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Abstract
Purpose: This study aims to analyze tourist return intention through destination attribute (attraction, accessibility, and amenities), promotion, and destination image mediated by tourist satisfaction.

Research methods: The study used 410 respondents who were domestic tourists who had visited Borobudur Temple using purposive sampling. The Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Model (PLS-SEM) is used to test hypotheses.

Results and discussions: All hypotheses are accepted, that the attributes of the destination (attraction, accessibility, and amenities), promotion, and destination image significantly influence on tourist return intention mediated by tourist satisfaction.

Conclusion: It is necessary to improve the quality of destination attributes at Borobudur Temple, promoting not only international tourists but also domestic tourists.
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INTRODUCTION
The tourism sector is currently one of the largest and fastest growing sectors in the global economy (Mahbubani, 2013). In fact, the competitiveness of the tourism sector especially in Indonesia continues to increase (BPS RI, 2018). The number of trips made by domestic tourists during 2018 reached 303 million trips, an increase of 12.37 percent compared to 2017 trips. This increase is considered a result of relatively improved economy and easier accessibility to tourist destinations throughout Indonesia (BPS RI, 2018).

However, despite the increasing number of domestic tourists visiting domestic destinations in Indonesia, domestic tourists prefer to go abroad. By 2019 there had been a record breaking of 10 million domestic tourists who go abroad (Patriella, 2019). Supported by Azril Azahari’s statement, Chairperson of the Indonesian Tourism Intellectuals Association (ICPI), the trend of increasing domestic tourist arrivals abroad might be influenced by the rising airline prices for domestic routes, so domestic tourists preferred to go abroad with relatively affordable airline price (Bahar, 2019).

Specifically, this study will focus on one of the destinations of domestic tourists, Borobudur Temple. It shows that most domestic tourists visit Borobudur Temple only once
(Pranowo, 2019). This might also be caused by the low satisfaction of domestic tourists in visiting Borobudur Temple, because satisfied customers will usually be willing to make another visit in the future. In line with the statement of Kotler & Keller (2012) that one way to retain customers is to create customer satisfaction, which in the scope of tourism is tourist satisfaction.

As stated in the Annual Report of PT TWC Borobudur, Prambanan and Ratu Boko 2018, that the main obstacle in achieving the targeted number of tourists is the lack of innovation in tourism objects. In fact, the success of developing tourist destinations is to maximize the destination attributes of tourism through 3A’s (Attraction, Accessibility, Amenities) (Yahya, 2019). Attraction is an attractive factor for tourist destinations that can invite tourists to visit (Pantiyasa, et al., 2018). Added, the Marketing Director of PT TWC Borobudur, Prambanan and Ratu Boko, Siahaan (2017) mentioned about accessibility factor. Supported by the statement of the Governor of Central Java, Pranowo (2018), one of the causes of the lack of facilities in supporting tourists who attend the event held at Borobudur Temple in terms of accessibility. According to Setyanto & Pangestuti (2019), accessibility requirements are the availability of public transportation, easy access where destinations must be easily found and reached and road conditions along the road to tourist destinations. Finally, amenity is a supporting element in tourism activities that allows tourists to enjoy tourist visits and provide comfort during their visit (Suharto, 2016).

In addition, lack of promotion is a factor that causes Borobudur Temple to be visited less by tourists (Pitana, 2016). With the promotion available, potential tourists can easily see, compare, and choose the destination they want to visit (Lai & Vinh, 2012), the impact can increase awareness of potential tourists to visit the destination being promoted (Melania & Ellyawati, 2018).

Besides being a cultural tourism destination, Borobudur Temple also attracts domestic tourists for the sanctity of the temple, which is a special influence factor for domestic tourists to visit Borobudur Temple. However, for tourists who have visited the temple, the sanctity of Borobudur Temple is no longer a special factor that distinguishes Borobudur from other tourist destinations (Hermawan, et al., 2016). Therefore, it is important that a tourist attraction has a destination image that can distinguish it from other destinations (Ksouri, et.al., 2015). Moreover, the destination image is very important in influencing tourist decisions in choosing a destination to visit (Zhang, Xu, Leung, & Cai, 2016) can also attract visitors for a repeat visit (Khansa & Farida, 2016). This is important because if tourists can build a positive destination image in their minds, then they will most likely visit the destination again (Stylos, et al., 2017). A pleasant experience in visiting a destination that exceeds their expectations will lead to tourist satisfaction (Sangpikul, 2018) and can make tourists return to visit (Wibowo, et al., 2016; Zhang, et al., 2017) further emphasizes the importance the experience of tourists in generating the intention of visiting again.

