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The purpose of this study is to examine the variables that affect the image creation of tourism destinations. This research is a case study on domestic tourists visiting Yogyakarta from 2007 to 2009. This research uses an exploratory and descriptive design, conducted once in one period (cross-sectional). A number of 105 domestic tourists were selected as samples by means of non-probability sampling method and snowball sampling technique. The data were analyzed using reliability and validity tests, frequency distributions, and regression analyses. Results showed that overall image was significantly constructed and affected by cognitive and affective evaluations. Cognitive evaluation was significantly affected by the types of information source from books and movies, while affective evaluation was affected significantly by social-psychological motivations. The research also proves that Yogyakarta has fulfilled the requirements to become a tourist destination; respondents showed positive feelings towards the town and also perceived the town positively.
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Introduction

The dynamics within Indonesia’s tourism industry, such as increasing competition among tourism destinations, as well as ever-changing tourist habits and expectations, have led to the need of a special strategy in developing Indonesia’s tourism potential.

In order to achieve this, a deeper understanding on the factors affecting the selection of tourism destinations is required in order to devise a marketing strategy for attracting tourists. One of these factors is the image of the tourism destination. Previous research has conceptualized image as something of value that can be used to identify the destination selection process conducted by tourists. This image is a result of cognitive and affective evaluation towards tourism destinations. Cognitive evaluation consists of tourists’ knowledge and beliefs on a particular destination, whereas affective evaluation is formed by the feelings that a tourist has on that destination.

The understanding of destination image will aid in the formulation of promotion strategies, which, in turn, will determine the success of tourism destinations. Goodall (1990) revealed that understanding the factors that affect the creation of image will aid in the identification of target markets and in determining which image should be promoted to each market segment. According to Gunn (1972) and Mercer (1971), creating image beforehand, i.e. before tourists travel, is the most important phase in the process of selecting destinations. Perceived image after arriving at the destination also affects consumer satisfaction and their intention to revisit the same destination, yet this depends on the ability of authorities of the destination to deliver experience as well as tourists’ perception on the image of tourism destinations.
This study is conducted in order to analyze the variables that affect the creation of tourism destinations’ image by studying domestic tourists visiting Yogyakarta between 2007 and 2009.

Literature Review

Forming Tourism Destination Image

In various tourism literatures, it is sometimes stated that tourism destination image is a concept widely used in empirical context, and that it is not a structured solid concept (Mazane & Schweiger, 1981; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). Image is a set of beliefs, ideas, and impressions towards a place or tourism destination (Crompton 1979a; Kotler et al. 1993). According to Assael (1984), image is an overall perception of a product that is formed through the processing of information from various sources. Lawson and Baud-Bovy (1977) defined tourism destination image as an individual’s, or group’s, expression of knowledge, impression, estimation, and emotional thoughts on a place or object.

Several researchers (Moutinbo, 1987; Gartner, 1993; Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Walmsley & Young, 1998; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a,b) stated that image is formed through various reasons and emotional interpretations from consumers, and is a consequence of two related components, that is: (1) cognitive evaluation that refers to one’s knowledge and belief towards an object, and (2) affective evaluation that refers to one’s feeling towards an object.

A model has been constructed in order to identify the factors that affect the creation of image. This model, developed from literature of various fields and disciplines, is designed to provide a framework for examining the forces that form image, and also the relationship between different evaluation levels in a structure (cognitive, affective, and overall) as well as the elements that determine the evaluations.

Figure 1 shows the general framework of the forming of tourism destination image developed from previous literatures. Interdisciplinary researchers agree that image is formed by two major forces: stimulus factors and external factors. Both originate from external stimulus, physical objects, and previous experience. Personal factors are a characteristic (social and psychological) from the individual who perceives.

Three main determinants in the forming of positive image before, or after a previous experience, actual visit were also reviewed, namely tourists’ motivation, social-demography, and variations in information source. Motivation and socio-demographics is the characteristic of consumers in the model shown in figure one. Each component is chosen based on literature review and research on other models.

The general conception of image is that it is viewed as an attitudinal construct consisting of mental representations of knowledge (belief), feelings, and overall impressions towards an object or destination. Researchers from various fields and disciplines agree that the construct of image consists of cognitive and affective evaluation.

