Preliminary Study on Rural Tourism Development in Kutai Kartanegara Regency, East Kalimantan: Potential and Status

*A Rinto Dwiatmojo*, Novita Indriani, Yusni Nyura, Friscylia Merlina George
*Doctoral Candidate, Razak Faculty of Technology, and Informatics UTM Kuala Lumpur, Politeknik Negeri Samarinda Samarinda, Indonesia
*rinto_dwiatojo@polnes.ac.id, yusninyura@polnes.ac.id
novita.indriani0909@gmail.com

Abstract—Rural tourism is an economic-driven activity that combines local community creativity, culture, and natural attractions and supported by appropriate facilities and accommodation for tourists. Kutai Kartanegara Regency might possess a combination of all these potentials due to its strategic location prior to the relocation of Indonesia’s New Capital City. However, information and feasibility of rural tourism development within Kutai Kartanegara is still unknown. This study aims to identify the potential of rural tourism including through classification of the level of tourism development in Kutai Kartanegara area. This research utilises a mixed-methods approach involving primary data and secondary data. The data was collected through literature review, questionnaires, observations, and interviews. Descriptive analysis was adopted for classifying cases and score values analysis. The stage status of tourism village development in Kutai Kartanegara was included in the development, pioneering, and advanced categories. This study indicated that accessibility and community readiness, and local attractions become a major contributors for providing support and implementing rural tourism development, with the score value of 3.05 respectively. The aspects of local institution and the amenities indicated a low score of less than 3.0. BUMDes (Village-owned Enterprises) and Tourism Awareness Groups (Pokdarwis) are currently not being optimised to providing support for the sustainability of rural tourism. Furthermore, lack of promotion and support from associations and the Government contributed to the lower level of tourism development.
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I. INTRODUCTION

According to [1], the tourism industry is macro and dynamic hence offering a huge potential for economic diversity whereby the cultural and natural resources and ecosystems in Indonesia can be utilized in a sustainable manner in a form of
	nature and cultural conservation while ensuring the welfare of the Indonesian people [2, 3, 4] Stating that Indonesian tourism originates from the people, by the people, and for the people. In detail, residents act as owners and therefore might have a better understanding of the tourist destinations in question. [3] The wealth and diversity of natural and cultural resources are also found in inland and rural areas, namely rural tourism as an alternative tourism development approach to build sustainable villages in the tourism sector. [5] The main potential in tourism villages can be seen from the lifestyle and quality of life and the authenticity of the surrounding community with different characteristics and unique experiences in a destination area. [6] These potentials include cultural heritage, agricultural activities, natural wealth, services, and historical and cultural tourist attractions. [7] The potential of a tourism village also affects the socio-economic conditions in the area around the countryside; therefore, a tourism village must be constantly creative and active when developing the identity and uniqueness of the area. [8]. In [9], there is a National Priority Program on Tourism Village Development which includes maintenance, development, procurement, and utilization of tourism village facilities, counseling on tourism village
management, tourism village promotion, building partnerships with third parties aimed at obtaining tourism village investment and development activities of other tourism villages and in line with the authority of the village from the results of the provisions at the Village Deliberation [9]. Developing tourism villages can be one way to restore Indonesia’s economy through tourism sector. [9, 10].

This study aims to evaluate the potential and level of tourism development of selected villages in Kutai Kartanegara Regency based on several evaluation criteria including number of attractions, amenities, accessibility, and readiness of local community resources and local management institutions to determine the stages of tourism village development. Meanwhile, the research results can be used as to guide future proposal for developing a more appropriate programs of a sustainable tourism village.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to [11], there was a purposive character in determining the location for tourism project, namely researching eight potential tourism villages in Kutai Kartanegara Regency. Those villages were designated as respondents and were represented by the Provincial Tourism Office, the Kutai Kartanegara Tourism Department, the Village Heads, and the representatives who played essential roles in realizing a sustainable tourism village. This study utilized primary and secondary data. It then utilized a mixed-methods approach and qualitative methods in assessing community and management readiness, tourism village policy aspects and assessing tourism aspects, such as Village Development Index. [12] Data analysis was carried out descriptively, and scoring was modified from the previous research by [13]. The score assessment uses a questionnaire stated in the index using indicators of attractions, amenities, accessibility, public awareness, and management institutions and calculating scores using the class interval formula as follows:

