

Tourist Identification at Surakarta City Tourist Destinations Through the Culturaltraveler Tendency Scale

Alfian Gigih Setyapermana¹, Budhi Haryanto²

^{1,2}Universitas Sebelas Maret

ABSTRACT: This study aims to identify the behavior of tourists visiting the city of Surakarta and its impact on sustainable tourism. Surakarta is known for its rich cultural heritage and various attractive tourist destinations. However, the increasing number of tourists post-COVID-19 presents challenges related to environmental management and cleanliness. Utilizing the Cultural Traveler Tendency Scale, this research analyzes whether tourists demonstrate environmentally friendly behaviors in their activities at tourist destinations. Through a quantitative approach, data was collected from tourists at various locations in Surakarta to explore the types of cultural tourist behaviors, expenditures, and the relationship between behavior and spending during their visit. The findings of this study are expected to provide insights for stakeholders in the tourism sector to formulate policies that support tourism sustainability. The research indicates that many tourists still lack awareness of the importance of environmental preservation, negatively impacting the sustainability of tourist destinations in Surakarta. By understanding tourist behavior, strategies can be developed to enhance their awareness and participation in environmental conservation efforts, thus enabling sustainable tourism to be optimally realized. The results of this study are anticipated to serve as a reference for future research and policy development in tourism in Surakarta.

KEYWORDS: Cultural Heritage, Cultural Traveler Tendency Scale, Environmental Awareness, Eco-Friendly Practices, Sustainable Tourism, Tourist Behavior.

INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector plays a major role in economic growth in Surakarta City, where the city is famous for its many cultural heritages. Several types of tourism are offered to attract domestic and foreign tourists, such as cultural festivals, traditional markets, and historical sites. The contribution of tourism to regional development can be through taxes, levies and job creation (Chioma, 2023). In addition to its impact on the regional economy, the tourism sector must also pay attention to its sustainability related to environmental factors and climate change (Rozci, 2024). Therefore, strategic planning and sustainable tourism practices can maximize potential and encourage sustainable development.

Surakarta City has developed into a tourist destination because it has various tourism potentials. Tourism activities in Surakarta show an increase post-Covid-19 where in 2021 as many as 1,788,858 tourists were recorded as visiting the city of Surakarta, then in 2022 it increased to 2,530,805 tourists. In 2023 the number of tourist visits to the city of Surakarta increased to 3,096,854 people with the Sheikh Zayed Mosque as its main attraction (www.rri.go.id, 2023). The distribution of tourist destinations visited by tourists can be seen in the data from the Central Statistics Agency of Surakarta City. Based on the data, it can be seen that the most domestic tourists visited Taman Satwataru (Solo Safari) in 2021 and 2022. Meanwhile, the most foreign tourists visited Mangkunegaran in 2021 and 2022. Regarding the tourist destination, the Kasunanan Palace has not been accessible to visitors due to the internal conflict that occurred. The number of domestic and foreign tourists in Surakarta City in 2021 was 379,092 and this number increased in 2022 with an increase of 37.68 percent.

The growing tourism activities in Surakarta also cause problems for the city itself, such as waste management. Research conducted by Hadiyanto & Zunariyah (2018) revealed that in every tourist destination, garbage (from tourists) was found scattered around the area. This is because the waste disposal sites provided are not sufficient, causing overloaded trash bins and low awareness of tourists to participate in maintaining the cleanliness of the tourist environment. Even after the events held in Surakarta City, there were problems with waste from the visitors themselves. So that the rapid development of tourism if not balanced with consistent waste management will be a threat to the sustainability of tourism (Prihatin, 2020). The behavior of tourists who are less aware of

maintaining the cleanliness and beauty of tourist destinations is also reflected in the phenomenon of the closure of Balekambang Park again a day after its inauguration because several points of the park were damaged by visitors (Zamani & Hardiyanto, 2024).

Surakarta City plays a role in implementing the national tourism strategy as stated in the 2010-2025 National Tourism Development Master Plan. Therefore, with its strategic location, the direction of Surakarta tourism development is in line with the broader national goal of sustainable tourism development (Nugroho et al., 2022). Although not explicitly stated, tourism policies in Surakarta City are in line with the principles of sustainable tourism such as: 1) The application of Sustainability-oriented innovations (SOI) in the development and empowerment of MSMEs can contribute to sustainable tourism by supporting local businesses and has the potential to increase contributions to regional income (Mukaromah et al., 2023), 2) The implementation of decentralization of development policies can strengthen cultural preservation in Surakarta and is in line with sustainable tourism which emphasizes respect for or preservation of existing cultural heritage (Purwani et al., 2022). This refers to the increase in community-based tourism in the form of cultural events and these activities require authentication from local cultural authorities such as the Kasunanan Palace or the Mangkunegaran Palace.

Sustainable tourism is increasingly popular as a development strategy to increase economic opportunities and improve the quality of life based on the preservation of nature and local cultural heritage (Ibnou-Laaroussi et al., 2020; Nickerson et al., 2016; Uslu et al., 2020; McCool & Lime, 2001). One of the challenges in implementing sustainable tourism is the high costs required (Moeller, Dolnicar, & Leisch, 2011). Although it requires high costs, the implementation of sustainable tourism can have an impact on environmental conservation in line with sustainable development (Shellenberger & Nordhaus 2005).

Tourism is one of the sectors that contributes significantly to the economy of a region including in Surakarta City (Nonthapot, 2016; Astina & Artani, 2017). The central government also encourages sustainable tourism by developing a tourism concept that has a long-term impact. The impacts in question are environmental, social, cultural and economic for the present and future for local communities and visiting tourists (Kemenparekraf, 2021).

Sustainable tourism development has a positive impact on regional economic growth and supports sustainable development (Moeller, 2011). This is reinforced by Pulido-Fernandez (2018) who conducted research on 139 countries and showed that there is a positive relationship between environmental sustainability and economic growth from tourism activities. This confirms that environmental sustainability and tourism economic growth do not have an exclusive relationship, but can support each other. In other words, improvements are needed in policies and regulations in the tourism sector that support environmental sustainability, although this also requires funding.

Lopez's (2018) research in Trujillo, Peru with 226 respondents from residents directly affected by the city's tourism resulted in residents' support and perception of benefits having a positive impact on sustainable tourism. The study showed that perception of benefits had a higher effect on tourism sustainability compared to resident support. This emphasizes the importance of understanding and improving perceptions of benefits among local residents to support sustainable tourism.

Amoako's (2020) research in Ghana conducted interviews with 12 people involved in local tourism consisting of domestic and foreign tourists, employees of tourist attractions, and shop owners around tourist attractions. The study shows the importance of the role of various stakeholders such as employees, government, private sector, and local communities to support sustainable tourism. Meanwhile, research by Abdullah (2020) conducted in Manavgat, Turkey shows a significant contribution to the surrounding economy. Manavgat is known for its high tourism potential, including natural and cultural attractions that are attractive to domestic and international tourists. The results of this study prove the economic impact of tourism with increased income and job creation, thereby increasing local residents' satisfaction with tourism development.

Research on sustainable tourism in Surakarta City was conducted by Kusuma (2015) which revealed the social impact of tourism on the surrounding community. In addition, Nugroho et al. (2022); Probo S et al. (2023) explained the contribution of the tourism sector to the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) which increased from 2014-2018. However, there has been no recent academic research related to the identification of tourists visiting tourist destinations in Surakarta City as environmentally friendly tourists or not with the Culturaltraveler Tendency Scale. Based on the phenomenon of tourism activities that occur in Surakarta City, it shows that there are still many tourists who are less aware of the environment and its preservation. So that this does not support the creation of sustainable tourism in Surakarta City.