Cognitive evaluation refers to the beliefs or knowledge about destination attributes, while affective evaluations, on the other hand, refers to the feelings associated with that destination. Based on consensus, it is dependent on cognitive evaluation towards an object and affective response which is a function of cognitive response. Overall image of a destination is formed by the results of cognitive and affective evaluation towards a particular destination.

Variables Affecting The Formation of Destination Image

The importance of destination image can be seen in the results of research conducted by Goodall (1990) which shows that identifying factors’ affecting destination image formation can aid in identifying target markets and in determining which image should be promoted to appeal a certain segment.

According to Gunn (1972) and Mercer (1971), image formation before creating image beforehand, i.e. before tourists travel, is the most important phase in the process of selecting destinations. Perceived image after arriving at the destination also affects consumer satisfaction and their intention to revisit the same destination, yet this depends on the ability of authorities of the destination to deliver experience as well as tourists’ perception on the image of tourism des-
Cognitive and Affective Evaluation

Cognitive evaluation refers to beliefs or knowledge about an object whereas affective evaluation refers to one’s feeling towards an object (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Burgess, 1978; Gartner, 1993; Holbrook, 1978; Walmsley & Jenkins, 1993; Ward & Russel, 1981; Zimmer & Golden, 1988). A person forms a cognitive and affective response towards an environment or place (Prohonsky, Fabian & Kaminoff, 1993).

Holbrook (1978) stated that, in marketing and consumer behavior, both components are more known as beliefs and affection. The number of findings in environmental psychology has also supported the governing rules of cognitive and affective image (Burgess, 1978; Hanyu, 1993; Lynch, 1960; Russel & Pratt, 1980; Russel, Lewicka & Niit, 1989).

The cognitive component is the knowledge on objective attributes of a destination, and the affective component is the knowledge on affective qualities of a particular destination (Generaux, Ward & Russel, 1983). According to Hanyu (1993), the definition of affection refers to the appreciation of affective qualities of an environment and cognitive qualities refer to the physical environment features. Baloglu & McCleary (1999) noted that environmental studies have focused on the cognitive and affective aspect, however there has not been any research attempting to gauge both constructs at the same time. Only a handful of researches have studied cognition and affection towards environments and destinations, among them Baloglu (1998), Dann (1996), as well as Mackay and Fesenmaier (1997).
Mutual agreements among various researchers have stated that affective evaluation is dependent on cognitive evaluation towards an object, and that affective response is formed by cognitive functions (Anand, Holbrook, & Stephens, 1988; Burgess, 1978; Gartner, 1993; Russell & Pratt, 1980; Stern & Krakover, 1993). The consensus suggests that despite the differences between the two dimensions, both form one unity.

The differences and relations between cognitive and affective components have been discussed in more depth in various consumer and tourist decision making models (Crompton & Ankomah, 1993; Mayo & Jarvis, 1981; Woodside & Lysonski, 1989). Mayo & Jarvis (1981) attempted to conceptualize models of tourists’ decision making process with much emphasis placed on attitude or destination image. In the model, tourists shape their feelings as a function from belief and opinion. Gartner (1993) proposed that between cognitive components (defined as the number of beliefs and knowledge about attributes of an object or product) and affective components exists several differences, yet they are hierarchically related.

Various literature showed that cognitive components should exist before affective components, and that it is also a form of consumer’s evaluation on his/her knowledge about an object (Holbrook, 1978; Russel & Pratt, 1980; Anand, Holbrook & Stephens, 1988; Stern & Krakover, 1993). The combination of both cognitive and affective components will then form overall image. The overall image could either be positive or negative, and is an evaluation of the product or brand. In tourism context, Baloglu & McCleary (1999a,b), as well as Stern & Krakover (1993) empirically showed that cognitive and affective evaluation has a direct impact on total destination image. Cognitive evaluation also has a significant impact on affective evaluation on tourism destinations.

H1: Cognitive evaluation significantly affects affective evaluation of tourism destinations.
H2: Cognitive evaluation significantly affects overall image of tourism destinations.
H3: Affective evaluation significantly affects overall image of tourism destination.

