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Abstract: This research's objective was to analyse the impact of sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking on tourist satisfaction and temporal revisit intention in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The respondents in this study were tourists in the city of Yogyakarta, with a sample size of 420 respondents. The methodology of this research employed a purposive sampling technique. Nonprobability sampling was performed using the structural equation modelling method that was processed using AMOS 22.0. The results of this research show that sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking have positive and significant effects on satisfaction. Satisfaction mediates the impact of sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking on revisit intention, showing that the influence of these factors on temporal revisit intention will be enhanced if tourists are satisfied. This study has implications for marketing strategies for tourism sectors in revisiting contexts.

Subjects: Cultural Studies; Hotel Management; Events; Hospitality; Tourism

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sirimonbhorn Thipsingh is an assistant professor in International Marketing at Khon Kaen University International College. Her research areas are Consumer Behavior (The psychology of Marketing), Tourism Marketing, Service Marketing, Customer Relationship Management. Phaninee Naruetharadhol is an assistant professor in Management. Chavis Ketkaew is Assistant Professor of management. Lakkana Hengboriboon is a lecturer in the Business Division at Khon Kaen University International College.

Lakkana Hengboriboon, Phaninee Naruetharadhol, Chavis Ketkaew, Sasichakorn Wongsaichia, and Wutthiya Aekthanate Srisathan are researchers at Khon Kaen University's International College, which is also part of the Center for Sustainable Innovation and Society, and whose main focus is on initiating research projects for the community in fields such as innovation, business and management, finance, and marketing.

PUBLIC INTEREST STATEMENT

In terms of tourism, Indonesia has a plethora of natural resources that are underutilized. Yogyakarta is a distinct region in Central Java that includes the modern cultural metropolis of Yogyakarta. Indonesia is creating a new sort of tourism called ecotourism. This study contributes both theoretically and practically to academic knowledge in the area of revisiting intention from visitor pleasure in the interaction between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value, and novelty seeking. Furthermore, Yogyakarta's tourism sector will be able to attract a larger number of tourists who will be happier with their travel experience and will return or advocate for the city.
1. Introduction

“Inclusive growth and ensuring a future with quality jobs are the concerns of government everywhere. Travel and tourism, which already supports one in every ten jobs on the planet, has already become a dynamic engine of employment opportunity” (World travel & tourism council, 2018, p. 2). Travel and tourism, one of the newest economic sectors, create jobs, drive exports and generate prosperity across nations. According to the analysis of the global economic impact of travel and tourism, the direct contribution of travel and tourism was 3.5% of total GDP and 10.3% of the total contribution in 2020. The global influence of COVID-19 has emphasized personal and economic wellness. To restore consumer confidence and allow safe travel, the World travel & tourism council (WTTC) has produced global rules. (WTTC, 2020).

Travel and tourism are key activities that benefit governments worldwide. Travel and tourism contribute directly to international spending, as does government spending on visitors. Tourism immediately impacts commodities such as lodging, transportation, entertainment, and attractions. Cultural, athletic, and recreational services are examples of industries that contribute to the economy. The direct contribution of travel and tourism to spending by residents, companies, visitors and the government is not limited to the sources of spending. Purchasing from suppliers is also be a minor indirect contribution to GDP and employment rates (World travel & tourism council, 2018).

Tourism is defined as the movement of people for a variety of reasons, whether business or pleasure (Parsons et al., 2018).

Tourism consists of mass tourism, in which many tourists travel to a tourist destination, stay in a hotel and do some activities, and alternative tourism, including natural, cultural, event, and other types of tourism as shown in Figure 1 (Dowling et al., 2002). Indonesia has a wealth of natural resources that are underutilized in terms of tourism. The government aimed to attract 20 million visitors by 2019. In some areas, tourism may be developing too rapidly without proper consideration of sustainability issues, both for the environment and for local residents (Ollivaud & Haxton, 2018). Yogyakarta is also one of the most famous tourist destinations in Indonesia, despite the problems that occur as a result of tourism development, such as environmental issues and the social, cultural and political impacts of development (Manaf et al., 2018). The Yogyakarta special region is a province in Indonesia, and it is considered the modern cultural city of Central Java. Yogyakarta has special features that attract visitors, as it is the main gateway to Central Java due to its geographical location. It has a distinctive culture, with its very lively city including Malioboro Street, which is famous for being crowded with people, street foods, and shops. Many travel agents and cheap hotels are located along this road or in adjacent tourist areas such as Sosrowijayan Street. The key attraction of Yogyakarta is Kraton (The Sultan’s Palace). The palace of the Sultan is the centre of Yogyakarta’s traditional way of life. It continues to create a spirit of refinement and has been a symbol of Yogyakarta art for centuries. The palace was built in the 18th century and the

Figure 1. Overview of tourism. Source: (Dowling et al., 2002).
ruins today are surrounded by city walls along with luxurious pavilions. Yogyakarta is the only city that still has a transit system similar to Becak (rickshaw-tradi). It also has a tradition of puppet shows that are performed at night. Social graphics that cover Yogyakarta walls reflect the culture and spirit of the capital of Java. On any day of the week, Yogyakarta visitors can choose from a variety of cultural events.

