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Abstract
The purpose of this study was to reveal the travel preferences of domestic tourists post-covid-19 pandemics. Data was collected through questionnaires using purposive random sampling. The respondents were 300 people ranged from 17 to 55 years old. Besides surveys, data was obtained through literature studies. It is analyzed using quantitative descriptive analysis. The analysis of tourist characteristics showed most of the age group travel in post-pandemic ranged from 26-45 years old. Observed from gender, as much as 52.2% of female tourists were dominating this criterion. In education level, the majority are undergraduates (49.1%). Based on region, majority of tourist come from Bali (54 %). Private employees dominate as much as 38.07%. The results showed that most respondents made regular trips 1 to 5 times a year (90.5%). They chose to travel immediately after the pandemic, which was between 1-3-month (35.7%). Finances and travel costs were very important concerns for almost 71.3% of tourists. As much as 63.3% of tourist chose to travel with a partner and airplane were the main choice (71%). They prefer cheap homestays rather than expensive hotels (48.6%). The type of tourism chosen were dominated by nature tourism (58.7%). Most tourists preferred to arrange their own trips than the other option (47.7%). It is expected that the results will become a consideration for tourism industry managers to determine the right products and services based on tourists’ preferences who will come in post-pandemic.
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INTRODUCTION
Observed from the development of Indonesia’s services balance, travel services have consistently shown positive contributions to this service with increasing value. In 2017, it was confirmed as much as USD 4.23 billion, which was higher than USD 3.64 billion in 2016. This is because the value of exports is greater than imports of travel services. Exports of USD 12.52 billion and imports of USD 8.29 billion revealed that the revenue of travel services from foreign tourists to Indonesia is greater than the excursions of Indonesian tourists abroad. Observed from the trend of service balance, the tourism service surplus has continued to increase over the past five years. Based on the publications of Bank Indonesia, this growth was because of an increase in services related to personal, cultural, and recreational services. Additionally, increase in the quality, quantity, and market expansion of passenger transportation services by resident business actors also effect this growth.
The following is a table of visits by foreign tourists, earning foreign exchange and spending per person.

**Table 1.** Foreign Tourist Visit, Foreign Exchange Earnings and Expenditure Per Person 2012-2017

| Year | Foreign Tourist Total (million USD) | Growth (%) | Average length of stay (days) | Foreign Exchange Earning Total (million USD) | Growth (%) | Per day (USD) | Per visit (USD) |
|------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|
| 2012 | 8,004,462                         | 5.16       | 7.7                           | 9,121                                       | 6.82       | 147.22        | 1,134          |
| 2013 | 8,802,129                         | 9.97       | 7.65                          | 10,054                                      | 10.23      | 149.31        | 1,142          |
| 2014 | 9,435,411                         | 7.19       | 7.66                          | 11,166                                      | 11.06      | 154.42        | 1,183          |
| 2015 | 10,406,759                        | 10.29      | 8.53                          | 12,226                                      | 9.49       | 141.65        | 1,209          |
| 2016 | 12,023,971                        | 15.54      | 8.39                          | 12,440                                      | 1.75       | 131.64        | 1,104          |
| 2017 | 14,39,799                          | 16.77      | 8.7                           | 15,240                                      | 22.51      | 1,201         |

*Source: ministry of tourism, 2018*

Viewed from the expenditure structure, most of the expenditure spent on hotels and accommodation was (4%), followed by restaurants (20%), and domestic transportation (13%), while the other is for tourism services and souvenirs.

The following is the data on domestic tourists which shows significant trend. It illustrated 250 million trips in 2013 which increased to 270 million in 2017. This was by reason of the development of the consumption pattern of the millennial generation desired to organize more travel than others, besides the effect of the improving economic conditions. In addition, the total expenditure was also increased from 177 trillion rupiah in 2013 to 253 trillion rupiah in 2017.

