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ABSTRACT
The number of international tourists and foreign exchange received by Indonesia shows a positive trend in the late 10 years, but it does not portray enough the real growth of intra-regional tourism destinations. It can be supposed that this growth did not follow a linear life cycle of destination due to the specific characteristics of each region and the external factors of tourism industry itself. This study intends to explain the dynamics of growth of tourism destinations based on province area in the period of 2002-2012. The analysis focuses on the shift of the destination development and its causes. It will approached by the adoption of TALC model which has been already used by the researchers before. The descriptive methods was used to interpret the macro data published by BPS. The study finds out: a) a difference of the life cycle of the most tourism destinations; b) a dynamics of up-and-down destination development; c) the unilinearity of the life cycle of tourism destination; d) the assumption difference of TALC model with the fact of the destination development phase in Indonesia. Therefore it is suggested, that: a) the real life cycle of tourism destination should be adopted as a basis for policy-making in destination development; b) a further study should be run by adding a comprehensive parameters of the destination development.
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Introduction
Indonesia is known as one of the best important tourist destinations in the Southeast Asia. It is due to the fact that the performance of tourism sector has been continuously increasing in the last 10 years. The number of foreign tourists is recorded of 5,033 million (2002) and increase to 8,044 million (2012). This trend is followed by the number of foreign exchange received from $4,305 billion (2002) to $9,120 billion (2012). Moreover, the number of domestic tourists is also significantly increasing from 225,0 million (2008) to 245,3 million (2012) with the total expenses rising from Rp. 123 quintillion to Rp. 171 quintillion (Pusdatin Kemenpar, t.t).

Nationally, this number shows positive and promising signs. The effect is also significant to the absorption of the workforce, since it is assumed that the tourism sector has high double effects (WTO, 2007; Booth, 1990). However, critical review should be given. The distribution of tourism development in each province doesn’t spread evenly, moreover in the level of tourism region. Geographically, the tourists concentration focuses in Java and Bali Island. This regard to the colonial history which made those two strategic islands as the central of economic growth of the colonized country (Lambard, 2005; Picard, 2006). Up to the present the imbalance still occurs. Even though in some provinces have a significant growth, such as North Sumatera, Riau Islands and South Sulawesi.

Other factor causes the imbalance is the low intersection among some of the provinces outside Java and Bali Island. Consequently, the tourists, especially foreign tourists, do not easily spread over the regions. This condition becomes worse by the weakness of destination management and less responsive to the shift of tourist market necessity. The government policy is often contra productive. For example, the inconsistency of politic and financial support on the development and the destination marketing has created barrier on the destination.

There has not been any study so far about the life-cycle of regional-based tourist destination. The study conducted by Putra and Hitchcock (2006) about the effect of terrorism towards the life-cycle of tourism in Bali seems to be interesting, although it only focuses on one destination, therefore it cannot be compared to another destinations. It means, the shift occurred in the growth of tourism destination in Bali is just locally and temporarily. About a decade ago, another researchers analyzed the life-cycle of region-based tourism destination in Indonesia (Sofield, 1995). It can be concluded that only Bali province records the highest rate.
This article derives from an assumption that the life-cycle of tourism destination in the province level has been changing in the past 5 - 10 years. Therefore, the dynamics occurred in the life-cycle should be reviewed more critically. The main question that should be answered is how has the dynamic of tourism destination life-cycle (read: province) been in Indonesia in the last 10 years? Which life-cycle shows stable performance and why? Based on that, the purposes of this article are a) a mapping of the development of province-based tourism destination in Indonesia using tourism area life-cycle (TALC) approach as well as to examine the validity of the approach; b) describing the shift of destination life-cycle based on certain time.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The problems discussed above using TALC model which was introduced by Butler (1980; 2006a). According to his explanation there was a similarity between the life cycle destination and the life cycle of services and commodities; it started slowly and then grew faster, continuously stable and in the end, it declined following the basic curve of asymptosis. Based on the theory the life cycle of tourism destination consists of 6 phases: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, rejuvenation or decline (Butler, 1980). Exploration phase is marked by the tourist visit aventurir or alocentric type (plog, 2001) and tourist subjects. The number of tourists are still limited. The facilities and infrastructure in this region are insufficient due to the regions that are newly found; in fact half of them are the facilities used by local people. The relation between tourists and people is close enough and the environmental and social problems are not prominent. The involvement phase is marked by the intensive contact between tourists and local people. This occurs because of the increase of tourist visit. People start to provide various facilities which are specifically designed for the tourists. Both the promotion and the tourism business division are designed and developed by the people. The social contact between the people and the tourists is marked by the economical shift which is rational. The increase on the infrastructural needs makes the government and the local people involve to provide or improve transportation and other facilities for tourists (Butler, 1980: 8). The support and government interest to grow tourism destination become stronger. The next is development phase which is marked by “a well-defined tourist market area, shaped in part by heavy advertising in tourist-generating areas” (Butler, 1980: 8). Tourist market becomes systemized and mass tourism. On the peak season, the number of tourists is more than the local people, the diversities of attraction, the tourist destination management and tourism organization develop increasingly based on the investment volume from private sector. For example, the use of attraction based on nature and culture which is done intensively and it influences the physically features of the region. This is followed by the development of artificial attraction in which its physical component and managerial are derived from another regions or countries. The promotion activity is done intensively; thus, the quality of the facility grows better and base on international standard. The shift on the physical features of the regions are urgently required because of the growth of the attraction is very prominent and it usually neglected by the local communities.