Although Indonesia is a modern Islamic country, the most exciting cultural offering is ballet. Indonesian ballet has dozens of dancers and musicians, luxurious attire and fireworks and narrates the story of Ramayana as an ancient Hindu epic poem. The Ramayana Ballet takes place at a couple of locations in and around Yogyakarta; thus far, the most impressive show is held in front of the thousand-year Prambanan temple outside Yogyakarta. Prambanan Temple was built between the 8th and 10th centuries. The Prambanan Temple is the best example of Hindu temple architecture in Java. The impressive features of this temple layout create a spectacular backdrop for the show. Dancers prepare for the show by Stuart Butler/Lonely Planet, as approximately 200 people, including light dancers, musicians and makeup artists, are involved in the main outdoor ballet production, which is held several nights a week from May to October. This performance tells the story of how the Hindu god Rama helped his wife Sita. The cultural and political core of the city is Kraton, which houses the large palace of the Yogyakarta Sultanate. Cultural events ranging from traditional Javanese dance to orchestral music are held every morning in the Kraton Pavilion. Not all cultural offerings in Yogyakarta are classical;
people are musicians who are natural, and sometimes it seems that every Indonesian boy wants to be a rock star.

Ecotourism is a new type of tourism that Indonesia is developing. As an incentive for governments around the world to develop sustainable tourism, the “Global Code of Ethics for Tourism” was created. Yogyakarta, being a tourist destination, has also been impacted by the new trend. In Yogyakarta, activity-based tourism, often known as ecotourism, has emerged, focusing on the experience of nature and culture while maintaining environmental sustainability (Vitasurya, 2016). There are several factors between the conditions that affect tourist decision-making in selecting tourist destinations. Previous research has shown that the relationship between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking affect consumer satisfaction (Berezan et al., 2013; Bigné et al., 2001; Demirgüneş, 2015; Toyama & Yamada, 2016). Many academics have linked customer satisfaction as a positive loyalty factor and driver of repurchase behaviour, a vital aspect of customer loyalty, both of which are critical to business success, especially in the hospitality industry (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Shoemaker & Lewis, 1999). There are inconsistent results of previous studies, however, as there is no research on temporal revisit intention in Yogyakarta. To fill this gap, this study merges the mediation effect of satisfaction with revisit intention. This research study examines the relationship between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking with tourist satisfaction as the mediator and how it affects temporal revisit intention in a comprehensive model.

From the background issues that have been described previously, it can be stated as follows: Do sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking cause tourist satisfaction and temporal revisit intention? Does satisfaction intervene in the relationship between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking, on the one hand, and temporal revisit intention on the other? This research makes a theoretical and practical contribution to academic knowledge in the context of understanding revisit intention. Additionally, the tourism sector in Yogyakarta will be able to attract a greater number of tourists who will be more satisfied with their travel experience and who will return to the city or advocate for the city.

2. Literature review
The impact of tourism growth on the environment has become an increasingly important topic within the hospitality industry. Companies consider sustainability actions that will increase customers' awareness and that are important factors for travellers in choosing accommodations (Berezan et al., 2013). Green practices include light bulbs, event sensors, keycards, public water, dispenser and towel policies, which have a positive effect on guest satisfaction and intention to return. At the same time, guests accept minor inconveniences to support sustainability (Kim & Han, 2010).

Green practices were initially adopted due to government pressure. Implementing green practices has increased the competitiveness of hotels, so some hotels apply the policy in green practice management. A green hotel image was considered favourable by hotel guests. Moreover, tourists seek green tourism by maintaining the environment. Green tourism combines sustainable practices in the tourism sector through travelling while maintaining the environment. Customers' intention to return is associated with loyalty. Loyalty is defined as “the likelihood of the customer’s returning to a hotel and that person’s willingness to behave as a particular to the organization” (Shoemaker & Lewis, 1999, p. 349). An antecedent for loyalty is satisfaction, and this satisfaction is a result of the cost of the purchase and the benefits that the customer received. Thus, satisfaction has been one of the ways to create consumer loyalty.

In addition, this study attempts to fill a gap in earlier research on satisfaction and revisit intention. Revisit purpose is frequently time-based. An important factor determining tourist motivation is contentment. Some aspects can be quantified at the first visit, while others can be quantified over time. Tourists act based on satisfaction. Postpurchase satisfaction is measured to
improve services. Clients will be happy and the firm will achieve its aims if the tourism experience is outstanding. Customer satisfaction influences revisit intention (Som & Badarneh, 2011). Customer satisfaction has been shown to be a predictor of loyalty (Oliver, 1981). A number of studies have linked customer satisfaction to positive loyalty factors, including repurchase behaviour in the hospitality industry (Baloglu, 2002; Han et al., 2008), especially in environmentally friendly places (Robinot & Giannelloni, 2010). Sustainable practices, such as using clean and renewable energy sources, have been shown to boost customer satisfaction, contribute to competitive advantage, and possibly enhance the effectiveness of consumer loyalty and return intentions (J. S. Lee et al., 2010).

2.1. Tourists satisfaction

Consumers’ willingness to pay is related to satisfaction. A study revealed that consumers’ willingness to revisit is associated with loyalty to hotels (Sunny Hu et al., 2010). Although hotels have probably increased in price, consumers are willing to pay a higher price to receive services. Satisfaction is an important aspect of the intention in consumer behaviour research. It is directly related to loyalty, which has been defined as “the likelihood of a customer’s returning to a hotel and that person’s willingness to behave as a partner to the organization” (Shoemaker & Lewis, 1999, p. 349). It results in a positive outcome, and consumer satisfaction brings benefits for the industry (Danaher & Hoddrell, 1996). In business, a relationship with customers should be built. Customers will return and consume again in the future when they have brand loyalty, especially in long-term relationships. The concept of loyalty is related to repurchase behaviour and takes into account the actual behaviour’s antecedents (Bloemer & Kasper, 1995). Customers’ future behaviour and sentiments towards certain products or services are strongly influenced by customer satisfaction (Jani & Han, 2014). The relationship between destination features and tourist satisfaction and inclination to return has been explored in particular by scholars (Eusébio & Vieira, 2013). Satisfaction and the will to return to a destination are positively influenced by destination qualities (Che et al., 2021). Tourists’ behavioural intentions to return to and recommend a location to others are influenced by tourism satisfaction (Zeng et al., 2021).

