

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN AGRO-TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AT KARANGSARI, BLITAR, EAST JAVA

Amanda Putri Nastiti¹, Luchman Hakim³, Soemarno²

¹*Environmental Resources Mangement and Development Master's Degree Program, Brawijaya University, Indonesia*

²*Departement of Soil Science, Agriculture Faculty, Brawijaya University, Indonesia*

³*Department of Biology, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia*

Email: amandanastita@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Community participation is one of the keys to success in the process of developing agrotourism in an area. This study aims to analyze the level of community participation in the development of Agro-tourism in Karang Sari, Blitar, East Java. Community involvement in the planning, implementation, evaluation, and USE of the results or output is a major factor in developing Karang Sari Starfruit Agro-tourism. Data collection research was carried out by distributing questionnaires to respondents consisting of stakeholders and communities around the agrotourism site. The data is processed using Microsoft Excel 2013 and Rank-Spearman Correlation Analysis using IBM SPSS 20. The results of the study show that the lack of community participation in the agrotourism development process occurs because it is influenced by internal factors such as age, education, employment, income level and length of stay. In addition to the influence of these internal factors, community members are also still not involved in any agrotourism development activities. The participation of the community can be improved by conducting activities that require the surrounding community to participate.

Keywords: *Community Participation, Agro Tourism Development, Internal Factors.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The tourism sector has an important role in improving the economic sector in Indonesia. Agrotourism is one of the development activities in the field of tourism that utilizes agricultural land from the beginning of production to agricultural products in various systems with the aim of expanding knowledge, understanding, and experience in agriculture. The development of agricultural areas to become the area of agro-tourism in a sustainable

manner can increase tourist visits which contribute to improving the quality of life and welfare of farmers and communities around the agrotourism location.

One of the principles of sustainable agrotourism is the participation of local people. Community involvement is considered to be one of the keys to success in agrotourism development. The participation of the local community can be involved in the stages of planning, implementing activities, managing, evaluating and utilizing the results or outputs which is very important so that it must be explained in the agrotourism planning document. Participation by empowering the community to be one of the determinants in the stages of agrotourism development activities. This is also done to provide knowledge and understanding to the public about their responsibilities and commitment to output and risk in agro-tourism development. The process of participation is also to raise the independence of the community so that they can improve their standard of living, use and access local resources as well as possible, including natural resources and human resources.

The development of agrotourism by empowering the community is currently widely applied in various regions in Indonesia, considering that Indonesia is an agricultural country where the majority of the population uses the agricultural sector as a livelihood. One area that develops its agricultural sector into an agrotourism area is Blitar City, namely Karang Sari Starfruit Agro Tourism. The main commodities of Karang Sari Village are star fruit and secondary crops. Star fruit as one of the main commodities developed is a leading tourist attraction, namely Starfruit Fruit Agrowisata. This agrotourism utilizes vacant-land owned by the government to plant starfruit trees. The advantage of Karang Sari Starfruit Agro-tourism, namely the Karang Sari starfruit

tree has been certified with superior varieties by the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture No. 483 / KPTS / LB 240/2004 and Karang Sari starfruit have a certificate of Premium Products No. 3. P2T / 2 / 11.03 / 02 / IV / 2013 which means safe from pesticides.

Success in developing tourism areas depends on cooperation and active participation from various parties and active participation of all members of the community, as well as support from the local government. The implementation of agro-tourism activities cannot be separated from the interference of the local community in Karang Sari Village. The aim of developing this Agro-tourism area is to improve the quality of life of the Karang Sari community by empowering the community to be actively involved in various agro-tourism development activities, from planning to utilizing its output. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the level of participation of the Karang Sari community in the development of Karang Sari Starfruit Agro Tourism.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study uses qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data is collected by means of observation and in-depth interviews with resource-persons (key informants) using interview guidelines. While quantitative data is obtained by questionnaire survey. The main research variable is the level of community participation in agrotourism development. The study was conducted in Karang Sari Village, at the location of the Starfruit Fruit Agro Tourism. The location of this study was determined purposively according to the research objectives. With the consideration that Blitar City has many tourist destinations, one of them is in the agricultural sector which needs to be developed into a better agro-tourism area.

