

**DETERMINANT FACTOR ANALYSIS ON COMMUNITY
RURAL TOURISM IN INDONESIA****Ika Sartika¹, dan Ella Wargadinata²**¹Prodi Teknologi Rekayasa Informasi Pemerintahan, IPDN , Jl. Ir Soekarno KM 20, Jatiningor, 456363²Magister Terapan Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jl. Ir Soekarno KM 20, Jatiningor 456363E-mail: ikasartika@upm.ipdn.ac.id ; ella@upm.ipdn.ac.id

ABSTRACT. Mostly the tourist destination in Indonesia found in rural areas and belongs to the local community, who lives with limitations in terms of economy, low infrastructure accessibility, and lack of ability to manage natural resources. The study tries to portray and identify the local context of community-based tourism concepts through academic perspectives. It intended to identify the success factors of community-based tourism management for rural tourism objects in Indonesia. It conducted in five water tourism objects from five different regions, are Umbul Ponggok, Situ Panjalu, Situ Cibulan, Kola Lagundih, and Srigethuk. The research used a quantitative approach with discriminant analysis, data collected from 221 respondents through a questionnaire. The study shows that from the six predictors is that the leadership came as the main factor driving success in its implementation. Leadership plays an important role in grass root tourism management since it conceives to a traditional community. Accordingly, the traditional entities may cultural, socio-economic, structural-administration aspects are, in practice, intertwined.

Keywords: *Participation, Ownership; Responsibility; Sharing of Resources; Leadership; Partnership*

**ANALISIS FAKTOR KEBERHASILAN PARIWISATA BERBASIS
MASYARAKAT PERDESAAN DI INDONESIA**

ABSTRAK. Hampir semua objek wisata di Indonesia berada di daerah perdesaan yang dimiliki oleh masyarakat yang hidup dengan segala keterbatasan dari segi ekonomi, rendahnya aksibilitas infrastruktur, dan rendahnya kemampuan untuk mengelola sumber daya alam. Kajian ini berusaha untuk memotret dan melakukan identifikasi konteks lokal pengembangan pariwisata berbasis masyarakat dari perspektif akademis. Kajian ditujukan untuk melakukan identifikasi faktor kesuksesan pengelolaan pariwisata berbasis masyarakat untuk objek wisata perdesaan di Indonesia. Kajian dilakukan di lima objek wisata air dari lima daerah berbeda, yaitu: Umbul Ponggok, Situ Panjalu, Situ Cibulan, Kola Lagundih dan Srigethuk. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan menggunakan analisis diskriminan, data dikumpulkan dari 221 responden melalui angket. Kajian memperlihatkan bahwa dari enam faktor pengelolaan pariwisata berbasis masyarakat, ditemukan bahwa faktor kepemimpinan menjadi faktor utama pendorong kesuksesan pengelolaan objek pariwisata berbasis masyarakat di perdesaan di Indonesia. Hal ini diakibatkan karena aspek budaya, sosial-ekonomi, struktur administrasi, dan politik.

Kata kunci: Partisipasi, Kepemilikan; Tanggung Jawab; Berbagi sumberdaya; Kepemimpinan; Kerja sama

INTRODUCTION

Abundant literature showed on how tourism brings multi-benefits for community development. Indeed tourism managed by local people said as a real, sustainable development (Nitikasetsoontorn,2015). Others revealed that the reciprocal relations between full people participation and the success stories on tourism managed by local people (Mayaka, Croy, Cox, & Croy, 2017; Polnyotee & Thadaniti, 2015). Therefore researches put more emphasis on local people's participation as a basic framework on community-based tourism studies.

However, less research intended to explore the role of leadership on CBT, especially when the tourism location in rural which bonding with their culture and put their leader as a movement center. A few papers mentioned on how leadership plays a role in CBT (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, and Duangseng, 2014; Kunjuraman & Hussin, 2017). The Ba Na Ton Chan rural tourism in Thailand achieve its goals caused by the leader's roles (Witchayakawin P and Tengku W, 2018).

Research on water tourism has been carried out by

previous researchers and dominated by marine tourism. The themes raised were quite diverse, ranging from joint tourism management between the local government and the private sector in Pangkajene Regency (Ahmad & Rahayu, 2019), the development of fishing tourism in the city of Padang to include local wisdom (Haryani & Huda, 2019) which is similar to this research, is about the development of culture-based tourism in Lake Maninjau West Sumatra (Firdaus, 2019). Research showed how local community efforts to increase visitor numbers through several programs.

This research inspires on the model of natural water spring management in a small village named Ponggok. Village *Ponggok* revitalizes its rural development based on local participation. It determines as a rural spring water tourist destination, which becomes a national model for rural development in Indonesia. This poor village transforms into one of the richest villages caused by professional management on their natural resources. Most of the villagers were in debt, but now they are enjoying the benefit of the 14 billion IDR as a tourism revenue (Sari, 2016; Apriyani, 2016; Hanifah, 2019).

The paper tried to explore five water spring destinations in rural areas located in different municipalities and operated by the local people. The paper tried to sensitize the critical factors of CBT in Indonesia rural, which still bound with traditional culture. Unlike most CBT research, the paper used a combination model through Nitikasetsoontorn (2015) basis and instrument development based on the local Indonesian context. The paper tried to sharpen the Thailand field result in Indonesia's rural atmosphere, which has distinct features due to different socio-economic-culture and the public administration system.