2.2. Temporal revisit intention

Osman and Sentosa (2013) stated that repeat visitation is based on the first experience in visiting certain places. Repeat visitors are more likely to return to the previous destination, which determines the likelihood of visiting the same place in the future (Kozak, 2001b). Consumer intentions are widely acknowledged in organizational strategies that investigate behavioural issues that affect consumer decisions. However, whether people undertake the behaviours of repeat visitors and whether they represent a homogeneous group or not remains to be answered (Oppermann, 2000). The research found that there is a difference between first-time visitation and repeat visitation in the willingness to pay for tourism. These criteria can be the segment of consumer behaviour that is associated with repeat buying for an industry, and it appears that repeat visitation depends on distance (Trimble & Luiz, 1991). The measure of hospitality’s long-term viability is hospitality’s impact on satisfaction, which in turn has an impact on the likelihood of returning (Nugroho et al., 2021).

2.3. Sustainability and sustainable practices

Sustainable practices give value to the physical environment and to lifestyles that ensure the environment and other people are not harmed, including society and culture. Sustainable practices also relate to important issues, including poverty, consumption, community and health. Sustainability decreases the negative impact on the environment and gives the responsibility for understanding and experiencing the foundations that are necessary for the development of the environment to the next generation. National research must be conducted on different aspects for future generations. Sustainable management has become renowned as a way to address the problems of temporary society. Modern management should be concerned with the awareness of limitations about the use of natural and cultural resources and the negative impact on the environment by groups or individual sectors (Dos Santos et al., 2017).
The concept of “sustainability” or “sustainable development” emerged from an environmental perspective (Hediger, 2010) and offers a number of different definitions. Currently, the scope of sustainability results in importance to society, the environment and the economy and emphasizes meeting their needs while maintaining other factors. The action of sustainability is not only related to renewable fuel sources and how to keep ecosystems balanced. In addition, there is a way to associate social sciences and environmental science with the development of technology. The main feature of sustainability is natural systems, which function to produce anything to support the need for ecological balance. In the modern world, people consume approximately 40% more natural resources than what they return to the environment (Lorek & Fuchs, 2013). Sustainability and sustainable development focus on the need to protect the environment and examine the longer-term effects of human activities and on how they can be improved. The main pillars of sustainability include the environment, society, culture, economy and policy. The environmental aspect lies in eco-friendly environmental strategies and human behaviour. The protection of natural resources and responsibility for green consumerism include land, water and air pollution as well as cleaner production related environmental management systems and management strategies to achieve the best management practices (Purvis et al., 2019).

In the modern world, people place more importance on peace, freedom, development, and the environment. Moreover, the tourism industry has become more developed. People are concerned about sustainable tourism on travel that does not harm the environment. The study on satisfaction level and intention to return according to sustainable green hotels (Berezan et al., 2013) found that sustainability has a positive impact on guest satisfaction and intention to return, and that this is perceived differently based on nationality. Similarly, the results show that guests have no objection to minor inconveniences to support sustainability, such as recycling; this, therefore, affects dissatisfaction. The main factor is how the organization and business sector must develop sustainable tourism to be convenient, which will create more satisfaction among tourists (Kim & Han, 2010). Many studies also conduct sustainability orientation in general, and specific sustainability measures are linked to customer satisfaction by word of mouth and pride (Gerdt et al., 2019; Pérez-Calderón et al., 2020).

2.4. Destination image

A destination image is an appealing system of ideas, opinions, feelings, visualizations, and intentions towards a destination (Tasci & Gartner, 2007). Moreover, it is a major topic for tourism destinations similar to brand image that affects travelling and selling travel products (Jenkins, 1999). Image refers to the exogenous and endogenous aspects that tourists get from the trip’s net worth according to costs and benefits. Destination image can be defined as the perception of a destination that depends on tourist decision-making. Once tourists have positive impressions of the destination, they take actions to revisit that destination (Bann et al., 2005). Destination image refers to the knowledge, beliefs, feelings and overall perception of tourists of each tourist destination (Crompton, 1979). The study of destination images is a subset of image measurement. There are four components of image as illustrated in Figure 2, including functional characteristics, holistic, and psychological characteristics (Echtner & Ritchie, 2003).

For marketers and managers at global tourism locations, achieving a high level of tourist satisfaction and providing a unique experience have become fundamental goals (S. Lee et al., 2017). Trust is widely recognized as a key factor in determining tourist satisfaction and loyalty to a destination (Artigas et al., 2017). The tangible and intangible performance dimensions of international destinations, such as environmental challenges, impact satisfaction, trust, and loyalty (Al-Ansi & Han, 2019).

2.5. Perceived value

Value should not only be viewed from the utilitarian perspective, meaning that a product’s value is based on its functions, but also includes the experience or the feeling around its consumption,
including hedonic and symbolic aspects (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982). Alternatively, the consumption value framework developed five dimensions of customer perceived value that influence consumer behaviour related to tourist satisfaction and intention to return, including functional, emotional, social, condition, and epistemic value. These dimensions associated with consumer perceived value affect tourist satisfaction (Waheed & Hassan, 2016). Furthermore, satisfaction was influenced by perceived value. In addition, overall satisfaction was linked to the intention of returning (An et al., 2019). The study was carried out in the city of Lima, Peru. Two dimensions of perceived value, namely, economic-functional and emotional-social, are predictors of tourist satisfaction and loyalty (Carvache-Franco, Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021). The consumer’s overall assessment of the value of a product or service is based on perceptions of what is received and given. To put it another way, perceived value is the result of a comparison of an offering’s benefits and costs. For business survival, customers’ perceptions of this benefit-to-cost ratio must be comparable to the firm’s benefit-to-cost ratio (Pham & Huang, 2015). Despite the fact that the tourism industry is still reeling from the effects of COVID-19, the perception of value continues to have a beneficial impact on guest loyalty and satisfaction (Paulose & Shakeel, 2021). Consider redefining your brand through the curation of new experiences in mindful tourism—activities that immerse visitors in the local culture and ways of life. Social tourism, educational tourism, citizen science, community exchange tourism, and slow tourism are all examples of public good tourism (Lapointe, 2020).