Data Collection

Data is collected by means of questionnaires. The population in this study is a community around the agro-tourism location whose residence is close to the Agro-tourism location. Determination of the number of respondents using Purposive Sampling techniques as many as 24 respondents. Questionnaire data were processed using the

Likert Scale calculation method and Microsoft Excel 2013 and the Rank-Spearman Correlation Analysis method using IBM SPSS 20.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Internal and External Factors Affecting Community Participation

Agro-tourism planning and development must involve the community optimally through discussion and local agreement. However, in its implementation, there are internal and external factors affecting community participation [26]. Internal factors from within a community group. These internal factors are that motivate someone to participate from within the individual. Individual characteristics including age, family member, level of education, income level, and length of stay at the location are internal factors that affecting the community in agro-tourism development.

Table 1. Internal Factors affecting community participation in the Karang Sari Agrotourism

Individual characteristics	Identification	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Age	Young (18-30 years)	0	0
	Adult (31-50 years)	12	50
	Old (>50 years)	12	50
Family member	Few (<2 persons)	2	8.3
	Moderate (3-4 persons)	16	66.7
	Many (>4 persons)	6	25
Level of education	Low (Elementary school)	12	50
	Medium (Primary high school)	4	16.7
	High (Secondary high school)	8	33.3
Income level	Low (<500.000)	0	0
	Medium (500.000-1.000.000)	1	4.2
	High (>1.000.000)	23	95.8
Length of stay	New (<23 years)	6	25
	Moderate (23-44 years)	7	29.2
	Old (>44 years)	10	41.7

Source: Research data in 2019.

External factors are factors that originate from outside the individual or the environment that affect someone to participate in an activity. External factors in the development of Karangsari agro-tourism include socialization by the village leaders, briefing about related constraints, the attendance of the mentoring team/facilitator, and the presenting learning materials.

Table 2. External factor affecting the community participation in the Karangsari Agrotourism

Intensity of Socialization			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
a. Socialization by the village leaders	High	6	25.0
	Moderate	18	75.0
	Low	0	0.0
b. Briefing about related constraints	High	1	4.2
	Moderate	18	75.0
	Low	5	20.8
c. The attendance of the mentoring team / facilitator	High	2	8.3
	Moderate	21	87.5
	Low	1	4.2
d. Presenting learning materials	High	2	8.3
	Moderate	19	79.2
	Low	3	12.5

Source: Research data in 2019.

The data indicate that the majority of people around the Agro-tourism location are 31-50 years old (Table 1). All respondents in this study were married. The number of family members in this study is divided into three categories, less than 2 people, 3 - 4 people and, more than 4 people. The highest percentage is 66.7% in category 3 - 4 families because many people who are aged 31 years and over mean that those who live there are indeed long-lived people and at that time the family planning program has not been implemented.

The majority of the education of the communities around the Agro-tourism location is elementary school education. This is due to the economic limitations of the community in the Karangsari region. People prefer to work and help the family economy. While the highest percentage of the length of stay is 41.7% in the category that has lived for more than 44 years in Karangsari. This is because the people who

are respondents to the study are native in Karangsari who have lived since birth until now. Respondents were well aware of the situation in the area, from the beginning Karangsari had not become a tourist place until now it was officially made a Karangsari Agro-tourism.

The data in Table 2 indicate that all external factor indicators have a moderate value. This means that the village leaders and the facilitator team are active enough to provide socialization to related constraints and development of Karangsari Agro-tourism.

3.2. Community Participation in Development of the Karangsari Agrotourism

Participation is an initiative taken by the community, guided by their own way of thinking, to take an active role in an activity. The level of participation is divided into four stages, the stage of planning, the stage of implementation, the stage of evaluation, and the stage of output utilization.

Table 3. Community Participation in the Stage of Planning

Stage of Planning			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Meeting attendance	High	4	16.7
	Moderate	3	12.5
	Low	17	70.8
Purposing opinions	High	0	0.0
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	24	100.0
Discussing opinions	High	0	0.0
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	24	100.0
Making decisions	High	0	0.0
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	24	100.0

Source: Research data in 2019.

Based on the data in Table 3, the participation of the Karangsari community at the stage of planning starts from the meeting attendance, the purposing and discussing opinions and making decisions are included in

the low category. This is because not all people are involved in Agro-tourism activities planning meetings. The people who participated in the planning meeting only work as Agro-tourism managers, farmers and traders, with very limited involvement of the surrounding community in their final decision. In fact, most people who do not work in Agro Tourism do not know about any planning activities in Agro Tourism.

The participation of the Karang Sari community at the stage of implementation with indicators of its attendance at meetings was included in the high category (Table 4). While the other three indicators into the low category. This is because the people who mostly work as crops planted farmers only attend Gapoktan meetings held once a month, which are also attended by Agro-tourism farmers. While at the stage of making a decision by the manager of Agro-tourism only.