In addition, the intention of tourists to re-visit is not only influenced by their experiences at the destination, but also by promotional efforts such as the spread of news about tourist attractions to others (Wu, et al., 2018). Considering the importance of what was mentioned above, this study aims to examine the influence of destination attributes (attraction, accessibility, and amenities), promotions, and destination images through tourist satisfaction on return intention of domestic tourists visiting Borobudur Temple. The framework in this study can be seen in Figure 1.
RESEARCH METHODS

The methodology used by this research is quantitative methods. Analysis of statistical or numerical data collected through questionnaires by analyzing existing statistical data and using computerized techniques. In this study the population will use domestic tourists who have visited Borobudur Temple in the last two years. The sampling technique used in this study is purposive sampling.

According to Sarwono (2015) and Hair et al., (2014) the minimum sample size is 10 times the largest number of formative indicators used to measure 1 latent variable or 10 times the largest number of structural paths aimed at certain latent variables in the structural model. So, the minimum respondents for this study are 70 respondents. In collecting data, this study received 410 questionnaires which were returned and used for analysis. This study uses a Likert Scale to measure questions. According to Oh & Kim (2017), a good Likert scale for the tourism industry is 7 (seven) points, thus this study uses 7-point Likert scale. A software of Smart Partial Least Square (SMART-PLS) from Ringle, et al., (2015) used in this study to analyze data and to test hypotheses. PLS-SEM is used to assess complex models consisting of mediation and moderation variables (Hair, et al., 2014; Sarwono, 2015). Furthermore, this software is also used by several tourism and hospitality journals (Mohaidin, Wei and Ali Murshid, 2017; Rajaratnam, Nair, Sharif and Munikrishnan, 2015). Design of the questionnaire in this study are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Questionnaire Design

| Latent Variable          | Statement (indicator)                                           |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Destination Attributes   |                                                                  |
| Attractions              | Borobudur temple has beautiful natural scenery (AT1)            |
|                          | Borobudur has an interesting history (AT2)                      |
|                          | Borobudur has an interesting cultural features (AT3)            |
| Accessibility            | There are many public transportation options to reach Borobudur Temple (AC1)). |
|                          | Road conditions to Borobudur Temple are good (paved, smooth, etc.) (AC2). |
|                          | Access to Borobudur Temple is relatively easy (AC3).          |
|                          | The time needed to reach Borobudur Temple is short (AC4).      |
| Amenities                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| It is very easy to find a tour guide at Borobudur Temple (AM1).          |
| It's easy to find handicraft / souvenir shops in Borobudur Temple (AM2). |
| Public toilets in Borobudur Temple are clean and comfortable (AM3).     |
| It's easy to find a hotel / homestay in the Borobudur Temple area (AM4).|
| There are various places to eat / restaurants in Borobudur Temple (AM5).|
| The price and portion of food in the restaurant at Borobudur Temple according to my preference (AM6). |

| Promotion                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I got information about Borobudur Temple from the Borobudur Park website and social media (PR1). |
| It's easy to find information about Borobudur Temple online (PR2).       |
| I often see Borobudur Temple advertisements on TV, Banners, Social Media, etc. (PR3). |

| Destination Image                                                         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| My visit to Borobudur Temple created a good impression (DI1).            |
| I felt comfortable during my visit to Borobudur Temple (DI2).            |
| The experience of my visit to Borobudur Temple was in line with my expectations (DI3). |

| Tourist Satisfaction                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I am satisfied with the scenery, history and cultural features of Borobudur Temple (TS1). |
| I am satisfied with the accessibility of Borobudur Temple (transportation, road, easy access, time) (TS2). |
| I am satisfied with the Borobudur Temple facilities (TS3).               |
| I am satisfied with the promotion efforts of Borobudur Temple (TS4).     |
| My decision to visit Borobudur Temple is worth my time and effort (TS5).|
| In general, I am satisfied with my decision to visit Borobudur Temple (TS6). |

| Tourist Return Intention                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I will definitely re-visit Borobudur Temple (RI1).                      |
| I will re-visit Borobudur Temple if it offers new things for me to experience (RI2). |
| I will prioritize Borobudur Temple compared to other cultural tourism destinations (RI3). |
| I would recommend Borobudur Temple to friends, relatives, family and others (RI4). |
| I have the desire to invite others to visit Borobudur Temple (RI5).      |

In analyzing the data in SMART-PLS, there are two steps must be considered, outer model and inner model. According to Sarwono (2015) the outer model is measured by connecting all manifest variables (indicators) with their latent variables using the measurement models of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability (Table 2). While, the measurement of inner model called the structural model aims to show and explain the relationship between each latent variable in the research model. Measurement models in PLS-SEM evaluated using the coefficient of determination, the path coefficient and the goodness of fit to see the value of R² value of t statistics, and Q². The hypothesis can be accepted if the statistical t value is greater than 1.96 and the P value is less than 0.05 or 5% for each pathway.