On the consolidation phase, the growth level of tourist starts to decline, even though in number it increases. The most prominent thing occurs in the people’s economic activity is dominated by tourism. Business unit, organizations form, business with foreign license, intra partnership model and government regulation become the business reference. The collaboration between institutions grows based on the same interest and its format becomes more complex (Haywood, 2006). Butler called it institutionalism. Apart from that, the high number of visitors and the growth of the facilities which are based on the needs of the visitors mostly disregard the needs of the local people themselves. As the consequences, people’s refusal and negative sentiment from people toward tourism will rise. They
tend to act anti pathetically because they consider tourism as something that limit their space and access toward public facilities which in fact are their own right (Johnston & Snepenger, 2005). This negative reaction is comprehended as one of the social, economic and cultural effect of the tourism growth (Marois & Hinch, 2005) which is very crucial regardless the management of tourism destination.

On the stagnation phase, the tourism growth is similar to the previous. Nevertheless, the numbers of tourists are the tourism business industry has been maximized on certain stage, the carrying capacity of the destination is abundant, thus gives bad effect to the environment social, and economic. For example, the positive impression towards the tourism destination fades away slowly although the number of repeater is still the same. Commonly, the features of the tourism destination are artificial. This is one of the reasons to make improvement physically outside the region. Butler stated that the type of tourists who visits on this stage is a mass and organized tourists as identified by Cohen (1979) or it is psycho centric tourists as described by Plog (2001).

After reaching the stagnation phase, the tourism destination deals with two possibilities, they are decline and rejuvenation phase. The characteristic of these phases are the tourists usually leave the region, except for the weekend, the tourism business management is organized intensively. Some of tourism facilities change into public facilities non-tourism and local people have the opportunity to buy property with low cost. As the result, the region has becomes uninteresting for the tourists. In extreme case, the region can change into slum area and lose its main function. The second possibility is rejuvenation which is done innovatively. For example: changing the function of the region finding new tourism market, making new marketing strategy, or shifting tourism attraction into new form.

As Butler stated that TALC is used to describe "the process of the development of tourists destinations in a wide variety of settings" (Butler, 2011: 3). It issued on only focus on micro locus, for example museum as an attraction unit in the city, but also as a wider space such as tourism strategic area, region or province (Butler, 2006b). The researchers have been applied this model as the basic analysis with single and small scale as Niagara Falls (Getz, 1992), tourist resolve (Andriotis, 2010) or industrial tourism area (Kamat, 2010), and also national park (Bo & Zhang, 2006; Boyd, johnston & Snepenger, 2006). In Indonesia, the first study on TALC application was conducted by Sofield (1995) who portrayed the life cycle of tourism in each province in Indonesia, but his analysis is only focus on the indicator of the tourists' number. TALC model is also used as the basic analysis toward Lake Toba tourist objects and shows the differentiation of the growth stage based on attraction indicator or tourism market (Lumbaraja, 2012).

