

Residents' Place Image and Perceived Tourism Impacts in Gunung Kidul, Yogyakarta Special Region

Nurti Rahayu

Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Trisakti, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: Nurti.gr8@gmail.com

Abstract—This paper aims to analyze the residents' image towards tourism of Gunung Kidul, one of the regencies in Yogyakarta special region. As one of the main tourism area in Yogyakarta, Gunung Kidul offers varied tourism objects to visitors. In this view, this paper seeks to explore the role of residents' place image affects their perceptions of tourism impacts. This paper also aims to find out the residents' support on tourism development in the area. The researcher would like to show more flexible perspectives on how the residents view tourism. To find out the data, online questionnaires are distributed through local residences. This research has revealed positive image of tourism viewed from economic, socio-cultural and environmental. These findings might be essential in shaping tourism blueprint from the local government and other stakeholder.

Keywords—*Residents Place Image; Destination place image; Tourism impacts; Tourism support;*

I. INTRODUCTION

Endowed with breathtaking landscape and numerous pristine white sandy beaches, Gunung Kidul is becoming one of the leading tourists destinations in Yogyakarta. This eastern part of Yogyakarta is no longer familiar for its poverty and drought which had been lingering the region's image for the past few decades. Situated near the Indian oceans, more and more deserted beaches are converted into tourism spots which offers the visitors with various landscapes combined with white sandy beaches, green hills, and waves, turning them into excellent spots for those who are seeking for sun, sand, and sea holiday. Coastal tourism, as a matter of fact, is not the primary tourists spot that is offered by the region.

Another tourism spot which can be found throughout the area is tourism villages. These villages showcase the nature and residents' lifestyle which are ready to welcome the visitors to have a live in experience in a green village. The examples of those are Putat, Nglanggeran, Bendung, Ngeposari, Beji, Bleberan, Umbulrejo, and Kemadang. As in Nglanggeran village, the rural character of this village stands firm against the modernity. The local still hold strong social patterns such as mutual cooperation system, mutual respect & courtesy, and simple lifestyle. Also, it has a lot of cultural uniqueness and local wisdom, such as traditional farming techniques and local food processing. (Nglanggeran, A Village below a 60-million-year-old volcano, 2018) This area is also rich of geotourism (Marlina, 2016, Vol.10 No.5) Tourism, of course, is not about the availability of wonderful tourism spots and people's hospitality. In fact, it involves several factors to make it a success.

Numerous researchers have explored on the impacts on tourism in various tourism destinations. This research would like to emphasize on how the residents view their own region. Besides, this also explores the perceived impacts from the residents' point of view. Those factors are signs on the residents' support on tourism in their area.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. A Brief Look at Gunungkidul Regency

Gunungkidul is one of the regencies in Yogyakarta Special Region. Located at the eastern part of the region, it has various geographical landscape ranging from coastal regions, hills and mountainous area which belongs to Mount Sewu Geopark; one of the oldest tropical karst landscape stretching for

approximately 120 kilometers. This geopark has been listed on UNESCO geopark along with Batur UNESCO geopark. (List of UNESCO Global Geopark, 2018) This geopark is unique for its limestone which is of Neogene age and it forms Oyo and Kepek formations as well as reef facies (Wonosari formation). This limestone creation dated back to Late Oligocene to Early Miocene rocks of volcanic-origin clastic. The volcanic and marine sediments underlie these limestones. It is important to note that there is still tectonic activity in the region because Gunung Sewu is located in front of an active subduction zone between the Indian Ocean, Australian and Eurasian plates.

The specific feature of Mount Sewu karst Geosite has enabled the formation of caves throughout the area. Ancient human settlement were identified in the caves and distributed along the dry valleys or near doline ponds (Haryono, 2010). The archeological artifacts were invented by Von Koenigswald and Tweedie in 1935. Since then, there was a sign of environment deterioration as a result of massive limestone mining throughout the regency which has been officially banned based on based on the rules of the Gunungkidul Regency in 2011 about Spatial Planning and Territory Gunungkidul District year 2010 to 2030, based on Ministerial Decree of ESDM in 2012 about Determination of Karst Areas Landscape (specified in Ministerial Decree in 2014 about Determination of Sewu Mountains Karst Areas). Despite the official ban of the activity, the limestone mining has contributed to the local revenue for some residents, so it can only be stopped gradually while the government tries to boost the tourism as another source of income.

