

**BUKTI KORESPONDENSI**  
**ARTIKEL JURNAL INTERNASIONAL BEREPUTASI**

Judul artikel : Loyalty motivations for religious tourism: Indonesian Muslim travelers umrah participating in umrah pilgrimage to Mecca, Saudi Arabia  
Jurnal : Tourism Research, 2020, Vol. 75 No. 2, pp. 466 - 478  
Penulis : Wu, C.H-J and Mursid, Ali

No	Perihal	Tanggal
1.	Bukti korespondensi article sudah disubmit dan direview	7 Desember 2018
2.	Bukti korespodensi konfirmasi revisi 1 (R1) sudah disubmit dan direview	5 Maret 2019
3.	Bukti korespondensi konfirmasi revisi 2 (R2) sudah disubmit dan direview	10 Mei 2019
4.	Bukti korespondensi konfirmasi artikel revisi 3 (R3) sudah di submit dan direview	23 Juni 2019
5.	Bukti korespondensi artikel accepted.	11 Agustus 2019

**1. Bukti konfirmasi artikel sudah disubmit dan direview  
(7 Desember 2018)**

**Tourism Review**

**Decision Letter (TR-11-2018-0155)**

**From:** dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk

**To:** ali.mursyid14@gmail.com

**CC:** cihan@cihan.org

**Subject:** Tourism Review - Decision on Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155

**Body:** 07-Dec-2018

Dear Mr. Mursid,

Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155 entitled "How motivations drive customer participation in achieving loyalty: umrah travelers' perspective" which you submitted to Tourism Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewers suggest a number of major revisions to your manuscript.

I also would like you to consider the following suggestions

Reappoint the paper to focus more on Religious tourism and loyalty/repeat visit

Perhaps title may be :

loyalty motivations for religious tourists: perspective of Indonesian Umrah travelers  
or similar

The quality of written English affects whether readers will read a paper and fully understand its ideas and contribution. Poor quality expression also entails delays in subsequent production work, and a lot of questions being sent to you by the Copy Editors. You should use this opportunity to check the expression of your case in the paper. That means ensuring that the English is clear, accurate and concise, and that the flow of ideas and arguments is logical and avoids unnecessary repetition. You should devote a good deal of time to this task.

It is advised that you get a colleague who is an experienced author and whose first language is English to read your paper and to help you, especially if English is not your first language. You might need to get help with this from a professional copy editing service with experience of work on academic articles, but carefully check the accuracy of their work. Also check the paper against the journal's Style Guidelines (see the journal's website and look at recent journal issues). That includes checking that references in the body of the paper match those in your list of references, and that referencing follows the Style Guidelines.

You should ensure that your arguments and the case made for your paper's original contribution are especially clear in the paper's Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion. Please also check all aspects of the paper very carefully. Remember that the journal has a tight page limit and many strong submissions, so that articles are limited to 5,500 words.

Create a table where you list the reviewers' comments and your responses to them clearly. Use review and different colour in your paper text to show the changes you have made. Please also ensure that all files are kept anonymous.

It would be difficult to make a substantive contribution to any journal without engaging more with the current conversations relevant to it. In order to do so, you would need to demonstrate familiarity with the work of other contemporary scholars working in the field to which you are submitting. Your paper seems that has neglected to look into *Tourism Review* as a leading journal in the field with 73 years history. The work in the journal evolved considerably, and to contribute to it, you would need to engage with it (and work in allied journals like *Tourism Review*, such as *Tourism Management*, *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Travel Research* and the like) more fully.

Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please be aware that the decision with regard to the publication of your paper is depending on the quality of your revisions.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tr> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You should use this

space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Because Emerald is trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Tourism Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, let me know; otherwise I may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Tourism Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,  
Dr. Cihan Cobanoglu  
Editor-in-Chief, Tourism Review  
cihan@cihan.org

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Comments:  
See above..

Additional Questions:

**<b>1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: There is no originality in terms of conceptual and methodological approaches. All these constructs have been extensively studied over the last two or three decades. The only difference is sample who is involved in umrah.