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) is a tourism management concept that fully engages the community. Many aspects focus on defining CBT. Some experts emphasize that CBT is a concept of sustainable development (Ellis & Sheridan, 2015). As noted, the main approach to sustainable development is to alter people's participation. Other consideration bears on local people's needs and capacities. Moreover, CBT has a close association with the local social-cultural setting. Many of the success stories in establishing links among CBT activities in rural development can be related directly to local daily lives, which attempts to derive economic benefits from existing ecology natural resources through local wisdom deliberations. The CBT may consider distinct tourism management based on social, cultural, environmental, either to encourage them to do so. If successful, such a CBT strategy can lead to a more economic-beneficial distribution of local people and natural resources preservation at the same time. CBT will achieve sustainable development tools if it meets with relevant criteria when it will give financial benefits to all local human beings without taking any negative impact to the natural resources as a tourism object (Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2016).

CBT also believe as empowering people mechanism. The decentralization of local tourism management to local people provides wide opportunities for them to involve deeply and stimulate their innovations to gain financial and non-financial benefits (Nitikasetsoontorn, 2015). CBT is participative tourism activities in which allow the local belongings to used by an outsider as visitors. Rural residents have similar opportunities to earn income in many ways, as a self-employed, working as tour guides, food service providers as parking lot owner or working as an employee for a more well-organized tourist provider. The benefit of CBT to local people is depending on the management used; it should be based on local circumstances (Polnyotee & Thadaniti, 2015).

Research on CBT has been carried out by experts with varying focus. Community participation is the most focused aspect discussed by researchers. The application of CBT is an approach to tourism development with participatory planning. Local people's participation is a pivotal issue in the planning process at the first stage of

CBT. Togetherness is necessary for all to sit and discuss together regarding identifying local people's interests. To some extent, despite the decentralization of the decision-making process to local people, the ideal CBT has to provide maximum benefits for them but also relate to natural resources conservation (Gumilar, 2018).

Looking at the existing forms of community participation, the model available on two forms of community participation applied in Indonesia, namely direct participation (active) and indirect participation. Community participation was often through representation, which concerning local practices (Mayaka, Croy, Cox, & Croy, 2017). However, the shifting paradigm on tourism management to give full participation in local people, which mostly lives in rural areas, also raises several dilemmas. Since those deprived of economic and social standards, participation for them needs to be formulated. Who should lead those and who should have initiative first (Petrie & Piveevie, 2016). Furthermore, an intervention process should be done through a systematic education basis, whereby local people are given some latitude, within prescribed fundamental tourism management, on how to: plan, execute, control and evaluate their potential objects which suit local conditions. More intensive than education as a tool to increase local participation, research in Alajar (Sout West Spain) shows migrant participation on CBT can affect the success of CBT and attract local people to participate more. (southwest Spain) (Ruiz-ballesteros & Rafael, 2016). Meanwhile, Towner & Towner (2016), in some cases, concluded that abandon local people ownership and giving it to foreign investors often linked to reducing local participation. Inadequate government backup on the model of grass-root tourism management also hampers local participation. Those intended to ensure that building local people capacity and consistent government support to give trust to the local people to manage their belongings will lead to high participation. The potential gain of local participation derives mainly from the close contact of locals with tourism objects. This evidence set out clearly a clear financial-social-environmental rationale for local people's participation. The sustainable development of local tourism management can ve achieved if trust to the local people with some effective supports are given at the grass-root level. Based on the extent of local's participation, the study conducted in Laos identified three classifications on its; active participation if locals touch intensively on CBT, passive participation if locals put themselves as doers without having direct interaction on the decision-making process. The third is the nonparticipation group, which labeled to locals who has a space with tourism management (Park, Phandanouvong, & Kim, 2017). From a successful CBTs standpoint, Rodrigues & Prideaux (2017) states that despite participation, some indicators came up as important factors that CBT's should run based on a partnership among multi-stakeholders, encouraging locals and strengthening local's skills.

In addition to participation, another focus that widely discussed is ownership. Ownership, along with participation, is considered important in the management of CBT (Towner & Towner, 2016). CBT recognized for its proper social justice and redistributive perspective linked to the alternative development approach. CBT, therefore, is anchored in concepts of alternative development through issues such as the local's confidence, enabling process, and long-term run where ownership, level of involvement, and distribution of benefits are the recurrent issues. Furthermore, it can conclude that CBT can understand as a mechanism which owned by the community, runs and controlled by them, for the sake of community. But ownership alone is not enough; insufficient local management skills will exacerbate if CBT intended to manage in the commercial business manner (Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017). The visitor only will come if the tourism object has a positive image (AB, 2018). Creating a good image for rural tourism is a challenge for the local community since most of them have inadequate skills and knowledge of tourism management. Ownership to the local tourist objects relates directly to the strong bound to managing it properly (Chubchuwong, Beise-zee, & Speece, 2015).