Information Source

According to Woodside & Lyonski’s (1989) tourism destination selection model, marketing or information source variables is a stimulant that has an impact on perception forming or cognitive evaluation, but it does not determine image formation from affective evaluation. It is quite similar with Um & Crampton’s (1990) and Um’s (1993) destination selection model, attributes (beliefs) for cognitive evaluation were formed by external factors consisting of various information sources such as symbolic stimulus (an attempt to promote destinations through the media) and social stimulus (peer recommendations and word of mouth).

The role of information sources was also discussed in the model designed by Fakaye & Crompton (1991). According to Gartner (1993), the types and amounts of external stimulation (information sources) affect the cognitive component of image, but does not affect the affective component. In this case, the cognitive component is a function of the variations (amount) and types of information sources obtained by tourists.

Burgess (1978) hypothesized that the type, amount, and quality of information affects the type of image that would be formed. Holbrook’s research (1978) showed that information source affects the cognitive component of destination image but it does not affect the affective component.

Based on these findings, it is proven that the amount and type of information sources consumed significantly affects cognitive evaluation of tourism destination.

H4: The amount of information sources significantly affects cognitive evaluation.
H5: The type of information source significantly affects cognitive evaluation.

Social-Psychological Motivation

Several researchers stated that motivation is related to the affective component of image, and that an individual’s affective image towards a destination is influenced by tourists’ motivation based on previous travel experiences (Dann, 1996; Gartner, 1993; Walmsley & Jenkins, 1993).
People go on tours for different motives and reasons. Motivation is considered as a central concept in understanding tourist’s behavior and the process of destination selection (Uysal & Hagan, 1993; Weaver, McCleary, Lepisto & Da-monte, 1994) because motivation is the force that drives all action (Crompton, 1979b,Iso-Aloha, 1982).

Motivation is usually defined as the social-psychological force that serves as the first step for individuals in choosing and participating in tour activities (Beard & Raghep, 1983; Crandall, 1980; Iso-Aloha, 1982). Motivation is also the main factor that gives influence in the destination selection and image formation model (Stabler, 1990; Um, 1993; Um & Crampton, 1990).

Um (1987) explained that touring motivation is a set of attributes that, if combined, could explain why a location is considered a tourism destination. Within it, all elements related to tour destination, and physically travelling to a destination, cultural characteristics, etc, are included.

Generally, according to Graham (1991), travel motivation can be classified into two parts, ‘push’ factors and ‘pull’ factors. ‘Push’ factors include cognitive processes and travel motivations, including socialization, discovering new things, seeking adventure, fulfilling dreams, and satisfying the need to break out of routines (Chon,1989). ‘Pull’ factors consists of tangibles and intangibles that ‘direct’ tourists to be aware of the gains from travel experience, such as nature, food, and people (Sarikaya, Sheppard & McLellan, 1997).

Holloway (1986) stated that the success of destinations depend on the cohesion between three factors, namely attractions, facilities, and ease of access for tourists. Raaij (1986) viewed destinations as a product, part of it is given (i.e. from nature) and part of it is man-made. Tourism destinations, as a natural product, is comprised of features of nature such as climate, sceneries, beaches, mountains, historical landmarks, and so on.

On the other hand, tourism destinations, as man-made products, is comprised of real features, such as lodging, tourism transportation packages, and sports and recreational facilities that can be adopted based on consumer preference and budget constraints. Such services and facilities can be created by marketers of travel agents to better satisfy tourists as they enjoy natural tourism products.

Based on the aforementioned researches, along with Baloglu & McCleary’s (1999), it is proven that social-psychological motivation significantly affects the affective evaluation of destinations.

H6: Tourists’ social-psychological motivation significantly affects the affective evaluation of destinations.

Demographic Variables

Most of the models of destination formation and selection treat social-demographic variables as a conventional variable of consumers that affects their perception towards an object, product, and destination (Friedmann & Lessig, 1986; Stabler, 1990; Um & Crompton, 1990; Woodside & Lysonski, 1989).

Fisk’s model of consumer behavior (1961-62), and Seth’s (1983), also stated that consumers’ social-demographic variables are a determinant of consumer image by treating it as an antecedent in the cognitive process. Even though several variables have been proposed to affect perception and image, such as age, education, income, sex, occupation, only age and education level are the main determinants in affecting image.

