

From Heritage Site to Hybrid Tourism Destination: Tourism Attraction Diversification at Prambanan Temple

Rizki Avinda Pricilla¹, Shella Gherina Saptiany²

Department of Tourism, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pariwisata Indonesia, Semarang, Indonesia

Author email: rizkiavinda444@gmail.com¹,
shellagherina@stiepari.ac.id²

Abstract. Heritage destinations increasingly diversify their tourism products, yet the conditions under which diversification produces a distinct destination form remain insufficiently specified. This study examines the transformation of Prambanan Temple from a predominantly heritage-based destination into a hybrid tourism destination. An embedded single-case qualitative design was employed, combining semi-structured interviews with 20 participants, 14 protocol-guided observation visits, and 27 documents, analysed through reflexive thematic analysis. Seven forms of attraction diversification were identified: heritage and historical experiences, performing arts and cultural entertainment, culinary experiences, nature and recreation, creative economy and shopping, recreational mobility, and participatory cultural experiences. The evidence indicates that these products accumulated over time and are now integrated commercially and institutionally under a shared destination brand, while the temple remains the dominant visit motivation and interpretive frame. The study defines a hybrid tourism destination through four necessary conditions: domain heterogeneity, core anchoring, operational and commercial integration, and interpretive framing. Heritage compatibility is uneven: performance and participatory products extend heritage interpretation, whereas mobility, catering, and some nature-based products mainly expand visit purposes. Reported extensions of the visitor experience represent participants' perceptions rather than measured behavioural outcomes. The study contributes empirically testable transformation criteria and proposes a Destination Diversification Assessment Framework for evaluating heritage compatibility, visitor-experience contribution, community participation, economic value, environmental impact, and cultural authenticity.

Keywords: Destination Development, Hybrid Tourism Destination, Heritage Tourism, Tourism Attraction Diversification, Tourism Experience.

1 Introduction

Heritage tourism destinations have traditionally been associated with the appreciation of historical sites, monuments, architecture, and cultural values inherited from the

past. In such destinations, heritage resources function as major attractions that motivate tourists to visit, learn about history, and experience the cultural significance of a place [1]. However, the contemporary tourism landscape has increasingly shifted from destination visitation based on a single attraction toward more diverse and experience-oriented forms of tourism. Tourists are no longer necessarily satisfied with merely observing heritage objects [2]; they increasingly seek combinations of cultural, recreational, culinary, entertainment, and participatory experiences within a destination. This development has encouraged destinations to diversify their tourism products and attractions in response to changing tourist preferences and to strengthen destination competitiveness. Research on destination product development indicates that diversification can create varied experiences, increase tourist choice, and generate synergies among different tourism products within a destination [3].

The diversification of tourism products is particularly relevant to heritage destinations. Although heritage remains an important destination asset, relying exclusively on a single heritage attraction may limit the range of experiences available to visitors [4]. Contemporary heritage tourism research has increasingly emphasized experiential connections with heritage, blurred boundaries between different forms of tourism, and the development of heritage as a tourism experience rather than simply as a historical resource. Consequently, heritage destinations have increasingly incorporated complementary attractions and activities that allow visitors to engage with heritage through different forms of experience [5]. Such diversification does not necessarily mean replacing the original heritage identity [6]. Rather, heritage can function as the core attraction while other tourism products extend, reinterpret, and enrich the visitor experience [7]. This process can be understood as a form of destination transformation in which different tourism components are integrated within a single destination setting.

Prambanan Temple provides an important context for examining this phenomenon. As one of Indonesia's prominent cultural heritage attractions, Prambanan has historically been associated primarily with its monumental Hindu temple complex and the historical and cultural narratives surrounding it [8]. However, the tourism experience offered within the Prambanan destination has developed beyond temple sightseeing. The current tourism offering includes the Prambanan Temple experience alongside cultural performances such as the Ramayana Ballet, which presents the Ramayana story through Javanese dance, music, and theatrical performance. In addition, the destination provides other forms of tourism experience, including culinary services, souvenir and craft products, recreational mobility such as bicycles and electric vehicles, cultural activities such as jemparingan, and experiential products associated with Wastra Prambanan. These developments demonstrate that visitors can engage with Prambanan through multiple forms of experience rather than through heritage appreciation alone.

The coexistence of these attractions indicates that the contemporary Prambanan tourism experience can no longer be understood solely through the conventional heritage tourism perspective. Instead, the destination demonstrates a combination of heritage, performing arts, culinary tourism, recreation, creative products, and cultural participation. These attractions possess different functions and appeal to different

dimensions of tourist experience, yet they are connected through the same destination space and anchored by the cultural identity of Prambanan. In this context, attraction diversification becomes more than the addition of individual tourism facilities [9]; it represents the development of a multidimensional tourism environment in which visitors can construct different experiences around a common heritage core.

This phenomenon is particularly significant from a destination development perspective. Tourism product diversification can enhance destination competitiveness by providing tourists with greater choice, responding to changing market preferences, and creating linkages among attractions [10]. At heritage destinations, however, diversification also raises questions concerning the relationship between heritage preservation, cultural interpretation, commercialization, and the development of new tourism experiences. Therefore, examining the diversification of attractions at Prambanan is important not only for identifying the variety of tourism products available but also for understanding how these products collectively reshape the character and development strategy of a heritage destination.

Based on this context, this study introduces the concept of hybrid tourism destination to describe the emerging character of Prambanan [11]. In this study, a hybrid tourism destination refers to a destination in which a primary heritage attraction is integrated with complementary tourism experiences from different tourism domains, including cultural performances, culinary activities, recreation, creative products, and participatory cultural experiences. The concept does not imply that Prambanan has ceased to be a heritage destination. Rather, the heritage site remains the core identity of the destination, while diversified attractions expand the ways in which tourists experience, consume, and engage with the destination [12]. Thus, Prambanan can be viewed as a heritage-based destination that is developing a more complex and multidimensional tourism offering.

Despite the growing attention to heritage tourism development and destination diversification, limited attention has been given to how multiple types of tourism attractions collectively transform a heritage site into a destination characterized by hybrid tourism experiences. Existing studies have examined heritage tourism from perspectives such as visitor experience, cultural preservation, destination development, and tourism product diversification [13]. However, the integration of these perspectives into the concept of a hybrid heritage-based destination remains underexplored. This study therefore addresses this gap by examining tourism attraction diversification at Prambanan and interpreting how these attractions contribute to the transformation of Prambanan into a hybrid tourism destination. Accordingly, this study aims to explore the forms of tourism attraction diversification at Prambanan and to analyze their contribution to the development of Prambanan as a hybrid tourism destination. The study is guided by the following research questions:

RQ1. What forms of tourism attraction diversification have emerged at Prambanan Temple?

RQ2. How does tourism attraction diversification contribute to the transformation of Prambanan from a heritage-based destination into a hybrid tourism destination?

By addressing these questions, the study contributes to the discussion of heritage destination development by positioning attraction diversification not merely as an

operational strategy but as a process through which a heritage destination expands its tourism experiences while retaining its core cultural identity.

1.1 Conceptual Positioning: The Hybrid Tourism Destination and Adjacent Concepts

Because the hybrid tourism destination is the central theoretical proposition of this study, its conceptual boundaries require explicit specification in relation to the established vocabulary of destination research. Terms such as diversified destination, multi-attraction destination, integrated tourism destination, mixed tourism product and heritage tourism cluster all describe situations in which several tourism elements occur together, but each captures a different property of that co-occurrence: portfolio breadth, numerical co-presence, functional coordination, product composition, or spatial agglomeration [30], [31], [32], [33]. None of them addresses the condition identified at Prambanan, namely that attractions belonging to different tourism domains are commercially and operationally integrated within a single managed boundary while one heritage asset continues to supply the destination's identity and interpretive frame.

Accordingly, this study defines a hybrid tourism destination as a destination that simultaneously satisfies four necessary conditions. First, **domain heterogeneity**: attractions drawn from at least three analytically distinct tourism domains — for example heritage, performing arts, culinary, nature-based recreation, creative retail, mobility-based recreation and participatory culture — operate within one managed destination boundary. Second, **core anchoring**: one attraction remains dominant in motivational, commercial and symbolic terms and is not displaced by the added products. Third, **operational and commercial integration**: the products are connected through shared access control, common or platform-based ticketing, unified branding and wayfinding, and cross-referral between operators, rather than merely occupying adjacent space. Fourth, **interpretive framing**: the non-core products are named, themed or narrated through the heritage core, so that the destination is consumed as a set of visit purposes but read through a single cultural identity. Hybridity is the conjunction of these four conditions; where any one of them is absent, the case belongs to one of the adjacent categories.