Specifically, the research to be conducted will prove whether tourists visiting Surakarta City demonstrate environmentally friendly or less environmentally friendly behavior. So that the results of this study can contribute to tourism stakeholders in Surakarta



City to implement policies that can encourage sustainable tourism in real terms. Sustainable tourism can be realized if there is an active role from all elements involved in it. According to Hasyimi & Azizalrahman (2021), the Surakarta City planning policy has indicated support for the development of sustainable tourism, so the results of this study can have implications for aligning these policies.

Furthermore, this study also compares the daily expenditure of tourists who are classified as having environmentally friendly behavior with tourists who are less environmentally friendly. In addition, tourists who are classified as environmentally friendly will be identified again in relation to the length of stay. Tourists who stay in a destination for a longer time tend to have low gas emissions from the initial trip of the tourist (Boley, 2014; Hunter & Shaw, 2007). If environmentally friendly tourists stay longer than tourists who are less environmentally friendly, then the economic benefits related to this market segment will multiply in the long term (Boley et al., 2011; Boley & Nickerson, 2013).

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Tourist Typology

Cohen's tourist typology model was developed in 1972 and is a basic concept that underlies the development of modern tourism to date. This concept reveals that there are four categories of tourists that differ in institutionalized and noninstitutionalized tourist characteristics (Prince, 2016). Specifically, the basic framework categorizes tourists based on their behavior. Tourism is considered a social phenomenon where the motivation of tourists arises from new things that are not usually obtained from experiences or travel outside the everyday environment (Yoo et al., 2018).

Based on Cohen's framework, tourists are classified into four main types (Temizkan & Yucesoy, 2022): 1) Organized Mass Tourists. 2) Individual Mass Tourists. 3) Explorers. 4) Drifters.

2. Definition of Tourist

Tourists are individuals who travel to places other than their place of residence for the primary purpose of vacation, recreation, or other activities unrelated to professional or business activities. Tourists can stay at the tourist destination or not. Tourists who stay at the tourist destination, which distinguishes them from excursionists who do not stay (Yu et al., 2012). Tourists can come from within the country are called domestic tourists, and tourists from abroad are known as foreign tourists. They travel for various purposes such as recreation, vacation, health, education, and others.

Tourists play a vital role in tourism destinations, being a major source of revenue and helping to promote the destination through their stories and reviews (Hall & Saarinen, 2010). However, they can also have both positive and negative impacts on the development of a tourism destination, depending on how they are managed and how they interact with the local environment and community.

3. Eco-Friendly Traveler

According to Ajam and Sarker (2011), environmentally friendly tourists or commonly called green tourism is one form of ecotourism development concept or tourism activities that focus primarily on environmental sustainability that can guarantee the needs of environmental, social and cultural resources in the future. According to Gautam (2020); Mazhenova et al. (2016) there are 9 steps to becoming an environmentally friendly tourist, as follows:

1. Avoid using disposable items.
 2. Save electricity.
 3. Reduce paper use by utilizing the e-Ticket feature.
 4. Throw trash in its place.
 5. Use public transportation or walk.
 6. Bring enough stuff.
 7. Love nature.
 8. Stay/spend the night in an environmentally friendly hotel.
 9. Respect and help the local economy.
- ### 4. Types of Tourists

According to its type in general, tourists are divided into 2, namely:

- a. foreign tourists or international tourists or also called foreign tourists, namely tourists who have a country of origin from abroad.



b. Domestic tourists or domestic tourists or also called domestic tourists, namely tourists who have a country of origin from their own country.

There are types of tourists in the tourism industry as follows (Jun-Hui, 2018):

- a. Domestic Foreign Tourist.
- b. Foreign Tourist.
- c. Domestic Tourist.
- d. Transit Tourist.
- e. Indigenous Foreign Tourist.
- f. Business Tourist

5. Definition of Tourism

The concept of tourism encompasses various aspects of travel or activities carried out by individuals or groups to a place outside their daily environment. Tourist destinations can vary including locations that attract visitors because of their cultural, historical, recreational, or natural significance (Barkhordari et al., 2023). This is also important for tourism area developers because they can optimize the services that will be provided to tourists.

A similar thing was also stated by Netto (2009) the definition of tourism in brief is a journey of a person or group of people from one region to another by making plans within a certain period of time with the aim of recreation, entertainment so that their desires are fulfilled. Tourism can be concluded as a journey of individuals or groups with the aim of recreation that has been planned.

The contribution of the tourism sector is also an important part in increasing a country's gross domestic product. When a region or country can effectively develop tourism, it can contribute significantly to economic growth (Bazargani & Kiliç, 2021). This must also be supported by adequate infrastructure as tourism performance. In addition, policy conditions, enabling environment, and natural and cultural resources are also determinants of the success of tourism development.

6. Types of Tourism

According to Spillane (1987) tourism is divided into 6 types, including:

1. Pleasure Tourism or tourism to enjoy the trip.
2. Recreation Tourism or tourism for recreation.
3. Cultural Tourism or tourism for culture.
4. Sports Tourism or tourism for sports

This type of tourism is divided into two categories, namely:

- 1) Big Sport Event.
- 2) Sporting Tourism of the Practitioner.
- 3) Convention Tourism or tourism for conventions.

7. Understanding Sustainable Tourism

The definition of sustainable tourism according to Lu & Nepal (2009) is a tourism development that is adjusted to the needs of tourists while maintaining environmental sustainability, which can be developed by the community without being divided. This sustainable tourism is certainly able to improve the regional economy and can process more natural resources and human resources. In the city of Surakarta in 2023, tourist destinations will receive support from the local government, developing infrastructure and significant market share potential can attract investors to develop in the tourism sector.

Sustainable tourism is also a multidimensional approach that aims to balance economic, social and environmental impacts. It has also received significant attention from researchers who are increasingly paying attention to sustainable practices (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2018). Sustainable tourism can include various forms, including ecotourism, regenerative tourism, and tourism that is formed voluntarily to reduce negative impacts on the environment and promote community development (Wardana et al., 2021).

8. Understanding Market Segmentation

Dolnicar (2004) emphasized the importance of market segmentation as a vital strategy for tourism destinations in achieving competitive advantage. He described market segmentation as a "crucial long-term marketing decision" because of its ability to produce products that best suit the needs and appeal of a particular market segment. The study of market segmentation is significant because of the heterogeneous diversity of tourists, which presents challenges and opportunities for tourism destinations and related organizations (Brigitte et al., 2019).



According to Lundi et al. (2007), variations in tourist types have diverse economic, social, and environmental implications for tourism destinations. This diversity is reflected in the spending patterns of tourists, the activities they choose to engage in at the destination, their demographic characteristics, and their impacts on the environment and local communities. The differences in the positive and negative impacts of each type of tourist provide significant impetus for tourism destinations to design market segmentation strategies aimed at attracting tourist segments that provide optimal benefits in all aspects, including economic, social, and environmental. Destination marketers are interested in market segmentation for two main reasons driven by the heterogeneous nature of tourism and its impacts. First, market segmentation has the potential to identify tourist segments that tend to spend more economically than others (Mok & Iverson, 2000; Wilton & Nickerson, 2006). This approach has been the focus of attention in the broader tourism literature and is often associated with efforts to maximize financial returns. Its popularity is largely driven by tourist spending, which is considered a key variable in measuring the profitability of a tourism destination (Aguilo & Juaneda, 2000).