One of the weakness of TALC model is the assumption that the growth of tourism destination whether in micro, meso or macro level occurs linear. For example, in Bali Putra and Hitchcock (2006) found something different. One of the fact was that Bali bombing created political flare which continuously made the growth of tourism in Bali did not reach consolidation phase. The second, weaknesses is the life cycle indicator while is used to TALC.

RESEARCH METHOD

The data used in this study is macro data which was taken from Badan Pusat Statistik (www.bps.go.id). This data consists of the number of domestic and foreign tourists, the number of star and non-star hotel and the length of stay in each provinces in a year. All the data is more complete compared to assumptive data which was used by Butler in the orally of TALC.

Below are the methods of the study. First, the number of hotel, (jh) and the length of stay (Los) in each province in the in period of 2002 - 2012 were gathered into 6 groups. On the other hand, the number of tourist (jw) in each province was counted from the period of 2003 - 2012 because in 2002 we couldn’t find these characteristics which were similar to the previous. These 6 groups were the representation of the life cycle tourism destination phases. Group interval was determined by counting the highest number of the tourists (jw) minus the lowest number of tourist (jw) divided by 5 or ((jw) - (jw))/6. The first group is (jw) and ((jw) + (i)). The same process was the same until 6 groups were formed, each group value 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. This procedure was also to determine the interval (i) on jh, that is by counting the sum of the most (jhb) and the fewest hotel (jhs). Then, (jhb) minus (jhs) divided by 6 or ((jhb) - (jhs))/6. Therefore, the first group is (jhb) until (jhs) + (i)). It continues on until 6 groups are formed, each has value 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

Second, scoring group of tourist number variable (jw) is 40 percent, hotel number variable (jh) and Los is 30 percent each. Higher score on variable (jw) based on expert judgment and assumption, that tourist number is a main indicator of area life cycle (Butler, 2006b). Next, each variable of group score is multiplied by variable score. Score calculation of tourist number is in the following:

1x40; 2x40; ..., 6x40, while the score of hotel number and Los is 1x30; 2x30; ..., 6x30.
Third, the combination of total score calculation on variable (stv) = ((w + Jh − LoS) each province in 2003 and in 2012 for tourist number and 2002 − 2012 for hotel number and LoS. The result was categorized into 6 classes. The interval (i) was determined by counting the total score of the highest variable (stv.t) minus the total score of the lowest variable (stv.r) divided by 6 or \( \frac{(stv.t) - (stv.r)}{6} \). So, first group (i) is \( (stv.t) - (stv.r) + (i) \). The groups of 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were counted by the same way. The province received the score of group 1 was classified into destination class on exploration phase, the province gained the score of group 3 was classified into development phase, the province gained the score of group 4 is classified into consolidation phase, the province gained the score of group 5 was classified into the stagnation phase, the province gained the score of group 6 was classified in rejuvenation or decline.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Tourism destination development in Indonesia based on provinces were significantly varied. The difference occurred as the result of province area expansion (Banten, Gorontalo, West Sulawesi, West Papua, Bangka, Belitung, Riau Islands, North Maluku) which automatically decreasing the number of tourists in the main province in 2012. With the exception of the factor, this study found fairly interesting fact in the context of TALC, among of them was the variation of destination life cycle development phase.

Stagnant Exploration Phase

In the period of 10 years, it was proven that it was not enough to change the life cycle of number of tourism destination in Indonesia. In 2002, West Sumatera, Jambi, Lampung, West Kalimantan and Papua were at exploration phase, recorded since in the next 10 years, everything was still at the same position. One of factors assumed to be the cause was attraction variation. The development of units or variety of tourist attraction in those provinces was quantitatively slow. In West Sumatera there had been international scale tourist attraction, Tour de Singkarak, but the effect to attract numbers of tourists was not strong enough. Local-national scale festival event, such as Krakatau Festival (Lampung) since 1990s, Muara Jambi Temple Festival (Jambi), Malay Arts and Culture Festival (West Kalimantan), Dayak Arts and Culture Festival (Central Kalimantan), Erau Festival (East Kalimantan), Lake Sentani Festival (Papua) apparently have not attracted international market effectively, so that the impact towards accommodation growth and tourists' length of stay was less.