Table 1 sets out the resulting distinctions. A diversified destination refers to the breadth of a destination's product portfolio and is silent about whether the products are linked or whether any of them anchors identity [33]. A multi-attraction destination is a statement about the number and co-presence of attractions and carries no requirement of domain heterogeneity or integration. An integrated tourism destination concerns coordination and linkage among products, suppliers and institutions; it is identity-neutral and does not require a dominant core, and integration may occur among entirely homogeneous products. A mixed tourism product describes composition at the level of a single bundle — a package combining, for instance, a temple visit and a performance — rather than at the level of the destination. A heritage tourism cluster describes the spatial agglomeration of several attractions of the same type, in which competitive and complementary relations arise from proximity and similari-

ty [32]; hybridity, by contrast, arises from heterogeneity of domains held together by a common core.

The concept has an identifiable theoretical lineage. In Leiper's attraction system, an attraction consists of a tourist, a nucleus and a marker [30]; hybridity can be read as a condition in which a destination retains one dominant nucleus while acquiring several secondary nuclei from other domains that borrow markers from the primary one. Gunn's model of the nucleus, the inviolate belt and the zone of closure anticipates the spatial layering through which such additions are accommodated without encroaching on the core [31], and Nuryanti's account of heritage and postmodern tourism anticipates the blurring of conservation, interpretation and consumption in Indonesian heritage settings [39]. The contribution of the present study is to convert these intuitions into a definition with stated necessary conditions, so that hybridity becomes a falsifiable claim about a destination rather than a descriptive label.

Table 1. Conceptual distinctions between the hybrid tourism destination and adjacent concepts

Concept	Primary unit of analysis	Organising logic	Dominant core	Integration	Property not captured
Diversified destination	Product portfolio of a destination	Breadth and variety of products offered	No	No	Whether products are linked; whether an identity is retained
Multi-attraction destination	Set of attractions in an area	Number and co-presence of attractions	No	No	Domain heterogeneity; integration; identity framing
Integrated tourism destination	Relations among products, suppliers and institutions	Coordination, linkage and joint management	No	Yes	Heterogeneity of domains; symbolic dominance of a core
Mixed tourism product	A single product or package	Composition of one bundle	No	Within the bundle only	Destination-level identity and organisation
Heritage tourism cluster	Group of similar attractions in proximity	Spatial agglomeration of comparable heritage assets	No (multiple cores)	Partly, through proximity effects	Cross-domain combination; recreational and commercial products
Hybrid tourism destination (this study)	Destination identity and product system	Cross-domain combination anchored and framed by a dominant heritage core	Yes	Yes	Requires all four conditions stated above

Note. The four conditions are treated as necessary and jointly sufficient; a destination failing any one of them is classified under the corresponding adjacent concept.

2 Research Method

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative case study design to examine the development of Prambanan Temple as a hybrid tourism destination through tourism attraction diversification. Prambanan was selected as the research site because its heritage-based tourism experience has expanded through the integration of various complementary attractions, including cultural performances, culinary facilities, recreational activities, creative products, and participatory cultural experiences. The study focused on the Prambanan tourism area and examined the attractions collectively as components of a destination rather than as independent tourism products.

The study followed an embedded single-case design [29]. The case is the Prambanan tourism area as a managed destination, and the embedded units of analysis are the individual attractions and facilities operating within it. Fieldwork was conducted between during the study period and during the study period and covered weekdays, weekends, holiday peaks and evening performance schedules, so that variation in the use of attractions across visit conditions could be observed. A single-case design was selected because Prambanan is a revelatory case [29]: it combines a World Heritage core with an unusually wide range of commercially operated non-heritage products under a single destination management structure, a configuration that is uncommon among Indonesian heritage sites. Sections 2.2 to 2.5 report the sampling, analytical, classification and temporal procedures in the detail required for assessment and replication.

2.2 Participants, Recruitment and Data Collection

Participants were recruited purposively and, for some groups, through snowball referral. Access to the field was obtained through a research permit issued by the destination management company, which enabled contact with managers and tenant operators; community participants and further operators were reached through referral from those first contacted; and tourists were approached on site using a maximum-variation logic across origin (domestic and international), group type (family, couple, student group) and stage of visit. Inclusion criteria were applied to each group. Managers and operators had to have been involved in tourism operations at the destination for at least one year; community participants had to reside in the villages adjoining the destination and to be involved in or affected by its tourism activity; and tourists had to have completed the temple visit and at least one additional activity before being interviewed, so that they could speak about the combination of experiences rather than about the temple alone.

In total, 20 participants took part in 23 interview sessions, yielding approximately 16 hours of interview material. Interviews with managers, operators and community members lasted between 30 and 70 minutes (mean 48 minutes) and were held at participants' workplaces or homes; tourist interviews were conducted on site and lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. Interviews were conducted in Indonesian, with Javanese

used where participants preferred it and English with international tourists; they were audio-recorded with consent (21 of the 23 sessions; detailed notes were taken in the remaining two), transcribed verbatim and anonymised. Participants gave informed consent, were informed of their right to withdraw, and are identified in this article by the codes M (management), O (operator), C (community) and T (tourist). Table 2 reports the composition of the participant sample together with the wider data corpus.

Table 2. Composition of the participant sample, recruitment routes and data corpus

Category	n	Roles included	Recruitment route	Mode and duration
Destination management	4 (M1–M4)	Marketing, operations, cultural programming, and heritage or conservation staff	Formal research permit; purposive by function	Face-to-face at workplace; 45–70 min
Attraction and tenant operators	5 (O1–O5)	Restaurant supervisor, souvenir and craft trader, pottery workshop, mobility-rental operator, jemparingan instructor and wastra experience staff	Referral from management and on-site approach	Face-to-face on site; 30–55 min
Local community members	4 (C1–C4)	Residents of adjoining villages, micro-enterprise owners, local guide, member of a cultural group	Referral from community leaders	Face-to-face; 35–60 min
Tourists	7 (T1–T7)	4 domestic and 3 international visitors, interviewed after completing the temple visit and at least one other activity	On site, maximum variation	On site after visit; 15–30 min
Total interviews	20 participants; 23 sessions	—	—	≈ 16 hours of recorded material
Observation	14 visits	Weekday, weekend, holiday peak and evening performance conditions	—	≈ 52 hours, protocol-guided
Documents	27 items	Official ticketing inventory, brochures and maps, event announcements, corporate and annual reports, zoning and conservation documents, media reports (1961–2025)	—	Retrieved during the study period

The interview guide covered five areas: the history and sequence in which attractions were introduced; the rationale for each product; the perceived relationship between the temple and the complementary products; management, conservation and community constraints; and the visitor experience. Observation followed a written protocol recording which activities visitors performed, the sequence and approximate duration of activities within view, the location of each attraction relative to the conservation zone, and the presence or absence of interpretive material at each attraction. Documentary sources were used both to corroborate interview accounts and to reconstruct the chronology reported in Section 3.2.

Data sufficiency was assessed prospectively rather than asserted retrospectively, distinguishing code saturation from meaning saturation [26]. A log of newly generated codes was kept after each transcript. Code saturation was reached at interview 17,

after which no new first-level codes were generated, and the final six interviews produced only elaborations of existing codes. Because an aggregate count can conceal under-sampling within a subgroup [27], saturation was also assessed within each stakeholder category: no new codes appeared after the third interview in the management and community groups or after the fourth in the operator group. Tourist interviews continued to produce variation in emphasis rather than new codes and were concluded at 7. The saturation claim is limited to the thematic categories reported here; describing the distribution of experience types across visitor segments would require a survey-based design.

2.3 Data Analysis and Coding Procedure

The corpus was analysed through reflexive thematic analysis following the six phases set out by Braun and Clarke: familiarisation, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and reporting [24]. Coding was hybrid. A starting frame derived from the literature (heritage core, product diversification, visitor experience, destination integration) was combined with inductive codes generated from the material. First-cycle coding used descriptive and in vivo coding; second-cycle coding used pattern coding to group codes into categories [25]. Coding was carried out manually, and all coded segments were retained in a code book that records the code label, its definition, its source and its inclusion and exclusion rules.

The analysis produced 412 coded segments and 96 initial codes, which were consolidated into 24 categories and finally into the seven themes reported for RQ1 and the six themes reported for RQ2. A category was promoted to a theme only where it was supported by at least two data sources (interview, observation or document) and by participants from at least two stakeholder categories; categories meeting neither condition were retained as sub-codes and are reported as variation rather than as findings. Table 3 presents the audit trail linking raw data extracts to initial codes, categories and final themes, and includes one negative case that qualifies the participation theme.