| Test                        | Parameters                                      | Rule of Thumb               |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Convergent Validity         | Loading Factor                                  | Factor>0.708                 |
|                             | Average Variance Extracted (AVE)                | Extracted>0.50              |
| Discriminant validity       | Heterotrait-Monotrait(HTMT)                     | <0.90                        |
|                             | Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)                 | ≤ 5                          |
| Reliability                 | Cronbach Alpha                                  | > 0.70                       |
|                             | Composite Reliability                           | > 0.70                       |
RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this study the majority of respondents came from West Java and DKI Jakarta, female between the ages of 21-25 years old. In terms of employment, the majority of respondents are students and employees. According to Hair, et al., (2019), the loading factor should be above 0.708 recommended, however, there are two constructs (AM2 and RI2) that have loading factor value of less than 0.708, then are removed from the model. Based on parameters on the outer model to assess convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability, the results found that all parameters met the requirements (see Table 3 and Table 4).

Table 3: Validity and Reliability Result

| Measurements | Outer Loadings | AVE  | VIF  | Cronbach Alpha | CR   | Final items (Initial items) |
|--------------|----------------|------|------|----------------|------|----------------------------|
| AC1          | 0.797          | 0.644| 1.653| 0.815          | 0.878| 4 (4)                      |
| AC2          | 0.817          |      | 1.797|                |      |                            |
| AC3          | 0.816          |      | 1.854|                |      |                            |
| AC4          | 0.779          |      | 1.592|                |      |                            |
| AM1          | 0.714          | 0.600| 1.442| 0.833          | 0.882| 5 (6)                      |
| AM2          | 0.702          |      | 1.783|                |      |                            |
| AM3          | 0.797          |      | 1.772|                |      |                            |
| AM4          | 0.766          |      | 1.751|                |      |                            |
| AM5          | 0.790          |      | 1.859|                |      |                            |
| AT1          | 0.807          | 0.642| 1.384| 0.722          | 0.843| 3 (3)                      |
| AT2          | 0.792          |      | 1.398|                |      |                            |
| AT3          | 0.804          |      | 1.494|                |      |                            |
| DI1          | 0.901          | 0.819| 2.608| 0.890          | 0.932| 3 (3)                      |
| DI2          | 0.911          |      | 2.762|                |      |                            |
| DI3          | 0.903          |      | 2.465|                |      |                            |
| PR1          | 0.793          | 0.633| 1.469| 0.711          | 0.838| 3 (3)                      |
| PR2          | 0.786          |      | 1.287|                |      |                            |
| PR3          | 0.809          |      | 1.493|                |      |                            |
| RI1          | 0.856          | 0.757| 2.304| 0.892          | 0.925| 4 (5)                      |
| RI2          | 0.827          |      | 1.99 |                |      |                            |
| RI3          | 0.902          |      | 3.076|                |      |                            |
| RI4          | 0.902          |      | 3.007|                |      |                            |
| TI1          | 0.775          | 0.647| 1.868| 0.889          | 0.916| 6 (6)                      |
| TS1          | 0.751          |      | 1.954|                |      |                            |
| TS2          | 0.701          |      | 1.817|                |      |                            |
| TS3          | 0.861          |      | 2.695|                |      |                            |
| TS4          | 0.862          |      | 3.178|                |      |                            |
| TS5          | 0.861          |      | 3.155|                |      |                            |
| TS6          | 0.861          |      |      |                |      |                            |

Table 4: HTMT Result

| Construct | AC  | AM  | AT  | DI  | PR  | RI  | TS  |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| AC        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| AM        | 0.835|
| AT        | 0.541|
| DI        | 0.557|
| PR        | 0.655|
| RI        | 0.425|
| TS        | 0.752|
Then this research continues on the inner model to answer the hypothesis shown in Table 5. In the results of the inner model, there are eleven hypotheses and all of them are accepted in this study with a t value greater than 1.96 and a P value (sig) less than 0.05 for every path. R² of tourist satisfaction was 0.451 meaning that tourist satisfaction can be explained by the exogenous latent variables (attractions, accessibility, amenities, promotion, and destinations image) as for 45.1%. Meanwhile, the R² for the return intention to visit was 0.778 meaning that return intention to visit can be explained by the exogenous latent variables (tourist satisfaction) as much as 77.8% and the remaining 22.2% is explained by other variables outside of this study. Value of Q² is 0.878 (> 0) meaning that attraction, accessibility, amenities, promotions, and destination image accounted for 87.8% which explains the effect on the intention to revisit through tourist satisfaction. While the remaining 12.2% is explained by other variables outside this study. In addition, the results of this study have a large predictive relevance, because the Q² value is above 0.50.

