THE EFFECT OF CULTURAL CONTACT ON REVISIT INTENTION ON YOGYAKARTA PALACE TOUR

Calvin Claudio Galang Wardana[1],

Farah Fadhilah Ansetti[2],

Gabriel David Pangihutan Sinambela[3],
(gabrieldavidps@gmail.com)

Oktavianus Richard Eriyanto[4],

Oke Sabella[5],

Siti Rahayu[6],

[1,2,3,4,5]*University of Surabaya, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of Cultural Contact on Revisit Intention on Yogyakarta Palace tourism. The dependent variable used is revisit intention, while the independent variables used are cultural contact, and cultural memory. The research method used is causal research with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach. The research sample was 105 tourists from the Yogyakarta Palace. Data collection techniques by distributing online questionnaires. The data analysis technique used classical assumption test, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis, and hypothesis testing.

Keywords : Cultural Contact, Cultural Memory, Revisit Intention.

PLEMINARY

Tourism has now undergone a transformation into cultural and creative tourism for the proliferation of cultural tourism. Cultural and creative tourism has become a new type and a new trend of tourism development at this time which is increasingly becoming an important destination for tourists Jovicic (2016). From the perspective of cultural sustainability, creative ways display cultural connotations that are difficult for tourists to understand in the form of entertainment and innovation, so that Alteza et al., (2021) can quickly contact, understand, and recognize local traditional culture. Moreover, with the deepening of the integration of culture and tourism, local traditional culture is increasingly widely known and known to the public in a relaxed manner, this is conducive to the inheritance and spread of traditional culture. In addition, from the perspective of sustainable development of scenic spots, today's tourists are no longer satisfied with traditional tourism cultural tourism. In younger travelers, studies have shown that creative cultural experience

activities are more conducive to their flow experience, which is conducive to shaping tourists' return visit intentions.

Yogyakarta itself is a city that is rich in cultural tourism. There are several cultural tours that attract tourists to come. Cultural tourism is the most popular tourist attraction when foreign and domestic tourists visit Yogyakarta. Among foreign tourists, Yogyakarta has a very strong cultural characteristic, therefore foreign tourists are willing to vacation in Yogyakarta to find out the origin of culture that has never existed in their home country. This is evidenced by the number of tourists who continue to increase every year.

One of the famous cultural attractions in the Special Region of Yogyakarta is the Yogyakarta Palace, which is the official palace of the Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat Sultanate located in the city of Yogyakarta. This palace was founded by Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwana I in 1775 as the newly established Yogyakarta Palace due to the split of Islamic Mataram with the Giyanti Agreement. This palace is a fraction of the Surakarta Hadiningrat Palace of the Yogyakarta Sunanate (Kingdom of Surakarta). So that the Mataram dynasty was continued by 2 Kingdoms, namely the Sultanate of Yogyakarta and the Sultanate of Yogyakarta. The palace is also one of the attractions in the city of Yogyakarta. Part of the palace complex is a museum that houses various collections belonging to the sultanate, including gifts from European kings, replicas of palace heirlooms, and gamelan. In terms of building, this palace is one of the best examples of Javanese palace architecture, having luxurious halls and spacious grounds and pavilions. To increase the number of tourist visits to the Yogyakarta Palace, a way is needed to increase the number of return visits in order to attract tourists to visit. The method in question is to add cultural attractions that can evoke memories for tourists so that it raises the intention of visiting tourists. Therefore, this study seeks to explore ways in which cultural contact can lead to the intention to return to visit Yogyakarta Palace tourism.

REVIEW THE LITERATURE USED AND HYPOTHESES

This study is a model replication of the research of Lai et al., (2021). The following are the proposed hypotheses:

H1: cultural contact has a positive effect on revisit intention
H2: cultural contact has a positive effect on cultural memory
H3: cultural memory has a positive effect on revisit intention

CULTURAL CONTACT

Cultural contact is a desire felt by tourists to mingle or involve themselves and their behavior in a local cultural activity Chen & Rahman, (2018). This is in accordance with the research of Lape, (2003) cultural contact is a form of group interaction with outsiders that creates diversity and the desire to regulate the interaction itself. Cultural contact can occur when groups of tourists visit tourist destinations within a few days Chen & Rahman, (2018).

CULTURAL MEMORY

Cultural memory is an activity in tourism that is able to provide memories for tourists so that it can influence certain choices for tourists. Schacter et al., (2012). Memory is the activity of remembering individual experiences and personalities. Memory is created because of remembering activities carried out by humans in an activity that has occurred Schacter et al., (1993). According to

research Withers, (2005) memory has an impact on local identity. Local identity such as cultural tourism is able to provide an understanding of local culture and cultural identity in carrying out cultural preservation. According to Tao (2015) in the research of Lai et al., (2021) memory can be formed due to personal emotions and can create a person's desire to travel. In terms of tourism according to Schacter et al., (2012).