Interval = \( \frac{\text{Highest Score} - \text{Lowest Score}}{\text{Number of classes}} \)

The attributes in Table 1:

| No | Aspects of Assessment | Attribute | Score value | Description |
|----|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1  | Attractions           | Beauty/ Charm | 1 to 5 | 1=Not Very Good |
|    |                       | Cleanliness/Comfort/Security | | 2=Not Good |
|    |                       | Uniqueness | | 3=Fairly Good |
|    |                       | Environmental Conservation | | 4=Good |
|    |                       | Variety of Activities | | 5=Very Good |
| 2  | Amenity               | Food Stalls/ Restaurant | 1 to 5 | 1=Not Very Good |
|    |                       | Homestay, Saung/ Gazebo | | 2=Not Good |
|    |                       | Parking Lot, Information Board | | 3=Fairly Good |
|    |                       | Waste Processing Site | | 4=Good |
|    |                       | Mushollah / Places of Worship & Toilet | | 5=Very good |
| 3  | Accessibility         | Road’s superiority areas | 1 to 5 | 1=Not Very Good |
|    |                       | Village Roads | | 2=Not Good |
|    |                       | Environmental Roads to Destinations | | 3=Fairly Good |
|    |                       | Public Transportation | | 4=Good |
|    |                       | | | 5=Very Good |

| 4  | Community Readiness | Awareness | 1 to 5 | 1=Not Very Good |
|    |                      | Participation | | 2=Not Good |
|    |                      | Hospitality | | 3=Fairly Good |
|    |                      | | | 4=Good |
|    |                      | | | 5=Very Good |
| 5  | Management Institutions | Available on Bumdes/Pokdarwis/others | 1 to 5 | 1=Not Very Good |
|    |                       | Tour Guides | | 2=Not Good |
|    |                       | Package Tour Packages | | 3=Fairly Good |
Tourism Promotions
Support/ Cooperation from outside

4=Good
5=Very Good

Source: The research by Tyas, N.W. and M. Damayanti, 2018

The index value of the tourism village was obtained by utilizing the average score in each village and the classification of scores on the harmonious status of the tourism village [1]. The index value on the status of tourism villages was described in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Total Score and reflection of Tourism Village Status

| Total Score | Tourism Village Status                  |
|-------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1.00-1.80   | Not Potential/least potential          |
| 1.81-2.60   | Potential / Pioneering/minimum potential|
| 2.61-3.40   | Developing/moderate potential           |
| 3.41-4.20   | Advanced/high potential                 |
| 4.21-5.00   | Independent                             |

Source: The guideline of Kemenpar Tourism Village, 2019

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 The Overview of Research Study Area

Kutai Kartanegara, as one of the districts in East Kalimantan, has 18 sub-districts, 44 sub-districts, 193 villages, with a population of 670,458 people in 2017. According to data from the East Kalimantan Provincial Tourism Office, there are 12 Tourism Villages in the Kutai Kartanegara Regency, which have many potentials to be developed and known through tourist attractions such as community creativity, culture, and nature, which are very interesting and can offer various tourism products and services. However, the information about these tourism villages is still minimal. Based on this research, the identification and classification of potential of each tourism village to be a sustainable tourism village in the Kutai Kartanegara Regency supported Indonesia’s New Capital City can be formulated.

3.2 Current Performance and Potential of Tourism Villages in Kutai Kartanegara

Tourism potential become one of the most critical components for tourism planning and development especially at village level. These components are closely related to destination management, management agency, improvement of supporting facilities, direct public participation, and awareness. In this study, the identification of potentials related to several aspects which have been carried out and stated in the measurement score index for each village as described in Table 3:

Table 3. Identification of tourism potentials of eight villages in Kutai Kartanegara