Table 4. Community Participation in the Stage of Organizing (Implementation)

The stage of Implementation			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Meeting attendance	High	11	45.8
	Moderate	3	12.5
	Low	10	41.7
Purposing opinions	High	1	4.2
	Moderate	1	4.2
	Low	22	91.7
Discussing opinions	High	1	4.2
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	23	95.8
Making decisions	High	0	0.0
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	24	100.0

Source: Research data in 2019.

Table 5. Community Participation in the stage of Evaluation

The Stage of Evaluation			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Meeting attendance	High	3	12.5
	Moderate	2	8.3
	Low	19	79.2

The Stage of Evaluation			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage (%)
Purposing opinions	High	1	4.2
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	23	95.8
Discussing opinions	High	1	4.2
	Moderate	1	4.2
	Low	22	91.7
Making Decisions	High	0	0.0
	Moderate	0	0.0
	Low	24	100.0

Source: Research data in 2019.

The participation of the Karang Sari community at the stage of evaluation, with all indicators including the low category (Table 5). Evaluation meetings for agro-tourism activities were only attended by managers, village leaders and facilitating team, without involving community members, farmers, and agrotourism traders. But the community around Agro Tourism sometimes still gives criticism and suggestions to managers for Agrotourism development.

Table 6. Community participation in the stage of output utilization

Stage of output utilization:			
Indicator	Categories	Frequencies	Percentage
Utilizing Output	High	22	91.7
	Moderate	1	4.2
	Low	1	4.2
Utilizing Facilities and Infrastructure	High	18	75.0
	Moderate	6	25.0
	Low	0	0.0
Discussing opinions	High	6	25.0
	Moderate	8	33.3
	Low	10	41.7
Making Decisions	High	3	12.5
	Moderate	1	4.2
	Low	20	83.3

Source: Research data in 2019.

Based on the data in Table 6, the participation of the Karang Sari community with indicators of the utilization of facilities and infrastructure is classified as a high category. Although the

involvement of the community is still lacking, the community is still given the opportunity to utilize the facilities and infrastructure in Agro-tourism. For people around Agrowisata who have a grocery store, they can sell Karangsari star fruit. In addition, infrastructure facilities in the form of PDAM water built in Agrotourism are also flowed to local residents to get clean water. At first, the water was only to flowing the land of starfruit farmers in Agro Tourism. The indicators for making decisions include the low category, because at the stage of making a decision by the manager of Agro-tourism only.

3.3. Correlation Internal and External Factors Affecting the Community Participation

The low level of community participation in development activities, especially in planning activities, implementing activities and evaluating monitoring is due to the lack of compatibility between planning and implementation. In addition, the management also did not involve the community in the implementation of all activities, this was due to the harmonious relationship between the manager and the surrounding community. The lack of community involvement in the development of Karangsari Agro-tourism is influenced by internal factors and external factors.

Table 7. The correlation between characteristics of respondents with the community participation

Variable	Variable					Participation
	Age	Family Member	Income Level	Level of Education	Length of Stay	
Age	1.00					
Family Member	0.160	1.00				
Income Level	0.209		1.00			
Level of Education	0.738**	0.475*		1.00		
Length of Stay	0.411*				1.00	
Participation	0.085	0.423*	0.064	0.143	0.183	1.00

Note: (**) signifikan p<0.01 ; (*) signifikan p<0.05

Based on the results of the correlation analysis in Table 7, there was no correlation between the characteristics of the respondents with their level of participation in the development of Karangsari agro-tourism. This means that community participation in the development of Karangsari Agrotourism does not suspend on individual characteristics such

as age, family member, level of education, income level and length of stay in the location. Both young, adult, old members; and members with low, medium, and high education are not very involved in all stages of Agro-tourism development.

Table 8. The correlation between the intensity of socialization and community participation

	Intensity of Socialization	Community Participation
Intensity of Socialization	1.00	
Community Participation	0.064	1.00

Note: (**) signifikan p<0.01 ; (*) signifikan p<0.05

Based on the results of the correlation analysis in Table 8, the intensity of the socialization on the development of agrotourism did not correlate with the level of community participation in the development of Karangsari Agro Tourism. This is because socialization does not work effectively, and external factors that support the development of Karangsari agro-tourism have no effect on the level of community participation in agrotourism development. The low level of community involvement in the socialization process carried out by village leader and the facilitating team was unable to guarantee community involvement in the development of agrotourism. However, village community leaders tried to get the community to take part in the socialization of agrotourism development activities, through the activeness of leaders and the frequency of their arrival in socialization activities [45]. A community leader or tourism village leader can influence and invite the community to take part in activities related to agrotourism. Democratic leadership style is characterized by members of the local community who have the right to speak out and can be a part of a role in decision making.