Another aspect that is considered important in CBT is a partnership (Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017). Partnership broadens the range and deepens the base of participation. Instead of viewing CBT exclusively within the local/rural community group, which isolated from other tourism stakeholders, partnerships address the relationship among communities, between communities and government, and between communities with other tourism providers. Collaboration as a further form of partnership that works based on fluid connectivity among stakeholders believed as a basic concept in community-based tourism for most developing countries (Stone, 2015). The collaborative process is a key dimension of CBT management planning. The collaborative process requires the participation of the community, the existence of equality of power, and the competence of actors as a guarantee of the sustainability of the dialogue of authentic citizens (Tresiana & Duadi, 2017). A collaborative process paves the success of local tourism through local capacity building in terms of knowledge enhancement, financial assistance, and tourist object promotions. Effective collaborative actions will lead to enhance rural livelihoods (Tolkach & King, 2015).

The three aspects above are indirectly determining the success of CBT in developing countries. Research on the determinants of success in managing CBT in Thailand experience has identified six factors, namely: (1) Participation; (2) Ownership; (3) Responsibility; (4) Sharing of resources; (5) Leadership; and (6) Partnership (Nitikasetsoontorn, 2015).

However, the process of community-based tourism also influenced by local context. Local cultures will shape on CBT development (Giampiccolli and Kalis, 2012). The

paper seeks to answer some basic questions on how these indicators work in different locations, which have different atmospheres, especially to identify the most important factor within factors above. Recently, none of the research showing these six indicators applied outside Thailand. In this case, the paper tries to enrich the research on CBT relates to the local context to these indicators. The paper's goal is to provide a general assessment of where the rural Indonesian community employs this valuable indicator. This study will try to test these six aspects of managing water tourism in Indonesia. Research conducted in five spring water tourism objects: 1) Umbul Ponggok, Village Polanharjo, Klaten Regency, 2) Kola Langgundih, Village Ujung Piring, Bangkalan Regency - Madura 3) Situ Panjalu, Village Panjalu, Ciamis Regency, 4) Sri Gethuk, Village Bleberan, Gunung Kidul Regency 5) Situ Cibulan, Village Maniskidul, Kuningan Regency.

Based on the description above, the research questions that will sight for solutions are: What are the key factors that can determine the success of CBT management in rural areas in Indonesia?

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach, which consists of two analyzes, descriptive statistics to see the respondent's response to the six determinants of the success of CBT management, and discriminant analysis to determine the determinants of the success of CBT management. Primary data obtained from the results of a survey of stakeholders in the management of CBT, which consists of: government officials, rural officials, and community. The sampling technique used was accidental sampling from visitors to these locations. Research conducted in different water spring tourism in five locations in West, Center, and East Java, which managed by the local community. The total number of respondents is 221 people. with details of each location as follows:

Table 1 Number of Respondents in Each Research Location

| Locations | Number of Respondents |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| Umbul Ponggok | 91 |
| Situ Panjalu | 38 |
| Situ Cibulan | 45 |
| Kola Lagundih | 22 |
| Srighethuk | 25 |
| Total | 221 |

The research questionnaire as the main instrument in this study was compiled based on six determining variables for the successful management of CBT, developed by (Nitikasetsoontorn, 2015). It covers: Participation (X1); Ownership (X2); Responsibility (X3); Sharing of resources (X4); Leadership (X5); Partnership (X6), and independent variable is The Success of CBT Management (Y).

The steps in the research analysis are: Conduct survey data collection on the success of water tourism management viewed from six dimensions; 2) Conduct descriptive analysis; 3) Testing the assumption of multivariate normal distribution on predictor variable data; 4) Testing the assumption of homogeneity. 5) Perform discriminant analysis to get linear functions. The variables used in this study are one response variable (Y) and six predictor variables (X).




Figure 1. The relationship between variable x and variable y

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analysis

The following are the results of a survey conducted on stakeholders in managing water tourism in Indonesia. The questions asked are: Does each dimension determine the success of water tourism management in Indonesia? The following table shows a profile of 221 respondents who have answered the questions in the questionnaire.

Table 2. Description of Respondents

| | Description | Number | % |
|--------|---------------------|--------|-------|
| Gender | Male | 114 | 51,58 |
| | Female | 107 | 48,42 |
| Status | Community | 168 | 76,02 |
| | Government official | 11 | 4,97 |
| | Village Officials | 24 | 19,01 |

The following table shows the results of a survey of all respondents for the six dimensions that determine the success of managing water attractions in five locations.

Table 3. Results of Survey

| Dimension | Response | |
|----------------------|-----------|----------|
| | Yes | No |
| Participation | 209 (95%) | 12 (5%) |
| Ownership | 214 (97%) | 7 (3%) |
| Responsibility | 205 (93%) | 16 (7%) |
| Sharing of Resources | 163 (74%) | 58 (26%) |
| Leadership | 197 (89%) | 24 (11%) |
| Partnership | 179 (81%) | 42 (19%) |

The survey results show that successive ownership, participation, and responsibility are the determinants of the success of water tourism management in Indonesia.