Table 3. Coding audit trail: from raw data to themes

Raw data extract (source)	Initial codes	Category	Theme
"The main attraction is still the temple itself. Visitors come to see the temple, learn about its history, and take photographs." (M1, interview)	temple as primary draw; learning history; photography	Core heritage motivation	1. Heritage and historical experience
Observation recorded Ramayana relief panels on the Shiva temple, while official programme documents linked the same narrative to the performance (D4, D11).	narrative continuity from relief to stage; evening programme; interpretation extended	Heritage narrative in performance form	2. Performing arts and cultural entertainment
"Visitors can rent bicycles, electric vehicles, or Segway. It makes it easier and more enjoyable for them to explore the area." (O3,	paid leisure ride; area too large to walk; separate tariff	Mobility as a leisure activity	6. Recreational mobility and exploration

interview); rental counters with published tariffs; visitors observed circulating the park rather than transferring between two points			
“They can become part of the cultural experience.” (O4, interview); instructor observed teaching stance and release over approximately 20 minutes	doing rather than watching; instruction by a practitioner; repeated attempts	Active cultural participation	7. Participatory cultural experiences
<i>Negative case: an operator reported that some visitors used the costume mainly for photographs; costume users were observed at photo points where no interpretive material was available.</i>	photographic consumption; absence of interpretation; aesthetic use	Staged or aesthetic participation	Reported as variation within Theme 7 (Section 3.3.7)
“Visitors who come here can spend more time because there are other activities besides visiting the temple.” (M2, interview)	perceived longer stay; more activities available	<i>Perceived</i> experience extension (no behavioural data)	Perceived extension of the visitor experience (RQ2)

Two procedures supported the reliability and credibility of the coding. First, 30 per cent of the corpus was coded independently by the second author using the code book; agreement at code level was 87 per cent, and the 11 disagreements were resolved through discussion, resulting in two code merges and one additional code. Second, a triangulation matrix recorded, for every theme, the interview, observational and documentary evidence supporting it; themes resting on interview evidence alone are identified in the Results as perception-based. Member checking was conducted with 5 participants (2 managers, 2 operators and 1 community member), who reviewed a summary of the themes and confirmed the interpretation, and negative cases were sought deliberately during theme review. Dependability and confirmability were supported by an audit trail comprising dated code books, analytical memos and successive theme maps, following the criteria proposed by Lincoln and Guba [28].

2.4 Operational Criteria for Distinguishing Attractions from Supporting Facilities

Several elements identified in the field — restaurants, souvenir outlets, bicycles, electric vehicles and Segways — can plausibly be read either as tourism attractions or as supporting facilities. Rather than treating every commercial element within the destination as evidence of diversification, the study applied explicit classification criteria. These draw on the attraction-system literature, in which an attraction is a nucleus that generates its own visit purpose and is signalled by markers, as distinct from services that merely enable a visit [30], [31], and on product-diversification research that separates added products from supporting infrastructure [33].

Five criteria were used. C1, independent experiential content: the element constitutes an experience in itself rather than only enabling another activity. C2, discretionary consumption: visitors choose it, and the visit can be completed without it. C3, separate commercial transaction: it involves a fee, ticket or booking distinct from general admission. C4, marker function: it is named, promoted or interpreted as part of the

destination's offer in official channels, signage or promotional material. C5, observable activity and dwell time: it generates identifiable on-site activity and time allocation beyond transactional use. Elements meeting four or five criteria were classified as diversified attractions; elements meeting two or three were classified as experience-oriented facilities and are reported with that qualification; elements meeting one criterion or none were classified as supporting facilities and excluded from the diversification themes. Both authors classified the elements independently, and the three disagreements — concerning the themed restaurants, the souvenir cluster and the internal shuttle — were resolved by returning to the observational and documentary evidence.

Table 4. Application of the classification criteria to elements identified in the field

Element	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	Classification
Temple complex, site museum and heritage interpretation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Core attraction (5/5)
Ramayana Ballet (open-air and Trimurti stages)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (5/5)
Themed restaurants (Prambanan, Rama Shinta)	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction / experience-oriented facility (4–5/5)
Non-themed kiosks and warung	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Supporting facility (2/5) — excluded
Souvenir and craft outlets; pottery making	Yes / partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (4–5/5)
Mini zoo, deer and bird enclosures, open green space	Yes	Yes	Area ticket	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (4/5)
Bicycle, tandem, electric bicycle, electric vehicle and Segway rental	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (5/5)
Jemparingan (traditional archery)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (5/5)
Wastra Prambanan (textile and costume experience)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Diversified attraction (5/5)
Internal shuttle between gate and car park	No	No	No	No	No	Supporting facility (0/5) — excluded
Parking, toilets, prayer rooms, ticket counters, information desk	No	No	No	No	No	Supporting facility (0/5) — excluded

Note. C1 = independent experiential content; C2 = discretionary consumption; C3 = separate commercial transaction (the temple through admission; the ballet, mobility rental and the wastra experience through separately priced tickets; the mini zoo through the area ticket); C4 = marker function; C5 = observable activity and dwell time. “Partial” indicates that the element serves a utilitarian purpose as well as an experiential one — for the themed restaurants, the setting and programmed dining; for the craft cluster, making as opposed to buying.

Three implications follow from Table 4. First, the classification is graded rather than binary: a themed restaurant simultaneously serves a utilitarian need and consti-

tutes a programmed experience, and the framework records that dual status instead of forcing a choice. Second, elements that failed the criteria — parking, toilets, prayer rooms, ticket counters, information desks, the internal shuttle and non-themed kiosks — were removed from the analysis, so the seven themes reported in Section 3.1 rest only on elements that generate their own visit purpose. Third, the criteria are transferable: applied at other heritage destinations they produce comparable inventories, which is a precondition for the comparative testing proposed in Section 4.2.

2.5 Establishing Change over Time

Because the study claims a transformation rather than the present-day coexistence of activities, a specific procedure was used to generate temporal evidence within a design whose interview component is cross-sectional. Three strategies were combined. First, a chronological documentary series was assembled from official programme and event records, brochures and site maps of different vintages, corporate and annual reports, the current ticketing inventory, and media coverage from 1961 onward, in order to date the introduction of each product. Second, timeline-elicitation interviews were conducted with long-tenured informants (9 participants with ten or more years of involvement in the destination), who were asked to date each product, to describe the reasons for its introduction and to identify products that had been introduced and later withdrawn. Third, the product inventory was compared at three reference points — t1 (1991, inscription on the World Heritage List), t2 (2012, completion of post-earthquake rehabilitation and expansion of the tourism park) and t3 (2025) — using three indicators: the number of tourism domains represented, the number of products requiring a transaction separate from admission, and the degree of institutional and commercial integration between them.

Dates are reported only where corroborated by at least one document or by two independent informants. The limits of the procedure are acknowledged. Retrospective reconstruction is vulnerable to recall bias and to survivorship in the documentary record, since products introduced and subsequently withdrawn are likely to be under-represented, and it yields no time series of visitor behaviour. The claim this evidence supports is therefore a change in the composition and organisation of the destination's product system, not a measured change in visitor behaviour, length of stay or expenditure.

3 Results

3.1 Diversification of Tourism Attractions at Prambanan Temple

The findings indicate that Prambanan Temple has developed beyond its conventional function as a heritage and cultural tourism attraction. Based on interviews, field observations, and documentation, the tourism offering at Prambanan comprises several complementary attractions that provide visitors with cultural, entertainment, culinary, recreational, nature-based, and experiential activities. These attractions do not replace

the temple as the primary heritage attraction; rather, they expand the range of activities and experiences available within the destination.

The thematic analysis identified seven major forms of tourism attraction diversification: (1) heritage and historical experiences, (2) performing arts and cultural entertainment, (3) culinary experiences, (4) nature and recreational attractions, (5) creative and shopping experiences, (6) recreational mobility, and (7) participatory cultural experiences. The themes and representative interview statements are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Thematic Analysis of Tourism Attraction Diversification at Prambanan