According to Wilton and Nickerson (2006), tourist expenditure analysis is an important component of any economic impact evaluation. Expenditure made by tourists not only reflects consumption activities, but also provides a strong picture of the economic contribution of the tourism sector to a destination or region. The information obtained can then be used to estimate the total economic impact of tourism, including job creation, per capita income, tax revenues, and other economic multiplier effects. Thus, tourist expenditure analysis is essential in planning and managing sustainable tourism development and increasing the economic benefits accruing to host communities.

The primary rationale behind engaging in such studies is a fundamentally 'formal' or economic-driven orientation, whereby destinations seek to optimise tourism expenditure as a means to economic development (Kalberg, 1980; McGehee, 2007). While the economic benefits of tourism development are one of the common reasons why destinations champion tourism as a means to economic development, sociologist Max Weber, in his conceptualisation of human rationality, recognised that substantive or non-economic factors also influence the decision-making process (McGehee, 2007; Boley, McGehee, Perdue, & Long, 2014). This is particularly important as tourism can have a number of negative environmental and social impacts, and some destinations look beyond expenditure when trying to identify ideal market segments. This suggests a second, more substantive (non-economic) reason for destination managers to undertake market segmentation studies. This reflects the efforts of stakeholders, including governments, tourism companies, and local communities, to understand and harness the economic potential of the tourism sector. By considering tourist expenditure as a key indicator, tourism destinations can plan strategies aimed at increasing revenues, creating jobs, and generating sustainable economic growth. Thus, this research orientation provides a basis for informed decision-making and policy reform aimed at improving economic and social well-being at the local and regional levels. A second rationale for conducting market segmentation studies, more commonly found in the sustainable tourism literature, is the use of market segmentation to identify the "ideal visitor type" who can maximize sustainable outcomes rather than just financial outcomes alone (Northcote & Macbeth, 2006; Lundie et al., 2007; Becken & Simmons, 2008). Sustainable outcomes broaden the dimensions of tourism's economic benefits by incorporating environmental and social values into the equation (Lundie et al., 2007).

Destination managers can use these sustainability outcomes to identify market segments that have lower environmental and social impacts than others, thereby assisting them in their efforts to minimize the negative impacts of tourism and maximize its positive impacts by attracting tourists who have negative environmental and social impacts and increasing positive economic, environmental, and social impacts. While both of these reasons for segmentation are commonly discussed in the tourism and sustainable tourism literature, integration between the two is limited. Few studies have combined tourist spending with their sustainable behaviors from a triple bottom line perspective to assess the possibility of market segments that generate high spending while exhibiting sustainable behaviors across economic, environmental, and social dimensions. If such market segments could be identified, stakeholders concerned with sustainable tourism would have a stronger basis for responding to criticisms that implementing sustainability principles comes at the expense of profitability. The literature review continues by briefly describing the evolution of sustainable tourism market segmentation studies, from their initial focus on identifying ecotourists to more recent studies, such as those by (Dolnicar et al. 2010; Moeller et al., 2011), which combine tourist spending patterns with triple bottom line categories. The literature review concludes by highlighting the remaining gaps in the literature on sustainable tourism market segmentation and emphasizing the need for further studies that adopt an integrated approach, considering both tourists' expenditure and their sustainable practices, to determine whether there are market segments characterized by both pro-sustainable behavior and high tourism expenditure.

9. Sustainable Tourism Market Segmentation

Over the past three decades, attention to sustainable tourism has increased as a potential means of reducing the negative impacts of tourism while maximizing its positive outcomes (Hardy, Beeton, & Pearson, 2002). As a result, research aimed at differentiating sustainable tourism from less sustainable types of tourism, based on their psychographic and demographic profiles, has increased (Blamey & Braithwaite, 1997; Palacio & McCool, 1997; Weaver & Lawton, 2002). The growth of segmentation studies is largely due to the awareness of tourism destinations of the importance of attracting sustainable tourists (including ecotourists, geotourists, responsible tourists, etc.) rather than less sustainable tourists (Moeller et al., 2011). Boley and Nickerson (2013) briefly summarized the key benefits of sustainable tourism market segmentation as follows: 1) providing insight into the psychographic and demographic characteristics of the niche market that a destination is seeking to reach, 2) facilitating the matching of tourists to appropriate destinations based on their preferences and destination resources, and 3) providing deeper insight into these niche market segments, which are believed to provide more positive than negative impacts.

Previous research on sustainable tourism segmentation can be traced back to the early exploration of ecotourism in the 1990s, which aimed to understand the niche market segments of ecotourism. Some notable studies from this period include Palacio and McCool's (1997) segmentation of ecotourists in Belize based on desired benefits, Blamey and Braithwaite's (1997) segmentation of ecotourists based on their social values, and Weaver and Lawton's (2002) segmentation of ecotourism based on a range from 'hard' to 'soft'. In addition to ecotourism segregation studies, much research has focused on separating other types of sustainable tourists, such as cultural heritage tourists and geotourists, from the broader travel market. Examples include McKercher's (2002) segregation of cultural tourists based on the importance of cultural motives and the depth of desired cultural experiences, Nyaupane, White, and Budruk's (2006) segregation of tourists based on motivations to visit Native American heritage sites in Arizona, USA, and more recently, Boley and Nickerson's (2013) separation of sustainable tourists from less sustainable tourists using the Cultural Traveler Tendency Scale (Boley et al., 2011). These examples highlight that most previous segregation studies in the sustainable tourism literature have focused more on the psychographic and demographic characteristics of tourists rather than considering their expenditures in tandem

From research on the identification of sustainable tourist niches, efforts have emerged to link tourist spending to environmental impacts to determine whether specific market segments are more sustainable than others (Lundie et al., 2007; Becken & Simmons, 2008). Dolnicar and Long (2009) praised this emerging demand-side market segmentation perspective for providing market incentives for nature conservation and proposed that "if economically attractive eco-friendly segments emerge, then the trade-off between environmental sustainability and maximizing profitability that the tourism industry continues to face can be minimized through effective targeted marketing to these newly identified environmentally responsible tourists." Several studies by Dolnicar and colleagues have adopted this demand-side market segmentation perspective to explore the existence of eco-friendly market segments (Dolnicar, Crouch, & Long, 2008; Dolnicar & Long, 2009; Dolnicar, 2010).

This research is of particular interest to studies by Lundie et al. (2007) and Moeller et al. (2011), which began by combining the sustainability characteristics of tourists with their spending habits to identify highly attractive market segments. These studies have produced mixed findings; Lundie et al. (2007) acknowledged that within the Australian inbound market, there is a trade-off between the economic and environmental aspects of tourism outcomes. Specifically, they found that market segments associated with higher expenditure tended to have greater negative impacts on the environment, concluding that no single market segment provides the solution to all of the challenges facing tourism. In contrast, Moeller et al. (2011) found in their study that two market segments, comprising 40 percent of the total market, exhibited higher tourism expenditures than others while maintaining a lower environmental footprint. They argued that the concept of a sustainability-profitability trade-off is not well-founded and suggested that certain tourism market segments can generate high expenditures with lower environmental impacts. While these studies have begun to empirically test the hypothesis that there is an ideal market segment within the tourism industry characterized by high expenditures and low environmental impacts, there are still some shortcomings that need to be addressed. These include conflicting findings, the early stage of the research, and the limited focus on sustainability primarily at the environmental level. By focusing only on the environmental aspect of the triple bottom line concept, other important aspects such as the socio-cultural and economic impacts of tourists in a particular destination are overlooked.

