# IS COMMUNITY BEHAVIOR CONTRIBUTE TO THE TOURIST VILLAGE QUALITY AT TOMOK SAMOSIR, NORTH SUMATERA?

Erika Revida<sup>1</sup>, Hadriana Marhaeni Munthe<sup>2</sup>, Sukarman Purba<sup>3</sup> <sup>1</sup> Departement of Public Administration, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia <sup>2</sup>Departement of Sociology, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia <sup>3</sup>Departement of Educational Management, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia Email : erikarevida@yahoo.com; hadrianamunthe@yahoo.com; arman\_prb@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** This research aims to analyze the contribution of community behavior on the tourist village quality at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. The samples of the research were 50 people (head of families) at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. The data was collected using a questionnaire, after being tested first. The data analysis technique used simple and multiple regression analysis. The result of the research found that there was a positive and significant contribution between community behavior on the tourist village quality at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. The contribution of community behavior on the quality of the tourist village was 51,69%. After tracing the three indicators of the community behavior, it turned out that psychomotor indicator had a stronger contribution on the tourist village quality, followed by affective, and cognitive of community behavior at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. To increase the tourist village quality, it can be done by increasing the community behavior quality, namely the quality of psychomotor, affective, and cognitive of the community at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera.

Keywords: Community behavior, Tourist village, and Tourist village quality.

### 1. Introduction

Village is the most basic form of government. Most of Indonesian's population lives in villages. A developed country is determined by the progress of its village. The more developed a village is, the more developed a country will be. Therefore, President Joko Widodo had set the third of Nawacita, namely to develop Indonesia from the periphery to strengthen the village.

Tourist is temporary travel that a person takes from one place to another with the aim not to earn money but to enjoy the beauty of nature. Tourist is one of the development sectors which is expected to increase the income or foreign exchange of the state, regional and community income. Tourist sector has multiple benefits needed by the community and government. Cozma and Monica (2017)<sup>1</sup> said that tourist has a significant impact on economic development. Law number 10 of 2009<sup>2</sup>, stated the objectives of tourist are to increase economic growth, improve people's welfare, eradicate poverty, overcome unemployment, preserve nature, environment, and resources, promote culture, raise the image of the nation, foster a love for the country, strengthen identity, and national unity, and strengthen friendship between nations, while Costa (2017)<sup>3</sup> stated that tourist is a central component in the development of the world economy and is one of the primary sources of income for developed and developing countries.

Tourist village is one part of tourist. Tourist village is the most basic community in a country that has a special characteristic to become a tourist destination. In the tourist village, the community still has a tradition and a relatively pure socio-culture. Hamzah and Irfan (2018)<sup>4</sup> said that a tourist village is a region with a certain area and has the unique potential of unique tourist

attractions and community communities that can create a blend of tourist attractions and supporting facilities to attract tourists to visit, including the growth of accommodation facilities provided by the local community.

Actually, a tourist village is the way to empower the community at the village. Tourist village has multiple benefits for the community. Pusiran and Xiao  $(2013)^5$  said that the tourist village contributes to achieving the government's agenda for employment and eliminating community poverty. It means that a tourist village is the one way to reduce poverty. Besides that, a tourist village will increase the presence of tourists, improve the quality of the environment, promote handicraft products, create new jobs, and improve the quality of life of rural communities. It is the reason why the quality of tourist villages needs to increase. Wendu  $(1993)^6$  stated that a tourist village was a form of integration between attractions, accommodations and amenities that were presented in a structure of community life which integrated with the procedures and traditions in the society.

In fact, the government had made efforts to increase the quality of the tourist village with various programs and activities as well as financial assistance, but until now the quality of the tourist village is still in the name, it had not shown the results as expected. One of the efforts to increase the quality of tourist villages by improving the quality of the contribution of community behavior. Enhancing the quality the contribution of community behavior such as socialization, counseling and assistance. But in the reality up to now there are still many community behaviors that do not support the improvement of the quality of the tourist village such as less caring, less hospitality, less honest and so on. This is the basic reason for a research entitled "The contribution of of community behavior to increase the quality of tourist village at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera". According to Bloom (1908)<sup>7</sup> the contribution of community behavior was devided into three domains namely cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

#### 2. Research Method

This research was conducted using quantitavie and qualitative methods (Creswell)<sup>8</sup> with simple regression analysis approach. The research sample was 50 persons (heads of families) at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. To collect data, it was done by using a questionnaire after tested first. The reliability level of the contribution of community behavior instrument was 0,935, and the quality of tourist village was 0,950. Before testing the research hypothesis, the normality and linearity test done with Kolmogorov-Smirnov formula and ANOVA.