Nickel and Wertheimer (1979) studied the affective image of several rest areas in Australia. Primary component analyses indicated that affective image of several rest areas varied by age and gender. Baloglu (1997) tested the variation of the image of the United States of America based on social-demographical characteristics of tourists from West Germany. The results of the study showed that several differences in image were based on age, marital status, and occupation. Husbands (1989) investigated the relationship between tourist perception and social-demographical variables, and found that there existed differences in perception towards Livingstone, Zambia based on age and education level variables.

Stern & Krakover (1993) selected education level as one of the most important consumer
characteristic and investigated the effects education level had on the relationship between cognitive, affective, and overall image. Based on the aforementioned studies, it has been proven that education level and tourist age significantly influence cognitive and affective evaluation of destinations.

H7: Tourists’ age significantly affects cognitive and affective evaluation of destinations.
H8: Tourists’ education level significantly affects cognitive and affective evaluation of destinations.

### Methodology

This research uses an exploratory-descriptive design conducted in one period (cross-sectional design). Primary data was collected using questionnaires, while the sample was collected using snowball sampling on 105 tourists from April to May 2009. The main characteristic that each respondent candidate should have is that they should have toured to Yogyakarta within the last two years, during the period of 2007 to 2009, and that they should at least spent one or two nights in the town.

### Table 1. Variable Measurements

| Variable                      | Question                                                                 | Scale |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| **Overall image**             | Based on cognitive evaluation (your opinion about Yogyakarta) and affective evaluation (what you feel about Yogyakarta), how do you perceive Yogyakarta’s overall image? | Likert|
| **Cognitive evaluations**     | I believe that Yogyakarta:                                                 | Likert|
|                               | 1. is a clean tourism destination                                         |       |
|                               | 2. has good accommodations and transportation systems                     |       |
|                               | 3. offers enjoyable nightlife                                              |       |
|                               | 4. has good quality infrastructure                                        |       |
|                               | 5. provides various interesting local cuisines                             |       |
|                               | 6. offers interesting cultural attractions / events                        |       |
|                               | 7. has an interesting history                                              |       |
|                               | 8. has a beautiful natural scenery                                         |       |
|                               | 9. gave me an experience worth the costs                                  |       |
|                               | 10. has low levels of pollution                                            |       |
|                               | 11. has a weather that is nice and conducive for touring                   |       |
| **Affective evaluations**     | I believe that Yogyakarta:                                                 | Likert|
|                               | 1. is a pleasant tourism destination                                      |       |
|                               | 2. is an arousing tourism destination                                      |       |
|                               | 3. is a relaxing tourism destination                                       |       |
|                               | 4. is an exciting destination                                              |       |
| **Amount of information sources** | Where did you obtain information about tourism in Yogyakarta? (pick more than one) | Rasio |
| **Type of information source** | Below are types of information considered important in forming a positive image about Yogyakarta. | Likert|
|                               | 1. Information from professionals (such as Travel Agents, Tourism Boards, National/Local Tourism Boards) |       |
|                               | 2. Word-of-mouth information from friends, family members, colleagues, etc. |       |
|                               | 3. Information from news/articles/advertisements/brochures (electronic and/or Internet media, and print media) |       |
|                               | 4. Information from books/movies                                           |       |
| **Socio-psychological travel motivations** | Given below are statements that reflect my motivation to go traveling to Yogyakarta | Likert|
|                               | 1. To relieve myself from stress and pressure                             |       |
|                               | 2. To relaxe myself, both physically and mentally                          |       |
|                               | 3. To do exciting things                                                  |       |
|                               | 4. To seek for pleasure                                                   |       |
|                               | 5. To do adventurous things                                                |       |
|                               | 6. To get entertained                                                     |       |
|                               | 7. To learn new things and expanding my knowledge                         |       |
|                               | 8. To experience different cultures and ways of life                      |       |
|                               | 9. To enrich my insight                                                   |       |
|                               | 10. To experience new and different locations                             |       |
|                               | 11. To meet other people with same interests                              |       |
|                               | 12. To build friendship/extend networks                                   |       |
|                               | 13. To visit places that none of my friends have ever been to             |       |
|                               | 14. To be able to retell the travels to peers                             |       |
| **Age and education**         | How old are you? ..... years                                              | Ratio and Interval |
|                               | What was your most recent education level?                                |       |
The two-year time span was implemented because the researcher views that two years is the maximum limit for a domestic tourist to remember their tour to Yogyakarta. Besides that it is hoped that the tourists still remember Yogyakarta, assuming that there is no major change in Yogyakarta. The second characteristic is that respondents should spend at least one night in Yogyakarta. By staying overnight, it is assumed that the respondents had more time to visit tourism objects in Yogyakarta.