REVISIT INTENTION

Revisit intention is the intention to revisit that is felt by tourists because of promotional efforts and new attractions at a tourist destination Tema, (2012). The intention to revisit is a follow-up action from the satisfaction experienced by tourists and make their decision to return to the place Um et al., (2006). According to Han et al., (2009) the intention to revisit arises because of a positive attitude towards the services provided. To influence the intention of returning tourists, it is necessary to have the satisfaction felt by Bigne et al., (2001).

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study using basic research research. Basic research is an activity in research and is not carried out without detailed decisions which are generally not intended to meet the needs of a particular group. The object of research is the Yogyakarta Palace tourists. The technique of collecting data was using a questionnaire, and data analysis was done by using the SEM (Structural Equation Model) test.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS RESULTS

Hasil analisis pada penelitian kontak budaya yang mempengaruhi minat kunjung kembali pada wisata Keraton Yogyakarta. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan meminta wisatawan menjawabkuesioner pernyataan yang diberikan oleh peneliti. Hasil yang dilakukan adalah sebagai berikut :

Table 1. Goodness of fit Measurement Model (CFA) Test

No.	*Goodness of fit*	Criteria	Test Results	Notes
1	CMIN/DF	≤ 3,00	1,917	Good Fit
2	RMSEA	≤ 0,08	0,096	Good Fit
3	GFI	Marginal Fit (0,8-0,9)	0,848	Marginal Fit
4	CFI	Good Fit (≥0,9)	0,888	Marginal Fit
5	TLI		0,862	Marginal Fit

Table 1 is the result of the Goodness of fit (GoF) measurement model (CFA) test. The following is a description of the results with the Goodness-of-Fit (GoF) criteria based on Hair et al., (2019: 637-639) which has several basic elements, namely CMIN/DF will be declared good fit if the value obtained meets the limit criteria 3. Based on GoF test results in this study amounted to 1.917 which means good fit. RMSEA will be declared good fit if the value obtained meets the limit criteria of 0.08. Based on the results of the GoF test in this study, it is 0.096 which means good fit. GFI has criteria of 0.8 - 0.9 it is declared marginal fit, while if it is found a value of 0.9 is declared good fit. Based on the results of the GoF test in this study, it was 0.848 which means marginal fit. CFI has criteria of 0.8 - 0.9, it is declared marginal fit, while if a value of 0.9 is found, it is declared good fit. Based on the results of the GoF test in this study, it was 0.888 which means marginal fit. The TLI has criteria of 0.8 - 0.9, it is declared marginal fit, while if it is found a value of 0.9 is declared good fit.

Based on the results of the GoF test in this study, it is 0.862 which means marginal fit.

Table 2. Std. loadings value, AVE and CR for each Dimension and Variable

Dimension / Variable	Indicator	Std. Loading(λ)	AVE	CR	Notes
Cultural Contact (CC)	CC1	0.688	0.258	0.841	Valid and reliable
	CC2	0.669			Valid and reliable
	CC4	0.482			Valid and reliable
	CC8	0.747			Valid and reliable
	CC10	0.8			Valid and reliable
	CC11	0.7			Valid and reliable
Cultural Memory (CM)	CM1	0.715	0.586	0.809	Valid and reliable
	CM2	0.734			Valid and reliable
	CM3	0.842			Valid and reliable
Revisit Intention (RI)	RI1	0.644	0.700	0.828	Valid and reliable
	RI2	0.715			Valid and reliable
	RI3	0.705			Valid and reliable
	RI4	0.717			Valid and reliable
	RI5	0.717			Valid and reliable

Table 2. shows the valid and reliable test results of the standardized loadings values for each dimension and stage 1 variables AVE and CR. An indicator is declared valid and reliable if it has an average variance extract (AVE) value of 0.5 and of construct reliability (CR) 0.7. All indicators in stage 1 have a standardized loadings value of 0.5 so that no indicators are omitted. All variables meet the average variance extracted (AVE) requirements. The results of the construct reliability (CR) variable meet the requirements of 0.7 cultural contact, cultural memory, and revisit intention are eligible. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981) in Huang et al. (2013) if the AVE value is less than 0.5 but the CR value is higher than 0.6 then the convergent validity of the construct is still acceptable.