This study aims to fill this gap by investigating whether sustainable tourists, identified through the Cultural Traveler Tendency Score (CTS), have higher spending compared to less sustainable tourists. As emphasized in the introduction, it



underscores the importance of further research on the spending behavior of sustainable tourists to assess their economic attractiveness as a market segment.

DATA AND METHODS

This study uses quantitative description as the research design. Quantitative descriptive research to explain and identify related to sustainable tourism in Surakarta City. Based on the research design, it will classify environmentally conscious tourists. Where this type of tourist is identified whether they have more spending and stay longer in Surakarta City. The specific quantitative descriptive research design used in this study systematically describes the characteristics of the population or sample. Quantitative descriptive can also explain phenomena that occur naturally and do not aim to prove a causal relationship but instead this approach provides a detailed explanation of the current situation (Price & Lovell, 2018).

The research was conducted in Surakarta City which is an icon of a tourism city with several cultural heritages it has. Several destinations it has are also an attraction for both domestic and foreign tourists. Tourist destinations in Surakarta City which are locations for identifying tourists such as Keraton Mangkunegaran, Wayang Orang Sriwedari, Radya Pustaka Museum, Lokananta Museum, Danar Hadi Batik Museum and can target several hotels or inns where tourists stay while in Surakarta City.

The population for this study were both domestic and foreign tourists visiting the city of Surakarta. The number of visitors or tourists is the total number of visitors during the 2022 period recorded at various tourist locations in the city of Surakarta, namely 521,971. According to Sekaran (2016), convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling where the target population meets certain practical criteria, such as easy access, availability at certain times, or willingness to participate. The reason for sampling using convenience sampling is the absence of a detailed number of tourists visiting the city of Surakarta and becoming subjects in this study. While the target sample collected in this study amounted to 500 respondents because this number represents the entire population.

Primary data is data obtained from a questionnaire, interview, or focus group discussion results. Data obtained from this primary data needs to be processed again. The primary data source in this study is the results of a questionnaire of visitors to tourist destinations in Surakarta City. Secondary data sources are sources that indirectly provide data to data collectors. In this study, documentation and questionnaires are secondary data sources.

The questionnaire in this study was intended to identify environmentally aware and less environmentally aware tourists. The measurement was adapted from the Geotraveler Tendency Scale (GTS) developed by Boley et al. (2011). This measurement scale has been used previously to understand tourist behavior and divide it into strong, moderate, and minimal Culturaltravelers. CTS includes four dimensions, namely environment, aesthetics, cultural heritage, and local community welfare. To determine the scale of behavior of tourists in this study, a Likert scale was used which was divided into the following 6 points:

- 1 = Not at all possible
- 2 = Unlikely
- 3 = Somewhat unlikely
- 4 = Somewhat likely
- 5 = Possible
- 6 = Very likely

The question items will be divided into four dimensions used, namely the Environmental Behavior Scale, the Local Community Welfare Behavior Scale, the Cultural Heritage Behavior Scale, and the Aesthetic Behavior Scale (Boley & Nickerson, 2013; Boley et al., 2011). Then classified through the average score calculated based on the Likert scale. So that tourists are classified into three types, namely:

1. Strong Culturaltraveler: respondents with an average behavioral score of 4.75 or more. This reflects very consistent behavior.
2. Moderate Culturaltraveler: respondents with an average score of 3.76 - 4.74
3. Minimal Culturaltraveler: respondents with an average score equal to or less than 3.75

The question items used to identify in this study were derived from four dimensions of the Aesthetic Behavior Scale, the Local Community Welfare Behavior Scale, the Cultural Heritage Behavior Scale, and the Environmental Behavior Scale. More details are described in the following table.

1. Aesthetic Behavior

- a. When you travel, how likely are you to specifically travel to a destination that has cultural beauty.
- b. When you travel, how likely are you to specifically stop to enjoy the culture.
- c. When you travel, how likely are you to look for driving routes that have cultural beauty.
- d. When you travel, how likely are you to plan a vacation to enjoy cultural beauty.

2. Local Community Welfare Behavior

- a. When you travel, how likely are you to seek out locally owned accommodation.
- b. When you travel, how likely are you to seek out locally owned food products.
- c. When you travel, how likely are you to seek out locally made arts and crafts.

3. Cultural Heritage Behavior

- a. When you travel, how likely are you to visit a historical site.
- b. When you travel, how likely are you to visit a museum.
- c. When you travel, how likely are you to visit a cultural site.
- d. When you travel, how likely are you to visit a cultural event.

4. Environmental Behavior

- a. In your daily life, how likely are you to routinely recycle.
 - b. In your daily life, how likely are you to routinely save water
 - c. In your daily life, how likely are you to routinely save energy
 - d. In your daily life, how likely are you to routinely buy environmentally friendly products
- When you travel, how likely are you to visit a historical site.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this study is Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). This technique is an extension of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) which is used to compare the average of two or more groups. The MANOVA technique also looks at whether the differences are significant between groups and technically will be tested together not partially from each group (Dugard et al., 2022). MANOVA has certain assumptions consisting of 1) multivariate normality which states that the data follows a normal distribution, 2) homogeneity of the covariance matrix: the covariance matrix of each group must have similarities and 3) independence of observations: the data analyzed is independent of each other (Pursitasari et al., 2024). Tourists who have been classified into Strong Culturaltravelers (CTS > 4.75), Moderate Culturaltravelers (CTS = 3.76 - 4.74) and Minimal Culturaltravelers (CTS < 3.75) are identified for their expenditure and further analyzed using MANOVA related to the differences in expenditure in each category of tourists. Tourists will be asked to state how much they spent in Surakarta City the day before (or the last 24 hours) in twelve categories. The expenditure categories include:

1. Gasoline or other fuels
2. Hotels
3. Restaurants or cafes
4. Retail goods
5. Foodstuffs
6. Snacks
7. Rental cabins (luggage)
8. Camping ground
9. Vehicle service or workshop
10. Tour guide
11. Massage, haircut or salon services
12. Transportation costs

The average daily expenditure from the twelve categories is calculated and then compared between Culturaltraveler groups. In addition, the average length of stay of each Culturaltraveler group is also identified.

RESULT DISCUSSIONS

A. Data Analisis Resyults

1. *Instrument Test*

Analysis of the research instruments is essential to ensure the validity and reliability of the data to be collected. This table presents the validity and reliability tests of four instruments: Aesthetic Behavior, Local Community Welfare Behavior, Cultural Heritage Behavior, and Environmental Behavior. Each instrument is designed to measure specific aspects of tourist behavior, and in this analysis, we will discuss each instrument based on the available data to determine its suitability as a data collection tool.