2.6. Novelty seeking

Novelty seeking is an important element that motivates tourists to travel by looking for something that is unique. Seeking various types of novelty is natural for tourists and supports the tourism industry as well as the investment sector (Cohen, 1979). Novelty is the characteristics of unfamiliar experiences that are different from usual life experiences. Various types of novelty motivate tourists to experience new journeys of future experiences (Faison, 1977). The theory of novelty seeking is based on stimulation, and places provide a particular level of stimulation. Although a particular stimulation may not reach the optimal level of stimulation, an organism is sought for additional complexity, adventure and other conditions. When all of these reach an optimal level, an organism’s stimulation is also reduced (Bello & Etzel, 1985). Younger generations are known for seeking novelty in ecotourism, and they purposefully influence others to do the same. (Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco et al., 2021).

2.7. Conceptual framework

2.7.1. Sustainable practices and tourist satisfaction

The initiative for the green environment was governmental pressure to reduce waste and to serve water and energy for sustainable practices. The green environment has become popular in the hotel industry. The customers were happy with being inconvenienced to support green practice (Kim & Han, 2010). Green hotels are favourable to promote guests’ revisit behaviour (J. S. Lee & Back, 2010). Additionally, sustainable practices and nationality have an effect on guest satisfaction and intention to return to green hotels (Berezan et al., 2013). Sustainable tourism should also maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and provide a meaningful experience for visitors, boosting their understanding of sustainability issues and encouraging them to participate in sustainable tourism initiatives (Minh et al., 2021). The tourism industry is likely to be one of the hardest hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. Sustainable tourism practices are thought to be a potential answer for stimulating tourism and aiding the tourism industry's restoration in the context of the level of satisfaction that tourists have when they consume sustainable tourism (Palacios-Florencio et al., 2021).

H3: Sustainable practices have a positive impact on tourist satisfaction.
2.7.2. Destination image and tourist satisfaction
The existence of a destination image explains the concept of a destination image created by different demand and supply agents. The balance between what tourists expect and what they receive is essential in promoting a destination. Destination image positively influences tourists’ overall satisfaction, which was acceptable by the experiment (Chi & Qu, 2008). The tangible and intangible performance dimensions of international destinations, such as environmental challenges, impact satisfaction, trust, and loyalty (Al-Ansi & Han, 2019). A favourable destination image would positively enhance the perceived trip quality and customer behaviour regarding the trip (Chen & Tsai, 2007). An empirical study indicated that destination image had a direct effect on perceived satisfaction (Bigné et al., 2001). In the case of a Mediterranean destination, the relation between destination image and tourism satisfaction was also explored, and there was a positive influence of the destination image on satisfaction (Puh et al., 2014). Even with online destination images, there is a correlation between word of mouth value and customer satisfaction (Al-Bourini et al., 2021). Maintaining a positive image of a destination might be more challenging in the case of ecotourism. Both attribute-based and holistic destination images were influenced by acting, enjoyable learning, and emotional experiences. In addition, through the mediating effects of destination image and satisfaction, the tourism experience had an indirect effect on loyalty (both destination loyalty and ecotourism loyalty; T. T. Li et al., 2021).

H$_2$: The destination image has a positive impact on tourist satisfaction.

2.7.3. Perceived value towards tourist satisfaction
Regarding the theory between tourists’ perceived value and their satisfaction, customer perceived value affects tourist satisfaction and revisit intention (Waheed & Hassan, 2016). A study about guesthouses in the Maldives showed that customer satisfaction could be enhanced by improving functional and emotional values. The five dimensions of perceived value affect satisfaction (Setiwati & Putri, 2012). Similarly, each dimension of perceived value has a different effect on satisfaction (Demirgüneş, 2015). Perceived value also influenced satisfaction. Additionally, total satisfaction was associated with return intention (An et al., 2019). Despite the industry’s ongoing struggles with COVID-19, the perception of value continues to positively impact visitor loyalty and pleasure (Paulose & Shakeel, 2021). Economic-functional and emotional-social components of perceived value predict tourist satisfaction and loyalty (Carvache-Franco, Alvarez-Risco, et al., 2021). Contemplate changing your brand by creating new mindful tourism experiences that engage guests in the local culture and way of life. Public good tourism includes social, educational, citizen science, community exchange, and slow tourism (Lapointe, 2020).

H$_3$: Received value has a positive impact on tourist satisfaction.

2.7.4. Novelty seeking and tourist satisfaction
Novelty-seeking theory provides a strong theoretical foundation to explain destination choice behaviour, showing that consumers switch products and make new purchases despite being satisfied with their initial purchase. The study showed that novelty satisfies people (Al Salmi & Hasnan, 2016). Most respondents similarly answered that if a destination is the same as their country, there is no reason to travel to it. At the same time, the effect of novelty on satisfaction and destination loyalty shows that novelty has an effect on the formation of satisfaction (Toyama & Yamada, 2016). Interestingly, novelty seeking simultaneously affects their travel experience satisfaction in smart tourism (Goo et al., 2022) but not in Meeting, incentives, conferences, exhibitions (MICE) destinations (Fitri, 2021). However, every young tourism enterprise has a strong drive for novelty seeking in ecotourism, and tourists are more satisfied with their visit
and more inclined to suggest and speak positively about the place (Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco et al., 2021).