| Hypotheses | Relations | t   | Sig  | Results  |
|------------|-----------|-----|------|----------|
| H1a | Attractions->Tourist Satisfaction | 7.393 | 0.000 | Received |
| H2a | Accessibility →Tourist Satisfaction | 4.822 | 0.000 | Received |
| H3a | Amenities →Tourist Satisfaction | 2.590 | 0.010 | Received |
| H4a | Promotion→Tourist Satisfaction | 4.433 | 0.000 | Received |
| H5a | Destination Image →Tourists Satisfaction | 11.497 | 0.000 | Received |
| H1b | Attraction→Tourists Satisfaction ->Tourist Return Intention | 7.050 | 0.000 | Accepted |
| H2b | Accessibility →Tourist Satisfaction ->Tourist Return Intention | 4.707 | 0.000 | Received |
| H3b | Amenities →Tourist Satisfaction ->Tourist Return Intention | 2.561 | 0.011 | Received |
| H4b | Promotions →Tourist Satisfaction →Tourist Return Intention | 4.111 | 0.000 | Received |
| H5b | Destination Image →Tourist Satisfaction →Tourist Return Intention | 9.067 | 0.000 | Received |
| H6 | Tourist Satisfaction →Tourist Return Intention | 18.159 | 0.000 | Received |

The analysis results for destination attributes are seen from Hypothesis 1,2,3 which are all accepted. In terms of attractions, Reitsamer & Brunner-Sperdin (2016) has the same results also a study from Guntoro & Hui (2013) where attraction significantly influences the return intention. For accessibility result, Setyanto & Pangestutti (2019) put forward similar result, also Rajaratnam, et al. (2015) and Chin, et al. (2018) also found that accessibility mediated by tourist satisfaction significantly influenced the intention of tourist return intention. For amenities, the result of this study in harmony with Darsono (2013) and Dilrukshi, et al. (2019) revealed that amenities had a significant influence on return intention with a very large effect.

Hypothesis 4 result shows that promotion has a significant influence on the satisfaction of domestic tourists in visiting the Borobudur Temple. Similar results were also present by Magatef (2015) and Ovita, et al. (2019) mentioned promotion has the most significant influence mediated by satisfaction with return intention. The result of Hypothesis 5 testing shows that destination image has a significant influence on the satisfaction of domestic tourist tourists visiting Borobudur Temple in line with research by Allameh, et al. (2015) also Zhang, et al. (2017) using the mediation variable of tourist satisfaction confirms that there is a positive and significant influence of the destination's image on the return intention which is mediated by an impressive tourism experience.

Hypothesis 6 results show that tourist satisfaction has a significant influence on the return intention of domestic tourists in visiting the Borobudur Temple. This is supported by previous studies from Bagus & Utama (2015) and Singh & Singh (2019) which provide empirical evidence that tourist satisfaction is a strong factor in influencing tourists’ desire to
return due to increased levels of satisfaction, returning consistency and willingness to recommend to other people.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that destination attributes (attractions, accessibility, and amenities), promotion, and destination image have an influence on tourist satisfaction in Borobudur Temple. Further, through tourist satisfaction has an influence as a mediator to the tourist return intention of domestic tourists at Borobudur Temple. This implies the fact that domestic tourists are satisfied and willing to return because of their good experience with the scenery, history and cultural features of Borobudur Temple. Added, domestic tourists are satisfied and willing to return because they found Borobudur Temple has a variety of public transportation services, good road conditions, easy access, and the short time needed to reach the destination. In terms of amenities, domestic tourists are satisfied and want to return because the availability and quality of facilities at Borobudur Temple are able to give a good impression so they are satisfied and want to visit again. The promotion of Borobudur Temple that provides information and expectations to domestic tourists will be followed by an increase in tourist satisfaction, which will attract them to visit again. Finally, the destination image mediated by tourist satisfaction has a significant influence on the return intention of domestic tourists to Borobudur Temple. This implies the fact that cognitive and affective images during the visit of domestic tourists to Borobudur Temple affect the level of satisfaction and return intention to this destination.

According to the results of this study, there are a number of recommendations given. For the Indonesian government and PT TWC Borobudur as the Borobudur Temple developer should pay more attention to improving the quality of attractions, accessibility, and amenities at Borobudur Temple, conducting promotions that will not only attract international tourists but also domestic tourists. It is also important to provide innovation at Borobudur Temple, because domestic tourists will be more likely to make repeated visits when there are new things for them to experience. For the next research it is necessary to analyze other factors which not examined in this study and are expected to get more information in determining important factors that influence tourist satisfaction and return intention to visit Borobudur Temple which later can also be implemented in research to other tourist destinations.
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