**<b>2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: There is an extensive coverage of the related literature on constructs but perhaps the author/s could search for the availability of any references on umrah visitors.

**<b>3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: This is the most problematic part of the study. The period of data collection takes 4 or 5 years (between 2013 and 2017) but this is too risk to create bias in the end. A total of 550 respondents is divided by 4 or 5 years means we will have 100 respondents on average each year. This is not a longitudinal study so why did the author/s tend to keep the period from 2013 to 2017?

Which months of the year was the data collected? How many data was collected every year? Where was the data collected, e.g. before or after their umrah experience?

Did they travel to Saudi Arabia for umrah or elsewhere?

how did the author/s collect the data, e.g. who filled out the surveys?

The loyalty scale was borrowed from Zeithamal (1986) but this is dated. There

might be some other newer scales in 2000s. As there is no evidence in the study on the extend of involvement in umrah experience, e.g. how many time each respondent has had the umrah experience to date. Using the same travel travel for umrah is a different issue and visiting a certain place for umrah is a more different issue. The latter always exists but the former can stop operating. Then, the loyalty will end automatically. To be more concise, what is the percent of loyal visitors between 2013 and 2017?

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Yes but there is no surprise with the results.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Implications for practice are fine but they are limited to expand the existing literature.

**6. Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Generally speaking, the study flows well but occasionally there are typo errors that needs proofreading.

Reviewer: 2

Comments:

Dear Authors,

Congratulations on submitting your manuscript for review.

The comments are offered in the hope of improving your paper.

Additional Questions:

**1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: 1) Yes. This is an interesting paper which investigates and provides insight into the customer participation and customer loyalty dynamic within the service delivery process.

**2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: 1) No. An important clarification is needed as it refers to the term 'service process'. Please define 'service process' for the reader. For whom, and by whom, is the service presumed to be provided?

2) Clarification on customer participation may be helpful. The authors invoke Auh et al's definition of customer participation as "the contribution of the customer to allocating their time in search of information, giving approval, as well as helping to make a decision in the service delivery process." Further, the term, 'voluntary customer relationships' (p5 L6) is presumed in the paper to exist at the consumer-to-business (C2B) level, i.e., between the visitor and tour agency. What about the customer-customer (C2C) relation? Have the authors considered? Would customers feel a greater sense of satisfaction through, or be more strongly motivated to participate in service processes where fellow consumers are benefiting from their participation? Based on the Payne et al (2008) citation, is it

both? In sum, how do intrinsic motivations work when directed at/towards a business vs. towards a fellow consumer? Supporting examples might also be helpful.

**3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: 1) There are opportunities for improvement here. A corollary of the above questions on the Literature review's definition of customer participation is the need for the authors to clearly help the reader understand 'directionality' of the service process. If the service delivery process involves more than two actors (and I suspect it does in reality), then the authors need to tease out the multiple, co-occurring relations among these actors. For e.g., customer A participates in transacting with business C and business D. The complexity of the process model under consideration by the authors theoretically implies that intrinsic/extrinsic motivators may be responsible for customer A's participation (e.g., wanting to provide evidence of a positive experience with business C to customer B), as well as on loyalty felt towards business C. On the other hand, customer A's participation (e.g., wanting to provide evidence of a negative experience with business D to customer B) may stem from absence of loyalty to business D. The complex nature of these interactions seem identified in H1 and H2, but could be better explicated in the relationship to the literature (P4 LL16-30).

2) H5 and H6 require greater clarity and theoretical underpinning.

3) Similarly, H7 and H8. Given the number of works cited (p7 LL5-8), what novel element does the study bring to the table? It may be a weakened argument to imply umrah context as the 'so what'.

4) There is no theoretical argument in the paper supporting H7 and its relevance to the study.

5) H8 appears to be depicted as H9(?) in the theoretical framework, with no mention in the text of an H9. Also, adjust graphic (Fig. 1) so that H3 is not hidden by H5.