H₄: Novelty seeking has a positive impact on tourist satisfaction.

2.7.5. Tourist satisfaction with revisit intention
Destination choice and product and service consumption have an impact on tourist satisfaction and are the most crucial factors for tourism competitiveness (Naidoo & Ramseook-Munhurren, 2012). Experience brokers is a research concept for tourists and tour guides (Weiler & Walker, 2014). Tourists react in a positive or negative way, referring to their experience (Rajesh, 2013). The literature has found that satisfaction is highly significant and has a positive effect on revisit intention (Waheed & Hassan, 2016). In the tourism industry, revisit intention is seen as an important factor to be considered for the development and existence of business (Pratminingsih et al., 2014). Tourist satisfaction and repeat visits form a new comprehensive model, in which satisfaction is a moderator for temporal revisit intention (Som & Badarneh, 2011), correlating with model satisfaction and performance quality for intention to return measurement (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Similarly, Berezan et al. (2013) showed that satisfaction affected guests’ intention to return by recognizing varied perceptions based on nationalities. Tourists’ behavioural intentions to return and to recommend the destination are influenced by their pleasure with the area they are visiting (Zeng et al., 2021). Satisfaction with a destination and the desire to return to that location are influenced positively by the characteristics of the destination (Che et al., 2021). Sustainable hospitality has an impact on satisfaction, which in turn has an impact on the likelihood of returning. Furthermore, satisfaction acts as a mediator between hospitality and the desire to return (Nugroho et al., 2021).

H₅: Tourist satisfaction has a positive impact on revisit intention. Figure 3

3. Methodology
The design of this quantitative research is a causal survey that collected data from questionnaires based on the research objectives of identifying the impact of sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking on tourist satisfaction and temporal revisit intention in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

3.1. Sampling method
A nonprobability sampling design was used in this research. This is a sampling technique in which the samples are gathered in a process that does not give all the individuals in the population equal chances of being selected. The target population was all visitors who stayed in each hotel around a special region of Yogyakarta. A minimum confidence level of 0.5 is an indication of the significance of the variable. However, the confidence level used in this research is 95% (Nunnally, 1975).

The author uses Slovin’s formula to define the sample size with a degree of error of 5% as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} = \frac{4,194,261}{1 + (4,194,261)(0.05^2)} = 399.99 \approx 400 \]

\( n = \) sample size

\( N = \) population as the number of tourists who arrived in Yogyakarta's hotel

\( e = \) level of significance 5%
3.2. Data collection

This research uses primary data. Primary data are obtained directly from respondents by distributing questionnaires. A total of 420 questionnaires were distributed to the target respondents. In this case, the data were collected from local and foreign visitors of Yogyakarta tourist destinations (Jalan Malioboro, Taman Sari, Kraton, Sultan Palace) by purposive nonprobability sampling. Data collection was self-administered, in which respondents read the questions and responded by writing on the questionnaire (Burns & Ann Veeck, 2017). A self-report questionnaire was used to collect data based on respondents’ personal feedback, thereby ensuring truthful and helpful opinions and that the data were adaptable for the research results. However, there were also disadvantages to this method, such as the probability of making errors while filling out the questionnaire, the speed in answering, and data precision (Cerri et al., 2019). The questionnaire design is important through validity and reliability testing (Taherdoost, 2018).

A closed-end questionnaire research approach was used in this study. A seven-point Likert scale is suitable for a standard psychometric scale to evaluate responses, as it also provides a more accurate assessment of a participant’s authentic judgment (Diener et al., 1985; Finstad, 2010; Q. Li, 2013). Researchers also informed the participants that their information would be treated confidentially and that there would be no repeated contact made by the researchers under any circumstances.

The questionnaires were applied to measure each independent variable, including sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value, and novelty seeking, and to measure satisfaction level. Satisfaction influences temporal revisit intention as presented in Table 1.

Testing the validity of the instrument is key to ensuring that it functions appropriately. The validity test in this study was conducted twice, namely, the pretest consisted of 40 respondents, and the posttest consisted of 420 respondents. According to Ghozali (2013), reliability testing is a tool for measuring a questionnaire, which is an indicator of a construct. Internal consistency is a method of reliability in which researchers typically use a measure based on the correlations between different items on the same test. It measures whether several items that propose to measure the same general construct produce similar scores. A questionnaire is said to be reliable if someone’s answer to the statement is consistent or stable. The value has to be >0.7 to become reliable.

3.3. Data analysis

For data analysis, this research used IBM SPSS version 27 and IBM AMOS version 26 through Khon Kaen University. The demographic information from data collection and descriptive analysis were analysed using IBM SPSS. To analyse confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modelling (SEM), this research used AMOS. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis is a part of the structural equation model that is used to measure the model for defining the relationship of item factors as expected or not. Structural equation modelling tests the hypotheses about whether the relationship between constructs is positive or negative and determines if the hypotheses are accepted or rejected (Bentler & Chou, 1987) SEM has two steps to analyse the model that uses CFA to determine whether the constructs are valid or reliable; the last step is model testing to confirm that the full structure of model is reliable (Hayle, 1995).

