Development Competitiveness Model Of Village Owned Enterprises (Bumdes) Through The Global Competition

by Mohamad Nur Singgih

Submission date: 20-Jul-2023 12:06PM (UTC+0700)
Submission ID: 2133909496
File name: Jurnal_Tekcnologi_dan_Manajemen.pdf (322.13K)
Word count: 5924
Character count: 34126

Development Competitiveness Model Of Village Owned Enterprises (Bumdes) Through The Global Competition

Mohamad Nur Singgih

Student of Doctoral Program in Management Science, State University of Malang
Lecturer in Management Study Program, University of Merdeka Malang
Correspondening author:
Email: msingh.1904139@students.um.ac.id

Abstract.
The development of a tourist village is an option for BUMDes in Malang district as a driver of the local economy. The research objective is to analyze to compile the BUMDes model in developing competitiveness that has competitive advantages in the global market. Methods of data collection using interviews, questionnaires and observations with a research sample of 200 respondents taken by purposive sampling from tourists visiting 10 tourist villages in Malang district. The approach used in this research is mixed methods, including qualitative and quantitative methods to assess the competitiveness and factors that affect the performance of BUMDes. The analysis technique uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to model tourism competitiveness in Malang district. The results showed that the competitiveness of tourism villages as indicated by the attractiveness (attractions), infrastructure, tourist facilities, accessibility and institutions significantly affected the competitiveness and increased performance of BUMDes in Malang district

Keywords*: Competitiveness, Tourism Village, Attractions, Management*

I. INTRODUCTION

Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises have a very strategic role in the development of the national economy by contributing to economic growth, employment, and earning foreign exchange. The national crisis has proven that MSMEs are a more resilient economic buffer compared to large-scale businesses. The current condition of MSMEs is facing a level of global competition. Global competition is a necessity that occurs in increasingly complex business competitions and cannot be avoided by MSMEs. The resulting competition has created various threats and opportunities for domestic and foreign MSMEs entering the Indonesian market. Law (UU) Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages

Provides autonomy for villages to regulate their own resources and direction of development through the formation of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) as a driver of village-level local economic development. BUMDesDesaWisata as UMKM in developing business to manage tourism villages must develop competitiveness to face the level of competition both at local, national and international levels. BUMDes problems in facing competition are innovating to develop potential attractions or attractions that are unique to the village itself, the provision of infrastructure, tourist facilities and accommodation as well as service quality to create competitive advantages that can compete in the global era. BUMDes must have competitive advantage in order to be able to compete and maintain their existence. Porter (2004) states that competitive advantage cannot be understood without looking at a company as a whole.

A competitive advantage strategy can be done by leading the cost in the market, focusing and creating unique products. In order to compete in business competition, marketing products are not only based on product quality, but also on strategies generally used by companies, namely market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and innovation.

The study of the competitiveness of BUMDes in Malang district which has competitive advantages is reflected in BUMDesSumber Sejahtera, PujonKidul village, Pujon sub-district, Malang district. This BUMDes has 8 business units that contribute to driving the economy of PujonKidul village. One of the business units that has been successfully managed is the tourist destination Café SawahPujonKidul. The competitive advantage of PujonKidul Rice Field Café is measured by the ability of the business unit to manage the potential of a tourist village to become an alternative tourism destination that attracts tourist visitsfor tourism potential: natural attractions with cool air and attractive natural scenery and restaurant or café facilities in the middle of rice fields, easy accessibility, infrastructure,

And community participation have been able to attract an average tourist visit of 2000 tourists per day (data source; visits PujonKidul 2019 tourists) Café SawahPujonKidul has become a model for managing the potential of a successful tourism village for the development of BUMDes in Malang district with an indication of the ability to increase village community income, reduce unemployment, open community business opportunities, increase village original income. The problem in this research is the BUMDes strategy in developing the competitiveness of a tourist village that has global competitiveness and is interesting to be used as a study in compiling a tourism village potential management model consisting of potential attractions, infrastructure, facilities, accessibility and village institutional support for development. Village Owned Enterprises (BUMDes). The purpose of this study is to develop a BUMDes model in developing competitiveness that is able to compete and have competitive advantages in the global market. From the results of this study, it is hoped that it can be used as a model for the development of BUMDes in managing the potential and competitiveness of tourist villages in Malang Regency

II. Literature review

a. Village Owned Enterprises (BUMDes)

In Law no. 32 of 2004 in conjunction with Law no. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government in Article 213 paragraph (1) states that, "Villages can establish village-owned enterprises according to the needs and potential of the village". The establishment of BUMDes was also based on Law no. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages in Article 87 paragraph (1) which reads, "Villages can establish Village-Owned Enterprises which is called BUMDes," and paragraph (2) which reads, "BUMDes is managed with a spirit of kinship and mutual cooperation," and paragraph (3)which reads, "BUMDes can run businesses in the economic sector and / or public services in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations. Village-owned enterprises (BUMDes) are village business institutions managed by the community and village government in an effort to strengthen the village economy and are formed based on the needs and potential of the village. BUMDes is a pillar of economic activity in the village that functions as a social and commercial institution.