### 3. Result and Discussion

#### 3.1. Result

After conducting research on 50 respondents, the results of calculation of descriptive analysis obtained the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, variance, range, minimum score of community behavior variable (X) and the quality of tourist village (Y). The description of calculated data of the contribution of community behavior and quality of tourist village was presented in table 1.

| Description    | The contribution of | Quality of Tourist Village |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
|                | Community Behavior  | (Y)                        |
|                | (X)                 |                            |
| Ν              | 50                  | 50                         |
| Mean           | 108.50              | 127.82                     |
| Median         | 108.50              | 126.00                     |
| Mode           | 107                 | 126                        |
| Std. Deviation | 10.878              | 12.313                     |
|                |                     |                            |

Table 1. The Summary of Descriptive Analysis Result of Research Variables

| The 2 <sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Inovations |
|--|
| in Social Sciences Education and Engineering ( ICoISSEE )  |
| August 07 <sup>th</sup> , 2021                             |

| Variance                 | 118.337 | 151.620 |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|
| Range                    | 46      | 48      |
| Minimum                  | 86      | 108     |
| Maximum                  | 132     | 156     |
| Sum                      | 5425    | 6391    |
| Minimum Ideal Score      | 30      | 35      |
| Maximum Ideal Score      | 150     | 175     |
| Mean Ideal Mean          | 90      | 105     |
| Ideal Standard Deviation | 20      | 23,33   |

1. The contribution of Community Behavior (X)

Based on the results of the answers in table 1, it was obtained an overview of community behavior from 50 respondents through the results of descriptive statistical analysis, namely the lowest score of 86, the highest score of 132, mean 108. 50, mode 107, standard deviation 10.87, the highest ideal score was 150, the lowest ideal score was 30, the average ideal score was 90, and the ideal standard deviation was 20. Furthermore, the results of the descriptive analysis were explained through the analysis of frequency distribution of group data with Strurges' rule, there were 7 classes with 7 interval lengths as shown in table 2 following.

| Table 2. Trequency Distribution of the contribution of Continuantly Denavior Data |                |           |           |               |  |  |
|---|----------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--|--|
|   |                | Absolute  | Relative  | Cummulative   |  |  |
| Class   | Interval Class | Frequancy | Frequancy | Frequency (%) |  |  |
|   |                |           | (%)       |               |  |  |
| 1   | 86 - 92        | 4         | 8,00      | 8,00          |  |  |
| 2   | 93 - 99        | 6         | 12,00     | 20,00         |  |  |
| 3   | 100 – 106      | 9         | 18,00     | 38,00         |  |  |
| 4   | 107 – 113      | 17        | 34,00     | 72,00         |  |  |
| 5   | 114 – 120      | 8         | 16,00     | 88,00         |  |  |
| 6   | 121 – 127      | 2         | 4,00      | 92,00         |  |  |
| 7   | 128 - 134      | 4         | 8,00      | 100,00        |  |  |
|   | Total          | 50        | 100,00    |               |  |  |
|   |                |           |           |               |  |  |

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the contribution of Community Behavior Data

Based on the frequency distribution table, it could be seen that the acquisition of an average score of 116.49 was in class 4, the smallest percentage of values was in the class 121-129 interval as many as 2 people (4%). So, there were 19 respondents (38%) who were below the avarage score and as many as 31 respondents (62%) were on average and above average scores. Based on these data, the criteria for the level of tendency of the contribution of community behavior variables were presented in table 3 below.

|       |                |                          | name, Bonavio                |            |
|-------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Class | Class Interval | Observation<br>Frequency | Relative<br>Frequency<br>(%) | Category   |
| 1     | 122 - 150      | 6                        | 12,00                        | Good       |
| 2     | 91 - 121       | 43                       | 86,00                        | Sufficient |
| 3     | 60 - 90        | 1                        | 2,00                         | Less       |
| 4     | 30 - 59        | -                        | -                            | Low        |

Table 3. Tendency Level of The contribution of Community Behavior Data (X)

#### The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Inovations in Social Sciences Education and Engineering ( ICoISSEE ) August 07<sup>th</sup>, 2021

| Total 50 100,00 |
|-----------------|
|-----------------|

From table 3, it was known that 6 respondents (12%) stated that the contribution of community behavior was in the good category, there were 43 respondent (86%) who stated that the contribution of community behavior was in the sufficient category, and there were 1 respondent (2%) who stated that the contribution of community behavior was in the less category. So, it could be concluded that the contribution of the contribution of community behavior on the tourist village at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera was in sufficient category.