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive analysis

This sample consisted only of tourists in Yogyakarta. According to the research plan, the sample size should be 400. As a result, 600 questionnaires were distributed, and 420 responses were obtained as shown below:
| Construct               | Indicators | Questions                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | References                     |
|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Sustainable practices  | SP         | 1) The hotel in Yogyakarta uses energy-saving light bulbs.  
2) The hotel in Yogyakarta uses a key card plug-in system to cut power in case of absence.  
3) The hotel in Yogyakarta uses eco-friendly paper with towels and toilet paper made of nonchlorine bleached paper, or paper with an eco-label.  
4) The hotel in Yogyakarta uses a filter system for efficient water usage. | (Berezan et al., 2013)          |
| Destination image      | DI         | 1) Yogyakarta has huge natural resources such as mountains, sea, and islands.  
2) Yogyakarta has important religious destinations such as Borobudur (Buddhism) and Masjid (Islam).  
3) Yogyakarta has the image of local people who are friendly and who make you feel happy.  
4) Yogyakarta is known for its safety and security. | Echtner and Ritchie (2003)       |
| Perceived value        | PV         | 1) The price of products and services in Yogyakarta are appropriate with what you have received.  
2) Yogyakarta is a suitable place to relax.  
3) Yogyakarta is an appropriate location to travel with family and friends.  
4) The climate in Yogyakarta is suitable for hanging out and doing some activities. | (Waheed & Hassan, 2016)         |
| Construct                          | Indicators | Questions                                                                 | References               |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Novelty seeking                   | NS         | 1) I experience a different culture in Yogyakarta.                        | Assaker et al. (2011)    |
|                                   |            | 2) Yogyakarta has a variety of things to see and do.                      |                          |
|                                   |            | 3) I experience local cuisine and new foods in Yogyakarta.                |                          |
|                                   |            | 4) I have the opportunities to see or experience people from different ethnic backgrounds in Yogyakarta |                          |
| Travel resource satisfaction      | SF         | (1) I am satisfied with the interesting natural resources in Yogyakarta such as seas, Islands, mountains, and volcanos. | (Kozak, 2001a)           |
| Physical and environmental tourism attraction |            | (2) I am satisfied with the traditional life of the local people in Yogyakarta. |                          |
| Facilities and access to the sources |            | (1) I am satisfied with the friendly people in Yogyakarta.                |                          |
| Activities                        |            | (2) I am satisfied with nonpolluting, waste and sewage in Yogyakarta.     |                          |
|                                   |            | (3) I am satisfied with the clear tourist zones in Yogyakarta.            |                          |
|                                   |            | (4) I am satisfied with the resting places in Yogyakarta.                 |                          |
|                                   |            | (5) I am satisfied with the location of the perfectly arranged stores in Yogyakarta. |                          |
|                                   |            | (6) I am satisfied with transportation in Yogyakarta.                     |                          |
|                                   |            | (1) I am satisfied with the tourist attractions such as Jalan Malioboro and Taman Sari. |                          |
|                                   |            | (2) I am satisfied with guide posts or signs that are easy and clear.     |                          |
|                                   |            | (3) I am satisfied with enough tourist information service centres.       |                          |
|                                   |            | (4) I am satisfied with the security while traveling, such as using life preservers in boats. |                          |
|                                   |            | (5) I am satisfied with the cleanliness of the public toilets.            |                          |
|                                   |            | (1) I am satisfied with the many tourist activities, such as shopping, walking, eating. |                          |
|                                   |            | (2) I am satisfied with the variety of products that not the same as those of other tourist destinations. |                          |
|                                   |            | (3) I am satisfied with the tasty food in Yogyakarta that is unique compared to other tourist destinations. |                          |
| Construct          | Indicators | Questions                                                                 | References                  |
|--------------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Revisit intention  | TRI        | (1) I will come back to Yogyakarta again next year.                      | (Phillips et al., 2013)     |
|                    |            | (2) I will come back to Yogyakarta again in 2 or 3 years.                |                             |
|                    |            | (3) I will come back to Yogyakarta again after 3 years.                  |                             |
|                    |            | (4) I will come back to Yogyakarta again when I have free time such as holidays. |                             |
Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents are women, with a total of 310 respondents (73.81 percent). Twenty-five percent of respondents (225) were between the ages of 20 and 29 (60.71 percent). The majority of responders (171) had four years of university study (40 percent). The level of education of 6 respondents was less than high school (1.43 percent), 109 respondents had a high school education (1.43 percent), 40 respondents had attended 2–3 years of college (9.52 percent), and 94 respondents had attained higher education or the postgraduate level (22.38 percent).

The majority of respondents, 242 in total (57.62 percent), were students. Entrepreneurship was represented by 41 respondents (9.76%), self-employment by 127 respondents (30.24%), retirement by 4 respondents (0.95%), and other vocations by 6 respondents (1.43%).

The majority of respondents, 298 in total (70.95 percent), were from Asian countries. There were 64 responses (15.24 percent) from North America, 55 respondents (13.10 percent) from Europe, and three respondents (0.71 percent) from Oceania.

Table 3 shows the travel behaviour of the tourists. The majority of respondents, 224 in total (53.33 percent), were visiting Yogyakarta for the first time, and the majority of them, 263 (62.62 percent), were travelling with friends or colleagues. Almost all of the tourists who visited the city, or 133 respondents (31.67 percent), used the bus as their mode of transportation, according to the majority of respondents (32.14 percent).

4.2. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

Ghozali (2013) stated that the test results are said to be reliable if they have a reliability construct value > 0.7. The results of this test indicate that the CR value for the sustainable practices variable is 0.9204, destination image is 0.9283, perceived value is 0.9263, novelty seeking is 0.9319, satisfaction is 0.9870 and temporal revisit intention is 0.9305, showing that the value of each variable is greater than 0.7. Based on these results in Table 4, it can be concluded that the overall instrument of the study is reliable. Thus, it can be used in this study.