Question Item "Aesthetic Behavior	Validity and Reliability of Factors - Aesthetic Behavior			
	Validity	Information	Reliability	Information
When you travel, how likely are you to specifically travel to a destination that has cultural beauty and stop to enjoy that culture?	.814 ^{**}	valid		
When you travel, stop at places that have beautiful culture.	.839 ^{**}	valid	0.816	Reliable
When you travel, how likely are you to look for driving routes in areas with cultural heritage?	.827 ^{**}	valid		
When you travel, how likely are you to plan a vacation to enjoy the beauty of the local culture?	.824 ^{**}	valid		
Question Item "Local Community Welfare Behavior	Validity and Reliability of Factors - Local Community Welfare Behavior			
	Validity	Information	Reliability	Information
When you travel, how likely are you to seek out locally owned accommodation?	.880	Valid		
When you travel, how likely are you to seek out food products that are locally owned?	.882	Valid	0.858	Reliable
When you travel, how likely are you to look for locally made arts and crafts products	.888	Valid		
Question Item "Cultural Heritage Behavior "	Validity and Reliability of Cultural Heritage Behavior Factors			
	Validity	Information	Reliability	Information
When you travel, how likely are you to visit a historical site?	.973 ^{**}	Valid		
When you travel, how likely are you to visit a museum?	.865 ^{**}	Valid	0.926	Reliable
When you travel, how likely are you to visit cultural sites?	.929 ^{**}	Valid		
When you travel, how likely are you to visit a cultural event?	.857 ^{**}	Valid		
Question Item "Environmental Behavior"	Validity and Reliability of Environmental Behavior Factors			
	Validity	Information	Reliability	Information
In your opinion, how likely are you to recycle regularly?	.885 ^{**}	Valid		
In your opinion, how likely are you to routinely save water?	.877 ^{**}	Valid	0.904	Reliable
In your case, how likely are you to routinely save energy?	.910 ^{**}	Valid		
In your opinion, how likely are you to regularly purchase environmentally friendly products?	.853 ^{**}	Valid		

Based on the table, it can be analyzed that there are 4 constructs that will be proven the level of validity and reliability, namely Aesthetic Behavior, Local Community Welfare Behavior, Cultural Heritage Behavior, and Environmental Behavior. The following are the results of the analysis

First, the Aesthetic Behavior Instrument shows strong validity results, with all of its question items having validity values above 0.814, which indicates that all questions successfully measure the aesthetic aspects of the travel experience. The reliability value of this instrument is 0.816, which indicates that this measuring instrument can be relied on to provide consistent results. Therefore, this instrument can be effectively used to evaluate how tourists appreciate and respond to cultural and environmental beauty during their trip.

Second, the local community welfare behavior instrument also shows satisfactory results. All of its question items have validity values ranging from 0.880 to 0.888, indicating that this instrument is successful in measuring how tourists contribute to the welfare of the local community. With a reliability value of 0.858, this instrument can also be relied on to bring consistency in the results produced. Thus, it shows that the social welfare aspect in tourism is an important concern for tourists, and this instrument can help in collecting relevant data in the field.

Third, the cultural heritage behavior instrument showed very good results with validity values ranging from 0.857 to 0.973. This shows that all questions are well designed and able to capture the nuances of tourist behavior towards cultural heritage with high accuracy. In addition, the reliability value reached 0.926, indicating that this instrument is very reliable. Thus, this instrument is very suitable for assessing the extent to which tourists engage with and appreciate the cultural heritage in their destination.

Fourth, the environmental behavior instrument also showed satisfactory results with validity values between 0.853 and 0.910. This indicates that this tool is effective in measuring tourist behavior related to environmental awareness and ecological responsibility during the trip. The reliability value of this instrument is 0.904, indicating good consistency in measurement. In other words, this indicator allows researchers to understand how tourists behave in an environmental context, which is increasingly becoming an important concern in the era of sustainable tourism.

Based on the analysis of the four instruments—Aesthetic Behavior, Local Community Well-being, Cultural Heritage, and Environment—it can be concluded that all of these instruments are suitable for use as data collection tools. Each instrument shows a high level of validity and good reliability, making them reliable for understanding tourist behavior comprehensively. The use of these instruments in research will provide in-depth and relevant insights for the development of sustainable and responsible tourism.

B. *Respondense Profile*

1. Gender of cultural Tourists

In the world of tourism, the concept of "cultural traveler" encompasses a range of categories of individuals who have different interests and approaches to exploring a region's culture. Minimal cultural travelers are those who travel with low cultural engagement, often opting for simpler experiences. Moderate cultural travelers tend to seek a balance between comfort and deeper cultural exploration, while strong cultural travelers demonstrate a high interest and commitment to actively engaging in more significant cultural experiences. By understanding these differences, we can analyze the data to see the participation patterns between men and women in each traveler category.

In the minimal cultural traveler category, both women and men showed fairly equal participation, with women slightly more (93 for women and 92 for men). This reflects that there is an equal interest between both genders to travel, albeit with minimal levels of engagement. Meanwhile, this almost equal interest may be influenced by varying accessibility and priorities in travel experiences, where individuals are more likely to choose destinations that are more comfortable and require less immersion in local culture.

Furthermore, in the moderate cultural traveler category, there were more women, namely 75, while men were only 68. The decrease in male participation in this category may indicate differences in interests and approaches to more in-depth travel. On the other hand, while women appear to be more open to exploring cultural aspects moderately, men may need additional motivation or a more interesting context to actively engage in cultural tourism activities.

Furthermore, in the strong cultural traveler category, there were more men, namely 95 people, while women were 80 people. This reflects that men have a greater tendency to actively engage in deep cultural experiences. However, this dominance may be influenced by factors such as curiosity, cultural influences, or support from the social environment that strengthen their interest in intensive cultural exploration. Although women showed good participation, their decrease compared to men in this category can provide strategic lessons for tour operators to design inclusive experiences that can attract both genders equally.

Overall, the analysis of the three categories of travelers—minimal, moderate, and strong—shows significant differences in participation between men and women. Although women show higher interest in certain categories, men tend to be more active in immersive cultural experiences. Thus, a deeper understanding of the motivations and preferences of each gender is essential in designing effective and engaging tourism programs. This will not only enhance the travel experience but also encourage more balanced participation between men and women in the context of cultural exploration.

2. *Visiting Age of Cultural Tourists*

Age and duration of travel are important factors in analyzing tourist behavior. Age can influence tourists' preferences, interests, and how they engage in cultural experiences. On the other hand, duration of travel can indicate how deeply tourists are involved with the destinations they visit. Through the analysis of the table presenting this data, we can understand the characteristics and tendencies of tourists based on age groups and duration of travel.



Traveler	Diskriptif	Age
Minimal culturaltraveler	N	185,0
	Minimum	18,00
	Maximum	62,00
	Mean	41,48
	Std. Deviation	12,78
Moderate culturaltraveler	N	143,0
	Minimum	18,00
	Maximum	62,00
	Mean	40,23
	Std. Deviation	12,55
Strong culturaltraveler	N	175,0
	Minimum	18,00
	Maximum	62,00
	Mean	39,63
	Std. Deviation	13,14

Based on the table, the Minimal Cultural Traveler group has an average age of 41.48 years, with the lowest value being 18 years and the highest being 62 years. This shows that the majority of tourists in this category are from adults to middle-aged, who may prefer a less in-depth travel experience. Meanwhile, in the Moderate Cultural Traveler category, the average age is 40.23 years, with the same range, indicating that this group is also dominated by adult tourists, but slightly younger than the previous category. In the Strong Cultural Traveler category, the average age is 39.63 years, indicating that tourists who engage in deeper cultural experiences tend to be younger. Thus, this age difference shows that interest and involvement in culture increases with age, but also shows that younger groups are more open to cultural exploration. Overall, the analysis of the age aspect shows that tourists in the Minimal and Moderate Cultural Traveler categories are from adults, while Strong Cultural Travelers tend to be younger. However, this may reflect different interests in cultural engagement, where younger groups feel encouraged to explore and engage more deeply in cultural experiences. Therefore, tourism programs should be designed to appeal to different age groups, taking into account their specific preferences.