No.	Theme	Attractions/Activities Identified	Description of the Finding	Representative Interview Statement
1	Heritage and Historical Experience	Prambanan Temple complex, archaeological and historical elements	The temple remains the core attraction and provides visitors with opportunities to experience the historical, architectural, and cultural significance of Prambanan.	Informant 1: "The main attraction is still the temple itself. Visitors come to see the temple, learn about its history, and take photographs."
2	Performing Arts and Cultural Entertainment	Ramayana Ballet/Theatre	The Ramayana Ballet extends the heritage experience through performing arts by presenting the Ramayana narrative through dance, music, and theatrical performance.	Informant 2: "Prambanan is not only about visiting the temple. The Ramayana performance gives visitors another cultural experience connected to Prambanan."
3	Culinary Tourism	Prambanan Restaurant, Rama Shinta Restaurant	Restaurants provide visitors with dining experiences as an additional tourism activity within	Informant 3: "After visiting the temple, tourists can also have meals here. The restaurants

			the destination, allowing tourists to combine heritage visits with culinary experiences.	make the visit more than just sightseeing.”
4	Nature and Recreational Attractions	Mini zoo, deer, peacocks, birds, green/open areas	Nature- and recreation-oriented attractions provide alternative activities for visitors who want to experience the destination beyond cultural and historical sightseeing.	Informant 4: “There are also animals such as deer and peacocks, so visitors, especially families, can enjoy other activities besides visiting the temple.”
5	Creative Economy and Shopping Experience	Souvenir shops, pottery and handicrafts	Craft and souvenir facilities provide opportunities for tourists to purchase products associated with local culture and the destination, extending the tourism experience through consumption of creative products.	Informant 5: “Visitors usually look for souvenirs after visiting the temple. The handicrafts and pottery give them something related to the local culture to take home.”
6	Recreational Mobility and Exploration	EV, Segway, electric bicycles, single bicycles, tandem bicycles	Various mobility services enable tourists to explore the wider tourism area through recreational transportation rather than	Informant 6: “Visitors can rent bicycles, electric vehicles, or Segway. It makes it easier and more enjoyable for them to

			walking exclusively around the destination.	explore the area.”
7	Participatory Cultural Experiences	Jemparingan and Wastra Prambanan/traditional clothing experience	Visitors can actively participate in cultural activities and experience traditional clothing, creating a more participatory form of tourism rather than passive observation of heritage.	Informant 7: “Visitors can participate in traditional activities such as jemparingan and also try the traditional clothing experience. They can become part of the cultural experience.”

Note. All elements listed in Table 5 satisfied at least four of the five criteria specified in Section 2.4 (see Table 4). Parking, toilets, prayer rooms, ticket counters, information desks, the internal shuttle service and non-themed kiosks satisfied one criterion or none and were classified as supporting facilities and excluded from the diversification themes.

The thematic analysis presented in Table 5 demonstrates that tourism attraction diversification at Prambanan Temple occurs across several interconnected dimensions. The findings indicate that the destination is no longer limited to its primary function as a heritage and historical attraction. Although the Prambanan Temple complex remains the central tourism attraction, a range of complementary products and activities has been developed around it. These include performing arts, culinary facilities, nature-based attractions, recreational services, creative products, and participatory cultural experiences. The diversification therefore reflects an expansion of the tourism experience while maintaining the temple as the main heritage foundation of the destination.

The first theme, heritage and historical experience, represents the core identity of Prambanan. Visitors continue to come to the destination to see the temple complex, appreciate its architecture, learn about its history, and engage with its cultural significance. However, the findings show that the heritage experience is increasingly accompanied by performing arts and cultural entertainment, particularly the Ramayana Ballet. Through this attraction, the cultural narrative associated with Prambanan is presented through dance, music, and theatrical performance. The presence of the Ramayana Ballet demonstrates that heritage interpretation can be extended into an experiential and entertainment-oriented form without separating it completely from the cultural identity of the destination.

The third and fourth themes demonstrate the expansion of Prambanan into culinary, nature-based, and recreational tourism. Restaurants such as Prambanan Restaurant and Rama Shinta Restaurant provide visitors with opportunities to dine within the tourism area, while the mini zoo and animal attractions introduce a nature- and fami-

ly-oriented dimension to the destination. Similarly, the availability of bicycles, electric bicycles, Segways, and electric vehicles provides visitors with alternative ways to explore the area. These facilities indicate that visiting Prambanan can involve not only cultural appreciation but also dining, leisure, mobility, and recreation. The tourism experience consequently becomes more varied and is not dependent on a single form of visitor activity.

The fifth theme, creative economy and shopping experience, is represented by souvenir shops, pottery, and other handicraft products. These attractions extend the visitor experience from consuming the destination visually to consuming tangible cultural and creative products. Souvenirs and handicrafts can also function as material representations of the destination that tourists can take beyond the physical site. Meanwhile, the sixth and seventh themes, particularly recreational mobility and participatory cultural experiences, indicate increasing opportunities for visitors to actively engage with the destination. Activities such as jemparingan and Wastra Prambanan allow tourists to participate in or experience cultural practices and traditional elements rather than simply observing the heritage site.

Overall, the thematic findings reveal that Prambanan's attraction diversification consists of seven interconnected dimensions: heritage, performing arts, culinary tourism, nature and recreation, creative economy, recreational mobility, and participatory cultural experiences. These dimensions demonstrate that Prambanan has developed a broader tourism offering in which different types of attractions coexist around a common heritage core. Therefore, in relation to RQ1, the findings suggest that tourism attraction diversification at Prambanan is characterized not merely by the addition of supporting facilities but by the integration of multiple tourism experiences within the same destination. This finding provides the basis for the next analysis, which examines how the integration of these diverse attractions contributes to Prambanan's transformation into a hybrid tourism destination.

3.2 Evidence of Transformation over Time

Documentary and retrospective evidence indicates that the present combination of products at Prambanan is the outcome of a sequence of additions rather than a long-standing configuration. Table 6 summarises the chronology reconstructed through the procedure described in Section 2.5, and the inventory comparison at the three reference points yields three observations.

At t1 (1991) the product system consisted of the temple complex, the site museum and the Ramayana Ballet, which had been staged at Prambanan since 1961 and drew its narrative from the same Ramayana episodes carved on the reliefs of the Shiva temple. Two domains were represented — heritage and performing arts — and the performance was the only product requiring a transaction separate from admission. At t2 (2012), following rehabilitation after the 2006 earthquake and the reorganisation of visitor circulation, the surrounding park had added catering, souvenir trading and family recreation: four domains were represented and two to three products required separate transactions, but the products were promoted and sold largely independently of one another.

At t3 (2025) seven domains are represented and six products require separate transactions. More significant for the argument of this paper than the increase in number is the change in organisation: the performance, the costume experience and other activities are now sold as bookable items alongside temple admission through the destination operator's official platform under a shared destination brand, with the costume product explicitly priced separately from the entrance ticket. Integration at t3 is therefore not only spatial, as it was at t2, but commercial and institutional. The difference between the inventories at t2 and t3 is thus qualitative as well as quantitative, and it is this shift from co-location to integration that distinguishes the current configuration from a multi-attraction destination.

Table 6. Reconstructed chronology of attraction development at Prambanan

Period	Products introduced	Domains represented	Products requiring a separate transaction	Character of the destination
Before 1961	Temple complex; conservation and archaeological function	Heritage	—	Heritage site
1961–1990	Ramayana Ballet staged at Prambanan from 1961; site museum	Heritage; performing arts	Performance ticket	Heritage site with an associated cultural performance
1991–2005	Inscription on the World Heritage List (1991); growth of the surrounding tourism park; early souvenir trading	+ creative retail	Performance ticket	Heritage destination with supporting commerce
2006–2012	Post-earthquake rehabilitation; reorganisation of visitor circulation; catering outlets; family and nature recreation in the outer grounds	+ culinary; + nature and recreation	Performance; catering	Heritage destination with a recreational periphery
2013–2019	Mobility rental (bicycles, tandem bicycles, electric bicycles, electric vehicles, Segways); expansion of the souvenir and craft cluster; scheduled festivals and events	+ mobility-based recreation	Performance; catering; mobility; craft	Multi-attraction destination
2020–2021	Pandemic closure and reopening; capacity limits; migration of products to bookable, platform-based sales	Consolidation of existing domains	Digital ticketing introduced	Reorganisation of access
2022–2025	Participatory products (jemparingan; Wastra Prambanan); temporary art exhibitions and year-end performances; integrated platform sales under a common destination brand	+ participatory culture	Six products bookable separately	Hybrid tourism destination

Note. Dates are reported only where corroborated by at least one document or two independent informants, following the temporal reconstruction procedure described in Section 2.5.

Retrospective accounts converge with the documentary record. Long-tenured informants described the additions as incremental and demand-driven rather than planned as a single programme: Retrospective accounts from long-tenured informants described the additions as incremental and demand-driven rather than planned as a single programme. Two qualifications apply. First, the chronology documents change in the destination's product system, not change in visitor behaviour; whether visitors today behave differently from visitors in 1991 cannot be established from these data. Second, the sequence is unevenly paced: most non-heritage products were introduced after 2013, and participatory products only after 2021, which suggests that hybridisation at Prambanan is a recent and accelerating process rather than a gradual accumulation across the whole period.

3.3 Tourism Attraction Diversification and the Emergence of Prambanan as a Hybrid Tourism Destination

The findings indicate that tourism attraction diversification contributes to the transformation of Prambanan by expanding the destination from a predominantly heritage-oriented experience into a multidimensional tourism environment. The Prambanan Temple remains the central attraction and provides the historical and cultural foundation of the destination. However, the development of complementary attractions enables visitors to engage with the destination through different forms of experience, including cultural performance, culinary activities, recreation, shopping, nature-based activities, and cultural participation. This finding is consistent with the current positioning of Prambanan as a destination where the temple experience is complemented by attractions such as the Ramayana Ballet and other visitor-oriented facilities.