| Aspects of Assessment | Attribute                      | Score | Description                                                                 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Attractions           | Beauty/ Charm                  | 3.30  | Aspects of rural tourism attractions in Kutai Kartanegara were sufficient in attracting tourist visits |
|                       | Cleanliness/Comfort/Security   | 3.23  |                                                                              |
|                       | Uniqueness                     | 3.25  |                                                                              |
|                       | Environmental Conservation      | 3.05  |                                                                              |
|                       | Variety of Activities          | 3.18  |                                                                              |
|                       | Average                        | 3.14  |                                                                              |
| Amenity               | Food Stalls/ Restaurant        | 2.00  | Inadequate infrastructure and facilities in the development of rural tourism in Kutai Kartanegara |
|                       | Homestay, Saung / Gazebo       | 2.30  |                                                                              |
|                       | Parking Lot, Information Board | 2.48  |                                                                              |
|                       | Waste Processing Site          | 2.70  |                                                                              |
|                       | Mushollah/ Places of Worship &| 3.20  |                                                                              |
|                       | Toilet                         |       |                                                                              |
|                       | Average                        | 2.35  |                                                                              |
| Accessibility         | Road’s superiority areas       | 3.18  | Accessibility supports the development of rural tourism                      |
|                       | Village Roads                  | 3.00  |                                                                              |
|                       | Environmental Roads to Destinations | 2.88 |                                                                              |
|                       | Public Transportation          | 2.58  |                                                                              |
| Community Readiness | Average | Participation and awareness through community capacity development needed to be increased |
|---------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Awareness           | 2.90    |                                                                                       |
| Participation       | 2.80    |                                                                                       |
| Hospitality         | 3.48    |                                                                                       |
| Average             | 3.12    |                                                                                       |

| Management Institutions | Available on Bundes/Pokdarwis/others | Institutions that manage have not tried optimally in the rural tourism development agenda |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Tour Guides             | 3.00                                |                                                                                         |
| Package Tour Packages   | 2.38                                |                                                                                         |
| Tourism Promotions      | 2.66                                |                                                                                         |
| Support/Cooperation from outside | 3.04                              |                                                                                         |
| Average                 | 2.75                                |                                                                                         |

Source: Data is processed from research results, 2021

Based on Table 3, the identification of potential tourism villages in Kutai Kartanegara Regency can be explained as follows:

Identification of the potential of eight Tourism Villages in the Kutai Kartanegara Regency in terms of attractions had generated the index score value of 3.19, with natural resources being the most attractive to tourists. The attractions of the Kutai cultural tradition were also unique and have been preserved since the time of their ancestors until today. The attractions however still need to be improved from time to time including via diversification of activities for each village to increase tourist visitation.

Identification of the potential of eight Tourism Villages in the Kutai Kartanegara Regency in terms of amenities received the index score value of 2.55. Some tourism villages in The Kutai Kartanegara have not developed suitable facilities that can support the development of tourism villages, such as lack of lodging and restaurants.

Identification of the potential of eight Tourism Villages in Kutai Kartanegara Regency in terms of accessibility had an average score of 2.8. This aspect seems sufficient to support tourism development; however, access to each village require further needs to be improved continuously.

In terms of community readiness, eight Tourism Villages in the Kutai Kartanegara Regency received an average score value of 3.06. The community hospitality was quite good. However, the awareness and community participation in developing tourism needs to be improved.

a. In terms of managing institutions, the eight-community received an average score value of 2.75. This aspect was considered weak hence it requires strong and continuous support and promising strategies from village management institutions.

3.3 The Classification of Status of Tourism Village Development in Kutai Kartanegara Regency

The implementation of tourism village development requires assessing knowledge about its weaknesses and strengths to determine the strategy. It can be carried out appropriately according to the target. The score analysis presented the result of tourism villages identification in various aspects. Accessibility and attractions received high score value, while for elements of tourism amenities, community readiness, and management institutions indicated a low score value. The role of the community is needed to identify problems at various stages of tourism development in the village. Community participation and awareness of Sapta Pesona (Seven Enchantments) in the villages towards tourism also need to be improved. The status of the tourism villages was presented in Table 4:

| No | Village       | Sub-district | Index Value and Tourist Village Classification |
|----|---------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------|
|    |               |              | Destination/Tourism resources | Index Value | Status          |
| 1  | Kendang Ipil | Bangun City  | Kendua Raya Waterfall - Kendang Ipil River Rafting | 2.85        | Moderate potential |
| 2  | Kersik       | Marang Kayu  | Kersik Blue-beach, Makela Kela | 2.90        | Moderate potential |
| 3  | Sumber Sari  | Loa Kulu     | Mountain of Bukit Biru, Waterfall, Agriculture, Fisheries, and Plantation | 3.13        | Moderate potential |
Based on the results, there are four villages in Kutai Kartanegara that can be entirely developed with Tourism Village (i.e., received score value of 2.85–3.13). These villages are Kendang Ipil village to Kandua Raya Waterfall, Kendang Ipil River Rafting, Kersik Village with Kersik Blue-beach destination, Sumber Sari with Mountain of Bukit Biru, Waterfalls, Agricultures, Fisheries and Plantations and the Kutai Lama Village, a cultural destination or historical heritage of the Kutai kingdom. The criteria adopted for developing a tourism village are including: (1) the village's was visited by daily visitors and tourists from nearby communities as well as out-of-town visitors; (2) development of infrastructure and tourist facilities, and economic activity; (3) employment opportunities for the village community; (4) Growing public awareness of tourism and the need for assistance from the Government, private sector, and experts as facilitators during the implementation of tourism village development. [10]