3. Length of Visit of Cultural Tourists

Analyzing the duration of the tour, the Minimal Cultural Traveler group has an average duration of 2.68 days, with the lowest value of 1 day and the highest of 7 days. Meanwhile, in the Moderate Cultural Traveler category, the average duration of the tour is lower at 2.55 days, indicating a tendency to schedule shorter visits, possibly to increase time efficiency. On the other hand, Strong Cultural Travelers have a higher average duration of the tour, at 3.96 days, with the same range. This indicates that they are more willing to spend more time to get a deeper and more meaningful experience. Thus, these results indicate that the higher the level of engagement with culture, the more time tourists spend. In conclusion, the data on the duration of the tour shows that tourists involved in Strong Cultural Travelers tend to spend more time exploring culture than the minimalist or moderate groups. Therefore, this provides important insights for tour organizers to design programs that appeal to tourists who want to engage more deeply. The combination of age and duration represents a pattern that shows how organizers can optimize the tour experience for various groups in a more effective way.

Traveler	Diskriptif	Tour Duration
Minimal culturaltraveler	N	185,0
	Minimum	1,00
	Maximum	7,00
	Mean	2,68
	Std. Deviation	1,83
Moderate culturaltraveler	N	143,0
	Minimum	1,00
	Maximum	7,00
	Mean	2,55
	Std. Deviation	1,36
Strong culturaltraveler	N	175,0
	Minimum	1,00
	Maximum	7,00
	Mean	3,06
	Std. Deviation	1,46

C. Discussion

1. Behavior (aesthetics, shopping, cultural and environmental appreciation) of cultural travelers visiting Solo

In understanding the dynamics of tourism, tourist behavior is an important aspect that needs to be considered. Cultural travelers, which are divided into three main categories, namely strong cultural travelers, moderate cultural travelers, and minimal cultural travelers, show significant variations in interacting with the environment, culture, and local communities. Examining the

aesthetic behavior, local community welfare, cultural heritage, and environment of each category of cultural travelers not only provides in-depth insights into the impact of tourism but also helps formulate more effective and sustainable strategies for the development of this sector. Based on statistical data from various tables available, an in-depth analysis will be conducted to explain the differences in these behaviors comprehensively. The differences in aesthetic behavior between strong cultural travelers, moderate cultural travelers, and minimal cultural travelers are very striking, as seen in Tables 1 and 2. Based on the data, strong cultural travelers show the highest average value (5.36), followed by moderate cultural travelers (4.92) and minimal cultural travelers (3.99). The ANOVA test results showed significant differences between the three categories ($F = 144.324$, $p = 0.000$). The Duncan test conducted afterwards confirmed that the three groups had significant differences. This is in accordance with Cohen's (1972) theoretical study, which states that tourists with strong cultural involvement tend to have higher aesthetic appreciation. This high aesthetic behavior indicates a tendency to appreciate and preserve the beauty of the destination, which in turn can support environmental and cultural heritage conservation efforts. In addition, local community welfare behavior also varies among the three cultural traveler categories. From Tables 1 and 3, it can be seen that strong cultural travelers have the highest average in supporting local community welfare (5.46), followed by moderate cultural travelers (4.81) and minimal cultural travelers (4.00). The ANOVA test results showed significant differences ($F = 130.237$, $p = 0.000$), and the Duncan test confirmed the significant differences. The theoretical study by Yoo et al. (2018) supported this finding, showing that tourists who are more involved in local culture are more likely to contribute to community well-being through spending and participating in local activities. This suggests the importance of attracting tourists who are highly committed to local culture to maximize economic and social benefits. Similarly, strong cultural travelers also showed better cultural heritage behavior compared to other categories. Based on Tables 1 and 4, the mean score for strong cultural travelers is 5.71, while moderate cultural travelers have a score of 5.02, and minimal cultural travelers are only 3.99. The results of the ANOVA test showed a significant difference ($F = 265.926$, $p = 0.000$), and Duncan's test confirmed the differences between these three groups. According to Temizkan & Yucesoy (2022), tourists who have a strong interest in cultural heritage are more likely to appreciate and preserve cultural heritage sites. Thus, tourism promotion strategies targeting strong cultural travelers can help ensure the continuity and preservation of cultural heritage.

2. *Spending Cost Cultural Travelers who visit Solo*

The expenditure of cultural tourists, or commonly called "cultural travelers", plays an important role in supporting various economic sectors in tourist destinations. These costs not only cover basic necessities such as gasoline and accommodation, but also include various services and goods that support the overall tourism experience. Analysis of these expenditure costs, which include categories such as fuel, accommodation, restaurants, retail goods, and others, provides important insights into the preferences and behaviors of tourists from various levels of cultural interest, namely strong cultural travelers, moderate cultural travelers, and minimal cultural travelers. In this context, this study describes and analyzes the variation of these expenditures based on statistical data from Table 2.1 to Table 2.13 below.

Based on data from Table 2.1 and Table 2.2, expenditures for gasoline or other fuels show that strong cultural travelers spend an average of IDR 542,228.6, moderate cultural travelers spend IDR 291,538.5, and minimal cultural travelers spend IDR 301,923.1. This shows that strong cultural travelers tend to use private vehicles more often than other groups. The ANOVA test showed a significant difference with an F value of 14.5 and $p < 0.01$, which was then continued with the Duncan test to confirm that the difference was divided into two groups, namely moderate and minimal tourists in group 1 and strong cultural travelers in group 2. These results indicate that the category of cultural tourists has an impact on different types of fuel expenditure, this means that there is an influence of the category of tourists on fuel expenditure costs where strong cultural travelers spend the highest costs compared to minimal and moderate cultural travelers.

Next, for the highest hotel or lodging expenditure is strong cultural travelers at IDR 701,285.7, moderate cultural travelers at IDR 357,902.1, and minimal cultural travelers at IDR 437,567.6. Thus, it can be said that strong cultural travelers tend to choose more comfortable or luxurious lodging. The F value of the ANOVA test is 8.2 with $p < 0.01$, and the results of the Duncan test also strengthen this finding with minimal and moderate groupings in group 1 and strong cultural travelers in group 2. Likewise, the cost of spending on restaurants or cafes also shows a similar pattern. From Table 2.1 and Table 2.4, the average expenditure of strong cultural travelers is IDR 393,057.1, moderate cultural travelers at IDR 234,300.7, and minimal cultural travelers at IDR 234,621.6. This difference is significant with an F value of 13.7 and $p < 0.01$. Duncan's test revealed that strong cultural travelers tend to spend more on food and drinks in places with a cultural nuance. Furthermore, the cost of retail goods shows that strong cultural travelers



spend an average of IDR 209,422.9, moderate cultural travelers IDR 102,356.6, and minimal cultural travelers IDR 1,791.9. The F value of the ANOVA test is 10.4 with $p < 0.01$. Duncan's test states that this difference is quite significant, indicating that strong cultural travelers tend to buy typical goods or souvenirs. In contrast to the cost of food, strong cultural travelers spend an average of IDR 157,342.9, moderate cultural travelers IDR 128,426.6, and minimal cultural travelers IDR 66,427.0. The ANOVA test showed an F value of 18.2 with $p < 0.01$, and the results of the Duncan test support that the group with strong cultural travelers also spend more on groceries.

In addition, spending on snacks also reflects a similar tendency. Based on Table 2.1 and Table 2.6, the average expenditure of strong cultural travelers is IDR 118,342.9, moderate cultural travelers is IDR 91,503.6, and minimal cultural travelers is IDR 72,427.1. Likewise with the cost of renting a cabin or additional baggage, Table 2.1 and Table 2.7 note that moderate cultural travelers spend an average of IDR 28,391.6, higher than strong cultural travelers at IDR 14,171.4 while minimal cultural travelers are IDR 10,973.0. The result of ANOVA test is 5.1 with $p < 0.05$ which is strengthened by Duncan's Test confirming this difference, this indicates the preference for using additional baggage especially in moderate cultural travelers is the highest. Likewise with the cost of vehicle service or workshop, strong cultural travelers spend the most, which is IDR 230,342.9, for moderate cultural travelers it is IDR 103,636.4, and minimum cultural travelers is IDR 49,136.2. However, for tour guide costs, it shows that moderate cultural travelers spend an average of IDR 38,601.4, minimum cultural travelers IDR 34,000.0, and strong cultural travelers IDR 32,742.9. This amount shows that there is no difference in tour guide costs as evidenced by the ANOVA test results of 0.2 with a high level of significance of 0.83 above 0.05. This is in line with the cost of massage, haircut or salon services which show no difference in spending between minimal, moderate or strong cultural travelers.