4.3. Goodness of fit

Assessing goodness of fit is the way to determine how far the model hypothesized “fits” or matches the sample data. The results of the goodness of fit are displayed in the following data. Based on the results in Table 5, it can be seen that the research model approaches a good fit.

CMIN/DF is a parsimonious conformity index that measures the goodness of fit of the model with the estimated coefficients to achieve conformity. The result of CMIN/DF in this study is 1.986, indicating that the research model fits from the threshold of less than 3 (Marsh et al., 1988).

The Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) shows the overall level of conformity calculated from the residual square of the model predicted compared to the actual data. The GFI value in this model is 0.873. The approximate value with the recommended level is higher than 0.90 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and another criterion is more than 0.85, which indicates a marginal fit research model (Hair et al., 2016).

RMSEA is an index used to compensate for the chi-square value in a large sample. The RMSEA value of this study was 0.049 with the recommended value of 0.08, indicating the fit research model (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

AGFI is GFI, which is adjusted to the ratio between the degree of freedom that is proposed and the degree of freedom from the null model. The AGFI value in this model is 0.855. The approximate value with the recommended level should be higher than 0.80, indicating the fit of the research model (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
### Table 2. Demographic profile of respondents (n = 420)

| Demographic Variables | Categories          | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender                | Male                | 110       | 26.19      |
|                       | Female              | 310       | 73.81      |
| Age                   | < 20 years          | 37        | 8.81       |
|                       | 20–29 years         | 255       | 60.71      |
|                       | 30–39 years         | 115       | 27.38      |
|                       | 40–49 years         | 10        | 2.38       |
|                       | 50 and above        | 3         | 0.71       |
| Education             | Less than high school | 6         | 1.43       |
|                       | High school         | 109       | 25.95      |
|                       | 2–3 year college    | 40        | 9.52       |
|                       | 4–year university   | 171       | 40.71      |
|                       | Postgraduate or above | 94     | 22.38      |
| Occupations           | Business            | 41        | 9.76       |
|                       | Self-employed       | 127       | 30.24      |
|                       | Student             | 242       | 57.62      |
|                       | Retired             | 4         | 0.95       |
|                       | Others              | 6         | 1.43       |
| Continent             | Asia                | 298       | 70.95      |
|                       | North America       | 64        | 15.24      |
|                       | Europe              | 55        | 13.1       |
|                       | Oceania             | 3         | 0.71       |

### Table 3. Travelling behaviour

| Behaviour Variables       | Categories           | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Number of times visiting  | First time           | 224       | 53.33      |
|                           | Second time          | 134       | 31.9       |
|                           | More than 3 times    | 62        | 14.76      |
| Travelling companion      | Alone                | 113       | 26.9       |
|                           | Friends/Colleagues   | 263       | 62.62      |
|                           | Family/Relatives     | 44        | 10.48      |
| Purpose of visit          | Adventure            | 26        | 6.19       |
|                           | Business             | 37        | 8.81       |
|                           | Eco-tourism          | 133       | 31.67      |
|                           | Pleasure/Leisure     | 121       | 28.81      |
|                           | Religion             | 6         | 1.43       |
|                           | Study                | 85        | 20.24      |
|                           | Others               | 12        | 2.86       |
| Transportation            | Bus                  | 135       | 32.14      |
|                           | GOJEK                | 37        | 8.81       |
|                           | GRAB                 | 105       | 25.00      |
|                           | Meter Taxi           | 46        | 10.95      |
|                           | Private Car          | 66        | 15.71      |
|                           | Others               | 31        | 7.38       |
TLI is an index of conformity that is less influenced by sample size. The TLI value in this study is 0.969, with a recommended value of 0.90, indicating the fit of the research model (Bentler & Bonett, 1980).

CFI is an index that is relatively insensitive to sample size and the complexity of the model. The CFI value in this study is 0.971, with a recommended value higher than 0.9 indicating a fit research model (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

| Variable                  | Indicator | Factor Loading | Composite Reliability |
|---------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Sustainable Practice      | SP1       | 0.894          | 0.9204                |
|                           | SP2       | 0.838          |                       |
|                           | SP3       | 0.871          |                       |
|                           | SP4       | 0.864          |                       |
| Destination Image         | DI1       | 0.876          | 0.9283                |
|                           | DI2       | 0.884          |                       |
|                           | DI3       | 0.851          |                       |
|                           | DI4       | 0.885          |                       |
| Perceived Value           | PV1       | 0.891          | 0.9263                |
|                           | PV2       | 0.87           |                       |
|                           | PV3       | 0.849          |                       |
|                           | PV4       | 0.874          |                       |
| Novelty Seeking           | NS1       | 0.881          | 0.9319                |
|                           | NS2       | 0.884          |                       |
|                           | NS3       | 0.871          |                       |
|                           | NS4       | 0.883          |                       |
| Satisfaction              | SF1       | 0.911          | 0.987                 |
|                           | SF2       | 0.908          |                       |
|                           | SF3       | 0.909          |                       |
|                           | SF4       | 0.908          |                       |
|                           | SF5       | 0.919          |                       |
|                           | SF6       | 0.903          |                       |
|                           | SF7       | 0.912          |                       |
|                           | SF8       | 0.908          |                       |
|                           | SF9       | 0.873          |                       |
|                           | SF10      | 0.912          |                       |
|                           | SF11      | 0.914          |                       |
|                           | SF12      | 0.907          |                       |
|                           | SF13      | 0.919          |                       |
|                           | SF14      | 0.912          |                       |
|                           | SF15      | 0.917          |                       |
|                           | SF16      | 0.914          |                       |
| Temporal Revisit Intention| TRI1      | 0.874          | 0.9305                |
|                           | TRI2      | 0.872          |                       |
|                           | TRI3      | 0.872          |                       |
|                           | TRI4      | 0.892          |                       |
Based on the overall measurement of the goodness of fit above, the model proposed in this study is acceptable.