b. Tourism Village

Gumelar (2010; 21),Tourism village is one of the alternative tourism products that can provide encouragement for sustainable rural development and has management principles, namely: (1) utilizing local community facilities and infrastructure, (2) benefiting the community local communities, (3) on a small scale to facilitate reciprocal relationships with local communities, (4) involving local communities, (5) implementing rural tourism product development.In addition, Priasukmana&Mulyadin (2001), Tourism Village is a rural area that offers an entire atmosphere that reflects the authenticity of the village itself, starting from the socio-culture, customs, daily life, having a typical village architecture and spatial structure. From socio-economic life or economic activities, tourism village has unique, attractive and potential to develop various components of tourism, for example: attractions, accommodation, food and beverages, souvenirs and other tourism needs.Ibori (2013) states that the determination of a village as a tourism village is at least based on several potential supporting components, namely:

1. There is an attraction or attraction that is typical of the village itself.
2. The existence of tourism facilities and accommodation such as, lodging facilities, food and beverage facilities, hawker or souvenir centers, and visitor centers.
3. The existence of tourist activities such as, enjoying the scenery and others.
4. The existence of general development as an effort to create tourist destinations that provide the best services for tourists.

c. Tourism Destination Competitiveness

Cvelbar et al., (2015) simply assess the competitiveness of tourist destinations through the number of tourist visits and the contribution of tourist activities in tourist destinations to regional income. The opinion of Cvelbar et al., (2015) is in line with the opinion of Delgado et al., (2012) that in assessing the competitiveness of tourist destinations, it can be done by the volume of tourist visits and the income obtained from the purchase of goods, services, and entrance tickets issued by tourists. The concept presented by

Cvelbar et al., (2015) and Delgado et al., (2012) focuses more on assessment based on policy stakeholders, in this case local government and managers of tourist destinations.A different concept from the opinion of Delgado et al., (2012) and Cvelbar et al., (2015) is described by Mira et al., (2016) and Cucculelli and Goffi (2015). Mira et al., (2016) and Cucculelli and Goffi (2015) state that looking at the competitiveness of tourist destinations in the tourism market, it cannot only be based on the number of tourist visits or the benefits obtained from tourist expenditure during a visit but seen through the impact of tourism activities on the economic, socio-cultural and environmental conditions at the tourist destination.Sirgy (2012) and Woo et al., (2016) add that destination competitiveness is assessed based on the impact of tourism activities on local residents, both increasing knowledge, infrastructure, and also impacting the quality of life of local residents.

The opinions expressed by several researchers who have been mentioned are more focused on assessing competitiveness based on local residents around tourist destinations. Althuizen et al. (2016) Assessment of the competitiveness of many tourist destinations over the last few decades has focused more on the point of view of policy makers and also local residents as hosts but ignores the point of view of tourists as consumers of tourism products themselves.Alhuizen et al., Campón-Cerro et al., (2016) and Chen et al., (2011) in their research stated that in order to assess the competitiveness of tourist destinations, it can be done by looking at the perceptions and satisfaction of tourists while visiting tourist destinations and loyalty of the tourists to visit tourist destinations.Chen et al., (2011) also suggest that the assessment of the competitiveness of a tourist destination needs to pay attention to the image of a tourist destination as an important indicator in assessing the competitiveness of a tourist destination. The understanding the indicators of competitive tourism can influence a tourist's decision. This conceptual paper proposes that the combination of competitiveness and attractiveness factors can increase the popularity of tourist village destinations. Competitiveness elements come from the supply side and attractiveness from the demand side of tourism. The Competitiveness elements consist of natural resources and key attractors, supporting facilities (conditioning and supporting factors), tourism facilities and infrastructure (general infrastructure) and service quality (tourism service), while the elements of attraction consist of destination image and customer satisfaction.

d. Sustainability Competitveness Model Of Tourism

Tourism Destination Competitiveness (TDC) The Ritchie and Crouch model is the model most frequently cited by the TDC which relatively attempts to include relevant predictors that have critical significance in scientific research. According to Ritchie and Crouch's model, this TDC conceptual model has about 36 attributes which are classified into six key factors. Core resources and attractants, Supporting factors and resources, Policy objectives, planning and development, Destination management and Qualification and Variable amplifiers in Ritchie and Crouch's (2003) fashion, applying Porter's (1990) core-core theory of competitive advantage, provides a useful framework. differentiate comparative from competitive advantage. The elements of comparative advantage are: human and physical resources, availability of knowledge, capital, tourism infrastructure, and historical and cultural assets. Competitive advantages include auditing and inventory, maintenance, growth and development, efficiency and effectiveness. The micro (eg, business) and macro environment (eg, nature, technology, etc.) are influenced by four different domains - qualifying and reinforcing determinants: destination policy, planning and development; core resources and drawers; and enabling factors and resources - suitable for the design of conceptual models for destination competitiveness. l describe and measure more direct and direct impacts of elements of the macro environment.