Table 3. Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis		Standardized Estimate	C.R.	P-value	Notes
H1(+)	CC – RI	0,423	3,162	0,002	Supported
H2(+)	CC – CM	0,695	4,938	***	Supported
H3(+)	CM – RI	0,363	3,152	0,002	Supported

Table 3 is the result of hypothesis testing. The hypothesis can be declared supported if it has a significance value that matches the criteria as in chapter 3, which has a critical ratio of 1.96 or has a p value of less than 0.05. In this study, there are 3 supported hypotheses. The three hypotheses are supported, namely hypothesis 1 is supported because it has the same direction of influence as the

hypothesis seen from the standardized estimates value, which is 0.695, and is significant based on the test results of critical ratio 1.96, which is 4.938 and p-value is 0.001(***). Hypothesis 2 is supported because it has the same direction of influence as the hypothesis seen from the standardized estimates value, which is 0.423, and is significant based on the test results of critical ratio 1.96 which is 3.162 and p value is 0.002. Hypothesis 3 is supported because it has the same direction of influence as the hypothesis seen from the standardized estimates value, which is 0.363, and is significant based on the test results of critical ratio 1.96, which is 3.152 and p-value is 0.002.

CONCLUSION

After processing the data to issue the results, doing hypothesis testing, it can be concluded that the three hypotheses that have been studied produce supported results.

This study shows that cultural contact has a positive effect on cultural memory in Yogyakarta Palace tourism. When tourists engage in cultural contact when visiting the Yogyakarta Palace, it will indirectly create memories that are remembered by tourists. Cultural contacts in this case such as tourists can try or do an activity in Yogyakarta Keratin tourism.

This study shows that cultural contact has a positive effect on revisit intention in Yogyakarta Palace tourism. When tourists are involved in cultural contact when visiting Yogyakarta Palace tourism, it will indirectly lead to an interest in revisiting these tourists because indirectly tourists will assume that they can involved in the local culture of the place.

This study shows that cultural memory has a positive effect on revisit intention in Yogyakarta Palace tourism. When tourists engage in cultural contact when visiting the Yogyakarta Palace, it will indirectly create memories that are remembered by tourists. When the memory has been remembered by tourists, then an interest arises to visit again because of the stimulus given by the memory that has already occurred.

SUGGESTIONS

For further researchers who wish to conduct research with the object of research which is the Yogyakarta Palace, it is hoped that they can conduct an object regarding a tourist destination area that has local culture. The number of samples in this study can still be increased so that further researchers can add more samples.

REFERENCES

Alteza, M., Satti, Z. W., Babar, S. F., Parveen, S., Abrar, K., Shabbir, A., Stavrianea, A., Kamenidou, I. (Eirini) Wu, J. S., Ye, S., Zheng, C. J., Law, R., Huang, Y. C., Liu, C. H. S., Erawan, T., Thi Khanh, C. N., Phong, L. T., Biswas, C., Deb, S. K., … Bai, B. (2021). Image transfer between mega business event, hosting destination and country and its effects on exhibitors' behavioral intention. *Tourism Review*, *3*(3), 533–558. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2020-0182

Bigne, J. E., Sanchez, M. I., & Sánchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, *22*(6), 607–616.

Chen, H., & Rahman, I. (2018). Cultural tourism: An analysis of engagement, cultural contact, memorable tourism experience and destination loyalty. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *26*, 153–

163.

Han, H., Back, K.-J., & Barrett, B. (2009). Influencing factors on restaurant customers' revisit intention: The roles of emotions and switching barriers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(4), 563–572.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B. & Anderson, R., (2019). Multivariate data analysis.
8th ed. Cengage Learning.

Jovicic, D. (2016). Cultural tourism in the context of relations between mass and alternative tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *19*(6), 605–612.

Lai, S., Zhang, S., Zhang, L., Tseng, H.-W., & Shiau, Y.-C. (2021). Study on the Influence of Cultural Contact and Tourism Memory on the Intention to Revisit: A Case Study of Cultural and Creative Districts. *Sustainability*, *13*(4), 2416.

Lape, P. V. (2003). A highway and a crossroads: Island Southeast Asia and culture contact archaeology. *Archaeology in Oceania*, *38*(2), 102–109.

Schacter, D. L., Addis, D. R., Hassabis, D., Martin, V. C., Spreng, R. N., & Szpunar, K. K. (2012). The future of memory: remembering, imagining, and the brain. *Neuron*, *76*(4), 677–694.

Schacter, D. L., Chiu, C.-Y. P., & Ochsner, K. N. (1993). Implicit memory: A selective review. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *16*(1), 159–182.

Tema, S. K. T. (2012). Examining the impact of visitors' emotions and perceived quality towards satisfaction and revisit intention to theme parks. *Jurnal Pengurusan*, *35*, 97–109.

Um, S., Chon, K., & Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents of revisit intention. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(4), 1141–1158.

Withers, C. W. J. (2005). Landscape, memory, history: Gloomy memories and the 19th-century Scottish highlands. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, *121*(1), 29–44.