doi: 10.1177/004728759703500402
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., & Dronberger, M. G. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, *30*(5), 693-703. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.10.021
- Calvo-Porrall, C., & Levy-Mangin, J.-P. (2016). Specialty food retailing: The role of purchase frequency and determinants of customer satisfaction and loyalty. *British Food Journal*, *118*(11), 2798-2814. doi:10.1108/BFJ-03-2016-0100
- Chew, E. Y. T., & Jahari, S. A. (2014). Destination image as a mediator between perceived risks and revisit intention: A case of post-disaster Japan. *Tourism Management*, *40*, 382-393. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2013.07.008
- Chi, C. G. (2011). Destination loyalty formation and travellers' demographic characteristics: A multiple group analysis approach. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *35*(2), 191-212. doi: 10.1177/1096348010382233
- Chin, W. W., Peterson, R. A., & Brown, S. P. (2008). Structural Equation Modeling in Marketing: Some Practical Reminders. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *16*(4), 287-298. doi: 10.2753/MTP1069-6679160402
- Choi, J. G., Tkachenko, T., Sil, S., & Cohen, J. S. p. a. f. t. b. (2011). On the destination image of Korea by Russian tourists. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 193-194. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.12.002
- Choi, M., Law, R., & Heo, C. Y. (2016). Shopping destinations and trust e Tourist attitudes: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, *54*, 490-501. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.01.005
- Choi, M., Lee, J.-S., & Seo, A. J. (2018). Shopping destination competitiveness: scale development and validation. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *35*(8), 1087-1103. doi: 10.1080/10548408.2018.1475276
- Fandos, C., & Flavián, C. (2006). Intrinsic and extrinsic quality attributes, loyalty and buying intention: an analysis for a PDO product. *British Food Journal*, *108*(8), 646-662. doi:10.1108/00070700610682337
- Fu, H., Ye, B. H., & Xiang, J. (2016). Reality TV, audience travel intentions, and destination image. *Tourism Management*, *55*, 37-48. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.01.009
- Gursoy, D., Chen, J. S., & Chi, C. G. (2014). Theoretical examination of destination loyalty formation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *26*(5), 809-827. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-12-2013-0539
- Hair, J. E., Hult, G. T., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(1), 115-135. doi: 10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8
- Kock, N., & Lynn, G. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: an illustration and recommendations. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *13*(7), 546-580.
- LeHew, M. L., & Wesley, S. C. (2007). Tourist shoppers' satisfaction with regional shopping mall experiences. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism, and Hospitality Research*, *1*(1), 82-96. doi: 10.1108/17506180710729628
- Li, M., Cai, L. A., Lehto, X. Y., & Huang, J. (2010). A Missing Link in Understanding Revisit Intention—The Role of Motivation and Image. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *27*(4), 335-348. doi: 10.1080/10548408.2010.481559

- Lin, C.-H., Morais, D. B., Kerstetter, D. L., & Hou, J.-S. (2007). Examining the role of cognitive and affective image in predicting choice across natural, developed, and theme-park destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(2), 183-194. doi: 10.1177/0047287507304049
- Lloyd, A. E., Yip, L. S. C., & Luk, S. T. K. (2011). An examination of the differences in retail service evaluation between domestic and tourist shoppers in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management, 32*(3), 520-533. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2010.04.004
- Moliner-Velázquez, B., Fuentes-Blasco, M., Servera-Francés, D., & Gil-Saura, I. (2019). From retail innovation and image to loyalty: moderating effects of product type. *Service Business, 13*(1), 199-224. doi: 10.1007/s11628-018-0378-5
- Pahlevi, M. R., & Suhartanto, D. (2020). The integrated model of green loyalty: Evidence from eco-friendly plastic products. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 257*, 120844. doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.120844
- Qi, S., & Chen, N. (2019). Understanding Macao's Destination Image through User-generated Content. *Journal of China Tourism Research, 15*(4), 503-519. doi: 10.1080/19388160.2019.1577199
- Qu, H. L., Kim, L. H., & Im, H. H. (2011). A model of destination branding: integrating the concepts of the branding and destination image. *Tourism Management, 32*(3), 465-476. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2010.03.014
- Rollero, C., & De Piccoli, N. (2010). Place attachment, identification and environment perception: An empirical study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 30*(2), 198-205. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2009.12.003
- San Martín, H., Herrero, A., & García de los Salmones, M. d. M. (2019). An integrative model of destination brand equity and tourist satisfaction. *Current Issues in Tourism, 22*(16), 1992-2013. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2018.1428286
- Souiden, N., Ladhari, R., & Chiadmi, N. E. (2017). Destination personality and destination image. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 32*, 54-70. doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.04.003
- Stylidis, D., Shani, A., & Belhassen, Y. (2017). Testing an integrated destination image model across residents and tourists. *Tourism Management, 58*, 184-195. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.014
- Su, X., Spierings, B., Dijst, M., & Tong, Z. (2019). Analysing trends in the spatio-temporal behaviour patterns of mainland Chinese tourists and residents in Hong Kong based on Weibo data. *Current Issues in Tourism, 1*-17. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2019.1645096
- Suhartanto, D. (2018). Tourist satisfaction with souvenir shopping: evidence from Indonesian domestic tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism, 21*(6), 663-679. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2016.1265487
- Suhartanto, D., Brien, A., Primiana, I., Wibisono, N., & Triyuni, N. N. (2020). Tourist loyalty in creative tourism: the role of experience quality, value, satisfaction, and motivation. *Current Issues in Tourism, 23*(7), 867-879. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2019.1568400
- Suhartanto, D., Lu, C. R., Hussein, A. S., & Chen, B. T. (2018). Scrutinizing Shopper and Retailer Perception on Shopping Destination Image. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research (AHTR), 6*(2), 169-187. doi: 10.30519/ahtr.444449
- Tosun, C., Temizkan, P., Timothy, D., & Fyall, A. (2007). Tourist shopping experience and satisfaction. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 9*, 87-102. doi: 10.1002/jtr.595
- Vinyals-Mirabent, S. (2019). European urban destinations' attractors at the frontier between competitiveness and a unique destination image. A benchmark study of communication practices. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 12*, 37-45. doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.02.006
- Wang, C.-y., & Hsu, M. K. (2010). The relationships of destination image, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions: An integrated model. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 27*(8), 829-843. doi: 10.1080/10548408.2010.527249
- Wang, H., Yong, S., & Ko, E. (2016). Pop culture, destination images, and visit intentions: Theory and research on travel motivations of Chinese and Russian tourists. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(2), 631-641. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.06.020

- Wong, I. A., & Wan, Y. (2013). A Systematic Approach to Scale Development in Tourist Shopping Satisfaction: Linking Destination Attributes and Shopping Experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(1), 29-41. doi: 10.1177/0047287512457263
- Yeung, S., Wong, J., & Ko, E. (2004). Preferred shopping destination: Hongkong versus Singapore. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6, 85-96. doi: 10.1002/jtr.474
- Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L. A., & Lu, L. (2014). Destination image and tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 40, 213-223. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2013.06.006