To increase the residents' welfare, the local government has committed to boost the tourism sector by issuing rules of the Gunungkidul regency no. 03 year 2014 about the master plan of tourism development 2014-2025. This rule states that the master plan of tourism development will be in three categories:

1. Baron - Sundak and the surrounding beaches serve as education and family based coastal tourism
2. Siung - Wediombo Bengawan Solo Purba area serve as karst geotourism
3. Patuk and the surrounding are as tourism village for handicraft and agro-ecotourism
4. Mount Sewu Geopark and the surrounding serve as the karst tourism destination

In order to clearly realize the masterplan, there is a strategy to establish six strategic tourism area, as the following:

1. Strategic Tourism Area I

This area focuses on the development of featured coastal tourist attractions with cultural attractions support. The coastal destinations are Parangendog, Watu Gupit, Bekah, Grigak, Gesing, Ngungah, Ngedan, Nguyahan, Ngobaran, Ngrenahan, and Torohudan. Other destinations are Langse and Carmel cave, Pessnggrahsn Gembirwati, Wonongobaran, Pertapaan Kembang Lampir, Sendang Beji, Cupu Panjolo, Turunan forest area, traditional arts, local cultures, and also tourism village and cultures.

2. Strategic Tourism Area II

This area specializes on the development of featured coastal tourist attraction with processed seafood culinary support. The destinations cover extensive area such as beaches, caves, lakes, rivers, parks, and tourism and cultural villages.

3. Strategic Tourism Area III

This area focuses on featured coastal tourist attraction with educational tourism, conservation, and adventure. The destinations covers caves, parks, and beaches with related characteristics such as Timang, Jogan, Siung, Wediombo, etc.

4. Strategic Tourism Area IV

This area emphasizes on the development of featured mountain tourism with educational tourism support, conservation, and adventure. The tourists destinations in ancient Bengawan Solo river, Nglanggeran geopark, fruit garden, forest, waterfalls, and handicrafts.

5. Strategic Tourism Area V

This program develops kars geopark tourists attractions with some adventure destinations such as caves; Pindul and Kalisuci for river tubing, and local dams. Tourism villages and culture are also included.

6. Strategic Tourism Area VI

This area development of featured mountain tourism with local culture support. The destinations are mountains, temples, waterfalls, local festivals, and local traditions and culture.

B. Place Image

A discussion of place image is always interesting. Although many researchers have explored this subject. A specific research on residents' place image in Gunungkidul is hardly found. Various scholars from various disciplines have tried to define it regarding its significance. Kotler et al. in Avraham (2008) states that the image of a place is "the sum of beliefs, ideals, and impressions people have toward a certain place." It means that image is the simplification of numerous associations and pieces of information related to a place and the cognitive product of the attempt to process large amounts of information. Boulding (1956, in Elizur 1987) defines image as the sum of the cognitive, affective and evaluative characteristics of the place or an inherent perspective of itself. Boulding clarifies the image of the place's residents from that of outsiders. He mentions that place image is composed of four components:

1. Cognitive (what one knows about a place);
2. Affective (how one feels about a certain place);
3. Evaluative (how one evaluates the place or its residents);
4. Behavioral (whether one considers immigrating to/working in/visiting/investing in a certain place).

While Boulding sets a clear distinction of the components, Elizur (1987) gave a more interesting definition, stating that an image of a place is the sum of all characteristics that come to mind when one thinks of the place. When people speak about the place, then they will directly consider some characteristics that remind them of that place. This research tries to investigate the residents' place image which is relevant to the tourists destinations.

Kotler et al. (1993) refer a place's image can be positive and attractive, negative, weak; when the place is unfamiliar, mixed which includes both positive and negative elements or contradictory. The last term refers to the place with a favorable image with one population and a negative image with another. Meanwhile, Elizur (1987) mentions place images as "rich" or "poor." A "rich" image means that we know a lot about the place, usually from different sources and also from personal visits and knowledge; a "poor" image means that we know very little about the place, and what we do know usually comes from only one source of information.

Residents' place image has an essential role in shaping the city branding which further clarifies that the perceptions of cities and mental images of them becomes active components of economic success or failure.