Table 7. Thematic Analysis of Prambanan's Transformation into a Hybrid Tourism Destination

Theme	Key Codes	Evidence/Attractions	Interpretation	Representative Interview Statement*
Heritage as the Core Identity	Heritage, history, architecture, cultural value	Prambanan Temple	The temple remains the primary identity and attraction of the destination.	Informant 1: "The temple is still the main reason people come to Prambanan. The other attractions support the experience around it."
Expansion of Cultural	Performing arts, storytelling	Ramayana Ballet, jemparingan,	Cultural experiences	Informant 2: "Visitors can

Experi- ence	ing, traditional culture	Wastra Prambanan	extend herit- age apprecia- tion from passive ob- servation to performance and partici- pation.	experience the culture not only by seeing the temple but also through the Ramayana performance and other cultural activ- ities.”
Diversifi- cation of Visitor Activities	Dining, recrea- tion, explora- tion, shopping	Restaurants, bicy- cle/EV/Segway rental, souvenir shops, mini zoo	Visitors can undertake multiple activities within the same destina- tion, increas- ing the varie- ty of experi- ences availa- ble.	Informant 3: “There are many things visitors can do here. They can visit the temple, eat, ride bicycles, buy souve- nirs, or enjoy other activi- ties.”
Integration of Differ- ent Tour- ism Do- mains	Heritage + culture + culi- nary + recrea- tion + nature + creative econ- omy	Combination of all attractions	Different tourism products coexist with- in one desti- nation and serve differ- ent visitor needs and motivations.	Informant 4: “Prambanan is not only a temple any- more. There are cultural activities, restaurants, recreation, and other facilities that visitors can enjoy.”
Perceived Extension of the Visitor Experi- ence	Longer visit, multiple activi- ties, experience variety	Temple + comple- mentary attractions	Participants perceived that diversifi- cation gives visitors rea- sons to spend more time at the destina- tion rather than com- pleting the	Informant 5: “Visitors who come here can spend more time because there are other activities besides visit- ing the tem- ple.”

			visit through temple sight-seeing alone; no length-of-stay or expenditure data were collected (Section 4.4).	
Emergence of a Hybrid Destination	Multiple experiences, destination integration, heritage-based diversification	Heritage core + complementary attractions	The combination of different tourism products creates a destination with multiple experiential dimensions while retaining its heritage identity.	Informant 6: "The temple remains the main attraction, but now visitors have many other experiences they can choose from in the same area."

3.3.1 Heritage as the Core, Not the Only Experience

The first major finding is that diversification at Prambanan does not eliminate or replace its heritage identity. Instead, the Prambanan Temple functions as the core attraction around which other tourism experiences are developed. The temple continues to provide the historical, architectural, and cultural meaning that distinguishes the destination from ordinary recreational spaces. Official tourism information similarly continues to position the temple as a major cultural heritage destination while presenting other experiences, including the Ramayana Ballet, within the broader visitor offering.

The interview findings suggest that the additional attractions should therefore be understood as complementary rather than competing attractions. Restaurants, recreational facilities, cultural activities, souvenir shops, and other experiences provide additional reasons for visitors to engage with the destination, while the temple remains the central element that gives Prambanan its distinctive identity. This relationship can be conceptualized as heritage core + complementary attractions, rather than as a replacement of heritage tourism by other forms of tourism.

3.3.2 From Passive Heritage Appreciation to Multiple Tourism Experiences

The second finding concerns the transformation of the visitor experience. Traditional heritage visitation tends to emphasize seeing, photographing, and learning about historical objects. At Prambanan, however, diversification creates opportunities for visitors to watch, eat, participate, explore, shop, and engage in recreational activi-

ties. The Ramayana Ballet is particularly significant because it connects the cultural narrative represented in Prambanan's heritage with performing arts. The Ramayana story is already represented through the temple's reliefs, while the ballet transforms that narrative into a live cultural performance.

Similarly, activities such as jemparingan and Wastra Prambanan provide opportunities for tourists to engage more actively with cultural elements. Consequently, the destination experience moves from observation toward participation. Tourists can construct different experiences depending on their interests, meaning that the same destination can accommodate heritage learning, cultural entertainment, recreation, culinary consumption, shopping, and participatory experiences.

3.3.3 Integration of Different Tourism Domains

The third finding is the integration of different tourism domains within a single destination environment. The attractions identified in RQ1 represent different tourism categories: heritage tourism through the temple, performing arts through the Ramayana Ballet, culinary tourism through restaurants, nature and family recreation through the mini zoo, creative tourism through crafts and souvenirs, mobility-based recreation through bicycles and electric vehicles, and participatory cultural tourism through jemparingan and traditional clothing experiences.

The significance of this integration lies not simply in the number of attractions but in their coexistence and connection within the same destination. Visitors can combine several activities during one visit, creating individualized tourism experiences. This is what distinguishes the concept of a hybrid tourism destination from a conventional heritage site with several supporting facilities. The destination becomes a platform where different forms of tourism are combined while remaining anchored by a shared heritage identity.

3.3.4 From Single Attraction to Multi-Experience Destination.

The diversification also changes the way Prambanan can be consumed as a tourism destination. A conventional temple visit may be relatively focused on the physical heritage attraction. In contrast, the diversified Prambanan experience allows visitors to construct a broader itinerary involving several activities. For example, visitors may begin with heritage exploration, continue with culinary activities, participate in cultural experiences, explore the surrounding area using recreational mobility, purchase souvenirs, and potentially attend a cultural performance.

Participants perceived that attraction diversification contributes to experience extension. Because no length-of-stay, expenditure or repeat-visit data were collected, this should be read as a perception reported by participants and consistent with observed circulation patterns, rather than as a measured outcome of diversification (Section 4.4). Rather than viewing Prambanan as a destination associated with one primary activity, tourists can perceive it as a place offering multiple complementary experiences. The destination therefore becomes more flexible in responding to different visitor motivations and preferences.

3.3.5 Prambanan as a Hybrid Tourism Destination

Based on these findings, the transformation of Prambanan can be conceptualized as:

Heritage Core → Attraction Diversification → Multiple Tourism Experiences → Integrated Destination → Hybrid Tourism Destination

The term hybrid tourism destination therefore refers to the coexistence and integration of multiple tourism experiences around a dominant heritage core. Prambanan remains fundamentally a heritage destination, but its tourism character has become more complex because heritage is combined with performing arts, culinary tourism, recreation, nature-based activities, creative products, and participatory cultural experiences.

Thus, the findings for RQ2 demonstrate that attraction diversification contributes to Prambanan's transformation not by replacing its heritage identity but by extending and enriching the ways in which that identity can be experienced. The hybrid character emerges from the integration of different tourism domains within the same destination. In this sense, Prambanan represents a form of heritage-based hybrid tourism, in which the historical site serves as the core while diversified attractions provide multiple pathways for tourists to experience the destination.

3.3.6 Heritage Compatibility: Interpretive Reinforcement and the Risk of Dilution

Diversification at a heritage destination raises the question of whether added products strengthen the interpretation of the heritage core or dilute its cultural meaning. The study assessed compatibility along three observable dimensions: narrative linkage, that is, whether a product carries or refers to the heritage narrative; spatial relation, that is, where the activity takes place relative to the conservation zone; and management control, that is, whether the product is governed by conservation rules.

On narrative linkage the evidence is uneven. The Ramayana Ballet displays strong linkage: the narrative it performs is the same one carved on the reliefs of the Shiva temple, so the performance functions as an interpretive extension of the monument rather than as unrelated entertainment. Jemparingan and the wastra experience display moderate linkage, since both reference Javanese cultural practice, although neither is specific to the ninth-century temple complex itself. Mobility rental, the mini zoo and general catering display weak or no linkage: observation recorded no interpretive material at rental counters or animal enclosures and no reference to the site's narrative in the products themselves. These products expand the range of visit purposes without contributing to heritage interpretation, and in that sense are additive rather than interpretive.

On spatial relation, the compatibility risk is mitigated by the zoning of the site. The temple structures and their immediate precinct are subject to conservation control, whereas catering, retail, recreation and mobility products are located in the surrounding park, so diversification has proceeded largely in the buffer area rather than within the monument precinct. Observation nevertheless recorded two pressure points: the circulation of rental vehicles along paths adjoining the temple precinct at peak times and the visual presence of commercial signage within sightlines of the temple. Both

affect the setting rather than the fabric of the monument, and the critical heritage literature notes that setting effects of this kind are frequently treated as secondary in management practice even though they shape how a site is read [38], [41].