4. CONCLUSION

Most people around the Karangsari Agro-tourism site are 31-> 50 years old. All respondents in this study were married. Most of these households (66.7%) have family members of 3-4 people. Around 50% of the community around the location of Agro-tourism have elementary education (elementary school), and

about 41.7% of the community has lived in this location for more than 44 years.

Dissemination related to agrotourism development is routinely carried out by village officials and facilitator teams. The level of participation of the Karangasari community in the development of Starfruit Agro-tourism is classified as low. This is due to the influence of internal factors and the lack of community involvement in various agrotourism development activities, and there are still some problems in terms of the relationship between agro-tourism managers and surrounding communities.

Community participation in developing agrotourism can be improved by creating activities that can involve the community. In addition, training and empowerment activities must be reproduced, so that the community gets direction and guidance in managing Agro tourism well.

5. REFERENCES

- Nurisjah, S. 2001. Pengembangan Kawasan Wisata Agro (Agrotourism). *Bulletin Tanaman dan Lanskap Indonesia*. 4(2): 20-23.
- Phillip, S., C. Hunter, and K. Blackstock. 2010. A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management*. 31(6): 754-758.
- Budiarti, T., N. Nasrullah., and U. Haryati. 2012. Potential Evaluation of Community-Based Agritourism in Banyuroto and Keep Rural Landscape Magelang District Central Java Indonesia. Symposium IFLA Asia Pacific Shanghai (CN). Oct 23-25th.
- Lupi, C., V.Giaccio, L.Mastronardi, A.Giannelli, and A.Scardera. 2017. Exploring the features of agritourism and its contribution to rural development in Italy. *Land Use Policy*, 64: 383-390.
- Flanigan, S., K .Blackstock and C.Hunter. 2014. Agritourism from the perspective of providers and visitors: a typology-based study. *Tourism Management*, 40: 394-405.
- [Karampela, S.](#), [T.Kizos](#) and [I.Spilanis](#). 2016. Evaluating the impact of agritourism on local development in small islands. *Island Studies Journal*. 11(1):161-176.
- Flanigan, S., Blackstock, K., and C. Hunter. 2015. Generating public and private benefits through understanding what drives different types of agritourism. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 41(1): 129-141.
- Adisasmita dan Raharjo. 2006. Membangun Desa Partisipatif. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
- Sgroi, F., E. Donia, and A.M. Mineo. 2018. Agritourism and local development: A methodology for assessing the role of public contributions in the creation of competitive advantage. *Land Use Policy*. 77: 676-682.
- Binns, T., and E. Nel. 2002. Tourism as a local development strategy in South Africa. *The Geographical Journal*. 168(3): 235-247.
- Fun, F.S., Chiun, L. M., Songan, P., and V. Nair. 2014. The impact of local communities' involvement and relationship quality on sustainable rural tourism in a rural area, Sarawak. The moderating impact of self-efficacy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 144: 60-65.
- Zhao, W. and Ritchie, J.R. 2007. Tourism and poverty alleviation: an integrative research framework. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 10 (2&3): 119- 143.
- Eshliki, S.A., and M. Kaboudi. 2012. Community perception of tourism impacts and their participation in tourism planning: a case study of Ramsar, Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 36: 333-341.
- Sumantra, I. K. and A. Yuesti. 2018. Evaluation of Salak Tibetan Agrotourism to Support Community-Based Tourism Using Logic Model. *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review*. 9(01): xx.