6) Regarding methods, how were participants identified? How was the survey coordinated by the junior lecturer?

7) What precautions were created (or tests undertaken) to minimize respondent bias? For e.g., it is possible that if the tourist did not have a positive tour experience, their reflection of the tour may be biased by negative perceptions. For e.g., was a screening question asked about the extent of their satisfaction with the tour?

8) Similarly, given that respondents were asked to recall a previous tour experience, how did the study design control for memory bias?

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: 1) Related to the above commentary on memory bias, this reviewer suggests inclusion of a regression analysis to determine if there are significant differences between respondents who took their umrah tour in more recent years (e.g., 2016-2017) and those who took their tours pre-2016.

2) The hypotheses listed in Table 4 should be formatted for better fit within column.

3) Why did the authors utilize SEM? Do not assume that every reader will know, nor that every reviewer will blindly accept use of a particular methodology without justification. There is justification related to the testing of individual and overall-model-based relationships, singularly and in conjunction. However, why did the authors not employ testing of the multiple, mediating/moderating model using Hayes PROCESS macro? Given that the a priori knowledge that customer

participation leads to customer loyalty, as cited by the authors (Chen and Wang, 2016) P3 LL11-18, would PROCESS or similar methods testing not be justified?

4)

<b>5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: </b> Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: 1) Given a focal purpose of the Tourism Review journal, to make relevant tourism research to "global society at large", how generalizable are these results? Why did the authors choose to sample umrah travelers and operators, and how generalizable is this knowledge across other travel and tour populations?

2) P12 LL10-24. The authors confirm consistency of their findings with a number of studies. This begs the wo what question within the Discussion segment.

3) P12 L13-14 One study with whose findings the authors' findings are inconsistent in the areas of "co-production and functional value" is Zainuddin et al (2013). The authors should engage the reader on why this might be so, instead of merely leaving it to the reader's imagination.

<b>6. Quality of Communication: </b> Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Generally, the paper is well-written with a few opportunities for grammatical correctness.

1) Throughout document. Incorrect spelling in author citation. Author Deci and Ryan, 1985 (not Decy)

2) P9 L42. State RMSEA value

3) P11 L22 "The presents study exploring how" requires correction for grammar

**Date Sent:** 07-Dec-2018

**File 1:** \* [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

## 2. Bukti konfirmasi artikel revisi 1 (R1) sudah disubmit dan direview (5 Maret 2019)

Tourism Review

**Decision Letter (TR-11-2018-0155.R1)**

**From:** dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk

**To:** ali.mursyid14@gmail.com

**CC:** cihan@cihan.org

**Subject:** Tourism Review - Decision on Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R1

**Body:** 05-Mar-2019

Dear Mr. Mursid,

Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R1 entitled "Loyalty motivations for religious tourists: the perspective of Indonesian umrah travelers" which you submitted to Tourism Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewers suggest a number of major revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please be aware that the decision with regard to the publication of your paper is depending on the quality of your revisions.

First you should follow very closely the journal instructions and follow all the fields when you submit the paper. Check the journal's Style Guidelines as on the journal's website [http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author\\_guidelines.htm?id=ijchm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author_guidelines.htm?id=ijchm) and recent journal papers <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>. Also check that references in the body of the paper match those in your list of references, and that referencing follows the Style Guidelines. Reviewers evaluate against these criteria and you should provide all the information required on the form.

You should showcase the original contribution of the paper in the paper's Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion. Please also check all aspects of the paper very carefully. The journal has a tight page limit and many strong submissions so articles are limited to 5,500 words (including references and figures).

Before resubmitting you should consider the following questions to justify publication and make clear :

- \* what is the original contribution of the paper ?
- \* What is the NEW knowledge and contribution to theory?
- \* How does it progress existing global knowledge?
- \* Who should read this paper ?
- \* How will they benefit from reading the paper ?
- \* Who will use this paper in their research?
- \* If you have studied in one location or industry, how can the paper benefit other locations or industries?
- \* How can you justify your methodology?
- \* Are the results clearly articulated and understandable by a non expert?
- \* Why is this paper significant and to whom ?
- \* What will be the impact of the paper to academic research and industry practice?
- \* Why someone will recommend this paper to his students or colleagues?