The Ritchie & Crouch's Conceptual Model of Destination Competitiveness

Macro environmental factors are categorized into six main groups related to the economy, technology, ecology, political and legal developments, socio-cultural issues, and the evolving demographic environment. A destination's (micro) competitive environment is created by the organization, influence, and forces that exist within that destination the direct arena of tourism activity and competition. These elements of the microenvironment tend to have a more direct and direct impact than the global (macro) environmental elements, as a general rule.

The "core resource and attractant" component describes the main elements of a destination's attractiveness. These factors are the main motivators for a visit to a destination. While other components are essential to success and profit, core and attracting resources are the fundamental reasons potential visitors choose one destination over another. Whereas the core and attracting resources of a destination are the main motivations for inbound tourism, supporting factors and resources provide the foundation upon which a successful tourism industry can be established. A further component of this model is "destination policy, planning and development." A strategic framework for planning and developing goals with specific economic and social objectives can provide a guiding hand towards tourism development direction and structure. The "destination management" component of the model focuses on activities that implement, on a daily basis, the policy and planning framework established under destination policies, planning and development, enhancing the attractiveness of core and attracting resources, strengthening the quality and effectiveness of supporting factors and resources, and best adapting to constraints or opportunities. imposed or served by determining qualifications and amplifying determinants Finally, the potential competitiveness of a destination is conditioned or limited by a number of factors that are outside the scope of the previous determinant group. These qualifiers and amplifiers moderate or increase the competitiveness of a destination by filtering out the influence of other destinations factor groups. They may be very important to represent tourism demand and potential ceilings, but mostly beyond the control or influence of the tourism sector itself to do anything.

III. Methods

a. Research Variables and Indicators

Table 1. Variables and indicators of tourism village competitiveness

Variable	Indicator
Resources and Attractions (Core Resources and Key Attractors)	Natural resources, historical and archaeological sitesartistic, architectural features, cultural attractions, and events of relaxing activities
Tourist Facilities	Quality of accommodation, Amount of accommodation, Eco-friendly accommodation, and Quality of food service
Infrastructure (General Infrastructure)	Environmental friendliness and quality of service, Transportation, Quality of road systems, Accessibility of facilities by persons with disabilities, Medical care facilities, Sanitation, waste disposal and solid waste disposal
accessibility	Destination accessibility, Proximity to other tourist destinations, Destination links with major markets, Destination links with city centers, and Security
Institutional	District Government Policies, Village Government Policies, Citizen Organization Support, and Village Institution Support

BUMDes performance (Organizational Performance)	Ability to increase income Ability to create business opportunities Ability to create jobs Ability to reduce poverty Ability to protect the environment

Methods of data collection using questionnaires and interviews through focus group discuss, using purposive sampling with 200 research respondents drawn from 10 tourist villages in Malang Regency. The analysis technique uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

IV. Result

To conduct the analysis in this study, inferential analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) techniques is usedm

a. Normality test

The data normality test was carried out by observing the CR value in a multivariate manner. If the multivariate critical ratio value is in the range of -2.58 to 2.58, it can be categorized that the data distribution is normal.

Table 2
Multivariate Normality Test Results

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
X51	1.000	5.000	-.699	-1.985	-.156	-.444
X52	1,000	5,000	-,664	-1,783	,177	,504
X53	1,000	5,000	-,415	-2,368	-,394	-1,122
X54	1,000	5,000	-,533	-2,039	-,157	-,449
Y6	1,000	5,000	-,606	-2,453	,317	,903
Y5	1,000	5,000	-,488	-1,780	-,261	-,744
Y4	1,000	5,000	-,716	-2,084	,496	1,414
Y3	1,000	5,000	-,808	-2,608	,806	2,296
X38	1,000	5,000	-,582	-2,315	-,201	-,572
X37	1,000	5,000	-,855	-1,877	,236	,673
X36	1,000	5,000	-,878	-2,005	-,034	-,096
X35	1,000	5,000	-,751	-2,279	-,035	-,099
X34	1,000	5,000	-,620	-1,537	-,154	-,438
X33	1,000	5,000	-,380	-2,164	-,471	-1,342
X32	1,000	5,000	-,621	-1,542	,187	,534
X31	1,000	5,000	-,556	-2,168	-,545	-1,554
X17	1,000	5,000	-,348	-1,985	,215	,612
X16	2,000	6,000	-,094	-,534	-,110	-,312
X45	1,000	5,000	,758	2,324	-,059	-,168
X44	1,000	5,000	,415	2,364	-,665	-1,895
X25	1,000	5,000	-,543	-2,097	-,323	-,919
X15	2,000	5,000	-,198	-1,130	-,606	-1,728
X14	1,000	5,000	-,521	-1,970	,129	,368
X13	2,000	5,000	-,310	-1,766	-,564	-1,607
X12	2,000	5,000	-,758	-2,321	,261	,744
X11	2,000	5,000	-,926	-2,280	,242	,690
X24	2,000	5,000	-,527	-2,003	-,279	-,796
X23	1,000	5,000	-,590	-2,365	-,236	-,673
X22	1,000	5,000	-,628	-2,582	-,037	-,106
X43	1,000	5,000	,080	,456	-,856	-2,441
X42	3,000	5,000	,000	,000	-1,125	-2,207
						,856
X21	1,000	5,000	-,662	-1,775	,300	