C. Destination Image

Tourist attractions are in some ways considered as products. Similar with other products, they require marketing positioning in the minds of customers. Thus, creating products image is highly essentials. In line with the growing interests of place image as one elements of place branding, a discussion on destination image cannot be fully separated from it.

A brief conceptual framework of destination image is given by Echtner and Ritchie (1991). The framework comprises of three continuums: attribute holistic, functional-psychological, and common-unique. The attribute holistic refers to some elements relating to the fields of psychology and consumer behavior. In other terms, destination image should be a reflection of perceptions of individual attributes such as climate, accomodation facilities, friendliness of the people as well as more holistic impressions in the form of mental pictures of the place.

As for functional psychological continuum, this might be perceived as individual attributes or as more holistic impressions. As for the attributes side, it consists of various perceptions of the individual characteristics of the destination, ranging from fuctional to psychological. Some examples for the functional characteristics are the availability of tourists sites, national parks or wilderness activities, historic sites, beaches, festivals, scenery, nightlife, etc. As for psychological characteristics, the statements are related with the hospitality/friendliness, restful/relaxing, atmosphere, quality service, fame, etc.

The final continuum is common-unique. The importance of uniqueness has been emphasized by Maccannel (1989). He further states of the characteristics as 'markers' or must-see sights which basically highlight the idea that destination image is perceived as common characteristics to unique features or auras.

D. Tourism Impacts

Numerous studies have emphasized the impacts of tourism in three major areas: economical, socio-cultural and environmental. Each of the impacts occurs both in positive and negative impacts. Those economic and socio-cultural impacts as a result of tourism depends on the type and intensity of the tourism, as well as from the characteristics of the local communities. Whether the impact is perceived as positive or negative are partly on the objective criteria, such as income received but also related to the perception of local communities. In this case, community groups will have different reactions to tourism development and often they cannot agree on a shared consensus (Inskeep, 1991)

In tourism, the impact of tourism affects all elements in the "tourism system". The tourism system refers to various sectors involved in facilitating travel to and from a destination, and the interconnection between the sectors. There are several approaches for analysing the tourism system, such as from geographical point of view, supply and demand dimensions, and approaches that emphasise system functioning for specific stakeholder groups. According to Frechtling in Kausar, 2010, studying the economic impact of tourism means analysing travel's activity impact on resident wealth or income in a defined area. Meanwhile, Stynes in Kausar (2010), on the other hand, said that economic impact analysis of tourism traces the flows of spending associated with tourism activity in a region to identify changes in sales, tax, revenues, income and jobs due to tourism activity.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

The study employs descriptive research design. Objects of the study is the residents of Gunungkidul regency. The research would like to seek information on the three areas:

1. What is residents' perceived image on tourism in Gunungkidul?
2. What is the residents' perceived image on tourism impacts in Gunungkidul?
3. What is the resident's perceived image on tourism development in Gunungkidul?

B. Data

To support the literature, references are sought both from online and offline sources. Local policy on tourism blueprint from the regency is utilized to provide clear description on the subject being discussed. Semi-structured interviews are conducted in order to obtain specific information from key informants either individually or in groups. Triangulation was performed towards key informants in order to avoid information bias. Informants are determined based on the needs of research data, i.e. those who are permanent residence with a comprehensive and adequate understanding of tourism development. Selected informants represent the government sector, business actors, religious/community leaders and people of various occupation. In addition, online focus group discussion was also conducted on social media to support the data.

C. Method

Sample is chosen by convenience sampling. The primary data was collected by online questionnaires which was broadcasted through WhatsApp groups and Facebooks communities. The total number of 97 responses were received during two months data collection on January to February 2018. Likert scale is utilized to gain the participants opinions regarding each statements. The questionnaires consist of three parts. The first part deals with demographic data, the second deals with residents' perceived image on tourism in their area, residents' perceived image on tourism impacts in Gunungkidul, and residents' perceived image on tourism development in Gunungkidul.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Demographic Data

The first part of the questionnaires reveal the demographic data. The result is as stated in the table below.