A paper published in Tourism Review should include an explicit discussion about its theoretical contribution, followed by implications for research and practice. Your paper should start with a literature review that focuses on theoretical contributions and theoretical models. Then the paper should clearly identify a research gap which is then addressed in the results of your paper. The paper should demonstrate originality and novelty in the theoretical contribution and implications. The usefulness of the contribution as well as its impacts and implications should be explicit.

You should avoid focusing only in one specific location. Tourism Review is an international journal and therefore articles should be equally interesting to readers

in San Francisco, Sao Paolo, Accra, Xilokastro, Yuvaskyla, Edinburgh, Yamoussoukro, Adana, Yogyakarta, Chengdu or Brisbane in the same way that you would not be interested in research undertaking in any of these places alone. The same applies to one sector of tourism alone. What can we learn from transportation, destinations, hospitality, attractions etc that can be generalisable. How can your paper contribute to theory and help organisations in multiple locations and companies to benefit from your conclusions?

Create a table where you list the reviewers' comments and your responses to them clearly. Make sure that you submit this as a SEPARATE ANONYMOUS FILE. Use review and different colour in your paper text to show the changes you have made. Please also ensure that all files are kept anonymous. More practically, you should ensure that your aims and contribution are clear in the Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion. The journal has a tight page limit and many strong submissions. Therefore articles are limited to 5,500 words including everything.

It is critical that the quality of written English is edited to the highest standard. Please make sure that English is clear, accurate and concise, and that the flow of ideas and arguments is logical and avoids unnecessary repetition. An experienced native English speaker colleague or a professional copy editing service for academic articles can help you.

It would be difficult to make a substantive contribution to any journal without engaging with the current conversation and relevant literature. You should engage with the style and the discussions published in Tourism Review. In order to do so, you would need to demonstrate familiarity with the work of other contemporary scholars working in the field to which you are submitting. Your paper seem that has neglected to look into Tourism Review as a leading journal in the field with 73 years history. The work in the journal evolved considerably as you can see on <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>. To fully contribute to the subject, you would need to engage with work in leading journals like Tourism Review, such as Tourism Management, Annals of Tourism Research, Journal of Travel Research, Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management and the like more fully.

Tourism Review was accepted into SSCI in December 2018 and will receive its first impact factor and Citation Report in June 2019. The SSCI coverage will begin with the 2016 volume and will demonstrate the contribution and impact of the Journal. We experience dramatic growth of the journal in submissions, quality and impact. See for your self on EarlyCite <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tr> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You should use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material



not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Because Emerald is trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Tourism Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, let me know; otherwise I may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Tourism Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,  
Professor Dimitrios Buhalis  
Editor in Chief  
Tourism Review  
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/loi/tr>

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Comments:

Due to the lack of its theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses, I am not able to support this manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

Additional Questions:

**1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: It is hardly to say this is an original contribution. There is nothing new and only the results of other studies on customer participation has been borrowed and applied into the context of umrah travelers. Perhaps that's why the author/s tends to use customers instead of umrah travelers. But I definitely refuse using "customer" for umrah travellers. How may we think that the people travelling with religious motivations but have no commercial benefits can be customers. Better to replace it with travellers or umrah travellers.

**2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: There is a limited relationship to the current literature on religious tourism or motivations of umrah travelers. The references listed in the end are mostly related to a wider coverage of various industry but one may consider that the application of motivation constructs developed in other fields cannot easily be adapted into religious tourism and expect similar results. If possible, the author/s should check the availability of some more references in the subject investigated.

**3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: From the methodology, I recall that this paper might have been submitted to a different journal previously. The major criticism relates to the sampling criteria of choosing travelers in the last five years. This is a very long milestone for someone to recall their motivations even only last year. I would expect the author/s to convince as to why such a long timespan has been chosen.