Variable	min	max	skew	c.r.	kurtosis	c.r.
X41	3,000	5,000	-,136	-,776	-1,229	-2,504
Y2	2,000	5,000	-,524	-1,988	-,210	-,598
Y1	1,000	5,000	-,710	-2,050	,656	1,869
Multivariate					18,581	2,416

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Based on the results of data processing from Table 2, it is known that the multivariate CR value is 2.125 which is between -2.58 to 2.58, so it is concluded that the assumption of multivariate normality has been fulfilled, thus the normality assumption required by SEM analysis has been fulfilled.

b.Outlier Test

The outlier test was carried out using the Mahalanobis distance method (Mahalanobis distance squared). If Mahalanobis distance squared is greater than the chi-square value at df = number of indicators and a significance level of 0.001, then the data is an outlier. The following is the calculation result of Mahalanobis distance squared:

Table 3
Outlier Test Results
(Mahalanobis Distance Squared)

Observation Number	*Mahalanobis d-squared*	p1	p2
158	66.596	0.001	0.000
17	66.188	0.001	0.000
174	65.857	0.001	0.000
34	65.814	0.001	0.000
98	63.869	0.001	0.000
129	62.785	0.002	0.000
20	62.965	0.002	0.000
89	62.943	0.002	0.000
85	62.566	0.002	0.000
145	61.994	0.003	0.000

Source: Primary data processed, 2019.

The results from Table 3 with the Mahalanobis distance squared show that statistically there are observations detected as outliers, namely, observations that have a Mahalanobis distance greater than the chi square table (df = 35, α = 0.001) which is 66.62. From the analysis it is known that at 16 None of the indicators used in this study contain outliers. Multicollinearity and Singularity Test Based on the SEM output of the sample covariance matrix, the result is 0.134, which means the value is greater than zero. So it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity and singularity, which means that this data is suitable for use.

c.Confirmatory Analysis of Exogenous Variables

Confirmatory analysis of exogenous variables (management commitment to service quality, customer-oriented staff service and customer value) was carried out to confirm whether the observed variables could reflect the analyzed factors, namely, having a model suitability test - goodness of fit test, significant factor weighting and lambda value or factor loading.

Table 4
Exogenous Variable Test Results

Indicator	Variabel Latent	*Factor Loading*	CR	P value	Description
X1.1	Attractions (Attractiveness) (X1)	0,563	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
X1.2		0,613	6,659	0,000	Valid
X1.3		0,687	7,177	0,000	Valid
X1.4		0,772	7,693	0,000	Valid
X1.5		0,724	7,409	0,000	Valid

X1.6		0,686	7,172	0,000	Valid
X1.7		0,691	7,199	0,000	Valid
X2.1	Infrastructure (X2)	0,615	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
X2.2		0,718	7,893	0,000	Valid
X2.3		0,742	8,072	0,000	Valid
X2.4		0,717	7,884	0,000	Valid
X2.5		0,730	7,984	0,000	Valid
X3.1	Tourism Facilities (X3)	0,595	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
X3.2		0,710	7,999	0,000	Valid
X3.3		0,697	7,899	0,000	Valid
X3.4		0,772	8,466	0,000	Valid
X3.5		0,771	8,466	0,000	Valid
X3.6		0,796	8,64	0,000	Valid
X3.7		0,832	8,89	0,000	Valid
X3.8		0,867	9,115	0,000	Valid
X4.1	Accessibility (X4)	0,634	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
X4.2		0,687	8,148	0,000	Valid
X4.3		0,753	8,751	0,000	Valid
X4.4		0,863	9,635	0,000	Valid
X4.5		0,876	9,728	0,000	Valid
X5.1	Institutional (X5)	0,761	13,394	0,000	Valid
X5.2		0,895	18,316	0,000	Valid
X5.3		0,924	19,581	0,000	Valid
X5.4		0,889	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
Reliabilityy Construct		= 0,973	(*cut-off value* = 0,7)		Reliable
Variance Extract		= 0,563	(*cut-off value* = 0,5)		Reliable