### 2. The Quality of Tourist Village (Y)

Based on the results of the answer in table 4, it was obtained an overview of the quality of tourist village (Y) through the results of descriptive statistical analysis, namely the lowest score 108, the highest score 156, mean 127.82, median 126, mode 126, standard deviation 12.31, the highest ideal score was 175, the lowest ideal score was 35, the ideal score average was 105, and the ideal standard deviation was 23,33. Futhermore, the results of the descriptive analysis were explained through the analysis of the frequency distribution of group data with the Sturges rule, there were 7 classes with 7 intervals of length, as shown in table 4 below.

| Class | Interval Class | Absolute<br>Frequency | Relative<br>Frequency<br>(%) | Cummulative<br>Frequency (%) |
|-------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1     | 108 – 114      | 8                     | 16,00                        | 16,00                        |
| 2     | 115 – 121      | 9                     | 18,00                        | 34,00                        |
| 3     | 122 – 128      | 11                    | 22,00                        | 56,00                        |
| 4     | 129 – 135      | 9                     | 18,00                        | 74,00                        |
| 5     | 136 – 142      | 6                     | 12,00                        | 86,00                        |
| 6     | 143 - 149      | 5                     | 10,00                        | 96,00                        |
| 7     | 150 – 156      | 2                     | 4,00                         | 100,00                       |
|       | Total          | 50                    | 100,00                       |                              |

Table 4. Distribution Frequency of Quality of Tourist Village Data (Y)

According to the frequency distribution table, it could be seen that the acquisition of an avarage score of 127.82 lies in class 3, the smallest percentage of values was in the 150-156 interval class as many as 2 respondent (4%). So there were 17 respondents (34%) who were below the avarage score and as many as 34 respondents (66%) were on average and above average scores. Based on these data, it could be that the criteria for the level of tendency of the tourist village quality variables were presented in table 5.

| Table 5. Tendency Level of Tourist Village Quality (Y) |                |                          |                              |            |  |  |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--|--|
| Class  | Class Interval | Observation<br>Frequency | Relative<br>Frequency<br>(%) | Category   |  |  |
| 1  | 142 - 175      | 9                        | 18,00                        | Good       |  |  |
| 2  | 106 - 141      | 41                       | 82,00                        | Sufficient |  |  |
| 3  | 70 - 105       | -                        | -                            | Less       |  |  |
| 4  | 35 - 69        | -                        | -                            | Low        |  |  |

| Total 50 100,00* |
|------------------|
|------------------|

From table 5, it could be seen that there were 9 research respondent (18%) who stated that the quality of the tourist villages was in the good category, and there were 41 (82%) who stated that the quality of tourist village was in the sufficient category. So, it could be concluded that the quality of the tourist village was in the quite good category.

Hypothesis testing was carried out after fulfilling the analysis requirements test, namely the normality test of each research variable and the linearity test between the pairs of research variable relationships. In the table 6, a summary of the results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov formula was presented.

|                                  |                | The contribution |                    |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|
|                                  |                | of Community     | Quality of Tourist |
|                                  |                | Behavior (X)     | Village (Y)        |
| N                                |                | 50               | 50                 |
| Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup> | Mean           | 108.50           | 127.82             |
|                                  | Std. Deviation | 10.878           | 12.313             |
| Most Extreme Differences         | Absolute       | .095             | .119               |
|                                  | Positive       | .095             | .119               |
|                                  | Negative       | 065              | 060                |
| Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z             |                | .672             | .840               |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)           |                | .757             | .481               |
| a. Test distribution was Nor     | mal.           |                  |                    |
| b. Calculated from data.         |                |                  |                    |
|                                  |                |                  |                    |

 Table 6. Summary of Normality Test Using Kolmogorov-Smirnov

The results of the calculations in table 6 show that the contribution of community behavior variable and quality of tourist village had *Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) >* 0,05, so it could be concluded that the data distribution of each research variable did not deviate from the normal distribution, meaning that the assumption of normality had been fulfilled. Futhermore, in table 7, a summary of the results of the linearity and recurrence tests was presented.