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Results are fine but appear to be typical in the context of a generic customer satisfaction study.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper

identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Implications for the theory are very limited and so generic. It should be more specific on religious travelers/tourism.

**6. Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: The results part is partially not reader-friendly but generally speaking the manuscript reads well..

Reviewer: 2

Comments:  
Dear Author/(s),

Congratulations on completing the revised submission. The attached comments are offered to further improve your manuscript.

Additional Questions:

**1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: The revised paper contains new, but not necessarily significant information. I offer this point because, as per the author response to multi-mediating relationship questions (and I presume the motivation towards renaming the paper's title), the authors wish to emphasize EOR, EHO, CP, and CL in the \*Indonesian umrah tour context\*, rather than make significant contribution to CP and CL theory. A new and significant contribution might have sought to do both. On the other hand, one positive of underutilized model testing is the potential for future, published work.

To the extent that there is a dearth of scholarship on umrah travelers and by extension, CP within religious tourism, I support the work as having potential to contribute originality to the field.

**2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes. This section of the paper has improved. P2 LL 39-50 provide a clearer raison d'etre for the study, specific to the umrah tour/traveler context.

**3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes. The inclusion of explicit references to "umrah travellers" within the stated hypotheses does aid in the structure and coherence of the manuscript.

Improvements in the theoretical framework (Figure 1) well done and offer an improved and clarified viewing. (See note in Results below)

In and around the sample data collection described (P8 LL3-13), how were respondents who actually "participated" (i.e., provide suggestions; had high levels of participation; and involved in service delivery decisions as per CP measurement scale) identified? These details are not provided in the purposive sampling descriptors provided.

What process was used to prepare the data for analysis i.e., the process which

resulted from the initial n=750 to n=500? Please explain.

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: The results of the tested model should display significance of each of the relationships tested among the latent variables. In this regard, it may be important for the authors to distinguish between the (theoretical) model to be tested (currently Figure 1) and the model test results currently listed in Table 5. (This may require editorial adjustment/collapse between Table 5 and Figure 1)

What is the \*overall\* significance of the measurement model? Was this determined? While this is stated in the text, it is recommended that the measure/(s) be included just below the Figure 1.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: In the revised version of the paper, I was admittedly disappointed that the authors chose to remove their previous reference to Zainuddin (2013). I encourage the authors to remember that sound, meaningful scholarly work is not measured on the extent to which it merely conforms "neatly" to the mold of prior work. Rather, it is the extent to which replicated and repeated work is able to intelligently contradict previous finding; and in so doing further the innovativeness and impact of scholarly research.

**6. Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: While there is evidence of improvement, there are still areas requiring grammatical review and correction. A few are cited below:

P 3 L6 "on the on the..."

P4 LL 3-6 Notwithstanding their use in Abstract, first use of the acronyms EOR and EHo within body of paper requires accompanying wording.

**Date Sent:** 05-Mar-2019

**File 1:** \* [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

### 3. Bukti konfirmasi artikel revisi 2 (R2) sudah disubmit dan direview (10 Mei 2019)

#### Tourism Review

##### Decision Letter (TR-11-2018-0155.R2)

**From:** dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk

**To:** ali.mursyid14@gmail.com

**CC:** cihan@cihan.org

**Subject:** Tourism Review - Decision on Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R2

**Body:** 10-May-2019

Dear Mr. Mursid,

Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R2 entitled "Loyalty motivations for religious tourists: the perspective of Indonesian umrah travelers" which you submitted to Tourism Review, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter.

The reviewers suggest a number of major revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript. Please be aware that the decision with regard to the publication of your paper is depending on the quality of your revisions.

Unless you can address the theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses that reviewer one has already addressed your paper cannot be supported manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

You need to be able to place your research in the theoretical context and consumer behaviour.

First you should follow very closely the journal instructions and follow all the fields when you submit the paper. Check the journal's Style Guidelines as on the journal's website

[http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author\\_guidelines.htm?id=ijchm](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author_guidelines.htm?id=ijchm) and recent journal papers <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>.