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Based on the information in Table 4, it shows that the factor loading value of each indicator exceeds the cut-off value of 0.5, the probability value (p) is less than or equal to 0.05, the Reliability Construct value of 0.973 is greater than the cut-off value of 0, 7 and the Variance Extract value of 0.5638 is greater than the cut-off value of 0.5. The attraction indicator (attractiveness) which shows the highest factor loading value is X1.4 with a value of 0.772, the infrastructure indicator which shows the highest factor loading value is X2.3 with a value of 0.742, the tourist facility indicator which shows the highest factor loading value is X3.8 with value of 0.867, the accessibility indicator which shows the highest factor loading value is X4.5 with a value of 0.876, the institutional indicator which shows the highest factor loading value is X5.3 with a value of 0.924. The results of this test indicate that the indicators tested have good reliability in shaping and operationalizing the latent variables of attractions (attractiveness), infrastructure, tourist facilities, accessibility and institutions.

d. Confirmatory Analysis of Intervening and Endogenous Variables

The test results for the significance of the factor loading endogenous variables (service performance and company reputation) are presented in the following table.

Table 5

Endogenous Variable Test Results

Indicator	VariabelLatent	*Factor Loading*	CR	P value	Description

Y1	BUMDes Development (Y)	0.665	10.054	0.000	Valid
Y2		0.833	*Fixed*	0.000	Valid
Y3		0.817	13.323	0.000	Valid
Y4		0,.15	13.277	0.000	Valid
Y5		0.752	11.851	0.000	Valid
Y6		0.632	9.422	0.000	Valid
Reliabilityy Construct	= 0,888	(*cut-off value* = 0,7)			Reliable
Variance Extract	= 0,572	(*cut-off value* = 0,5)			Reliable

Based on the information in Table 5, it shows that the value of the factor loading for each indicator exceeds the cut-off value of 0.5, the probability value (p) is less than or equal to 0.05, the Reliability Construct value of 0.888 is greater than the cut-off value of 0.7 and the Variance Extract value of 0.572 is greater than the cut-off value of 0.5. The BUMDes development indicator that shows the highest factor loading value is Y2 with a value of 0.833. The results of this test indicate that the indicators tested have good reliability in establishing and operationalizing the latent variables of BUMDes development.

e.Model Fit Test (Goodness Of Fit)

Based on the SEM model computation, the goodness of fit indexes are presented in Table 6. Furthermore, the index values are compared with the critical value (cut-of value) of each index. A good model is expected to have goodness of fit indices that are greater than or equal to the critical value.

Table 6

Goodness of Fit Test Results for Modified Structural Models

Goodness Of Fit Index	*Cut-off Value*	Value Result	Description
Chi-Square (df = 94)	128.80	898.160	Good
Probability Chi-Square	≥ 0.05	0.061	Good
CMIN/DF	≤ 2.00	1.648	Good
RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.064	Good
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.896	Marginal
AGFI	≥ 0.90	0.903	Good
CFI	≥ 0.95	0.955	Good
TLI	≥ 0.95	0.932	Marginal

Source: Primary data processed, 2019.

Based on the evaluation results of the Goodness of Fit Indices criteria in Table 6, the model evaluation shows that not all of the model criteria are good. Even though the GFI and TLI values are still below the cut-off value, these values are not that far from the cut-off value. According to Arbuckle and Wothke (1999: 617), the best criteria used as an indication of the goodness of the model are CMIN / DF values that are less than 2, and RMSEA which is below 0.08. In this study, the CMIN / DF and RMSEA values have met the cut off value, as well as the CFI value, therefore the model can be categorized as suitable and suitable for use, so that interpretation can be made for further discussion.

Table 7

Endogenous Variable Test Results

Indicator	VariabelLatent	*Factor Loading*	CR	P Value	Description
Y1	BUMDes Development (Y)	0.665	10.054	0,000	Valid
Y2		0.833	*Fixed*	0,000	Valid
Y3		0.817	13.323	0,000	Valid
Y4		0.815	13.277	0,000	Valid
Y5		0.752	11.851	0,000	Valid
Y6		0.632	9.422	0,000	Valid
Reliabilityy Construct	= 0.888	(*cut-off value* = 0.7)			Reliable
Variance Extract	= 0.572	(*cut-off value* = 0.5)			Reliable

Source: Primary data processed, 2019.