Interesting fact was also shown in the life cycle of South Sumatera and Maluku moving from exploration phase to involvement phase. Both provinces, actually, were not categorized as popular destination to tourists nor offered so many attractions. However, national and international events (PON and SEA Games) as well as MTQN Maluku was assumed to provide significant contribution for the development of the destination.

Dynamic of Involvement Phase

Dynamic cycle occurred in the involvement phase. There were three dynamic patterns in this phase. First, a number of destinations (Aceh, Bengkulu, NTT, Sultra, Sulteng, and Sulut) set back from involvement phase (2002) into exploration phase (2012) (see figure 2 and 3). Apparently, it was difficult to debate that these provinces, probably an exception for North Sumatera province, were less expansive in the infrastructure development and the destination promotion both in domestic area and overseas. A little surprise that destination life-cycle in North Sumatera has been setting back for the last 10 years. It was difficult to explain why deterioration occurred. The expansion of Gorontalo province didn’t seem to be the appropriate reason since tourism development in this province was considered to be insignificant. Besides, North Sumatera province has been known for a long time as one of important destination for its natural attraction and culture. The regular performance of Sail Bunaken and Tomohon International Flower Festival seemed to be unable yet to increase the visitation of both international and inter-island of domestic tourists. Almost the same as Bengkulu province, it must be admitted that this region, factually, has not been a part of strategic area in the national tourism map. Aside from potential beaches as attractions, national politics support for the destination development has not been so significant.

Aceh and Central Sulawesi province were facing negative impression problem from global world resulted from the insecurity issue, so that support for tourism development was not maximum. Generally, tourism development is not in a priority scale in both regions. The long effect of tsunami in 2004 was seemingly to be strong enough toward the deterioration of tourism development in Aceh as well. East Nusa Tenggara province had a huge opportunity following the next life-cycle positively due to ecotourism destination promotion through an event Sail Komodo. Nevertheless, limited accessibility became an obstacle to move positively to a higher phase. Moreover, nature-based attraction, which was main in this province, inflicted segmented
tourist market to eco tourists (Walpole & Goodwin, 2000). One of eco tourist characteristics is they are in a small group (Hoskins, 2002). As a consequence, the number of tourists is relatively small. Less supporting condition of land and sea transportation infrastructure has a role in the life-cycle deterioration of strategic destination.

Second, in 2012 West Nusa Tenggara province stood at the same position as that in 2002. Actually, hotel infrastructure growth was sufficient, supported by the opening of international airport, yet the growth of tourist number was not as rapid as other region, for example Bali. Other factor, which was considered as to have a role behind the fact, was the development of concentrated tourism region in Lombok Island, specially in the region of Senggigi Beach, Gili Air, Gili Meno and Gili Trawangan. Almost the same as East Nusa Tenggara, specially Flores Island, the tourist segment coming to the region was special tourism tourists so that the number was qualitatively limited. Physical development in tourism centre region in small islands began to be seemingly so bored that the development orientation was leading to the southern part of the island of "million mosques".

Third, on the other side, North Sumatera province moved positively from involvement phase (2002) to development phase (2012). It means, cyclical movement received by the province with rapid economic growth relates to its status as the gate of international tourists, especially from Malaysia. As written by Butler (1980; 2006a) involvement phase was signified by the increasing of infrastructure improvement. The same thing occurred in some provinces (Aceh after tsunami). In West Nusa Tenggara province, especially Lombok Island, international airport was built at different location from the former one and spent almost Rp. 1 trillion. In Kuta Beach area, Southern Lombok, international investment chain/hotel resorts were also established since mid of 2000. Regarding positive life-cycle of destination, South Kalimantan province apparently related to the increasing of tourist number, especially foreign tourists, to conservation area Tanjung Puting. Ecotourism has long become an "icon" for environment lover and gained global world attention.