The results are in line with the research put forward by researchers who discussed the importance of community participation in the development of CBT (Stone, 2015); (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2015); (Towner & Towner, 2016); (Park et al., 2017); (Kunjuraman & Hussin, 2017); (Mayaka et al., 2017). The survey results also support researchers who state that ownership is a determining factor for the successful management of CBT (Chubchuwong et al., 2015). Meanwhile, the importance of responsibility in tourism has been linked to social responsibility by many researchers. Research on the importance of social responsibility in realizing sustainable tourism is a widely discussed theme (Mihalic, 2014; Paskova & Zelenka, 2019; Smith & Lei, 2015). Other researchers link social responsibility with financial performance in the tourism industry (Theodoulidis, Diaz, Crotto, & Rancati, 2017). Other researchers argue that social responsibility can improve the quality of life of people around tourism sites (Mathew & Sreejesh, 2017). Furthermore, to realize sustainable tourism requires careful development planning (Hughes & Scheyvens, 2016). Responsibility in tourism is also associated with a desire to reduce the negative impact of tourism on the surrounding community (Gao, Huang, & Zhang, 2016; Grimwood, Yudina, Muldoon, & Qiu, 2015). The tourism industry also must report all its activities to all stakeholders (Grosbois, 2015).

These three dimensions are perceived almost the same by all respondents, which is above 90%. This result is influenced by the education of respondents who are mostly college graduates (89,90%).

The results will be different if the respondent's profile changes. The results of this survey influenced by the status of the respondents. The data obtained shows the majority of respondents are the community. The survey results do not involve tourism business actors and government officials.

Discriminant Analysis

The discriminant analysis used to see the magnitude of the influence of each dimension on the success of CBT management. The six dimensions are broken down into deeper questions to see stakeholder responses.

The first step in discriminant analysis is the normality test of the data using the Pearson correlation test. The correlation coefficient obtained for 0.974 shows a very high correlation coefficient. Significant value (0,000) <0.05 means that there is a significant correlation. That is, the data comes from samples that normally distributed multivariate.

The second step is the multicollinearity test, with the results, as in Table 2 below. From the correlation matrix, it appears there are no numbers that reach 0.5 or above, and it can conclude that there is no multicollinearity in the data.

The third step is to test the equality of the variance-covariance matrix (homoskedasticity), with the following results.

Table 4. Pooled Within-Groups Matrices

| | | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 |
|-------------|----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Covariance | X1 | 3.108 | .678 | -.380 | .288 | .135 | .020 |
| | X2 | .678 | 3.208 | -.358 | .503 | -.393 | -.004 |
| | X3 | -.380 | -.358 | 2.890 | -.219 | -.534 | .013 |
| | X4 | .288 | .503 | -.219 | 1.724 | .226 | .257 |
| | X5 | .135 | -.393 | -.534 | .226 | 2.836 | .096 |
| | X6 | .020 | -.004 | .013 | .257 | .096 | 1.584 |
| Correlation | X1 | 1.000 | .215 | -.127 | .124 | .046 | .009 |
| | X2 | .215 | 1.000 | -.118 | .214 | -.130 | -.002 |
| | X3 | -.127 | -.118 | 1.000 | -.098 | -.187 | .006 |
| | X4 | .124 | .214 | -.098 | 1.000 | .102 | .156 |
| | X5 | .046 | -.130 | -.187 | .102 | 1.000 | .046 |
| | X6 | .009 | -.002 | .006 | .156 | .046 | 1.000 |

a. The covariance matrix has 219 degrees of freedom.

Table 5. Test Results

| | | |
|---------|---------|-----------|
| Box's M | | 6.119 |
| F | Approx. | 2.001 |
| | df1 | 3 |
| | df2 | 71007.427 |
| | Sig. | .111 |

Tests null hypothesis of equal population covariance matrices.

The table above shows that the null hypothesis can accept the value of p-value (Sig.) is 0.111, and the level research confidence is 95%. From the results of this test, it can conclude that the data come from populations that have the same variance-covariance matrix (homoskedasticity). Thus, the analysis process can continue.

Table 6 below shows the results of discriminant analysis through an average vector similarity test.

Table 6. Tests of Equality of Group Means

| | Wilks' Lambda | F | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|----|---------------|--------|-----|-----|------|
| X1 | .998 | .476 | 1 | 219 | .491 |
| X2 | .942 | 13.500 | 1 | 219 | .000 |
| X3 | .978 | 4.985 | 1 | 219 | .027 |
| X4 | .996 | .915 | 1 | 219 | .340 |
| X5 | .929 | 16.856 | 1 | 219 | .000 |
| X6 | .985 | 3.434 | 1 | 219 | .065 |

Judging from the p-value (Sig.), variables X₂ (Ownership), X₃ (Responsibility) and X₅ (Leadership) have different averages for the two CBT management groups, categorized on 'yes' and 'no.' The result shows that there are differences between respondents who assess yes and no to CBT management related to X₂ (Ownership), X₃ (Responsibility), and X₅ (Leadership). While the variables X₁ (Participation), X₄ (Sharing of Resources), and X₆ (Partnership) have an average that is not the same/different for the two CBT management groups categorized on 'yes' and 'no'. The result shows that there is no difference between respondents who assess yes and no to CBT management related to X₁ (Participation), X₄ (Sharing

of Resources) and X₆ (Partnership). Thus, there are 3 significantly different variables for the two discriminant groups, namely X₂ (Ownership), X₃ (Responsibility), and X₅ (Leadership).