Based on the information in Table 7, it shows that the factor loading value of each indicator exceeds the cut-off value of 0.5, the probability value (p) is less than or equal to 0.05, the Reliability Construct value is 0.888 greater than the cut-off value of 0.7 and the Variance Extract value of 0.572 is greater than the cut-off value of 0.5. The BUMDes development indicator that shows the highest factor loading value is Y2 with a value of 0.833. The results of this test indicate that the indicators tested have good reliability in establishing and operationalizing the latent variables of BUMDes development.

V. Conclusion

Attraction (attractiveness) has a significant effect on the development of BUMDes. In terms of the tourism product, to attract tourist visits to destinations in order to improve the performance of BUMDes, infrastructure has a significant effect on the development of BUMDes. The better the infrastructure owned by the tourist attractions, the more it can improve the performance of BUMDes. Tourist facilities have a significant effect on the development of BUMDes. The more complete the tourist facilities available, the more it can attract tourists and improve the performance of BUMDes.

Tourism facilities quantitatively refer to the number of tourist facilities that must be provided, and qualitatively show the quality of services provided to tourists. Accessibility has a significant effect on the development of BUMDes. The better the accessibility, the more tourists visit and have an impact on the performance of BUMDes. One form of comfort that tourists need is easy accessibility. Institutions have a significant effect on the development of BUMDes. The better the institutional management, the better the BUMDes performance can be. The institutional indicator that makes the biggest contribution to increasing BUMDes development is the support from village institutions (BPD, LPMD, POKDARWIS, PKK) for the development of tourism villages.

REFERENCES

[1] AL-MASROORI, R. S.2006b. Destination Competitiveness: Interrelationships betweendestinationplanning and developmentstrategies and stakeholders'supportin enhancing Oman'stourism industry.*Unpublished doctoraldissertation). Griffith University, Australia*.

[2] ADHIKARI,ADANBHATTACHARTA,S.2014.Appraisalofliteratureoncustomerexperience intourismsector: review and framework.***JournalCurrent Issues in Tourism*** Volume 19, 2016 -Issue4.
D. A. Tasci, W. C. Gartner, and S. T. Cavusgil, "Conceptualization and Operationali-zation of destination image," Journal of Hospitality & Tourism research, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 194- 1223, 2007

[3] P. Mat Som and M. B. Badarneh, "Tourist Satisfaction and Repeat Visitation; Toward a New Comprehensive Model," International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, vol. 6, no. 1, 2011

[4] ALTHUIZEN,N.,WIERENGA,BDANCHEN,B.2016.*ManagerialDecision-Makingin Marketing:MatchingtheDemandandSupplySideofCreativity.* ***Journalof MarketingBehavior***: Vol. 2: No. 2–3, pp 129-176.

[5] AMSAL,A.A.DANMAHARDIKA,H.2017.PendekatanExperienceEconomy PadaPemasaranFestival Pariwisata: PengaruhTerhadapKepribadianFestivalYang DirasakanPegunjungDanReputasiFestival.***MIX:JurnalIlmiahManajemen***, Volume VII, No. 2, Juni 2017.

[6] AQUILINO,L DANWISE,N.2016.EvaluatingtheCompetitivenessoftheNorthernand SouthernMacro-RegionsofItaly.***Journalof TourismCulture and Territorial Development*** Vol 7, No.13

[7] BALOGLU,S.&MCCLEARLY,K. W.1999. A modelofdestination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research,*26**,**868-897.

[8] CAI, L. A. 2002. Cooperative brandingfor ruraldestinations.*Annals ofTourism Research,*29**,**720-742.

[9] CAMPÓN-CERRO,A.M, ALVES, H DANHERNÁNDEZ-MOGOLLÓN,M.J.2016.Sustainable improvementof competitivenessinruraltourismdestinations:The questfor touristloyalty inSpain.***JournalofDestinationMarketing&Management*** Volume 6,Issue3, September2017, Pages 252-266.

[10] CETIN,G.,KIZILIRMAK,IDANBALIK,M.2017.TheSuperiorDestinationE xperience.***Journal of Tourismology*****,** Vol.3, No.2.

[11] CHANDRALAL,LDANVALENZUELA,F.2013.Exploring MemorableTourismExperiences: Antecedents andBehavioural Outcomes.*Journal of Economics, Business and* ***Management*****1**(2):177–81.

[12] CHANG,S.2018.ExperienceEconomyintheHospitalityandTourismContext.*Tourism*

[13] *Management Perspectives*27(May):83–90.

[14] CHEN, C.M., CHEN, S.H., LEE, H.T. DAN TSAI, T.H. 2016. Exploring destination resourcesandcompetitiveness–Acomparative analysisoftourists' perceptions andsatisfactiontowardanislandofTaiwan.*Ocean&CoastalManagement*, Vol. 119, pp. 58-67.