Table 7. Summary of Linearity Test Results and Significance Test

|    | Correlation Between | L       | Linearity Test |        |         | sion Sign | ificant Test |
|----|---------------------|---------|----------------|--------|---------|-----------|--------------|
| No | Variables           | $F_{h}$ | Sig.           | Status | $F_{h}$ | Sig.      | Status       |
| 1  | X with Y            | 0,985   | 0,528          | Linear | 51,477  | 0,000     | Significant  |

According to the results of the calculations for the linearity test, it was obtained that the value of  $F_{count}$ = 0.985 and a significance value (sig) > 0.05, or 0.528 > 0.05, so that the variable pairs had a linear relationship, and for the significance test, the  $F_{count}$  value had a

significance value (sig) < 0.05, or 0.00 < 0.05 so that the form of meaningful variable relationship could be stated so that the linearity assumption had been fulfilled. After the test analysis requirements were met, the calculation of simple regression analysis was continued. In table 8, the calculation results were presented.

|      |                             | Unstand<br>Coeffi | ardized<br>cients | Standardized<br>Coefficients |       |      |
|------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| Мо   | del                         | В                 | Std. Error        | Beta                         | Т     | Sig. |
| 1    | (Constant)                  | 39.473            | 12.374            |                              | 3.190 | .003 |
|      | The contribution of         | .814              | .113              | .719                         | 7.175 | .000 |
|      | Community Behavior          |                   |                   |                              |       |      |
| a. C | Dependent Variable: Quality | of Tourist Villa  | age               |                              |       |      |
|      |                             |                   | -                 |                              |       |      |

Table 8. The Regression Equation Coefficient  $\hat{Y} = 39,47 + 0,81X$ 

The resgression equation showed that  $\hat{Y} = 39,47 + 0,81X$ . Increasing the variable quality of tourist village will increase the variable of the contribution of community behavior, each increase of one score in the quality of tourist village was followed by an increase of 0.81 community behavior scores at a constant 39.47. Table 9 presented the regression coefficient significance test using the ANOVA formula.

|       |            | Sum of   |    |             |        |                   |
|-------|------------|----------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model |            | Squares  | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|       | Regression | 3844.539 | 1  | 3844.539    | 51.477 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
| 1     | Residual   | 3584.841 | 48 | 74.684      |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 7429.380 | 49 | · · ·       | · · ·  |                   |

Table 9. ANOVA Significance Test of The Regression Equation  $\hat{Y} = 39,47 + 0,81X$ 

a. Predictors: (Constant) The contribution of Community Behavior

b. Dependent Variable: Quality of Tourist Village

The research hypothesis stated that the contribution of community behavior had a positive and significant effect on the quality of tourist village at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. Based on table 9 ANOVA the significance test of the regression direction coefficient was very significant because the value of  $F_{count} = 51.47$  was greater than  $F_{table} = 8.96$  at  $\alpha = 0.01$ . The correlation coefficient  $r_{xy} = 0.719$ . When compared with the  $r_{table}$  value at  $\alpha = 0.01$  obtained 2.36, then the  $t_{count} > t_{table}$  or 7.71 > 2.36 so that it could be concluded that the correlation coefficient was meaningfull. Based on the results of these calculations, the hypothesis Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted, or it could be stated that the contribution of community behavior had a positive and significant direct effect on the quality of tourist village, it was verified. The coefficient of determination  $r_{xy}^2 = (0.719)^2 \times 100\% = 51.69\%$ . The contribution of the contribution of community behavior (X) on the quality of tourist village (Y) was 51.69\%, or it could be stated that there was 51.69\% variation in the quality of tourist village (Y) could be explained by variations of the contribution of community behavior (Y), and the rest 48.31% determined other variables.

Further traced, to find out the contribution of indicator of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of tourist village was done by calculating the contribution of each indicator of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of tourist village. The result

#### The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Inovations in Social Sciences Education and Engineering (ICoISSEE) August 07<sup>th</sup>, 2021

of the calculation of descriptive analysis of each indicator of the contribution of community behavior variable were presented on table 10 below.