Meanwhile, based on the results of the formation of linear functions as shown in table 6, the shape of the linear function as is: $Y = -12,560 + 0,405X_2 + 0,469X_5$

Table 7. Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

| | Function | |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------|
| | 1 | |
| X2 | | .405 |
| X5 | | .469 |
| (Constant) | | -12.560 |
| Unstandardized coefficients | | |

The result supported by Independent Inter-Variable Correlation, as shown in the following table. The Matrix Structure Table explains the correlation between the independent variables and the discriminant functions that formed. The variable X₅ (Leadership) is most closely related to the discriminant function, then variable X₂ (Ownership). While variables X₁ (Participation), X₃ (Responsibility), X₄ (Sharing of Resources), and X₆ (Partnership) not included in the discriminant model.

Table 8. Structure Matrix

| | Function | |
|-----------------|----------|-------|
| | 1 | |
| X5 | | .695 |
| X2 | | .622 |
| X4 ^a | | .236 |
| X3 ^a | | -.233 |
| X1 ^a | | .192 |
| X6 ^a | | .035 |

Pooled within-groups correlations between discriminating variables and standardized canonical discriminant functions. Variables ordered by the absolute size of correlation within the function.

This foregoing research clearly reveals that leadership is the most influencing factor for the successful management of CBT in Indonesia.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted in Sabah Malaysia, and poor local leadership is one of the challenges in managing tourism in rural areas (Kunjuraman & Hussin, 2017). Some of the studies that support leadership are the importance of social capital (Guo, Zhang, Zhang, & Zheng, 2018), clear institutional arrangements, power and authority (Hampton & Jeyacheya, 2015), and the importance of vision to ahead in managing CBT.

This result is convincing that the village head plays a central role in rural development in Indonesia (Sutiyo & Maharjan, 2017; Suwardianto, 2015). The important role of the head village on community-based tourism stated clearly by Aini (2019). She mentioned four leadership dimensions; intelligence, maturity, social-human relations, the self- motivation that owned by the head village to develop the tourism object belong to the rural community (Ainii, 2019).

Leadership in this research refers to the role of the village head, which is put by statistics analysis is the most influencing factor as it was administrative-powerfull, having an authority on traditional-social based and politically legitimate. The important role of leadership in the village can trace by historical context. The village formed when several people with their families choose a place to live in particular areas that are supported by natural sources for their livelihood. The strongest and most powerful among flocks as they were building the bare land as a small hamlet naturally have the honor of being a village leader (Soetarto & Sihaholo, 2016). The Head village viewed as a person who has more capacity, knowledge, economic-political power compare with the common villagers. He, mostly head village, is a man who can influence others to join with his ideas. The village had has a legitimate power on the political basis when he votes directly by villagers. The Head village has power on a socio-economic-cultural basis since He put on the highest strata among villagers and has the power to direct and guide villagers. The Village head's role can explain through four aspects: Cultural, Socio-Economics, Administrative-Structural, and Political.

1) Cultural

In the beginning, the village was formed based on kinship, and then the group created cultural customs that bound themselves. This relationship creates a growth of new commitment, and later on, it embedded in their way of life. This new form will pass within ages through their descendants as their values and belief.

On Javanese culture, the leader put on top hierarchy. The relations between the village head and villagers build based on solidarity but not equality, the leader comes as a guardian and also act as a parent for the community (Sutiyo & Maharjan, 2017). Research on rural tourism development showed that the village leader involves directly on CBT management in planning, controlling, and

evaluating stages (Septian, 2017). Research conducted in rural tourism in China showed that a traditional leader who has power among the villagers came as a key factor in sustainability on their tourism object (Xu, Zhang, & Tian, 2017). In the case of community-based tourism in rural Indonesia, the head village becomes a central actor since the villagers put fully trust their leader, who will bring them into better condition. The leader has a negotiation competency that mostly used a traditional approach, which is preferable for most Indonesian (Diliani, 2016). Historically, those who live in a village in Indonesia were live in traditional cultures. They bound by kinship, and they are family members. The villager in Indonesia classified as the collectivist society, which puts the group interest rather than individual matters. The prominent characteristics of this traditional society are '*gotong-royong*' or mutual assistant and '*musyawarah-mufakat*' or literally means as deliberation to get consensus. Accordingly, traditional approach is a direct personal-approach from the head village to the community member, which manifested through different ways, such as informal chit chat, or involve with the villager activities. The head village put themselves as a part of the community.

The result of this research also showed in other rural tourism in Indonesia, that the development of potential rural tourism put the role of Head village leadership as the key success of the concept of rural tourism (Maulana & Ramadanty, 2018). In the case of Ponggok, as the most developed rural tourism object among other locations, the role of the head village on rural tourism development started from the first stage when the village declares and take action to put it on the village planning document. He also boosts this initiative through the village-owned enterprise to collaborate with academicians to make a comprehensive planning program. The head village is empowering local youth to involve directly in this tourism object as a swimming pool operators, as an underwater photographer (Gunawan, 2011). The progressive initiative of the head village on the Ponggok freshwater tourism succeeds in creating a multiplier economic effect on to whole villagers. The ponggok freshwater came as the best tourism village in Indonesia ("Ponggok Jadi Desa Wisata Terbaik, Ratusan Warganya Jadi Investor," n.d.). The Ponggok Village-owned enterprises, Tirta Mandiri as the owner of Ponggok tourism object, was built in 2009 with 150 million IDR income, and in 2017 reached 12 billion IDR and grow as village enterprises with 13 business units ("BUMDes Tirta Mandiri Menembus Batas," n.d.).