[15] CHEN,C.M.,CHEN,S.H.&LEE,H.T. 2011b. Thedestination competitiveness of Kinmen'stourism industry:exploring the interrelationships between tourist perceptions,service performance, customersatisfactionand sustainable tourism.***Journalof Sustainable Tourism***, 19**,** 247-264.
[16] CHI,C.G.Q.&QU,H. 2008.Examining the structuralrelationshipsof destination image, tourist satisfactionand destination loyalty:An integrated approach. *Tourism Management,* 29**,** 624-636.
[17] CRACOLICI,M.F., NIJKAMP,P. &RIETVELD,P. 2008.Assessmentof tourism competitivenessbyanalysing destinationefficiency. *Tourism Economics,*14**,**325-342.
[18] Ryan and I. Glendon, "Application of leisure scale to tourism," Annals of tourism Research, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 169-184, 1998
[19] Ryan, Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective, London: Routledge, 1991.
[20] CROUCH,G.I.&RITCHIE,J.R.B.1999. Tourism, Competitiveness and Societal prosperity. ***Journal of BusinessResearch***,44**,** 137-152.
[21] CUCCUELLI, M DAN GOFFI, G.2015. Does sustainabilityenhancetourism destination competitiveness?Evidence fromItalian Destinationsof Excellence**.***Journalof Cleaner Production***1**11:370-382.
[22] CVELBAR,L.K., DWYER,L.,KOMAN,MDANMIHALIC,T.2015.Drivers of Destination CompetitivenessinTourismA GlobalInvestigation**.*****JournalCurrentIssuesin Tourism***. Volume: 55 issue: 8, page(s): 1041-1050.
[23] DAMANIK,J.2013.*PariwisataIndonesia:AntaraPeluangdanTantangan*.Pustaka
[24] Pelajar :Yogyakarta.

[25] Scrogin, R. Holfer, K. Bolye, and J. W. Milon, "An efficiency approach to choice set formation: theory and application to recreational destination choice," Applied Economics. vol. 4, no. 18, pp. 333-350, 2010
[26] D.-B. Park and Y.-S. Yoon, "Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study," Tourism Management, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 99-108, 2009
[27] DELGADO,M.,KETELS,C.,PORTER,M.EDANSCOTTSTERN.2012.TheDeterminantsof National Competitiveness.*NBERWorking Paper*Series, No. 18249.
[28] DRAGICEVIC, V., JOVICIC,D., BLESIC,I., STANKOV,U DANBOSKOVIC,D. 2012. Business TourismDestination Competitiveness:A Case OfVojvodinaProvince(Serbia). *EconomicResearch-Ekonomskaistraživanja*, Vol. 25 (2012)No. 2 (311-332).
[2 9] DWYER,L.&KIM,C.2003.Destination competitiveness: determinants and indicators.
[30] *Currentissuesintourism,* 6**,** 369-414.
[31] ESTEVÃO,C.,FERREIRA,J., DANNUNES,S.2016. DeterminantsOfTourismDestination Competitiveness:A SEM Approach.*InMarketing Places andSpaces*. Vol.10, pp. 121-139.
[32] EUSÉBIO, C DANVIEIRA,A.L.2013.DestinationAttributes' Evaluation, Satisfaction and BehaviouralIntentions: a Structural Modelling Approach.International*Journal of Tourism Research*Volume15,Issue1 January/February2013.
[33] FERNANDES,T.S., SILVA,A., REIS,RDANLEAO,C.2016.GatheringInformationBasedon FocusGroups:Consumer'sInvolvementintheUseofVending Machines.*The QualitativeReport*, 21(13), 19-33.
[34] FERNANDES,TDANCRUZ,M.2016.Dimensionsandoutcomesofexperiencequality in tourism:The caseofPortwinecellars.***JournalofRetailingandConsumer Services*** 31 (2016)371–379.

[35] GARTNER,W.C.1986. Temporalinfluences on image change.*AnnalsofTourism Research,*13**,**635-644.
[36] GARTNER, W.C. 1994. Image formation process.***JournalofTravel& Tourism Marketing***,2**,** 191-216.
[37] GOMEZELJ, D. O. &MIHALIC, T. 2008. Destination competitiveness-- Applyingdifferent Models,thecaseof Slovenia. *Tourism Management,* 29**,** 294-307.
[38] Gumelar S. 2010. Hand out kuliah Concept Strategi Pengembangan dan Pengelolaan Resort and Leisure. Bandung
[39] H. N. Mak, K. K. F. Wong, and R. C. Y. Chang, "Health or Selfindulgence? The Motivations and Characteristics of Spa-goers," ***International Journal of Tourism Research***, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 185- 199, 2009
[40] HUDSON, S., RITCHIE, B. &TIMUR, S. 2004a.Measuring destination competitiveness: An empiricalstudy ofCanadianskiresorts.*Tourismand HospitalityPlanning&Development,* 1**,** 79-94.
[41] Ajzen, The theory of planned behavior, Organizational behavior and human decision process, 1991, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 179-211
[42] Kim,J.H.,Ritchie, J.R.B.,danMcCormick,B.2012."Developmentofascaleto measurememorabletourismexperiences**".*****JournalofTravelResearch***,Vol.51No.1, pp. 12–25.
[43] Kim,J.H.,danRitchie,J.R.B.2014.Cross-culturalvalidationofamemorable tourismexperiencescale(MTES).***JournalofTravelResearch*.**Vol.53No.3,pp. 323–335.
[44] Kim,HdanChen,J.S.2018.TheMemorableTravelExperienceandItsReminiscence Functions**.*****JournalofTravelResearch***Articlefirstpublishedonline:May15, 2018.
[45] Kim,J.2017.TheImpactof MemorableTourismExperiencesonLoyalty Behaviors: TheMediating EffectsofDestinationImageandSatisfaction.*JournalofTravel Research* 004728751772136.