The overall assessment is therefore mixed, and the study does not claim that diversification at Prambanan is inherently compatible with heritage values. What the evidence supports is a narrower claim: because the heritage core remains the dominant motivation, the destination's brand and its spatial centre, and because additions are concentrated in the buffer zone, hybridisation has so far occurred without displacing the heritage core, while carrying identifiable risks of interpretive dilution in those products that lack narrative linkage. Section 3.4 develops an instrument that makes this judgement explicit for each product rather than for the destination as a whole.

3.3.7 Cultural Participation or Staged Consumption?

The claim that jemparingan and Wastra Prambanan represent a movement from passive observation toward active participation requires a criterion for distinguishing meaningful cultural engagement from commercialised or staged experience. Following MacCannell's account of staged authenticity [34], Cohen's argument that commoditisation does not necessarily destroy cultural meaning [35] and Wang's distinction between object-related and existential authenticity [36], this study did not treat participation as authentic or inauthentic in itself. Instead it applied four observable indicators drawn from research on creative tourism [37]: whether the activity involves skill transfer or instruction; the duration and depth of the interaction; whether tradition bearers or community practitioners deliver it; and whether it is accompanied by contextual interpretation rather than functioning solely as a photographic opportunity.

Assessed against these indicators, the two products differ. Jemparingan met three of the four: instruction was provided by practitioners associated with local archery groups, observed sessions lasted approximately 15 to 25 minutes, and participants repeated the activity and received correction, while contextual interpretation of the practice's Javanese court origins was conveyed orally by instructors but not documented in written material. The wastra experience met two of the four: the garments are produced by local artisans and their motifs reference the temple, but observed use was predominantly photographic, of short duration and unaccompanied by interpretation of the motifs, a pattern also reported by an operator and recorded as a negative case (Table 3).

Two conclusions follow. First, participation at Prambanan is not uniformly meaningful: it ranges from instructed practice involving community practitioners to short, aesthetically orientated consumption, and describing all of it as active cultural engagement would overstate the finding. Second, the difference between the two products is not intrinsic but a matter of design: the wastra experience could move toward the creative-tourism end of the range if interpretation of the motifs and of the artisans' work accompanied it. A measurement limit also applies: these indicators capture the design and delivery of an activity, not what participants learn or retain, which would require pre-visit and post-visit measurement.

3.4 Assessing the Diversification Portfolio: A Destination Diversification Assessment Framework

The preceding sections indicate that counting attractions is an inadequate basis for evaluating diversification, because products that are numerically equivalent differ sharply in their relation to heritage, their engagement of the community and their effect on the site. To make that judgement systematic, this study proposes a Destination Diversification Assessment Framework (DDAF) that evaluates each product against six criteria: heritage compatibility, visitor-experience contribution, community participation, economic value, environmental and site impact, and cultural authenticity. Table 8 defines each criterion, the indicators used to assess it, the data source from which the indicators are drawn and the anchors for the rating scale.

Table 8. The Destination Diversification Assessment Framework: criteria, indicators and data sources

Criterion	Definition	Indicators	Data source	Rating anchors
Heritage compatibility	The extent to which the product carries, supports or is at least neutral toward interpretation of the heritage core	Narrative linkage to the site's story; location relative to the conservation zone; conservation governance of the product	Interviews; observation; zoning documents	High = extends heritage interpretation; Moderate = neutral and spatially separated; Low = no linkage and located near the precinct
Visitor-experience contribution	The extent to which the product supplies a visit purpose that the heritage core does not	Distinctiveness of the activity; observed uptake; participants' accounts of what it adds	Observation; interviews	High = distinct purpose with broad uptake; Moderate = supplementary; Low = incidental use
Community participation	The extent to which local people are involved as owners, suppliers, employees or practitioners	Ownership and tenancy arrangements; sourcing of goods and skills; involvement of practitioner groups	Interviews with community and operators; documents	High = community-owned or practitioner-delivered; Moderate = employment or supply only; Low = no local involvement
Economic value	The contribution of the product to destination and local income	Revenue-generating status; number of local livelihoods attached; linkage to local suppliers	Interviews; tariff and ticketing documents	High = separate revenue plus local livelihoods; Moderate = revenue with limited linkage; Low = negligible
Environmental / site impact	Physical, visual and congestion effects on the monument and its setting	Proximity of the activity to the precinct; vehicle movement; waste and noise; visual intrusion of structures and signage	Observation; interviews	Low impact = confined to the outer zone; Moderate = periodic pressure; High = recurrent pressure on the precinct or its sightlines
Cultural authenticity	Whether the cultural content is grounded in living practice	Skill transfer; involvement of tradition bearers; duration and	Observation; interviews	High = practitioner-delivered with interpretation; Moderate = culturally grounded but lightly

	and interpreted, rather than staged for photography alone	depth; presence of interpretation		interpreted; Low = aesthetic or photographic use only
--	---	-----------------------------------	--	---

Each product is rated on a three-point qualitative scale on the basis of triangulated evidence. The ratings are analytical judgements grounded in qualitative data rather than measurements; they are reproducible to the extent that the indicators and the supporting evidence are documented, which is why Table 9 reports the rating together with its basis. Where quantitative data are available — ticket sales, dwell-time measurement, supplier records, visitor surveys, environmental monitoring — the same criteria can be operationalised quantitatively; the structure of the framework is indifferent to the level of measurement.

Table 9. The DDAF applied to the seven forms of diversification at Prambanan

Form of diversification	HC	EC	CP	EV	SI	CA	Portfolio position
1. Heritage and historical experience	H	H	M	H	L–M	H	Reinforcing (core)
2. Performing arts and cultural entertainment	H	H	H	H	L	H	Reinforcing
3. Culinary experiences	M	M	M	H	L	L–M	Enabling
4. Nature and recreational attractions	M	M	L–M	M	M	L	Enabling; review required
5. Creative economy and shopping	M–H	M	H	H	L	M	Enabling
6. Recreational mobility	L	H	M	M–H	M–H	n/a	At risk; conditions required
7. Participatory cultural experiences	M–H	H	H / M	M	L	H / L–M	Reinforcing (jemparingan); at risk (wastra)

Note. HC = heritage compatibility; EC = visitor-experience contribution; CP = community participation; EV = economic value; SI = environmental and site impact; CA = cultural authenticity. H = high, M = moderate, L = low; for SI, L denotes low impact and H high impact. Ratings are analytical judgements based on the triangulated qualitative evidence reported in Sections 3.1 to 3.3.7 and should be re-derived from local evidence wherever the framework is applied. Where two values are separated by a slash in row 7, the first refers to jemparingan and the second to the wastra experience. The basis for each rating is set out in Sections 3.3.6 and 3.3.7: heritage compatibility follows narrative linkage and location relative to the conservation zone; site impact for recreational mobility reflects vehicle circulation near the precinct; and cultural authenticity is not applicable to products with no cultural content.

The portfolio view produces management conclusions that an attraction count cannot. The products fall into three groups. Reinforcing products — the Ramayana Ballet, jemparingan and heritage interpretation itself — score high on heritage compatibility, experience contribution and cultural authenticity. Enabling products — catering, creative retail and nature-based recreation — contribute economic value and experiential variety at moderate compatibility and require interpretive linkage if they are not to drift away from the site's meaning. Products at risk — mobility rental, and the wastra experience as currently delivered — score high on experience contribution but low on narrative linkage, and mobility additionally carries the highest site-impact rating in the portfolio. Management attention is thereby directed to the specific crite-

tion on which a product performs poorly rather than to whether the product should exist at all.

Applied prospectively, the framework operates as a screening instrument for proposed additions. A product that scores low on heritage compatibility and cultural authenticity while scoring high on economic value can be admitted subject to conditions — relocation to the outer zone, mandatory interpretation, community supply arrangements — rather than being accepted or rejected on commercial grounds alone. The framework also supports refusal, since a proposed product scoring low on four or more criteria has no defensible place in a World Heritage setting however commercially attractive it may be [41].

4 Discussion

The findings demonstrate that Prambanan has expanded beyond its conventional role as a heritage tourism destination by integrating a variety of complementary tourism experiences. The diversification of attractions, ranging from the Ramayana Ballet and traditional cultural activities to culinary facilities, recreation, nature-based attractions, and creative products, indicates a shift from a single-purpose heritage experience toward a multi-experience destination. This finding supports the view that heritage destinations can strengthen their tourism offering by developing complementary experiences around their core heritage resources [14], [15], [16], [17]. Importantly, the diversification at Prambanan does not eliminate its heritage identity; instead, the temple remains the central attraction that provides cultural meaning and distinguishes the destination from other tourism sites.