*Source: Ministry of Tourism, BPS, 2017*

**Figure 1.** Number of Trips and Expenses of Indonesian Tourists 2013-2017

However, travel activities in Indonesia, especially Bali, must stop in 2020 because of COVID-19 outbreak, which began spreading in Indonesia since February 2020. It was
followed by a state ban for citizens to travel abroad, including Bali. As a result of this, hotel occupancy decreased by 60 to 80%. The following is the data on foreign tourist visits to Bali in 2020.
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*Figure 1. Number of Trips and Expenses of Indonesian Tourists 2013-2017*

This condition results in the closure of thousands of hotels in Indonesia, including Bali and thousands of employees are put on furlough. The economy of the Balinese people has been greatly affected including the consumption patterns. Routines and expenses are selected for primary desires (the need for food and health products) compared to the need for extravagance chattels including travelling.

In the tourism sector, the pathway to new normal is to prepare various aspects. In Indonesia, it was declared by government based on the decree of the Minister of Home Affairs no 440-840 2020 on 27th May 2020. It is concerning guidelines for the new normal order productive and safe from Covid -19 for civil servant in the ministry of Home affairs and Regional Governments. It arranges health services, outdoor activities, workplace, educational services, business trip, event, and public transportation. The context of tourism becomes quality for the environment and health. Visitors will validate the condition of the tourism spot, whether there is already a systemized mitigation at the tourist spot, SOP or system that limits visitors to tourist attractions, is the visitor's health guaranteed, will the visitors safety guaranteed etc.

From this background, the author is interested in raising the issue of what are the travel preferences of domestic tourists in post-pandemic? This study aims to analyze the travel preferences of domestic tourists in post-pandemic. The theories that support this research are:
Tourist Motivation

This research used theory proposed by Ryan (1991) regarding factors driving a person to travel. This theory was chosen because the option of tourism activities determined by tourist motivation. It explained the tourist's drive which influence the types of tourism facilities, types of activities, cost, companion and transportation. Various factors driving a person to travel according to Ryan (1991) explained as follows:

1. Escape. The desire to escape from an environment that feels mind-numbing, or boredom from daily work.

2. Relaxation. The desire for nourishment, which is also related to the motivation to escape above.

3. Play. The desire to relish the joy through innumerable games which are the reappearance of childishness, and desire to disengage from glitches.

4. Strengthening family bond. The desire to strengthen kinship, especially in the context of visiting friends and relatives. Usually this tour is done together (group).

5. Prestige. The desire to show prestige by visiting a destination that shows class and lifestyle which is an encouragement to increase status or social standing.

6. Social interaction. The desire to comprise in social interactions with colleagues or with the local communities.

7. Romance. The desire to meet people who can provide a romantic atmosphere or to fulfill sexual desires.

8. Educational opportunities. The desire to perceive something new, study other people, other areas or to know other ethnic cultures. This is the dominant drive in tourism.

9. Self-fulfillment. The desire to replicate on ourselves because self-examination can usually be found when we experience new atmosphere.

10. Wish-fulfillment. The desire to realize dreams by savings money with the intention of travelling. This is very clear in the religious journey as part of a strong desire or impulse from within.