Also check that references in the body of the paper match those in your list of references, and that referencing follows the Style Guidelines. Reviewers evaluate against these criteria and you should provide all the information required on the form.

You should showcase the original contribution of the paper in the paper's Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion. Please also check all aspects of the paper very carefully. The journal has a tight page limit and many strong submissions so articles are limited to 5,500 words (including references and figures).

Before submitting you should consider the following questions to justify publication and make clear :

\* what is the original contribution of the paper ?

\* What is the NEW knowledge and contribution to theory?

\* How does it progress existing global knowledge?

\* Who should read this paper ?

\* How will they benefit from reading the paper ?

\* Who will use this paper in their research?

\* If you have studied in one location or industry, how can the paper benefit other locations or industries?

\* How can you justify your methodology?

\* Are the results clearly articulated and understandable by a non expert?

\* Why is this paper significant and to whom ?

\* What will be the impact of the paper to academic research and industry practice?

\* Why someone will recommend this paper to his students or colleagues?

A paper published in Tourism Review should include an explicit discussion about its theoretical contribution, followed by implications for research and practice. Your paper should start with a literature review that focuses on theoretical contributions and theoretical models. Then the paper should clearly identify a research gap which is then addressed in the results of your paper. The paper should demonstrate originality and novelty in the theoretical contribution and implications. The usefulness of the contribution as well as its impacts and implications should be

explicit. <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> You should avoid focusing only in one specific location. Tourism Review is an international journal and therefore articles should be equally interesting to readers in San Francisco, Sao Paolo, Accra, Xilokastro, Yuvaskyla, Edinburgh, Yamoussoukro, Adana, Yogyakarta, Chengdu or Brisbane in the same way that you would not be interested in research undertaking in any of these places alone. The same applies to one sector of tourism alone. What can we learn from transportation, destinations, hospitality, attractions etc that can be generalisable. How can your paper contribute to theory and help organisations in multiple locations and companies to benefit from your conclusions?

<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> Create a table where you list the reviewers' comments and your responses to them clearly. Make sure that you submit this as a SEPARATE ANONYMOUS FILE. Use review and different colour in your paper text to show the changes you have made. Please also ensure that all files are kept anonymous. More practically, you should ensure that your aims and contribution are clear in the Abstract, Introduction and Conclusion. The journal has a tight page limit and many strong submissions. Therefore articles are limited to 5,500 words including everything. <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

It is critical that the quality of written English is edited to the highest standard. Please make sure that English is clear, accurate and concise, and that the flow of ideas and arguments is logical and avoids unnecessary repetition. An experienced native English speaker colleague or a professional copy editing service for academic articles can help you. <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> It would be difficult to make a substantive contribution to any journal without engaging with the current conversation and relevant literature. You should engage with the style and the discussions published in Tourism Review. In order to do so, you would need to demonstrate familiarity with the work of other contemporary scholars working in the field to which you are submitting. Your paper seem that has neglected to look into Tourism Review as a leading journal in the field with 74 years history. The work in the journal evolved considerably as you can see on <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>. To fully contribute to the subject, you would need to engage with work in leading journals like Tourism Review, such as Tourism Management, Annals of Tourism Research, Journal of Travel Research, Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management and the like more fully. <sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

Tourism Review is abstracted and indexed by Associate Programs Source Plus, Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities in Marketing, Current Abstracts, Social Sciences Citation Index (Clarivate Analytics). It is ranked by AIDEA (Italy), Australian Business Dean's Council (ABDC) Journal Ranking List, Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS, UK) Academic Journal Guide, ESSEC Rankings of Journals 2016, The Publication Forum (Finland), Scopus. Tourism Review is committed to ethical publishing and follows the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines regarding peer review. [http://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical\\_guidelines\\_for\\_peer\\_reviewers\\_0.pdf](http://publicationethics.org/files/Ethical_guidelines_for_peer_reviewers_0.pdf) It also recognizes the need to improve the ways in which the outputs of scholarly research are evaluated and is a member of DORA the Declaration on Research Assessment <https://sfedora.org/>

<sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub> Tourism Review was accepted into SSCI in December 2018 and will receive its first impact factor and Citation Report in June 2019. The SSCI coverage will begin with the 2016 volume and will demonstrate the contribution and impact of the Journal. We experience dramatic growth of the journal in submissions, quality and impact. See for your self on EarlyCite <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/toc/tr/0/0>.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tr> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You should use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Because Emerald is trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Tourism Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, let me know; otherwise I may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Tourism Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,  
Professor Dimitrios Buhalis  
Editor-in-Chief, Tourism Review  
dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk  
[http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author\\_guidelines.htm?id=tr](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author_guidelines.htm?id=tr)

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1

Recommendation: Reject

Comments:

I am still with my earlier decision that is "reject". I do apologize for clicking on "minor revision" other than "reject" in my first report but now it is the time to correct this misplacement. Due to the lack of its theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses, I am not able to support this manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

Additional Questions:

<b>1. Originality: </b> Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Due to the lack of its theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses, I am not able to support this manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

<b>2. Relationship to Literature: </b> Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Due to the lack of its theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses, I am not able to support this manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

**3. Methodology:** Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Due to the lack of its theoretical and methodological design and methodological weaknesses, I am not able to support this manuscript for publication in Tourism Review.

**4. Results:** Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: They are fine but not the case as the study has a number of conceptual and methodological drawbacks.

**5. Implications for research, practice and/or society:** Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: The study offers no implications for research or society.

**6. Quality of Communication:** Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: It looks much better.

Reviewer: 2

Recommendation: Accept

Comments:

Dear Author/(s),

Congratulations on the improvements made to your paper. The comments offered are in the hope of improving the manuscript further.

Regards,

Additional Questions:

**1. Originality:** Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: Yes. The paper contains new and moderately significant information adequate to justify publication.

The study explores religious tourism and how motivation aspects, including expected organizational rewards (EOR) and enjoyment in helping others (EHO) affect umrah travelers' participation, satisfaction, and eventually loyalty.

EOR and EHO are not new, rather they are clarified in the context of perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty. It is the context of Umrah travel that forms a very specific and limited contribution to the field. I believe this niche research important, but question its utility to the target Tourism Review readership. To the extent that it moderately extends our understanding of EOR and EHO, the study justifies publication.

**2. Relationship to Literature:** Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?: Yes. The author/(s) have made a reasonable effort in ensuring relationship to current literature has been established.

<b>3. Methodology: </b>Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: Yes. The paper has established a sound theoretical framework.

Why the use of "impact" in H1 and "affect in H2? P5 LL16, 19

<b>4. Results: </b>Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: Considering earlier versions of the manuscript. the current iteration is considerably simplified.

The authors have also incorporated the reviewer comments for both a theoretical and final model.

<b>5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: </b>Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Religious tourism has significant implications for civil society today and Umrah travel. There is little to no implications for society, public policy, or quality of life. A short paragraph may enhance benefit to the manuscript's readers.

<b>6. Quality of Communication: </b> Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Grammatical corrections are still required, and a revisit with a copy editor suggested.

P3 L4 Intrinsic and intrinsic motivation

P4 LL43 - 54

P9 L40 The most travelers

**Date Sent:** 10-May-2019

**File 1:** \* [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

#### 4. Bukti konfirmasi artikel revisi 3 (R3) sudah disubmit dan direview (23 Juni 2019)

### Tourism Review

**Decision Letter (TR-11-2018-0155.R3)**

**From:** dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk



**To:** ali.mursyid14@gmail.com

**CC:** cihan@cihan.org

**Subject:** Tourism Review - Decision on Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R3

**Body:** 23-Jun-2019

Dear Mr. Mursid,

Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R3 entitled "Loyalty motivations for religious tourists: the perspective of Indonesian umrah travelers" which you submitted to Tourism Review, has been reviewed.