The questionnaires were self-administered, using a combination of open and close-ended questions and scaled response questions using a 1-5 Likert scale. The questionnaire consisted of two parts, the first was screening questions to ensure that the respondents met the required characteristics, while the second part was the main questions containing the variables subject to examination. Prior to the survey, a pre-test using 30 questionnaires was conducted from respondents. The analysis methods used were reliability tests, factor analyses, frequency distribution, and regression analyses which were then analyzed using SPSS 11.5 for Windows.

Table 2. Results of Reliability and Validity Tests

|                                      | Cronbach’s Alpha | Significance | Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin MSA |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| Social-Psychological Motivation      | 0.8131           | 0.000        | 0.618                  |
| Cognitive Evaluation                 | 0.6683           | 0.000        | 0.721                  |
| Affective Evaluation                 | 0.6521           | 0.000        | 0.732                  |

Variable Measurements

Variable measurements can be seen on Table 1. Overall image of destination was measured using a 1-5 Likert scale (1=very un-positive, 5=very positive). Affective, cognitive evaluation and social-psychological motivation were also measured by 1-5 Likert scales (1=highly disagree, 5=highly agree).

The amount of information sources used was measured using a ratio scale, the minimum was zero, the maximum was seven. The measurement was conducted by summing the amount of information sources used. Information sources consisted of brochures/travel guides, friends/family, national/local tourism board, articles/news/Advertisements (from print, electronic, and Internet media), tour bureaus, travel agencies, and books/movies.

The level of importance of information type was measured using a five point Likert scale (1=very unimportant, 5=very important). Information type consisted of professional, word of mouth, news/article/Advertisements/brochures, and books/films. Age was measured using a ratio scale where respondents were asked to fill in their age. Education level was measured using an interval scale ranging from SD (elementary school) to S2 (graduate).

For reliability and validity tests, the variable social-psychological motivation, cognitive evaluation, affective evaluation obtained a Cronbach’s Alpha value above 0.6, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy above 0.6, and a significance value below 0.05.

Result and Discussion

Respondents’ Profile

A summary of the demographic profile of the respondents is shown in table 3.

Regression Analyses

A summarization of the regression analyses conducted is shown in table 4.

The explanation for the regression results are as follows:

In this research, it is shown that cognitive evaluation has a significant effect towards affective evaluation on destinations. It can be said that when a tourist has a good, or positive, cognitive evaluation, then his/her affective evaluation would also tend to be positive. For example, take a domestic tourist travelling to Yogyakarta, knowing that Yogyakarta is a clean tourism destination, or that it is a town with various interesting local cuisines. This happens because that tourist has either already
seen is firsthand or has previously experienced it and believes in that. This results in his/her having a positive feeling towards Yogyakarta, he/she would feel that Yogyakarta is a fun and interesting destination. Cognitive evaluation would also have an effect on overall image of the destination in a positive way. Thus, the better the cognitive evaluation, the better the overall image of the destination.

A tourism destination should beforehand fulfill the criteria, or requirements, for a tourism destination, namely natural and man-made features. In this case, Yogyakarta has natural sceneries, interesting history, and a climate that supports encourages tourists to come. Man-made products are based on local government’s regulations that supports tourism within their area, such as keeping the area clean, providing infrastructure, and stimulating tourism by providing interesting cultural attractions. Fulfilling these requirements would make an effect on domestic tourists’ affection. They would then have positive affection towards the destination, and they would also feel happy to have visited the destination. This affective evaluation also positively influences overall image of tourism destinations. Thus, the better the affective evaluation, the better the overall image of a destination.