Table 1. Frequency Analysis of Demographic Data

| Respondent | Profiles | The Percentage |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Gender | Female | 47.80% |
| | Male | 56.50% |
| Length of Residence | Less than 10 years | 3.10% |
| | 11-20 years | 21.60% |
| | 21-30 years | 26.80% |
| | More than 30 years | 49.50% |
| Education | Primary | 1% |
| | Secondary | 65% |
| | College | 34% |
| Occupation | Entrepreneur | 22.7% |
| | Private Employee | 33% |
| | Housewife | 18.60% |
| | Retiree | 2.10% |
| | Others | 23.6% |
| Age | less than 34 years | 31% |
| | 35-44 years | 54% |
| | 45-54 years | 12% |
| | 55-64 years | 3% |

From the table above, most of the participants is male with 56.5%; the total number is 52 people, with the female participants is only 44 people. As for the length of residents, the majority lives for more than 30 years. This facts is related to the age which says that most of them is in the age range of 35-44 years old (54%). Another data revealed is the education level which is dominated by secondary educatiob graduates which consist of junior and senior high school for 65%, while the college graduate is 34%. Because of this level of education, most of the residents work as private employee for 33%. The rest work as an entrepreneur, and others.

B. Residents’ Perceived Image on Tourism in Gunungkidul

Table 2. Residents’ Perceived Image on Tourism in Gunungkidul

| No | Gunungkidul | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|-------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | has an attractive scenery | 82.5% | 17.5% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | has pleasant weather | 42% | 53% | 4% | 1% | 0% |
| 3 | has nice architecture/buidings | 38% | 58% | 2% | 2% | 0% |
| 4 | has interesting historic sites | 53% | 38% | 10% | 0% | 0% |
| 5 | has an effective local government | 24% | 58% | 17% | 2% | 0% |
| 6 | has effective public services | 30% | 49% | 18% | 3% | 1% |
| 7 | offers good job opportunity | 13% | 62% | 20% | 5% | 0% |
| 8 | has a good transportation system | 9% | 40% | 36% | 13% | 1% |
| 9 | has a good food/restaurant | 10% | 54% | 24% | 12% | 0% |
| 10 | has good nightlife/entertainment | 28% | 48% | 16% | 9% | 0% |
| 11 | is a good place for shopping | 16% | 56% | 17% | 12% | 0% |
| 12 | is inhabited by friendly locals | 72% | 28% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 13 | is a safe place to live | 70% | 27% | 3% | 0% | 0% |
| 14 | is clean | 27% | 64% | 8% | 1% | 0% |
| TOTAL | | 514.5% | 653% | 175% | 60% | 2% |

The second table states the residents’ perceived image on tourism in Gunungkidul. As seen from the table, majority of the participants mention that Gunungkidul has attractive scenery. This is proven from the availability of breathtaking landscapes ranging from valley, hill, beaches, waterfalls, underwater river, etc. As for the weather, 53% participants agree that the area has pleasant weather. The tropical weather is a heaven for foreign tourists to have sunbathing in the beaches. The next item is the building and historic sites. Most people agree on the statements as in this area, the local house called Joglo can be found throughout the area, while the historical sites are from the ancient remains of civilizations in the form of megalithic sites in Sokoliman and near ancient Bengawan Solo river. Other features mostly gain good image such as the transportation, the local government, and the tourism facilities.

C. Resident’s Perceived Image on Tourism Impacts in Gunungkidul

Table 3. Residents’ Perceived Image on Tourism Impacts in Gunungkidul

| No | Impacts of Tourism on.... | Strong Positive | Positive | No Impact | Negative | Strong Negative |
|----|---|-----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| 1 | number of jobs | 46% | 54% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | standard living | 43% | 56% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| 3 | revenue generated in the local | 45% | 54% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| 4 | infrastructure | 41% | 53% | 5% | 1% | 4% |
| 5 | price of land and housing | 46% | 52% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| 6 | Cultural activities/entertainment | 49% | 50% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| 7 | availability of recreational facilities | 52% | 46% | 2% | 0% | 0% |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| 8 | opportunity to meet people from other culture | 47% | 51% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| 9 | community spirit among local residents | 40% | 55% | 5% | 0% | 0% |
| 10 | quality on public services | 33% | 55% | 12% | 0% | 0% |
| 11 | Crime level | 8% | 27% | 29% | 28% | 8% |
| 12 | Environmental pollution | 7% | 33% | 28% | 30% | 7% |
| 13 | Noise level | 7% | 36% | 16% | 34% | 7% |
| 14 | size of crowds | 25% | 55% | 6% | 13% | 1% |
| 15 | level of traffic congestion | 37% | 51.5% | 3% | 8% | 1% |
| TOTAL | | 525% | 728% | 116% | 114% | 28% |

The third table reveal the residents’ perceived image on tourism impact in their area. The impacts are broken down into 15 (fifteen) which mainly dervied from three big aspects of tourism impacts such as economical, socio-cultural, and environmental. The economical aspect is represented by questions number 1-5. The participants mostly agree that tourism has something to do with their lives such as increasing number of jobs, standard living, revenue generated in the local price of land and housing , and also insfrastructure.