2) Socio-Economics

For village communities who are still bound by traditional culture and hold their traditional values strongly, they viewed their leader as a person who has more advantages. Put at the upper level and as a community who has a lower position will make them obey and follow the leader's instruction easier. At javanese culture which

all tourism objects researched, they still keep their ancestor norms that leader is someone who should be followed, in this case, the village head factor is a determining factor for development at the village level. The relationship between the village community and the village head is a patron-client relationship, which causes the village community to have high adherence to their leaders. Mostly, villages in Java are agricultural-based, and the village head is the landowner who is cultivated by villagers, and this is how the patron-client was formed (Maftuchin, 2016). This traditional pattern still exists in rural areas in Indonesia, which shows the natural connection between the head village to support the economy of the villagers to fulfill their basic needs. The relationship born between different classes or different social statuses, the head village as a patron put in a higher position and villagers as a client at an inferior place. In this pattern, the patron comes as a giver and client as a receiver (Lukiyanto, Widita, & Kumalasari, 2018). The Head village came as a person who has advantages compared to other common villagers, so he has the power and authority to direct and guide the community, also get recognition and support from them. He also has the power to mobilize the community to achieve particular goals. While leadership itself is, by definition, an activity that influences people to work together to achieve the goals they want.

3) Structural-Administration

It started when decentralization law enacted in 1999, which give a wide authority to local government to manage their local affairs due to local conditions and their capacities (Almaarif & Maksum, 2017; Lambelanova, 2017). Then, the Government of Indonesia expands this policy to the lowest level of the government unit. Both policies are the umbrella for local government organizations to manage their local affairs based on local conditions. Since the village law issued in 2014, the position of the village head as a village administrator has strengthened. Village heads formally have a very important role in village development. The village head is the legalized leader in one particular village area. Officially, He has a duty as the first person who has full responsibility for village administration affairs (Tahir, 2017). As can be seen recently, the head village has strong control over village administration affairs, in terms of planning, spending, and reporting of annual village planning. Though those duties should discuss with village representative board members. The relationship between those village institutions is a partnership, consultation, and coordination (Khaeril, 2015). However, the power of the village head as executive viewed more based on historical and socio-cultural background, and it was strengthened by the political aspect when the village head was elected directly by villagers.

Based on Village regulation number 6/2014 the tasks of head village stated clear and details. The Head village has a wide range of authority, from administrative tasks

to social work as a villager's guardian. In administration domains, the head village has a specific job; he or she acts as implementor and executor village regulations. The head village also acts as a social worker. He or She also has a responsibility to maintain village social-life stability. In brief, head village influence on community-based tourism so far has deeply linked due to two major reasons. First, the annual village planning was perceived by law as his authority. This mechanism is a good opportunity to put rural tourism as a focus of the village development agenda. The head village will involve directly to boost the village economy by maximized village capital in terms of financial and social capital.

The progressive development of tourism objects in rural, however, varies. A creative strategy presented by an innovative head village has gained into the tourism object's development. Head village intervention through smart collaborative has been increased tourism object's income and contributed to the villagers' welfare. Second, the villager's trust of the head village and its competencies led to a solid of substantive dialogue between internal village institutions: community groups, informal leaders, village-owned enterprises, and external institutions, i.e: academicians, upper-level administration, financial institutions and even collaborates with private business. The smart head village also maximized CSR-corporate social responsibility for rural tourism object development.

4) Political

Village in Indonesia applied direct election for the head village since the Dutch colonial era and continued when Independence in 1945. The village political practices show that direct election at the village level in Indonesia is a genuine democratic model in Indonesia and even it practiced before any election at the municipal, province, or Presidential election, which just started in 2004. The Indonesian political situation at the state level impacted the power of the head village (Antlov, 2003). Although due to the existence of village representative board come as a check and balance mechanism for head village power which put head village is not a sole authority at the village level; however, the power of the head village is still strong and embedded in rural lives of what viewed. As mentioned, "Don't be underestimated with head village power" (Sutiyo & Maharjan, 2017). The power of the head village also supported by new decentralization law, which enacted in 2014 and strengthened by law for the village in 2016. Since the government of Indonesia identified rural development as the 'heart to the economic growth', in the mid-2000s, the rural development remains as marginalized and underdeveloped (Hariri, 2018).

On the other hand, due to the majority population living in rural areas. While abundant natural resources located at the village, however poverty mostly found in this area. Because of these challenges and obstacles, the Government of Indonesia implements a new approach

that puts rural as a forefront on national development strategy. And village as the lowest public organization is a vital factor as a development agent to reach the vulnerable groups in rural (Aritonang, 2016). Shortly since its enacted, the GOI has released an enormous state budget called as village fund as fuel for boosting the economy in rural. To properly understand the factor that has contributed to the achievement of this goal, the head village comes as a development agent.

Furthermore, as a winner in the direct election, the head village has majority power, which turns on to the number of supporters for his policies. Following this phenomena, the head village power touch on development tourist object directly. In response to developing a rural tourism object, a head leader use his wide authority to involve a better management directly to increase the number of visitors.