Dyetomyc Development Phase
Life-cycle occurred at two different destinations in development phase. In 2002 Jakarta and South Sulawesi province were in this life-cycle phase. Yet 10 years later the city moved forward to the next phase, consolidation, while South Sulawesi moving backwards into involvement phase. Why was it so? The rapid growth of tourism infrastructure, variety and intensity of the event was high, and the position of Jakarta as the capital of which was becoming a hub once the gates of in and out international tourists could be seen as a reason why the life cycle motion of these destinations was leading to a positive-vertical. Nevertheless, the cycle that moved from the development phase to the consolidation was actually "slow", considering the capital was almost never vacuum of diverse cultural, economic and political even throughout the year. We can assume that the development of tourism infrastructure shifted from the center of the nation's
economic growth to the periphery area, namely Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi. In contrast, South Sulawesi Province faced the effects of the province division by the emerging of West Sulawesi that "broke up" both hotel distribution and the number of tourists in 2012. The entrance of international tourists to Tana Toraja was not completely through Makassar, but directly toward the capital of the new province. Other factors thought to relate to tourism development pattern concentrated around Makassar which actually began to feel bored. Both provinces had left the development phase leading to different directions and in dyctomic pattern as well as showed that the trend of the national tourism destination development was not much in progress.

**Involuntively Consolidation Phase?**

In the last 10 years there has been a sight that none of the provinces recorded a positive-vertical life-cycle. Figure 2 and 3 above explicitly illustrate this point. Central Java and Yogyakarta, which had been in a consolidation phase in 2002, did not shift to the next level of growth (stagnation) in 2012. Did it represent an involuntively development, that is the development characterized by the dynamics of static growth in number of tourists, attractions, accommodations and length of stay? The answer, it might be so if we considered the LoS factor in general. Yogyakarta, for example, recorded the growing of domestic tourist in significant numbers, but in the contrary, the number of foreign tourists was still far behind. Construction of hotel infrastructure continued and even the construction of international airport had been planned since 5 years ago. In addition, the average LoS of tourists was relatively short, still in the range of 2 nights. This situation had been running for a long time, despite various promotional efforts intensively performed. Evolving discourse raised "second destination after Jakarta or Bali" factor as a cause of low LoS in DIY. This means that tourists chose this destination not as the major destination, but rather be the second or even third after Bali. Not extensive territory and reliable transportation infrastructure made available tourist attractions could be reached easily, quickly, and inexpensively. This also resulted that tourists generally did not spend a long time in this special destination labeled.

Involuntifly character was also traced in Central Java. The segment of tourist market here was domestic tourists who did a fairly intensive motion from one destination to another destination and relatively limited in the short time (Damanik & Cemporaningish, 2012). Quantitatively additional number of hotels occurred over the years in various cities, particularly in Solo, Magelang, and Purwokerto, and many cultural attractions continued to be promoted in different cities. However, it should be noted that generally society antagonism symptoms, as assumed by Butler, had not emerged in this phase. It is interesting to note that Riau province was not part of the consolidation involutif above.

Instead it suffered a vertically-negative cycle of consolidation phase in 2002 to involvement phase 2012 (see Figure 2 & 3). The degree of deterioration dived deeply for passing one level, the development phase. This was the only destination that suffered from extreme stepping back cycle. The most likely cause was the expansion factor (Riau Islands Province). The main tourism area that once united in one province, then integrated under the new province. Batam and Bintan Island were the center of tourism's rapid economic growth was no longer a part of Riau Province. Riau mainland itself relatively does not have a lot of tourism resources, so that the development of tourism back to the zero point after the division of the province.