|                |                |                             |                               | Quality of Tourist |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
|                | Cognitive (I1) | Affective (I <sub>2</sub> ) | Psychomotor (I <sub>3</sub> ) | Village (Y)        |
| N Valid        | 50             | 50                          | 50                            | 50                 |
| Mean           | 35.38          | 37.12                       | 36.00                         | 127.82             |
| Median         | 36.00          | 38.00                       | 36.00                         | 126.00             |
| Mode           | 36             | 38                          | 36                            | 126                |
| Std. Deviation | 6.321          | 5.652                       | 5.806                         | 12.313             |
| Variance       | 39.955         | 31.944                      | 33.714                        | 151.620            |
| Range          | 24             | 23                          | 22                            | 48                 |
| Minimum        | 24             | 25                          | 25                            | 108                |
| Maximum        | 48             | 48                          | 47                            | 156                |
| Sum            | 1769           | 1856                        | 1800                          | 6391               |

| Table               | 10. | Summary | of | Descriptive | Analysis | of | Each | Indicator | of | The | contribution | of |
|---------------------|-----|---------|----|-------------|----------|----|------|-----------|----|-----|--------------|----|
| Community Behavior. |     |         |    |             |          |    |      |           |    |     |              |    |

Futhermore, the correlation between indicators of the contribution of community behavior with the quality of tourist village was shown in figure 1 below.



Figure 1. Empitical Causal Relationship Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor with Quality of Tourist

# Village

To find out the magnitude of the contribution of each indicators of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of the tourist village, it was carried out using multiple regression analysis and the result of the calculations were presented in table 11 below.

Table 11. Multiple Regression Equation  $\hat{Y} = 40,05 + 0,64X_1 + 0,75X_2 + 1.02X_3$ 

#### The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Inovations in Social Sciences Education and Engineering ( ICoISSEE ) August 07<sup>th</sup>, 2021

|       |                               | Unstandardized<br>Coefficients |            | Standardized<br>Coefficients | · · · |      |
|-------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|-------|------|
| Model |                               | В                              | Std. Error | Beta                         | t     | Sig. |
| 1     | (Constant)                    | 40.058                         | 12.650     |                              | 3.167 | .003 |
|       | Cognitive (I1)                | .643                           | .202       | .330                         | 3.185 | .003 |
|       | Affective (I <sub>2</sub> )   | .756                           | .222       | .347                         | 3.402 | .001 |
|       | Psychomotor (I <sub>3</sub> ) | 1.026                          | .220       | .484                         | 4.674 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Quality of Tourist Village

From table 11, it could seen that the contribution of cognitive indicator on the quality of tourist village was 0.330, the magnitude of the contribution of affective indicator on the quality of tourist village was 0.347, and the magnitude of the contribution psychomotor indicator on the quality of tourist village was 0.484. The amount of direct contribution from each indicator of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of tourist village was presented in table 12.

Table 12. Summary of Direct Contribution for Each Indicator of The contribution of Community Behavior on The Quality of Tourist Village.

| ,                             |              | , .                                  |      |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| Indicator                     | Big          | Direct Donation Amount               | Rank |
|                               | Contribution |                                      |      |
| Cognitive (I1)                | 0,330        | $(0,330)^2 \times 100 \% = 10,89 \%$ | 3    |
| Affective (I <sub>2</sub> )   | 0,347        | $(0,347)^2 \times 100 \% = 12,04 \%$ | 2    |
| Psychomotor (I <sub>3</sub> ) | 0,484        | $(0,484)^2 \times 100 \% = 23,43 \%$ | 1    |
|                               |              |                                      |      |

From table 12, it could be seen that from the three indicators of the contribution of community behavior, it turned out that psychomotor indicators had a strong contribution on the quality of tourist village, followed by affective and cognitive indicator on the quality of tourist village.

# 3.2. Discussion

Until now, the tourist village has not run optimally as expected. There are various problems faced in improving the quality of tourist villages, including the low behavior of the community in developing tourist villages. This is in line with the research results of Revida (2018)<sup>9</sup>, and Revida (2019)<sup>10</sup>.

According to the results of hypothesis testing, it shown that the community behavior had a positive and direct contribution on the quality of tourist village at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. The amount of contribution of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of tourist village was 51.69%, or it could be stated that there was 51.69% of the variation in the quality of tourist village (Y) could be explained by variations on the contribution of community behavior (X), and the remaining 48.31% was determined by other variables. This research was supported by research of Hwang, et al (2012)<sup>11</sup>, Parsek and Greenberg (2000)<sup>12</sup>, Klein, et al (1999)<sup>13</sup>.