In this research, the respondents surveyed were tourists that have been to Yogyakarta before, at least once. As a result, no matter how much information sources used and or owned by a tourist would not have an effect on cognitive evaluation.

Table 3. Summary of Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

| No. | Demographic Element | Note   | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|---------------------|--------|-----------|------------|
| 1.  | Sex                 | Women  | 74        | 67.6%      |
|     |                     | Men    | 34        | 32.4%      |
| 2.  | Age                 | < 20 years | 12    | 11.4%      |
|     |                     | 20 – 25 years | 80   | 76.2%      |
|     |                     | 26 – 30 years | 7    | 6.7%       |
|     |                     | 41 – 45 years | 2    | 1.9%       |
|     |                     | 46 – 50 years | 2    | 1.9%       |
|     |                     | > 50 years | 2     | 1.9%       |
| 3.  | Area of Domicile   | DKI Jakarta | 52   | 49.5%      |
|     |                     | Jawa Barat  | 35    | 33.3%      |
|     |                     | Banten   | 12     | 11.4%      |
|     |                     | Jawa Timur  | 2     | 1.9%       |
|     |                     | Jawa Tengah | 2     | 1.9%       |
|     |                     | Jambi    | 2      | 1.9%       |
| 4.  | Frequency visiting Yogyakarta | First time | 14 | 13.3% |
|     |                     | Between 2 to 4 times | 40 | 38.1% |
|     |                     | More than 4 kali | 51 | 48.6% |
| 5.  | Average expenditure per month | Below Rp 1.000.000 | 37 | 35.2% |
|     |                     | Rp 1.000.001- Rp 2.000.000 | 49 | 46.7% |
|     |                     | Rp 2.000.001- Rp 3.000.000 | 7  | 6.7% |
|     |                     | Rp 3.000.001- Rp 4.000.000 | 3  | 2.9% |
|     |                     | Rp 4.000.001- Rp 5.000.000 | 3  | 2.9% |
|     |                     | above Rp 5.000.000 | 6  | 5.7% |

Tabel 4. Regression Results

| Hypotheses                                                                 | Result | Regression Model |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------|
| H1: Cognitive evaluation significantly affects affective evaluation of tourism destinations | H1 accepted | Y = 0.502X + error |
| H2: Cognitive evaluation significantly affects overall image of tourism destinations | H2 accepted | Y = 4,143 + 0.117X + error |
| H3: Affective evaluation significantly affects overall image of tourism destination | H3 accepted | Y = 4,143 + 0.169X + error |
| H4: The amount of information sources significantly affects cognitive evaluation | H4 rejected | -- |
| H5: The type of information source significantly affects cognitive evaluation. | Only information from books/movies | Y = 0,423X3 + error |
| H6: Tourists’ social-psychological motivation significantly affects the affective evaluation of destinations | H6 accepted | Y = 0,305X + error |
| H7: Tourists’ age significantly affects cognitive and affective evaluation of destinations | H7 rejected | -- |
| H8: Tourists’ education level significantly affects cognitive and affective evaluation of destinations | H8 rejected | -- |
evaluation. This is because tourists’ cognitive evaluation is formed by their own experience after visiting the destination.

As much as 101 respondents obtained information about Yogyakarta from friends and/or family, another 46 obtained information from articles/news/advertisements, another 15 gained information from brochures/travel guides, and 17 respondents gained information from books/films. Information from professionals, on the contrary, was used only by a small fraction of respondents, information from national/local tourism boards was only used by one respondent, tourism bureaus were used by six respondents, and travel agents were only used by one respondent.

Regression analyses proved that only types of information source from books/films had a significant effect on cognitive evaluation of destinations.

Based on importance, about 60 respondents (57.1%) viewed information from professionals as important, and another 21 respondents (21%) viewed it as very important.

For word of mouth information dissemination, 51 respondents viewed word of mouth information as important, and another 51 respondents viewed it as very important.