Preference

According to Kotler (2000) consumer preferences indicate consumer preferences from a wide selection of existing service products. Preference is a fondness (inclination of the heart) to something. Preference is also defined as the choice of whether someone likes or dislikes a product. Meanwhile, according to Indarto (2011) consumer preferences are defined as subjective (individual) tastes, as measured by utility from various goods. Various attributes such as quality, price, promotion, and packaging attached to the product can affect consumer preferences.
RESEARCH METHOD
The object of this research is people planned a tour regardless of their travel history. Data were collected using survey. Research instruments used was questionnaires. In addition, this research also collects data through literature study using literature or documents published by other parties. Respondents are individuals who answered a questionnaire consisting of three hundred respondents collected within a period of three months (May - July 2020). The sampling technique used was purposive random sampling. It is a sampling technique with certain considerations to achieve data which can represent the population (Sugiyono, 2010). This study consisted of quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data is data in form of tourist visits to certain region in Indonesia, meanwhile, qualitative data is in form of descriptions or information regarding the conditions of tourism in Bali and other area in Indonesia. This research used primary data, obtained through the results of distributing questionnaires to respondents spread across several regions in Indonesia, namely East Java, West Java, DKI Jakarta, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Papua, East Nusa Tenggara and West Nusa Tenggara. Meanwhile, secondary data was the data used and published by non-processing organizations (Sangaji and Sopiah, 2010), including data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, the tourism office, and the results of previous studies. The data analysis applied was quantitative descriptive analysis, which is done by classifying a variable data based on their respective groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The characteristics of domestic tourists who became respondents were observed from their age, gender, occupation/type of work and area of origin. From Table 2 can be concluded that most of the age group decided to travel after the pandemic were the majority of 26-45 age group. It was supported by Ryan and Houston (2000) which found that in Northern Australia age influenced preference. Younger age tends to be more adventurous. In terms of gender, domestic tourists are dominated by female tourists at 52.2% compared to male tourists who are only 47.8%. In the level of education, most of the population who travel is the bachelor’s degree (49.1%). This can be the basis for preparing appropriate information services according to the level of education of tourists, including tour guides who have competencies in accordance with the level of tourist education. In region of origin, the majority group originates from the Bali (54%). Most domestic tourists who will carry out their travels come from private workers at 38.07%. Thus, the management of tourist destinations needs to pay attention to the forms of tourist activities that become interest to workers and students.
Table 2. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Domestic Tourists

| No. | Respondent Profile | Category | Percentage |
|-----|--------------------|----------|------------|
| 1   | Age group          |          |            |
|     | 17-25 years        |          | 28.6%      |
|     | 26 - 36 years      |          | 8.8%       |
|     | 37 - 45 years      |          | 15.17%     |
|     | > 45 years         |          |            |
| 2   | Gender             | Male     | 47.8%      |
|     | Female             |          | 52.2%      |
| 3   | Education level    | High school | 7.0%       |
|     | Diploma            |          | 29.0%      |
|     | Bachelor           |          | 49.1%      |
|     | Masters            |          | 12.1%      |
|     | Doctoral           |          | 2.8%       |
| 4   | Area of origin     | Bali     | 54.0%      |
|     | East Java          |          | 6.7%       |
|     | Central Java       |          | 3.0%       |
|     | West Java          |          | 4.7%       |
|     | DKI Jakarta        |          | 4.7%       |
|     | Sumatra            |          | 2.0%       |
|     | Sulawesi           |          | 2.0%       |
|     | Kalimantan         |          | 5.0%       |
|     | NTT                |          | 9.0%       |
|     | NTB                |          | 4.0%       |
|     | Papua              |          | 4.7%       |
| 5   | Occupation/Types of work | Students | 26.6%       |
|     | Civil servants     |          | 3.2%       |
|     | Private employees  |          | 38.7%      |
|     | Entrepreneur       |          | 29.9%      |
|     | Etc                |          | 1.6%       |

Source: analysis results, 2020

The table below are the results of the discussion regarding the preferences of domestic tourists in traveling seen from various indicator: They are Trip intensity, Destination, Cost consideration and Trip arrangement.

Table 3. Trips Intensity

| No | Trips’ frequency | Percentage |
|----|------------------|------------|
| 1  | 1-5 times        | 90.6%      |
| 2  | 6-10 times       | 4.7%       |
| 3  | More than 10 times | 4.7%     |

Most of the respondents made regular trips 1 to 5 times a year, namely 90.5%. This shows that most respondents have quite high habits, needs and intensity to travel within one year.

Table 4. Destination

| No | Area/Region | Percentage |
|----|-------------|------------|
| 1  | Bali        | 41%        |
| 2  | Java        | 17%        |
| 3  | Sumatra     | 2.8%       |
| 4  | Kalimantan  | 3%         |
| 5  | NTT         | 4.7%       |
| 6  | NTT         | 21%        |
From this table, Bali is the most planned place to be visited in the new normal era, which is 41 percent. People tend to stay within their countries for travel. People are more likely to stay within their countries on vacation travel, and larger families with young children are particularly likely to travel short distances. Thus, a country's tourism industry would do well to aggressively market tourism products to retain citizens of its own country (Lamondia, 2010).