Community behavior is very important and essential in improving the quality of tourist villages. However, based on the results of the study, it shows that the behavior of the community has not supported the improvement of the quality of the tourist village in Tomok Samosir, North Sumatra. This is also supported by the results of Revida's research (2020)<sup>14</sup> Therefore, community behavior needs to be improved by always communicating, educating and providing information as well as continuous assistance to the community in the tourist village in Tomok Samosir, North Sumatra. Based on the results of the study, it was found that the low community behavior was caused by a lack of community sense of belonging to the tourist village so that the quality of the tourist village in Tomok Samosir, North Sumatra was still low. This is supported by the results of Revida's research (2018)<sup>15</sup>.

After tracing the results of the research, it was found that of the three indicators that shape the contribution of community behavior, namely cognitive, affective, and psychomotor, it turned out that the three indicators significantly contributed on the quality of tourist village. Psychomotor indicators had a very strong contributed on the quality of tourist village followed by affective, and cognitive. Blom's theory (1908)<sup>7</sup> stated that the contribution of community behavior consists of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor and research results by Wahyudi (2010) concluded that the behavior had an influence on the environmental quality.

# 4. Conclussion

The results of the research concluded that the contribution of community behavior had a positive and significant contributed on the quality of tourist village at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera. The contribution of the contribution of community behavior on the quality of tourist village was 51,69%. To increase the quality of tourist village, it can be done by enhancing the quality of the contribution of community behavior, namely the quality of psychomotor, affective, and cognitive of the community. Of three indicators of the contribution of community behavior, psychomotor indicator had a stronger contribution on the quality of tourist village, followed by affective, and cognitive of community at Tomok Samosir, North Sumatera.

# Acknowledgement

Thank you very much to the Rector Prof. Dr. Runtung, SH, MHum, and Chairman of Research Institute of Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia Prof. Dr. Erman Munir, MSc and his staff who had approved and provided funds for this research which were sourced from TALENTA fund 2020. Thank you also ton those who help this research.

# References

- Cozma, Adeline C. & Monica Maria C. 2017. Tourist Development In Rodna Mountains National Park: The Public Administration, A Key Stakeholder. Journal Of Tourist
- 2. Law Number 10 of 2009. Tourist. Jakarta: State Secretariat of Repubic of Indonesia.
- 3. Costa, J. (2017). How Are Companies and Destinations "Surfing the Wave" of Global Tourist? Strategic Question Overview. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourist Themes.* 9 (6). 588-591.
- Hamzah, AS and Irfan, M. (2018). Law Enforcment of Constitutional Court Decision No. 69/PUU-XII/2015 (Mixed Marriage Issue Without Agreement. Jurnal Notariil. 3 (1). 01-12.

- 5. Pusiran, A. K., and Xiao, H. (2013). Challenges and Community Development : A Case Study of Homestay in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*. 9 (5). 1-17
- 6. Wendu, Nuryanti. 1993. Concept, Perspective, and Challenges. Papers of International Conference Report on Cultural Tourist. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.
- 7. Bloom, Benyamin. 1908. Psikologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- 8. Creswell, J.W. 2002. Research Design. Qualitative and Quantitave Approaches. New York: Sage Publicatioon, Inc.
- 9. Revida, Erika, et.al. 2018. Development Model of Community Tourist Service Quality Based on Social Capital in Lake Toba, North Sumatera. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology (IJCIET). Vol.9 (11). pp.1430-1436.
- 10. Revida, Erika, et al. 2019. The Influence of Implementation of Sapta Pesona Policie on The Quality of Community Tourist Services at Tiga Ras Simalungun, North Sumatera.
- 11. Hwang, D., Stewart, W. P., & Ko, D. W. (2012). Community behavior and sustainable rural tourist development. *Journal of Travel research*, *51*(3), 328-341.
- 12. Parsek, M. R., & Greenberg, E. P. (2000). Relationships between community behavior and pathogenesis in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. In *Virulence Mechanisms of Bacterial Pathogens, Third Edition* (pp. 77-92). American Society of Microbiology.
- 13. Klein, D. A., Steinberg, M., Galik, E., Steele, C., Sheppard, J. M., Warren, A., ... & Lyketsos, C. G. (1999). Wandering behaviour in community-residing persons with dementia. *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*, *14*(4), 272-279.
- 14. Revida, Erika and Munthe, Hadriana Marhaeni. (2020). Implementation Model of Tourist Village Policy to enhance Community Participation at Meat Tourist Village Toba Samosir, North Sumatera.
- 15. Revida, Erika; Siahaan, Asima Yanti; Purba, Sukarman. 2018. The Influence of Social Capital towards The Quality of Community Tourist Services in Lake Toba Parapat, North Sumatera.