I am willing to accept your paper provided that you make the following improvements:

**CHANGE TITLE TO**

Loyalty motivations for religious tourism: Indonesian Muslim travelers umrah participating in Umrah pilgrimage to Mecca, Saudi Arabia

USE term umrah travellers instead of customers

**REFERENCES TO**

Add current literature on religious tourism or motivations of umrah travelers. Also explore all religion, muslim, culture related travel research published in tourism review <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/loi/tr>

**METHODOLOGY**

Explain why the sampling criteria of choosing travelers in the last five years. Explain why such a long timespan has been chosen.

Therefore, I invite you to revise your manuscript.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tr> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also highlight the changes to your manuscript within the document by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or coloured text.

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Centre.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You should use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

**IMPORTANT:** Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that Emerald requires you to clear permission to re-use any material not created by you. If there are permissions outstanding, please send these to Emerald as soon as possible. Emerald is unable to publish your paper with permissions outstanding.

Because Emerald is trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Tourism Review, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as

possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, let me know; otherwise I may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Tourism Review and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Dimitrios Buhalis  
Editor in Chief  
Tourism Review  
[http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author\\_guidelines.htm?id=tr](http://www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/products/journals/author_guidelines.htm?id=tr)

**Date Sent:** 23-Jun-2019

**File 1:** \* [How-to-submit-a-revision.doc](#)

## 5. Bukti konfirmasi artikel sudah diterima (Accepted) (11 Agustus 2019)

### Tourism Review

#### Decision Letter (TR-11-2018-0155.R4)

**From:** dbuhalis@bournemouth.ac.uk

**To:** cedric@gms.ndhu.edu.tw, ali.mursyid14@gmail.com

**CC:** cihan@cihan.org

**Subject:** Tourism Review - Decision on Manuscript ID TR-11-2018-0155.R4

**Body:** 11-Aug-2019

Dear Wu, Cedric; Mursid, Ali

CONGRATULATIONS I AM PLEASED TO ACCEPT YOUR PAPER FOR PUBLICATION IN TOURISM REVIEW!

Your articles makes a valuable contribution to tourism literature and you should announce and celebrate your major achievement! Well done !

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript TR-11-2018-0155.R4, entitled "Loyalty motivations for religious tourism: Indonesia Muslim travelers' umrah participating in Umrah pilgrimage to Mecca, Saudi Arabia" in its current form for publication in Tourism Review. Please note, no further changes can be made to your manuscript.

Please go to your Author Centre at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tr> (Manuscripts with Decisions for the submitting author or Manuscripts I have co-authored for all listed co-authors) to complete the Copyright Transfer Agreement

form (CTA). We cannot publish your paper without this.

All authors are requested to complete the form and to input their full contact details. If any of the contact information is incorrect you can update it by clicking on your name at the top right of the screen. Please note that this must be done prior to you submitting your CTA.

If you have an ORCID please check your account details to ensure that your ORCID is validated.

By publishing in this journal your work will benefit from Emerald EarlyCite. As soon as your CTA is completed your manuscript will pass to Emerald's Content Management department and be processed for EarlyCite publication. EarlyCite is the author proofed, typeset version of record, fully citable by DOI. The EarlyCite article sits outside of a journal issue and is paginated in isolation. The EarlyCite article will be collated into a journal issue according to the journals' publication schedule.

FOR OPEN ACCESS AUTHORS: Please note if you have indicated that you would like to publish your article as Open Access via Emerald's Gold Open Access route, you are required to complete a Creative Commons Attribution Licence - CCBY 4.0 (in place of the standard copyright assignment form referenced above). You will receive a follow up email within the next 30 days with a link to the CCBY licence and information regarding payment of the Article Processing Charge. If you have indicated that you might be eligible for a prepaid APC voucher, you will also be informed at this point if a voucher is available to you (for more information on APC vouchers please see <http://www.emeraldpublishing.com/oapartnerships>)

Thank you for your contribution. On behalf of the Editors of Tourism Review, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Yours sincerely,  
Professor Dimitrios Buhalis  
Editor-in-Chief, Tourism Review

**Date Sent:** 11-Aug-2019