- Damanik, Janianto dan Helmut. 2006. *Perencanaan Ekowisata*. Andi Offset. Yogyakarta.
- Tew, C., and C.Barbieri. 2012. The perceived benefits of agritourism: The provider's perspective. *Tourism Management*. 33(1): 215-224.
- Rogerson, C.M., and J.M.Rogerson. 2014. Agritourism and local economic development in South Africa. *Bulletin of Geography. Socioeconomic Series*. 26(26): 93-106.
- Songkhla, T. N., and B.Somboonsuke. 2012. Impact of agro-tourism on local agricultural occupation: A case study of Chang Klang district, southern Thailand. *Journal of Agricultural Technology*. 8(4): 1185-1198.
- Kristanto, U.N. 2014. *Kelompok Tani Margomulyo: Belimbing Karang Sari Buah Ketekunan dan Kegigihan*. Blitar.
- Haywood, K. M. 1988. Responsible and responsive tourism planning in the community. *Tourism Management*, 9(2): 105-118.
- Bramwell, 1999. Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. *Annals of tourism research*. 26(2): 392-415.
- Taylor, G. 1995. The community approach: does it really work. *Tourism management*. 16(7): 487-489.
- Dalimunthe, N. 2007. *Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam pengembangan potensi wisata Bahari Pantai Cermin Kabupaten Serdang Bedagai*. Thesis. Universitas Sumatera Utara. Medan.
- Tosun, C. 2006. Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism management*. 27(3): 493-504.
- Simmons, D. G. 1994. Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism management*. 15(2): 98-108.
- Keogh, B. 1990. Public participation in community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 17(3): 449-465.
- Slamet, M. 2003. *Pembangunan Masyarakat Berwawasan Partisipasi*. Sebelas Maret University Press. Surakarta.
- Pangestu, M.H.T. 1995. *Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pelaksanaan Kegiatan Perhutanan Sosial (Studi Kasus di KPH Cianjur, Jawa Barat)*. Thesis. Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor.
- Girsang, I.J. 2011. *Faktor yang mempengaruhi partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam kegiatan perbaikan prasarana Jalan (Studi kasus: program Nasional pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri perdesaan di Desa megamendung, Bogor)*. Skripsi. Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor.
- Tosun, C. 2005. Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the developing world. *Geoforum*. 36(3): 333-352.
- Scheyvens, R. 1999. Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism management*. 20(2): 245-249.
- Nasdian, F.T. 2012. *Pengembangan Masyarakat*. IPB Press. Bogor.
- Salampessy, M.L., Nugroho, B. dan Purnomo, H. 2010. *Partisipasi Kelompok Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan Lindung, Kasus di Hutan Lindung Gunung Nona Kota Ambon Propinsi Maluku*. *Journal Perennial* 6(2): 99-107.
- Jamal, T. B. and D. Getz. 1995. Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of tourism research*. 22(1): 186-204.
- Simmons, D.G. 1994. Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15(2):98-108.
- Sadono, D., Sumardjo, Gani, D.S. and Amanah, S. 2014. Farmer Empowerment in The Management of Rice Farming in Two Districts in West Java. *Journal of Rural Indonesia* 2 (1): 105-126.
- Reed, M. G. 1997. Power relations and community-based tourism

- planning. *Annals of tourism research*, 24(3): 566-591.
- Blackstock, K. 2005. A critical look at community-based tourism. *Community development journal*, 40(1): 39-49.
- Esu, B.B. 2012. Linking human capital management with tourism development and management for economic survival: The Nigeria experience. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(11): xx.
- Marcelina, A. 2018. Tingkat Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengembangan Desa Wisata Lebakmuncang, Bandung, Provinsi Jawa Barat. Skripsi. Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor.
-]Halstead, L. 2003. Making community-based tourism work: An assessment of factors contributing to successful community-owned tourism development in Caprivi, Namibia (No. 60). Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.
- Jewell, B., A.Blackman, A.Kuilboer, T.Hyvonen, G.Moscardo, and F.Foster. 2004. Factors contributing to successful tourism development in peripheral regions. *Journal of Tourism Studies*. 15(1): 59-xx.
- Kontogeorgopoulos, N., A.Churyen and V. Duangsaeng. 2014. Success factors in community-based tourism in Thailand: The role of luck, external support, and local leadership. *Tourism Planning & Development*. 11(1): 106-124.
- Timothy, D. J., and C.Tosun. 2003. Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process. *Journal of Tourism Studies*. 14(2): 2-xx.
- Tosun, C. 2000. Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism management*. 21(6): 613-633.
- Nelson, F., And A.Agrawal. 2008. Patronage or participation? Community-based natural resource management reform in sub-Saharan Africa. *Development and change*. 39(4): 557-585.
- Aref, F., Redzuan, M. R., and Z.Embry. 2009. Assessing community leadership factor in community capacity building in tourism development: A case study of Shiraz, Iran. *Journal of Human Ecology*. 28(3): 171-176.
- Farrelly, T.A. 2011. Indigenous and democratic decision-making: Issues from community-based ecotourism in the Boumā National Heritage Park, Fiji. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. 19(7): 817-835.