As for the socio-cultural impacts, questions number 6-10 deals with this. The avearge response of this area is either strongly agree or agree. It means that they feel positive impacts as a result of tourism activity in the area. The last questions deal with the environmental impacts (no 11-15). As for the crime level, the majority says that tourism has no effect on it (29%), tourism has positive impact on pollution (33%), tourism has positive impacts in increasing the noise level with 36%, tourism has positive impacts in increasing the size of crowds (55%) and the last finding states that it has affected positively on the level of traffic congestion with 55%.

D. Resident’s Perceived Image on Tourism development in Gunungkidul

Table 4. Residents’ Perceived Tourism Impacts in Gunungkidul

| No | Residents' Opinion | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--------------|--|----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Tourism should be further developed | 72% | 28% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | The local government should fund the promotion of tourism in Gunungkidul | 51% | 47% | 2% | 0% | 0% |
| 3 | The volume pf tourists visiting Gunungkidul should increase | 65% | 35% | | 0% | 0% |
| TOTAL | | 188% | 110% | 2% | 0% | 0% |

The last table enquires about the residents’ opinion on the development of tourism in their area. The three questions try to seek info on their support of this program. The majority of the participants strongly agree that tourism should be further developed with 72%, that the local government should provid more budget on the promotion with 51%, and they also strongly agree that the number of tourists visiting their area should be increased.

V. CONCLUSION

It can be summarized that the tourism in Gunungkidul gain positive image viewed from the residents' point of view. Anyhow, the negative image is taken from the inavailability of good transportation, good shopping area, and good restaurants. As for the last one, bad publication of the inappropriate food price of some area was often transferred by social media. Some local tourists complained that they had been overcharged for the food and drink they bought in the tourism sites. To solve this, the local government has launched some program to educate the seller by stating standard price, but again some sellers happened to take advantage of the flourishing visitors in the peak season.

Dealing with the impacts of tourism, the research reinforced the theory that tourism facilitate economical growth and sociocultural in the area. In this case, positive impacts are felt by the residents. The negative impact is revealed for the environmental perspectives as the participants mention that tourism has affected to the raise of crime, noise, pollution, and traffic congestion in the area.

Last but not least, it can also be concluded that the majority of the participants strongly agree that tourism should be developed in terms of promotion budget to increase the number of tourists.

REFERENCES

- Avraham, E. a. (2008). *Media Strategies for Marketing Places in Crisis*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Echtner, C. M. (1991). The Meaning and Measurement of Destination Image. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 2 (2), 2-12.
- Elizur, J. (1987). *National Image*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- Haryono, E. a. (2010). Significant Features of Gunung Sewu Karst As Geopark Site. *4th International UNESCO Conference on Geopark* (pp. 1-9). Langkawi: Research gate.
- Inskip, E. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. New York. . New York.
- Kausar, D. (2010). *Socio-Economic Impact of Tourism on a World Heritage Site (WHS): Case Study of Rural Borobudur, Indonesia*. Nagoya University.
- Kotler, P. a. (1993). *Marketing Places*. New York: Free Press.
- List of UNESCO Global Geopark*. (2018, March 3). Retrieved from [www.unesco.org: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/earth-sciences/unesco-global-geoparks/list-of-unesco-global-geoparks/](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/earth-sciences/unesco-global-geoparks/list-of-unesco-global-geoparks/)
- Maccannel, D. (1989). *The Tourists*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Marlina, E. (2016, Vol.10 No.5). Geotourism as a Strategy of Geosite Empowerment towards the Tourism Sustainability in Gunungkidul Regency, Indonesia. *International Journal of Smart Home*, 131-146.
- Nglanggeran, A Village below a 60-million-year-old volcano* . (2018, March 6). Retrieved from <http://www.indonesia.travel: http://www.indonesia.travel/tw/en/destinations/village-tourism/nglanggeran-village>