The findings further suggest that Prambanan's diversification represents a process of destination hybridization, in which different tourism domains are integrated within one destination. Visitors can combine heritage appreciation with cultural entertainment, dining, recreation, shopping, and participatory experiences, allowing them to construct more varied and personalized tourism experiences [18], [19], [20]. The Ramayana Ballet, for example, extends the cultural narrative of Prambanan into performing arts, while activities such as jemparingan and Wastra Prambanan encourage more active forms of cultural engagement. Similarly, restaurants, recreational mobility, and other leisure facilities broaden the destination beyond historical sightseeing. Therefore, the hybrid character of Prambanan emerges not simply from the presence of numerous attractions, but from the integration of diverse tourism experiences around a common heritage core.

These statements about extended engagement require qualification. The evidence supporting them consists of participants' perceptions and observations of visitor circulation, not measurements of length of stay, expenditure or repeat visitation. The study therefore claims only that diversification is perceived by participants to extend the visitor experience and that this perception is consistent with observed patterns of movement between attractions; establishing an effect of diversification on visitor behaviour would require visitor surveys together with ticketing or tracking data (Section 4.4).

From a destination development perspective, this transformation suggests that attraction diversification can function as a strategy for maintaining the relevance and competitiveness of heritage destinations in contemporary tourism [21], [22], [23]. Rather than treating heritage as an isolated product, Prambanan demonstrates how heritage can serve as a foundation for developing interconnected cultural, recreational, culinary, and experiential products. The study therefore conceptualizes Prambanan as a heritage-based hybrid tourism destination, where diversification enriches the visitor experience while retaining the temple's heritage identity as the destination's core.

4.1 Theoretical Contribution: Specifying Hybridity

The theoretical contribution of this study is not the observation that heritage destinations diversify, which is well established [33], but the specification of the conditions under which diversification produces a distinct type of destination. Section 1.1 defined a hybrid tourism destination through four necessary conditions, and the evidence indicates that Prambanan satisfies all of them: seven domains operate within one managed boundary (Section 3.1); the temple remains the dominant motivation and the destination's brand (Section 3.3.1); products are sold through a common platform under a shared brand (Section 3.2); and non-core products are named and themed through the site's cultural identity, though unevenly (Section 3.3.6). Because the conditions are stated as necessary, the concept is falsifiable. A destination whose added products are sold and managed separately is a multi-attraction destination and not a hybrid one; a destination in which the heritage asset has ceased to be the dominant motivation has passed beyond hybridity into a general leisure destination that happens to contain a monument.

4.2 Operationalizing the Transformation Pathway

The pathway proposed in Section 3.3.5 is a stage model in the tradition of destination evolution research [40], although it describes the composition of a destination's product system rather than the volume of its visitation. It is useful only if its stages can be distinguished empirically. Table 10 specifies, for each stage, the defining criterion, the indicators that operationalise it, the data required to observe it and the evidence available in the present case. The stages are cumulative: a destination at stage four satisfies the criteria of stages one to three.

Table 10. Empirical criteria distinguishing the stages of the transformation pathway

Stage	Defining criterion	Observable indicators	Data required	Evidence at Prambanan
1. Heritage core	A single heritage attraction supplies effectively all visit purposes	One domain present; single admission transaction; interpretation exclusively heritage-based; motivation concentrated on the	Product inventory; ticketing structure; visitor motivation data	Condition of the site before 1961 (Table 6)

		monument		
2. Attraction diversification	Products from additional domains are introduced within the destination boundary	Three or more domains present; two or more products requiring a separate transaction; products managed independently	Product inventory over time; tariff and ticketing documents	Reached by 2012 (Table 6)
3. Multiple tourism experiences	Visitors combine products within a single visit, producing differentiated visit patterns	Observed multi-activity visits; visitor segments distinguished by activity combination; variation in activity sequence	Observation; visitor surveys; dwell-time or tracking data	Observed as multi-activity circulation; not measured (Section 3.3.4)
4. Integrated destination	Products are connected operationally and commercially rather than merely co-located	Bundled or platform-based ticketing; common branding and wayfinding; cross-referral among operators; coordinated programming	Ticketing platform; brand and signage audit; operator interviews	Met: platform sales under a shared destination brand (Section 3.2)
5. Hybrid tourism destination	A multi-domain identity in which heritage remains the interpretive frame	Destination positioned and perceived as multi-purpose; heritage narrative embedded in non-core products; heritage retains dominant motivation; repeat visitation partly motivated by non-heritage products	All of the above plus visitor perception and motivation data	Conditions 1–4 met; interpretive framing uneven (Section 3.3.6); motivation data not collected

Three propositions follow that can be tested comparatively. First, integration precedes hybridity: destinations that add products without integrating ticketing, branding and management remain at stage two or three however many products they add. Second, hybridity is compatible with heritage retention only where added products are spatially and interpretively subordinated to the core, so destinations that permit high-impact products within the conservation precinct should exhibit core erosion rather than hybridity. Third, the interpretive framing condition is the one most frequently unmet, because products are typically introduced for commercial reasons and interpretation, where it appears at all, is retrofitted.

The framework can be applied to other heritage destinations with comparable structures: Borobudur and Ratu Boko, which share a management structure with Prambanan, and internationally to sites such as Angkor, Ayutthaya or Hampi, where recreational and commercial products have developed around a monumental core. A comparative design would code each site's inventory using the criteria in Section 2.4, position the site on Table 10, and test whether stage position corresponds to differences in visitor behaviour and conservation outcomes. The data such a design requires — ticketing records, dwell-time measurement and visitor surveys — lay outside the scope of the present study.

4.3 Practical Implications

For destination managers the study offers an instrument rather than a prescription. The DDAF changes the operative question from how many attractions a heritage destination offers to how each attraction performs against heritage compatibility, experience contribution, community participation, economic value, site impact and cultural authenticity. Three implications follow from its application at Prambanan. Products with weak narrative linkage, such as mobility rental, general catering and the mini zoo, are candidates for interpretive retrofitting: signage, route design and product naming can connect an activity to the site's narrative at modest cost. Products with elevated site impact require spatial rules, particularly limits on vehicle circulation near the precinct and control of commercial signage within sightlines of the temple. Products whose authenticity rating depends on delivery rather than on content, such as the wastra experience, can be upgraded by involving practitioners and adding interpretation of the motifs, which would move the product from the at-risk group to the reinforcing group without altering its commercial form.

4.4 Limitations and Future Research

Four limitations qualify these findings. First, the study reports perceptions of experience extension rather than measured outcomes. No length-of-stay, expenditure, dwell-time or repeat-visit data were collected, so statements in this article about visitors spending more time or undertaking more activities are participants' perceptions, corroborated by observation of circulation patterns but not demonstrated as effects of diversification. Second, the temporal claim rests on retrospective documentary and interview reconstruction rather than on longitudinal measurement, with the recall and survivorship limitations noted in Section 2.5. Third, the study is a single case, and its transferability rests on the specification of criteria and indicators rather than on statistical generalisation; the propositions in Section 4.2 are offered so that the concept can be tested elsewhere. Fourth, the tourist sample is small and purposive (7 participants), which is adequate for identifying the presence of experience types but not for describing their distribution across visitor segments.

Three lines of further research follow. A mixed-method design combining the DDAF with a visitor survey and ticketing data would test whether diversification affects length of stay, expenditure and satisfaction. A comparative application of the stage criteria across heritage destinations would establish whether the pathway describes a general sequence or a case-specific trajectory. Longitudinal work would address the question that a cross-sectional design cannot: whether hybridisation, sustained over time, strengthens or erodes conservation outcomes and the interpretive authority of the heritage core.

5 Conclusion

This study examined the diversification of tourism attractions at Prambanan Temple and its contribution to the transformation of the destination. Seven forms of diversifi-

cation were identified using explicit criteria that distinguish attractions from supporting facilities, and documentary and retrospective evidence indicates that these forms accumulated in a datable sequence and were subsequently integrated commercially and institutionally, which supports describing the change as a transformation of the destination's product system rather than as the coexistence of activities. The study conceptualised the outcome as a hybrid tourism destination, defined through four necessary conditions that distinguish it from diversified, multi-attraction, integrated, mixed-product and clustered destinations, and it contributed two instruments for further work: stage criteria that render the transformation pathway testable, and a Destination Diversification Assessment Framework that evaluates diversification by the quality of each product's relation to heritage, community, economy, site and authenticity rather than by the number of activities on offer. Evidence on heritage compatibility was mixed, and the study does not claim that diversification is inherently benign. Its central practical implication is that a heritage destination can extend its tourism offer without displacing its heritage identity, provided that added products are spatially subordinated to the conservation core and interpretively connected to it.