4.4. Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis testing is used to address the study's objectives and to assess the relationships between structural models. Table 6 illustrates the analysis of the data hypotheses using the value of the standardized regression weight, which indicates the coefficient of effect between variables:

![Diagram of the hypothesis testing model]

Based on the overall measurement of the goodness of fit above, the model proposed in this study is acceptable.

According to the results from the regression paths of the hypothesis development shown in Table 6, Hypothesis 1 has shown that sustainable practices have a positive effect on tourist satisfaction, which is accepted (t = 3.501, b = 0.221, p < 0.001). Hypothesis 2 indicated that destination image has a positive effect on tourist satisfaction (t = 3.37, b = 0.145, p < 0.001). Hypothesis 3 indicated that perceived value has a positive effect on tourist satisfaction (t = 4.19, b = 0.258, p < 0.001). Hypothesis 4 indicated that novelty seeking has a positive effect on tourist satisfaction, which is the strongest relationship of the factors (t = 5.576, b = 0.421, p < 0.001). Last, Hypothesis 5 indicated that tourist satisfaction has a positive effect on temporal revisit intention (t = 26.332, b = 0.862, p < 0.001). Hence, the 5 stated hypotheses are all significant and supported; figure 4 shows that the structural model design is useful and the results of hypothesis testing.

### Table 5. Assessing goodness of fit

| Goodness-of-fit index | Threshold | Research Model | Model |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|
| RMSEA                 | ≤ 0.08    | 0.049          | Fit   |
| GFI                   | ≥ 0.90    | 0.873          | Marginal |
| AGFI                  | ≥ 0.80    | 0.855          | Fit   |
| CMIN/DF               | ≤ 2.0     | 1.986          | Fit   |
| TLI                   | ≥ 0.90    | 0.969          | Fit   |
| CFI                   | ≥ 0.90    | 0.971          | Fit   |
| NFI                   | ≥ 0.90    | 0.944          | Fit   |
| RMR                   | < 0.08    | 0.025          | Fit   |

Figure 4. Hypothesis testing model.
### Table 6. Structural equation model

| Hypothesis | Standard Estimate | C.R. | P Value | Result |
|------------|------------------|------|---------|--------|
| H1         | Sustainable practices—> Satisfaction | 0.221 | 3.501 | *** | Supported |
| H2         | Destination Image—> Satisfaction | 0.145 | 3.37  | *** | Supported |
| H3         | Perceived Value —> Satisfaction | 0.258 | 4.19  | *** | Supported |
| H4         | Novelty Seeking —> Satisfaction | 0.421 | 5.576 | *** | Supported |
| H5         | Satisfaction—> Temporal Revisit Intention | 0.862 | 26.332 | *** | Supported |

Note: P Value <0.001 ***

### 5. Conclusion and discussion

The main purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking and tourist satisfaction as the mediator and how it has affected temporal revisit intention in the city of Yogyakarta. The findings support the relationship between sustainable practices, destination image, perceived value and novelty seeking and consumer satisfaction (Berezan et al., 2013; Bigné et al., 2001; Demirgüneş, 2015; Toyama & Yamada, 2016). The findings of this research found that novelty seeking has the greatest effect on tourist satisfaction, found through the practices of culture, foods, ethnic background, and sightseeing (Al Salmi & Hasnan, 2016; Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco et al., 2021; Goo et al., 2022). Next, perceived value and sustainable practices have similar effects on satisfaction. Perceived value can be considered in price, place and climate (Carvache-Franco, Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021; Demirgüneş, 2015; Waheed & Hassan, 2016). Sustainability practices can also come from energy saving and green practice hotels (Berezan et al., 2013; J. S. Lee & Back, 2010; Minh et al., 2021; Palacios-Florencio et al., 2021). Although destination image is the factor with the least impact, it also has a significant effect on tourist satisfaction. Marketing promotion can occur through practices such as creating high levels of tourism and tourist expectations through experience (Al-Ansi & Han, 2019; Al-Bourini et al., 2021; T. T. Li et al., 2021).

The study of the mediating role of tourist satisfaction on temporal revisiting confirmed the indirect effect of sustainability practices (Berezan et al., 2013), destination image (Al-Ansi & Han, 2019; Al-Bourini et al., 2021; T. T. Li et al., 2021), perceived value (An et al., 2019; Carvache-Franco, Alvarez-Risco et al., 2021; Waheed & Hassan, 2016) and novelty seeking (Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco, Carvache-Franco et al., 2021; Toyama & Yamada, 2016) on temporal revisiting through tourist satisfaction.

Importantly, the study found a strong relationship between tourist satisfaction and revisit intention. Tourist satisfaction also influences the development (Pratminingsih et al., 2014) and competitiveness of the tourism industry (Naidoo & Ramseook-Munhurrun, 2012).

Last, this research can contribute both theoretically and practically to academic knowledge through the comprehensive tourism model used to examine temporal revisiting intentions. Additionally, Yogyakarta’s tourism sector and other novel destinations will be able to attract more tourists who will be more satisfied with their travel experience and will either return or advocate for the city as a result of their cultural experiences and sustainable practices.
6. Limitations and future research

This research was conducted in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, which has limited geographic coverage. The researcher had a limited amount of time to collect data. The questionnaire was also in English, which may have presented a language barrier for some local tourists, although the researcher also assisted some responders in understanding the questions.

Future research can examine more elements while distinguishing between Western and Eastern cultural tourists to compare their preferences regarding the factors that influence their level of satisfaction and intention to return.
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