Meanwhile, three villages are considered as at the developing stage with promising potentials. The criteria used for pilot tourism village are including: (1) tourism activities are still in early stage of development; (2) relatively few visitors come and usually come from the surrounding communities; (3) limited provision of tourism facilities; (4), received limited assistance from the Government and the private sector is needed, and (5) lack of public awareness of the village potentials. [1]

The tourism village with developed status is Pela Village, with the village destinations being Lake Tourism, Fisherman Activities, Watching the Pesut Mahakam, Tanjung Tamannoh, and sunset at Semayang Lake. If people want to enter this traditional village, there will be no entrance fee. However, the Government is still paying attention by assisting in the capital that can be utilized according to the community's needs. The criteria for developed villages align with the CBT concept with the criteria of the community's active role in managing the village tourism business. Various strategies used by stakeholders in implementing the development of tourism villages must pay attention to the community's needs. Community aspirations are crucial inputs when carrying out the process of designing and implementing tourism village development. [14]

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Conclusion

Based on the research and discussion carried out by the authors, the following conclusions were obtained:

Identification of the potential of Tourism Villages in Kutai Kartanegara Regency in terms of attractions and community readiness had an average score of 3.19. The attractions of the Kutai cultural tradition were also unique and have been preserved to this day since the ancestors' time. The attractions that still need to be improved are the variety of activities for each village to increase tourist attraction. The aspect of community readiness was at an average value of 3.06. Community hospitality was quite good. Improvements must be made to raise awareness and community participation in developing tourism.

Aspect of tourism amenities received an average score value of 2.55. Some tourism villages in Kutai Kartanegara had not equip with facilities that could support the development of tourism villages, including lack of lodging and restaurants, and the accessibility aspect had an average value of 2.8. This aspect was
enough to support tourism development. It is just that access to each village needed to be improved continuously. Furthermore, the aspect of the management institution was at an average value of 2.75 which categorized as weak. Therefore, local institution needs support and continuous improvement.

Tourism village development in Kutai Kartanegara consisted of three status stages: moderate potential, minimum potential, high potential. Almost all tourism villages were in moderate potential, such as Kedang Ipil, Kersik, Sumber Sari, and Kutai Lama Tourism Villages. The status of tourism villages that were still minimum potential are Sanga Sanga Dalam, Batuah, and Sungai Bawang villages. The status of a high potential Tourism Village was in Pela Village.

4.2 Recommendations

From the conclusion above, the researchers put forward the following recommendations:

Active role of local stakeholders in tourism management such as tourism associations, the private sector, and villages, local and central governments are needed to achieve sustainable tourism development in the long term. There is a need for a forum to facilitate various accommodation, infrastructure, and training needed by village communities to develop tourism villages. This forum is required to actively carry out coordination meetings at the Regional/Provincial level to set targets and directions in line with tourism programs within the Ministries, Institutions, and Regions.

The implementation of training for capacity building by institutions and ministries are very much needed and need to be conducted regularly. Local institutions can play a role to carry out training regional agencies and BUMDes (Village-owned Enterprises) can collaborate in helping village communities in terms of business economy and capital to increase the capacity of human resources in each village in harmony with Pokdarwis (Tourism Awareness Groups) and requires legitimacy as tour managers, tour guides, promotions, and packaging of tour packages with training based on capabilities. Tourism village development planning needs to be included in the Statutes and Bylaws (AD/ART) of the village design activity agenda category and the Village Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD). This problem must be implemented to strengthen the Village Government's commitment to increase original village income, develop tourism villages, and ensure that the community is aware of the village agenda transparently to run smoothly.
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