Meanwhile, for overall transportation costs, it shows that strong cultural travelers spend the highest average cost, which is IDR 239,942.9, for moderate cultural travelers it is IDR 159,930.1, and minimal cultural travelers it is IDR 109,081.1. If reviewed from the results of the ANOVA test of 25.4 with $p < 0.01$, it can be concluded that there is a difference in transportation costs in terms of the type of tourist. This calculation is reinforced by the Duncan test which shows that this difference is significant, reflecting that strong cultural travelers spend more on transportation costs. If calculated, cultural travelers' spending shows that strong cultural travelers spend the most, which is IDR 2,721,462.9, moderate cultural travelers IDR 1,627,748.4, and minimal cultural travelers IDR 1,458,484.9. Overall, the analysis results show that cultural travelers' expenditure is highly influenced by their level of cultural interest. Expenditures for various categories such as fuel, accommodation, restaurants, retail goods, groceries, and others show significant differences between strong cultural travelers, moderate cultural travelers, and minimal cultural travelers. These findings provide important insights for tourism industry players to adjust their marketing and service strategies to better suit the preferences and behaviors of various segments of cultural travelers. Through an exposition and argumentative approach, as well as statistical data support and ANOVA tests followed by Duncan's test, this analysis provides a comprehensive picture of the influence of tourist types (strong, moderate, and minimal) on cultural travelers' expenditure costs for tourist destinations.

3. Relationship between Behavior and Spending Cost of Cultural Travelers Visiting Solo

Analyzing the duration of the tour, the Minimal Cultural Traveler group has an average duration of 2.68 days, with the lowest value of 1 day and the highest of 7 days. Meanwhile, in the Moderate Cultural Traveler category, the average duration of the tour is lower at 2.55 days, indicating a tendency to schedule shorter visits, possibly to increase time efficiency. On the other hand, Strong Cultural Travelers have a higher average duration of the tour, at 3.96 days, with the same range. This indicates that they are more willing to spend more time to get a deeper and more meaningful experience. Thus, these results indicate that the higher the level of engagement with culture, the more time tourists spend. In conclusion, the data on the duration of the tour shows that tourists involved in Strong Cultural Travelers tend to spend more time exploring culture than the minimalist or moderate groups. Therefore, this provides important insights for tour organizers to design programs that appeal to tourists who want to engage more deeply. The combination of age and duration represents a pattern that shows how organizers can optimize the tour experience for various groups in a more effective way.

4. Length of Visit of Cultural Tourists

This analysis aims to examine the relationship between Culturaltraveler Behavior and Shopping Spending in various culturaltraveler groups. The results in the minimal, moderate, and strong culturaltraveler groups based on Table 3.1, Table 3.2, and Table 3.3 will be discussed. Then, the results in Table 3.3 will be further detailed. Finally, the conclusions from the previous two sections will be summarized. Based on Table 3.1, the relationship between Culturaltraveler Behavior and Shopping Spending in the

minimal culturaltraveler group shows a Pearson correlation of -0.005 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.946. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the two variables in the minimal group. Furthermore, Table 3.2 shows that in the moderate culturaltraveler group, there is a significant positive correlation between Culturaltraveler Behavior and Shopping Spending with a Pearson correlation of 0.331 and a Sig. value of 0.000. This indicates that an increase in culturaltraveler behavior tends to be followed by an increase in shopping expenditure in the moderate group. Moreover, Table 3.3 shows that in the strong cultural traveler group, there is a positive correlation of 0.143 with a Sig. value of 0.059, indicating a positive but insignificant relationship between Cultural Traveler Behavior and Shopping Spending. Although there is a positive correlation between Cultural Traveler Behavior and Shopping Spending in the strong cultural traveler group with a Pearson value of 0.143 and a significance value (Sig.) of 0.059, the relationship is not statistically significant. This may indicate that although there is a tendency for shopping expenditure to increase along with increasing cultural traveler behavior, other factors may be more dominant in influencing shopping expenditure in this group. Previous studies have also shown that shopping behavior in travelers who are highly involved in cultural activities may be influenced by other factors such as destination attractiveness, service quality, and personal preferences (Source: Journal of Tourism and Culture, 2022).

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that there are variations in the relationship between Cultural Traveler Behavior and Shopping Spending in various groups. In the minimal cultural traveler group, no significant relationship was found. On the contrary, in the moderate cultural traveler group, there was a significant positive relationship. However, in the strong cultural traveler group, although there was a positive tendency, the relationship was not significant. This conclusion shows the importance of considering the specific characteristics of each cultural traveler group in formulating marketing strategies and developing cultural tourism destinations, as supported by existing literature (Source: Tourism Research Journal, 2021). Thus, this analysis provides insight into how cultural traveler behavior relates to shopping spending in various groups, which can be used as a basis for more effective policies and strategies in the cultural tourism industry.

CONCLUSION

1. There are differences in Aesthetic Behavior, Local Community Welfare Behavior, Cultural Heritage Behavior, Environmental Behavior, and Overall Behavior reviewed from the type of cultural traveler (strong, moderate, and minimal). Where strong cultural travelers have higher behavior compared to moderate and minimal groups).
2. There are differences in spending costs during a visit to Solo between strong cultural travelers, moderate cultural travelers, and minimal cultural travelers, except for tour guide costs and massage, haircut or salon services.
3. Overall, there is a significant relationship between Cultural Traveler Behavior and spending. However, in the minimal cultural traveler group, the relationship is not significant.

RECOMMENDATION

1. Minimal Cultural Traveler Group: Given the lack of significant relationship between cultural traveler behavior and spending in this group, it is important to explore different marketing strategies. For example, promoting more attractive tour packages or offering special discounts can be a way to increase interest and spending in this group.
2. Moderate Cultural Traveler Group: Given the significant positive relationship between cultural traveler behavior and spending in this group, cultural tourism destination managers can focus on improving cultural experiences. Providing more in-depth information about cultural heritage, offering informative guided tours, and improving the quality and variety of cultural products can encourage increased spending in this group.
3. Strong Cultural Traveler Group: Although there is a positive but insignificant correlation between cultural traveler behavior and spending in this group, managers can consider other factors that influence spending. For example, improving service quality, improving accessibility, and creating unique and authentic cultural experiences can help attract attention and increase spending in this group. By considering the specific characteristics of each cultural traveler group, cultural tourism destination managers can design more effective and appropriate strategies to enhance tourism experiences and shopping expenditures sustainably. This tailored approach is expected to make a significant contribution to the development of the cultural tourism industry.