CONCLUSION

Based on descriptive analysis result, it can be concluded there are three important factors, namely: ownership, participation, and responsibility; But the results of a more comprehensive analysis, through discriminant analysis, show that the variable that most influences the success of CBT management is leadership; Leadership in this research refers to the role of village head which is put by statistics analysis is the most influencing factor as it was administrative-powerfull, having an authority on traditional-social based and politically legitimate. Based on literature review, village head's role can be explained through four aspects: Cultural, Socio-Economics, Administrative Structural, and Political.

Traditional approach is a direct personal-approach from head village to the community member which manifested through different ways, such as informal chit chat, or involve with the villager activities. The head village put themselves as a part of the community; The traditional pattern still exists in rural areas in Indonesia which shows the natural connection between head village to support the economic of the villagers to fulfill their basic need. The relationship born between different classes or different social status, the head village as a patron put in a higher position and villagers as a client at an inferior place; As a social worker, the head village has responsibility to maintain the village social-life stability; As a winner on direct election, head village has majority power which turns on to the number of supporters for his policies. Following this phenomena, the head village power touch on development tourist object directly. In response to development rural tourism object, a head leader use his wide authority to involve directly better management to increase the number of visitors.

REFERENCES

- AB, A. (2018). Citra Destinasi Dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Intensi Untuk Berkunjung Kembali Di Sulawesi Selatan Sebagai Destinasi Pariwisata. *Determinant Factor Analysis on Community Rural Tourism in Indonesia (Ika Sartika, dan Ella Wargadinata)*
- Sosiohumaniora, 20, (3), 207–2014. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v20i3.14050>
- Ahmad, B. & Rahayu, F.S.P. (2019). The Partnership of Maritime Tourism Management in Kapoposang Island Pangkajene Regency. *Mimbar*, 33, (1), 182–190.
- Ainii, A.Q. (2019). Kepemimpinan Kepala Desa Dalam Pengembangan Pariwisata Berbasis Masyarakat (Community Based Tourism) Di Desa Ponggok Kecamatan Polanharjo Kabupaten Klaten. *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 8, (2), 11–20.
- Almaarif, A. & Maksum, I.R. (2017). Functional Decentralization Construct in Decentralization Policy in Indonesia (A Study of Irrigation, Education, and Free Trade Sectors). *JKAP*, 21, (1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jkap.25383>
- Antlov, H. (2003). Village Government And Rural Development In Indonesia: The New Democratic Framework. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 39, (2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074910302013>
- Aritonang, D. (2016). Kebijakan Desentralisasi Untuk Desa Dalam UU Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 (Decentralization Policy for Village in Law No. 6 Year 2014). *Legislasi Indonesia*, 12, (3), 1-28.
- BUMDes Tirta Mandiri Menembus Batas. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://swa.co.id/swa/trends/bumdes-tirta-mandiri-menembus-batas>
- Chubchuwong, M., Beise-zee, R., & Speece, M. W. (2015). The Effect of Nature-based Tourism , Destination Attachment and Property Ownership on Environmental-friendliness of Visitors : A Study in Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, (June), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2014.925482>
- Diliani, D.S.N.A. (2016). Identifying the Leadership Effectiveness of the Executive Leaders in Indonesia. *International Journal Of Administrative Science & Organization*, 23, (1), 28–35.
- Firdaus. (2019). Potency of Integrated Cultural Tourism Development at Maninjau Lake Area, West Sumatera. *Mimbar*, 34, (1), 72–82.
- Gao, J., Huang, Z.J. & Zhang, C. (2017). Tourists' perceptions of responsibility: an application of norm-activation theory. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, (August), 25, (2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1202954>
- Grimwood, B.S.R., Yudina, O., Muldoon, M. & Qiu, J. (2015). Responsibility in tourism: A discursive analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 50, 22–38.
- Grosbois, D.de. (2015). Corporate social responsibility reporting in the cruise tourism industry: a performance evaluation using a new institutional