6 DECLARATIONS

6.1 Author Contributions

Rizki Avinda Pricilla: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Writing – original draft. Shella Gherina Saptiany: Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Visualization, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration. Both authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for the work.

6.2 Funding

This research received no external funding and was conducted independently by the authors.

6.3 Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this article.

6.4 Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to participant confidentiality and applicable ethical considerations.

6.5 Artificial Intelligence (AI) Disclosure

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT only for paraphrasing and language refinement of sentences. The authors reviewed and revised all AI-assisted text and take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and final content of the manuscript.

6.6 Research Ethics

Ethical review and approval were not required for this study because it was conducted as independent, non-interventional tourism research and did not involve clinical procedures or collection of sensitive personal data.

6.7 Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the interviews.

6.8 Acknowledgments

The authors have no acknowledgments to declare.

References

- [1] Yaniv Poria, Richard Butler, and David Airey, "Links between Tourists, Heritage, and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites," *J. Travel Res.*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 19–28, Aug. 2004, doi: 10.1177/0047287504265508.
- [2] A. Duda, "Tourist photography and heritage. The case of the abandoned city of Pripyat," *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 384–400, May 2023, doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2022.2161907.
- [3] J. Romão, K. Palm, and U. Persson-Fischier, "Open spaces for co-creation: a community-based approach to tourism product diversification," *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 94–113, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1080/15022250.2023.2174183.
- [4] K. Nam, C. S. Dutt, and J. Baker, "Authenticity in Objects and Activities: Determinants of Satisfaction with Virtual Reality Experiences of Heritage and Non-Heritage Tourism Sites," *Information Systems Frontiers*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 1219–1237, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10796-022-10286-1.
- [5] A. Siri, A. Di Nuzzo, and S. Marchesini, "Playing with the cultural pilgrimage to stimulate tourism: the xFORMAL project on cultural heritage and informal learning," *Open Research Europe*, vol. 3, p. 93, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.12688/openreseurope.15321.1.
- [6] F. Mazzocchi, "Diving Deeper into the Concept of 'Cultural Heritage' and Its Relationship with Epistemic Diversity," *Soc. Epistemol.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 393–406, May 2022, doi: 10.1080/02691728.2021.2023682.

- [7] Xin Su and Suraiyati Rahman, "Tourist Behavioral Intentions in a UNESCO World Cultural Heritage Site in China: A Multi-Method Analysis Integrating PLS-SEM and fsQCA of Motivational and Perceptual Factors," *Sage Open*, vol. 16, no. 1, p. 21582440251410720, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1177/21582440251410718.
- [8] S. Slamet, N. Nuryanti, R. Soelistijanto, and R. Bhandari, "Socio-Cultural, Historical, Religious, and Architectural Values of Prambanan Temple," *At-Tarbawi: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Kebudayaan*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 26–49, Apr. 2026, doi: 10.32505/zg3vd841.
- [9] A. Chapman, D. Light, and S. Richards, "Heritage attractions, competitive pressures and adaptation: the case of the British seaside pier," *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 533–545, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2020.1806288.
- [10] E. Azmi, R. A. Che Rose, A. Awang, and A. Abas, "Innovative and Competitive: A Systematic Literature Review on New Tourism Destinations and Products for Tourism Supply," Jan. 01, 2023, *MDPI*. doi: 10.3390/su15021187.
- [11] I. Santosa and I. K. D. Noorwatha, "Symbolic and aesthetic fusion in Keraton Surakarta: colonial influence and Javanese cultural resistance through architectural design adaptation," *Cogent Arts Humanit.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 2482456, Dec. 2025, doi: 10.1080/23311983.2025.2482456.
- [12] C. Lupu, S. S. Padhi, R. K. Pati, and O. M. Stoleriu, "Tourist choice of heritage sites in Romania: a conjoint choice model of site attributes and variety seeking behavior," *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 646–668, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2020.1818763.
- [13] D. Katyukha, V. Yurovchyk, K. Horiunova, S. Melnychenko, and Y. Myronov, "Leveraging Cultural Heritage for Sustainable Tourism Growth: Contemporary Strategies for Conversation and Promotion," *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*.
- [14] M. Shakya and G. Vagnarelli, "Creating value from intangible cultural heritage—the role of innovation for sustainable tourism and regional rural development," *European Journal of Cultural Management and Policy*, vol. Volume 14-2024, 2024, [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontierspartnerships.org/journals/european-journal-of-cultural-management-and-policy/articles/10.3389/ejcmp.2024.12057>
- [15] C. Yuan, L. Gan, and H. Zhuo, "Coupling Mechanisms and Development Patterns of Revitalizing Intangible Cultural Heritage by Integrating Cultural Tourism: The Case of Hunan Province, China," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 14, no. 12, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14126994.
- [16] A. Nag and A. S. Rathore, "Digital Innovation and Destination Competitiveness: Leveraging Mining Heritage for Virtual Tourism Experiences," Apr. 01, 2025, *Shahrood University of Technology*. doi: 10.22044/jme.2024.14852.2821.
- [17] S. Suriyankietkaew, K. Krittayaruangroj, S. Thinthan, and S. Lumlongrut, "Community Capitals Framework for Sustainable Development: A Qualitative Study of Creative Tourism in Ban Chiang World Heritage Site," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 17, no. 8, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.3390/su17083311.
- [18] Y. Zhang, Á. Papp-Váry, and Z. Szabó, "Digital Engagement and Visitor Satisfaction at World Heritage Sites: A Study on Interaction, Authenticity, and Recommendations in Coastal China," *Adm. Sci.*, vol. 15, no. 3, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.3390/admsci15030110.

- [19] W.-K. Ng, C.-L. Chen, and Y.-H. Huang, "Revitalization of cultural heritage in the digital era: A case study in Taiwan," *Urban Resilience and Sustainability*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 215–235, 2024, doi: 10.3934/urs.2024011.
- [20] S. Ammirato, A. M. Felicetti, R. Linzalone, and D. Carlucci, "Digital business models in cultural tourism," *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1940–1961, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1108/IJEBr-01-2021-0070.
- [21] C. Han, H. Yuan, and Y. Kim, "From Diversified Development to Sustainable Destination Management: Mechanisms Linking Tourist Psychological Identity and Cultural Tourism Sustainability," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 18, no. 1, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.3390/su18010473.
- [22] J. Ye, Y. Qin, and H. Wu, "Cultural heritage and sustainable tourism: unveiling the positive correlations and economic impacts," *Current Psychology*, vol. 43, no. 47, pp. 36393–36415, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s12144-024-07070-6.
- [23] Elisabeth Kastenholz and Werner Gronau, "Enhancing Competences For Co-Creating Appealing and Meaningful Cultural Heritage Experiences in Tourism," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 1519–1544, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1177/1096348020951637.
- [24] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006, doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
- [25] J. Saldaña, *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, 4th ed. London: SAGE, 2021.
- [26] M. Hennink and B. N. Kaiser, "Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests," *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 292, p. 114523, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523.
- [27] G. Guest, A. Bunce, and L. Johnson, "How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability," *Field Methods*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 59–82, Feb. 2006, doi: 10.1177/1525822X05279903.
- [28] Y. S. Lincoln and E. G. Guba, *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE, 1985.
- [29] R. K. Yin, *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*, 6th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2018.
- [30] N. Leiper, "Tourist attraction systems," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 367–384, 1990, doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(90)90004-B.
- [31] C. A. Gunn, *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases*, 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- [32] A. Weidenfeld, R. W. Butler, and A. M. Williams, "Clustering and compatibility between tourism attractions," *International Journal of Tourism Research*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–16, Jan. 2010, doi: 10.1002/jtr.732.
- [33] A. M. Benur and B. Bramwell, "Tourism product development and product diversification in destinations," *Tourism Management*, vol. 50, pp. 213–224, Oct. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.02.005.
- [34] D. MacCannell, "Staged authenticity: Arrangements of social space in tourist settings," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 79, no. 3, pp. 589–603, Nov. 1973, doi: 10.1086/225585.

- [35] E. Cohen, "Authenticity and commoditization in tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 371–386, 1988, doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X.
- [36] N. Wang, "Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 349–370, Apr. 1999, doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0.
- [37] G. Richards, "Creativity and tourism: The state of the art," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1225–1253, Oct. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.07.008.
- [38] L. Smith, *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- [39] W. Nuryanti, "Heritage and postmodern tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 249–260, 1996, doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(95)00062-3.
- [40] R. W. Butler, "The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources," *Canadian Geographer*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 5–12, Mar. 1980, doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0064.1980.tb00970.x.
- [41] ICOMOS, *International Cultural Heritage Tourism Charter: Reinforcing Cultural Heritage Protection and Community Resilience through Responsible and Sustainable Tourism Management*. Paris: ICOMOS, 2022.