[46] Komsic, JdanDorcic, J. 2016.Tourism Destination Competitiveness AndOnline Reputation:ConceptualizationandLiterature Framework Analysis.*Tourism& Hospitality Industry2016, Congress Proceedings*, pp. 144-157

[47] KANG, S. K. &HSU, C. H. 2005. Dyadic consensuson family vacation destinationselection. *Tourism Management,*26**,** 571-582.

[48] KONECNIK,M.&GARTNER,W.C.2007. Customer-basedbrandequity fora destination. *Annals of Tourism Research,*34**,**400-421.

[49] Kotler, Marketing Principles, New York: Prentice Hall, 2009

[50] KOZAK,M.,BALOGLU,S.&BAHAR,O. 2010b. Measuring Destination Competitiveness: Multiple DestinationsVersus Multiple Nationalities.***Journalof Hospitality Marketing &Management****,*19**,** 56-71.

[51] L. G. Schiffman and L. L. Kanuk, Customer behavior, Engglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prebtice Hall.

[52] Matos, J. Mendes, and P. Valle, "Revisiting the destination image construct through a conceptual model," Dos Algarves. A Multidisciplinarye-journal, no. 21, ISSN: 2182-5580

[53] Mira, Maria Rosario ,Althauzen (2016) Destination competitiveness and competitiveness indicators: llustration of the Portuguese reality, Tekhne 2016

[54] MURPHY,L., MOSCARDO,G.&BENCKENDORFF, P. 2007. Using brand personality to differentiate regionaltourismdestinations.***journal ofTravelResearch****,*46**,** 5-14.

[55] P. S. Manhas and Ramjit, "2013 Customer Experience and Its Relative Influence on Satisfaction and Behavioural Intention in Hospitality and Tourism Industry***," South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage(SAJTH)***, vol. 6, no. 1, January 2013

[56] PriasukmanaSoetarsodan R. Mohamad Mulyadin, 2001, Pembangunan DesaWisata :PelaksanaanUndang-undangOtonomi Daerah, ***Jurnal Info SosialdanEkonomi*** Vol 2 No 1,2001

[57] RITCHIE,J.R.B.&CROUCH,G.I.2000. The competitivedestination,a sustainableperspective. *Tourism Management,*21**,** 1-7.

[58] R. L. Oliver, Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer, NewYork: McGraw-Hill, 1997

[59] S. Jang and R. Feng, "Temporal destination revisit intention: the effects of novelty seeking and satisfaction," Tourism Management, vol. 28, pp. 580-90, 2007.

[60] TIMOTHY,D. J.2011.*CulturalHeritageand Tourism:An Introduction,*Toronto, Channel View Publications.

[61] UNWTO. 2008.*Tourist2020 vision* [Online]. http://www.unwto.org/facts/eng/vision/htm.

[62] Y. C. Wang, W. R. Lin, P. H. Yeh, and C. R. Lui, "The role of destination image in formation of destination loyalty at leisure farm: Difference between first-time and repeat visitors," presented at the 7th CPTHL Symposium Chiang Mai, Thailand, 2011

[63] Y. Yoon and M. Uysal, "An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model," Tourism Management, vol. 26, pp. 45-56, 2005

[64] *UU No. 32 tahun 2004 juncto UU No. 23 tahun 2014 tentangPemerintahan Daerah*

Development Competitiveness Model Of Village Owned Enterprises (Bumdes) Through The Global Competition

ORIGINALITY REPORT

21%	18%	9%	10%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	www.iiste.org Internet Source	7%
2	www.easpublisher.com Internet Source	7%
3	www.ijstm.inarah.co.id Internet Source	4%
4	Submitted to Krida Wacana Christian University Student Paper	3%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	< 3%
Exclude bibliography	On		

Development Competitiveness Model Of Village Owned Enterprises (Bumdes) Through The Global Competition

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11