**Weak Stagnation**

The life cycle of tourism destinations at stagnation phase was very weak or slow. This could be seen from the absence of provincial tourism destinations experiencing vertical-positive shift (forward) and vertical-negative (backward). East Java Province was the only destination in the stagnation phase in 2002. That was, compared to other provinces, besides Bali and West Java, at that time the tourism development in East Java was high. The same conditions persisted until 2012. During the 10 years tourism in East Java moved slowly, not backward but also did not record a drastic change. We can interpret this by seeing the well established tourism area (Batu / Malang, TN Baluran, Meru Betiri, TN Blambangan, Pasir Puthih, and others). Some cities also hold regular events, such as Banyuwangi Festival, Jember Carnival Festival, besides a variety of cultural and tourism events in the city of Surabaya itself. Mass tourism format that characterizes this phase represented by the presence of Jatim Park which attract a lot of domestic tourists. Regional scale events (ASEAN Tourism Forum) held in 2012, can be seen as part of the effort to maintain the development of local tourism status. In short, the existence of the only destination on stagnation cycle has shown the development of tourism destination level for 10 years in Indonesia is relatively weak in general.
Stable Rejuvenation

Stable rejuvenation phase is attached to Bali and West Java Province, because the position of destination life-cycle has not declined over the next 10 years. Tourism in Bali was once greatly disrupted after the Bali bombing (Putra & Hitchcock, 2006), yet the turbulence was only relatively short in duration. Rapid promotion through a number of international scale MICEs, among others were PATA Congress (2003) and the World Geothermal Congress (2010), had accelerated the recovery. Outstanding characteristic in stable destinations was growing accommodation infrastructure of villas owned by outside investors and numbers of tourists continue to grow. Data showed that Bali domination as a national-international tourism destination has not been replaced by other. Another important indicator is the development of artificial attraction is quite prominent. Some ecotourism-based amusement parks, such as Bali Park, present as an additional attraction that previously fairly limited (Arida & Damanik, 2012). Stable rejuvenation phase also occurred in tourism destinations in West Java as a result of the tourism infrastructure development in Bandung, Puncak-Cianjur, Bogor, Depok, Bekasi, Pangandaran, Pelabuhan Ratu, Ciamis, Garut, and others. The existence of artificial tourist attractions, among others are TMII, Taman Safari, Cister, Trans Studio, making domestic tourists influx to the region. Bandung and Puncak-Cianjur area, for example, are always full (and jammed) by the arrival of domestic tourists. In recent years, Bandung has also become attractive destinations for Malaysia tourists facilitated by direct flights to and from the capital. This also causes the life cycle of both destinations has not entered into the decline phase. One thing to note is fact, that characteristics of mass tourism destination brisk development growth undergoing rejuvenation cycle. This fact is in contrast to what is assumed by Butler in the TALC.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study provides a critical interpretation on quantitative data about the development of tourism in all provinces for 10 years. TALC models used in the study turned out to have limitations, particularly for photographing the life-cycle of provincial locus-based destination. Nevertheless, by focusing on the above analysis, the study comes to the following conclusions:
1. The life cycle of Indonesian tourism destinations vary each province due to the development background, the changes in region scope, and the intensity and sustainability of the tourism attraction events;
2. Contrary to the assumptions in TALC model, the life cycle of one or several of Indonesia's tourism destinations are not always positive-vertical, but also negative-vertical but also caused by political events and natural;
3. Different assumptions in TALC model, the life cycle of most of Indonesia tourism destination does not shift or "stationer" in the exploratory phase, although spent up to 10 years of time;
4. The "stationer" life-cycle experienced by the majority of tourism destination in Indonesia at the time at one of those six development phase;
5. Effect of infrastructure and tourism promotion development toward the life-cycle motion of different destinations depending on the destination development phase; the effect on the exploration phase is relatively weak, while in the development phase is relatively strong.

There are three recommendations that need to be addressed as the analysis implications and conclusions above. First, the planners at province and central levels should use the life cycle reality of each destination as the basis of policy formulation destination development, both in the supply and strengthening of both infrastructure and increasing promotion. This will facilitate the monitoring actions of development and measurement received at one specific time period. The second, more comprehensive study about the life cycle of tourism destinations need to be done by: a) adding development indicators, such as the proportion of local residents to work in the tourism sector, the proportion of tourism investment volume and types of tourism institutional; b) the timeframe referred to as the destination development duration, for example 20, 25 or 30 years. Parameters completeness will be able to capture more accurately the destination life-cycle in the future. ***
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