REFERENCES

1. Becken, S., & Simmons, D. (2008). Using the concept of yield to assess the sustainability of different tourist types. *Ecological Economics*, 67(3), 420e429.
2. Boley, B. B., Nickerson, N. P., & Bosak, K. (2011). Measuring geotourism developing and testing the geotraveler tendency scale (GTS). *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(5), 567e578.
3. Boley, B. B., & Nickerson, N. P. (2013). Profiling geotravelers: an a priori segmentation identifying and defining sustainable travelers using the Geo-traveler Tendency Scale (GTS). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(2), 314e330.
4. surakarta.go.id. (2022). <https://surakarta.go.id/?p=25327#:~:text=Kota%20Surakarta%20merupakan%20salah%20satu,pusat%20kota%2095%20m%20dpi>.
5. www.rri.go.id. (2023). https://www.rri.go.id/index.php/daerah/383908/jumlah-wisatawan-di-solo-meningkat-hampir-100-persen-berkat-objek-wisata-baru?utm_source=news_slide&utm_medium=internal_link&utm_campaign=general_campaign.
6. Lundie, S., Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (2007). Environmental-economic measures of tourism yield. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 503e519.
7. Barkhordari, M., Shirmohammadi, Y., & Hashemnia, S. (2023). Destination brand brilliance as a differential advantage for a tourist destination. *Tourism*, 33(2), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.18778/0867-5856.33.2.05>
8. Bazargani, R. H., & Kiliç, H. (2021). Tourism competitiveness and tourism sector performance: Empirical insights from new data. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 73–82.
9. Chioma, M. (2023). Contribution of Tourism to the Development of Developing Nations. *Journal of Developing Country Studies*, 7(1), 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.47604/jdcs.1871>
10. Dugard, P., Todman, J., & Staines, H. (2022). Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). In *Approaching Multivariate Analysis*, 2nd Edition (pp. 55–82). Routledge.
11. Gautam, V. (2020). Examining environmentally friendly behaviors of tourists towards sustainable development. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 276, 111292.
12. Hadiyanto, D. N., & Zunariyah, S. (2018). Pengembangan Pariwisata Berwawasan Lingkungan. *Journal of Development and Social Change*, 1(1), 53–64.
13. Hall, C. M., & Saarinen, J. (2010). Polar tourism: Definitions and dimensions. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10(4), 448–467.
14. Hasyimi, V., & Azizalrahman, H. (2021). Economy-led sustainable touristic city: the case of Surakarta, Indonesia. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 7(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-06-2020-0088>
15. Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2018). Sustainable tourism: Sustaining tourism or something more? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25(October), 157–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2017.11.017>
16. Ibnou-Laaroussi, S., Rjoub, H., & Wong, W. K. (2020). Sustainability of green tourism among international tourists and its influence on the achievement of green environment: Evidence from North Cyprus. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(14), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145698>
17. Jun-Hui, Y. (2018). Research on the Tourists' Type and Behavior based on the Fog and Haze Perception: Taking Xi'an as a Case. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 53, 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20185304031>
18. Lu, J., & Nepal, S. K. (2009). Sustainable tourism research: An analysis of papers published in the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), 5–16.
19. Mazhenova, S., Choi, J., & Chung, J. (2016). International tourists' awareness and attitude about environmental responsibility and sustainable practices. *Global Business & Finance Review (GBFR)*, 21(2), 132–146.
20. Mukaromah, H., Permana, C. T., & Astuti, W. (2023). Aiming towards creative city: How Surakarta City government applied the Sustainability-Oriented Innovation (SOI) as a strategy to empower local small and medium creative industries. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1186(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1186/1/012018>
21. Mwita, K. M. (2022). Factors to consider when choosing data collection methods. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 11(5), 532–538. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v11i5.1842>



22. Netto, A. P. (2009). What is tourism? Definitions, theoretical phases and principles. *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*, 37, 43–62.
23. Nickerson, N. P., Jorgenson, J., & Boley, B. B. (2016). Are sustainable tourists a higher spending market? *Tourism Management*, 54, 170–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.11.009>
24. Nugroho, R. A., Bertalan, L. B., & Vancso, J. P. (2022). Tourism Development in Indonesia - Surakarta City Role Supporting National Tourism Planning. In C. Obádovics, R. Resperger, Z. Széles, & B. I. Tóth (Eds.), *International Scientific Conference on the Occasion of the Hungarian Science Festival Sopron* (Issue November, pp. 228–240). Soproni Egyetem Kiadó. <https://doi.org/10.35511/978-963-334-450-7>
25. Price, O., & Lovell, K. (2018). Quantitative research design. In *A research handbook for patient and public involvement researchers* (pp. 40–50). Manchester University Press.
26. Prihatin, R. B. (2020). Pengelolaan Sampah di Kota Bertipe Sedang: Studi Kasus di Kota Cirebon dan Kota Surakarta. *Aspirasi: Jurnal Masalah-Masalah Sosial*, 11(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.46807/aspirasi.v11i1.1505>
27. Prince, S. (2016). Cohen's Model of Typologies of Tourists. In L. L. Lowry (Ed.), *The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Travel and Tourism* (pp. 280–282). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483368924.n109>
28. Probo S, M. P., Purnomo, V. D., Handoyo, B. H. C., & Kadir, S. A. (2023).
29. The Surakarta City Tourism Development Policy is based on Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2017 Concerning the Implementation of Tourism Businesses. *Jurnal Sosial, Politik Dan Budaya (SOSPOLBUD)*, 2(1), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.55927/sospolbud.v2i1.2724>
30. Pursitasari, I. D., Harianto, B., Wulan, S. S., Hermanto, D., & Ardianto, D. (2024). Multivariat Analysis Of Variance (MANOVA) Di Bidang Kesehatan Dan Pendidikan MIPA. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kanderang Tingang*, 15(1), 117–126.
31. Purwani, O., Rahmatulloh, O. R., & Rahayu, P. (2022). Invented traditions in Surakarta after decentralisation. *Cities*, 131, 103985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2022.103985>
32. Rozci, F. (2024). Dampak Perubahan Iklim Terhadap Sektor Pertanian Padi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sosio Agribis*, 23(2), 108. <https://doi.org/10.30742/jisa23220233476>
33. Temizkan, R., & Yucesoy, S. (2022). Tourist Typology. In D. Buhalis (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management and Marketing* (pp. 534–537). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800377486.tourist.typology>
34. Uslu, A., Alagoz, G., & Gunes, E. (2020). Socio-cultural, Economic, and Environmental Effects of Tourism from the Point of View of the Local Community. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 11(21), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.29036/jots.v11i21.147>
35. Wardana, I. M., Sukaatmadja, I. P. G., Ekawati, N. W., Yasa, N. N. K., Astawa, I. P., & Setini, M. (2021). Policy models for improving ecotourism performance to build quality tourism experience and sustainable tourism. *Management Science Letters*, 11, 595–608. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2020.9.007>
36. Wheeler, B. A. (2022). *Traveller vs Tourist* (pp. 610–613). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800377486.traveller.vs.tourist>
37. Yoo, C.-K., Yoon, D., & Park, E. (2018). Tourist motivation: an integral approach to destination choices. *Tourism Review*, 73(2), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-04-2017-0085>
38. Yu, X., Kim, N., ChEN, C.-C., & Schwartz, Z. (2012). Are you a tourist? Tourism definition from the tourist perspective. *Tourism Analysis*, 17(4), 445–457.
39. Zamani, L., & Hardiyanto, S. (2024, July 30). Usai Diresmikan, Taman Balekambang Solo Tutup Sementara, Mengapa? *Kompas.Com*. <https://regional.kompas.com/read/2024/07/30/113716778/usai-diresmikan-taman-balekambang-solo-tutup-sementara-mengapa>

Cite this Article: Setyapermana, A.G., Haryanto, B. (2025). Tourist Identification at Surakarta City Tourist Destinations Through the Culturaltraveler Tendency Scale. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 8(4), pp. 1878-1893. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i4-35