Table 5. Information Sources Used

| Information Sources Used                  | Respondents |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Brochure/Travel guide                    | 15          |
| Friends/Family                           | 101         |
| National/Local Tourism Boards            | 1           |
| Articles/News/Advertisements             | 46          |
| Tourism bureaus                          | 6           |
| Travel agents                            | 1           |
| Books/Films                              | 17          |

Source: Analyzed by researcher

Table 6. Frequency of Professional Information Source

| Professional Information | Respondents |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Unimportant              | 7           |
| Neutral                  | 17          |
| Important                | 60          |
| Very Important           | 21          |

Source: SPSS output operated by researcher

Table 7. Frequency of Word of Mouth Information Source

| Word of Mouth Information | Respondents |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Neutral                   | 3           |
| Important                 | 51          |
| Very Important            | 51          |

Source: SPSS output operated by researcher

Table 8. Frequency of Professional Information Source

| Professional Information | Respondents |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Unimportant              | 7           |
| Neutral                  | 17          |
| Important                | 60          |
| Very Important           | 21          |

Source: SPSS output operated by researcher

Table 9. Frequency of Professional Information Source

| Professional Information | Respondents |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Unimportant              | 7           |
| Neutral                  | 17          |
| Important                | 60          |
| Very Important           | 21          |

Source: SPSS output operated by researcher
The reasons or motivations for someone to travel or visit a destination can have an effect of affective evaluation, or one’s feelings. In this context, the motivation beneath tourists’ travel to Yogyakarta is to relax, enjoying themselves, experiencing different cultures and locations, enriching one’s insight, and to retell their traveling experience to peers. If this motivation is achieved it will then influence one’s feelings, or affective evaluation, in a positive attitude towards the destination. Affective evaluation will, in turn, affect overall destination image.

Age and education level of tourists does not have an effect on their cognitive and affective evaluation towards Yogyakarta. Respondents indicated that their affective evaluation or feelings toward Yogyakarta was not affected, or influenced, by their age. The same is true for education level: respondents affective evaluation towards Yogyakarta was not influenced by their education level.

Conclusion

Cognitive evaluation has a significant effect, either direct or indirect, towards overall destination image, while affective evaluation has a significant and direct effect towards overall destination image. It can be concluded that a tourism destination should fulfill the criteria that in turn can have an effect on tourists cognitive evaluation. Favourable cognitive evaluation would then influence affective evaluation which, in turn, affects overall image formation.

Social-psychological motivations significantly affects the affective evaluation on tourism destination. To this point, the motivation of domestic tourists is to relax, enjoy themselves, experiencing different cultures and locations, enriching their insight and to retell their traveling experience to peers. Should this motivation be fulfilled, it will then influence affective evaluations, or feelings, towards the destination. This affection will then influence overall destination image.

Even though the types of information from professionals did not have a significant effect on cognitive evaluation, 57.1% of the respondents believed that information from professionals are important. However, the downside to this is that among the respondents, only eight of them obtained information about Yogyakarta from professionals (six obtained information from tourism bureaus, one from a travel agent, and another one from the National/Local Tourism Board). It can be concluded that information sources from professionals, especially the National/Local Tourism Board is still very limited.

The types of information sources from books and movies had a significant effect on cognitive evaluation. From this result, books and movies can then be used as mediums for promotion or information about Yogyakarta’s tourism destinations.

Further research could focus on examining variables that affect destination image formation by comparing domestic tourists visiting the destination for the first time with tourists that have revisited the destination. Further research could be conducted by studying foreign tourists. The research would then be conducted to examine the variables that affect destination image formation with foreign tourists visiting Indonesia as the case. Both recommendations could be conducted by using case studies on other tourism destinations in Indonesia besides Yogyakarta, such as Bali and Lombok, or other destinations frequently visited by domestic and foreign tourists. Further research could also focus on gaining a deeper understanding of the effects of information source types used by tourists on cognitive evaluation, instead of only the types of information sources considered important. Research on the effects of the amount of information sources used for cognitive evaluation would also prove beneficial. The amount of information sources could be classified into information sources ‘intentionally’ seeked by tourists, and information sources gained ‘inadvertently’. Respondents education level and age in this research did not vary greatly, therefore further research should use a wider respondent base with greater variations in age and education level in an attempt to gain deeper results. Research should also be conducted at local tourism boards, by interviewing or information seeking, in order to understand the courses of action that authorities have taken to increase tourism in their jurisdiction in order to gain a sharper and deeper result.
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