Table 5. Cost Consideration

| No | Indicator          | Percentage |
|----|-------------------|------------|
| 1  | Very Important    | 71.3%      |
| 2  | Important         | 26%        |
| 3  | Less Important    | 2.7%       |

Financial considerations and travel costs are high priority concern for almost all tourists. This is evidenced with as much as 71.3% still realize price as the main consideration in post-pandemic travel. This is supported by Truonga and Shimizu (2017) which revealed that cost is a major consideration determining the demand for a destination.

Table 6. Trip Arrangement

| No | Indicator                                | Percentage |
|----|------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1  | Companion:                               |            |
|    | - Alone                                  | 11.75%     |
|    | - Couple                                 | 63.3%      |
|    | - Family/relatives                       | 22%        |
|    | - Social Community                       | 3%         |
| 2  | Mode of transportation:                  | 15%        |
|    | - Personal vehicle                       |            |
|    | - Travel transportation                  | 14%        |
|    | - Plane                                  | 71%        |
| 3  | Accommodation                            | 48.6%      |
|    | - Cheap homestay                         |            |
|    | - 3 stars hotel                          | 31.9%      |
|    | - 4 stars hotel                          | 15.2%      |
|    | - 5 stars hotel                          | 4.3%       |
| 4  | Tour Types                               | 58.7%      |
|    | - Nature tourism                         |            |
|    | - Adventure tourism                      | 13.7%      |
|    | - Marine tourism                         | 11.2%      |
|    | - Shopping Tourism                       | 9.1%       |
|    | - Pilgrimage Tourism                     | 7.3%       |
| 5  | Source of Purchase packages / types of tours | 21.9%   |
|    | - Online travel agent                    |            |
|    | - Offline travel agent                   | 30.4%      |
|    | - Self -arranged travel                  | 47.7%      |

As much as 63.3% of tourists preferred to travel with a partner (husband / wife / girlfriend). 71 % of people prefer to choose airplanes for transportation. In general, a tourist
destination’s accessibility can also be improved by developing the transportation, infrastructure network or by improving connectivity between the network and tourist facilities. For example, the distance from a tourist’s place of origin to the desired destination can be diminished by adding a direct link between the two locations within the transportation network (Truonga and Shimizu, 2017). In terms of accommodation, cheap homestays are the main choice, namely 48.6%. In terms of tourism activity, 58.7% chose natural tourism such as enjoying the beauty of nature, the sea, mountains, and activities in the open air. This is conformable with the research of Lamondia (2010) which revealed that many travelers look forward to visiting national parks and nature reserves on holiday. As a result, these travelers are significantly more likely to travel to countries that have large land areas. Most of the tourists choose to arrange their own trips including tickets, accommodation, restaurants, and transportation services in the tourist destination (47.7%).

CONCLUSIONS

From the results and discussion in the previous chapter, there are some conclusions drawn regarding the preferences of Indonesian tourists in post-pandemic tourism. Most of the respondents travel regularly 1 to 5 times a year, namely 90.5%. Tourist thinks that finances and travel costs are very important concerns for almost all tourists where 71.3% still consider price as a major consideration in post-pandemic travel. In term of companion, as much as 63.3% of tourists chose to travel with a partner and they preferred to use airplanes for the best transportation (71%). In terms of accommodation, cheap homestays are the main choice, namely 48.6%. Tourist preferred to conduct their travel in open air. This was shown in high figure namely 58.7% of tourist choose natural tourism such as enjoying the beauty of nature, the sea, mountains, and outdoor activities. In the arrangement, as much as 47.7% of tourists choose to arrange their own trips, including tickets, accommodation, restaurants, and transportation services in tourist destinations.

It can be suggested that this research can be a reference for tourism industry managers to anticipate the arrival of tourists in post pandemic and become a reference in an effort to meet the needs of tourists according to tourist preferences, in particular preparing the type of accommodation, the type of tourist favored, and the appropriate price.
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