- theory based model. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9582(October). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1076827>
- Gumilar, I. (2018). Partisipasi Masyarakat Pesisir Dalam Pelestarian Ekosistem Hutan Mangrove (Studi Kasus di Kabupaten Indramayu Jawa Barat. *Sosiohumaniora*, 20, (2), 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v20i2.14707>
- Gunawan, K. (2011). Manajemen BUMDES Dalam Rangka Menekan Laju Urbanisasi. *WIDYATECH Jurnal Sains Dan Teknologi*.
- Guo, Y., Zhang, J., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, C. (2018). Examining the relationship between social capital and community residents' perceived resilience in tourism destinations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1428335>
- Hampton, M. P., & Jeyacheya, J. (2015). Power, Ownership and Tourism in Small Islands: Evidence from Indonesia. *WORLD DEVELOPMENT*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.12.007>
- Hariri, A. (2018). Eksistensi Pemerintahan Desa Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Asas Subsidiaritas Dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 Tentang Desa. *Legality*, 26, (2), 253–266.
- Haryani, & Huda, N. (2019). Developing Fishing Tourism Destination Based on “Anak Nagari” Concept in Padang City. *Mimbar*, 34, (1), 51–59.
- Hughes, E., & Scheyvens, R. (2016). Corporate social responsibility in tourism post-2015: a Development First approach a Development First approach. *Tourism Geographies*, (September). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2016.1208678>
- Khaeril, A. (2015). Hubungan Kerja Antara Kepala Desa Dengan Badan Permusyawaratan Desa (BPD) Meenurut Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 Tentang Desa. *Jurnal IUS*, 3, (2), 207–221.
- Kunjuraman, V., & Hussin, R. (2017). Challenges of community-based homestay programme in Sabah, Malaysia: Hopeful or hopeless? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 21, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2016.10.007>
- Lambelanova, R. (2017). Implementasi Kebijakan Otonomi Daerah Bidang Pendidikan, Kesehatan Dan Perekonomian Di Kabupaten Bandung Barat. *Sosiohumaniora*, 19, (2), 185–198
- Lukiyanto, K., Widita, A., & Kumalasari, R.D. (2018). Patron-Client Relationship in Microenterprise Development as a Cultural Heritage in Modern Era. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum*, 26, (S), 155–162.
- Maftuchin, A. S. (2016). Tuan Tanah dan Lurah: Relasi Politik Lokal Patron-Client di Desa Sukorejo Kecamatan Godanglegi Kabupaten Malang dalam Kurun Waktu 2007-2013. *UMBARA: Indonesian Journal of Anthropology*, 1, (2), 128–149.
- Mathew, P. V., & Sreejesh, S. (2017). Impact of responsible tourism on destination sustainability and quality of life of community in tourism destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 83–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.10.001>
- Maulana, Y., & Ramadanty, S. (2018). *Leadership In Rural Tourism: Case Study Wangun Lestari Village, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia*.
- Mayaka, M., Croy, W. G., Cox, J. W., & Croy, W. G. (2017). Participation as motif in community-based tourism: a practice perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, (September), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1359278>
- Mihalic, T. (2014). Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse - Towards ‘responsustainable’ tourism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.062>
- Nitikasetsoontorn, S. (2015). The Success Factors of Community-Based Tourism in Thailand. *NIDA Development Journal*, 55, (2), 24–58.
- Park, E., Phandanouvong, T., & Kim, S. (2017). Evaluating participation in community-based tourism: a local perspective in Laos. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 3500 (May), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1323851>
- Paskova, M., & Zelenka, J. (2019). How crucial is the social responsibility for tourism sustainability? *Social Responsibility Journal*, 15, (4), 534–552. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-03-2018-0057>
- Petric, L., & Piveevic, S. (2016). Community Based Tourism Development – Insights From Split, Croatia. In *Tourism & Hospitality Industry* (pp. 294–307).
- Polnyotee, M., & Thadaniti, S. (2015). Community-Based Tourism: A Strategy for Sustainable Tourism Development of Patong Beach, Phuket Island, Thailand. *Asian Social Science*, 11, (27), 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n27p90>
- Ponggok Jadi Desa Wisata Terbaik, Ratusan Warganya Jadi Investor. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://nasional.tempo.co/read/876100/pongkok-jadi-desa-wisata-terbaik-ratusan-warganya-jadi-investor>
- Rodrigues, C. B., & Prideaux, B. (2017). A management model to assist local communities developing community-based tourism ventures: a case study from the Brazilian Amazon. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2017.1309045>
- Ruiz-ballesteros, E., & Rafael, C. (2016). Community-building and amenity migration in community-based tourism development. An approach from southwest Spain. *Tourism Management*, 54, 513–

523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.01.008>
- Septian, A. (2017). *Peran Pemimpin Dalam Pengembangan Desa Wisata Pentingsari Di Kabupaten Sleman, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Smith, R.A. & Lei, J. T. O. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility and the Operationalization Challenge for Global Tourism Organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20, (5), 487–499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2014.918555>
- Soetarto, E. & Sihaholo, M. (2016). *Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa. Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa* (1st ed.). Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.
- Stone, M. T. (2015). Community-based ecotourism : a collaborative partnerships perspective. *Journal of Ecotourism*, (April), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2015.1023309>
- Sutiyo, S., & Maharjan, K. L. (2017). Rural Community Leadership in Decentralization. In *Decentralization and Rural Development in Indonesia* (1st ed., pp. 99–109). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3208-0_8
- Suwardianto, Si. (2015). *Peranan Kepala Desa Dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Di Desa Sidoagung Kecamatan Godean Kabupaten Sleman*. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Tahir, I. (2017). Model Efektivitas Organisasi Pemerintahan Desa. *Sosiohumaniora*, 19, (3), 233–237. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v19i3.13070>
- Theodoulidis, B., Diaz, D., Crotto, F., & Rancati, E. (2017). Exploring corporate social responsibility and financial performance through stakeholder theory in the tourism industries. *Tourism Management*, 62, 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.018>
- Tolkach, D., & King, B. (2015). Strengthening Community-Based Tourism in a new resource-based island nation : Why and how ? *Tourism Management*, 48, 386–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.013>
- Towner, N., & Towner, N. (2016). Community participation and emerging surfing tourism destinations : a case study of the Mentawai Islands destinations : a case study of the Mentawai Islands. *Journal of Sport & Tourism ISSN:*, (March), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2016.1151819>
- Xu, K., Zhang, J., & Tian, F. (2017). Community Leadership in Rural Tourism Development: A Tale of Two Ancient Chinese Villages. *Sustainability*, 9, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9122344>