

COMPARING TOURISM COMPONENTS IN SITU BAGENDIT 1 AND 2

Wati Susilawati¹, Dini Turipanam Alamanda², Tia Rosalina³
^{1,2,3}Universitas Garut, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research aims to determine the tourism components in Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects and to examine differences in tourist attractions and activities, accommodation, tourist facilities and services, transportation facilities and services, other infrastructure, and institutional elements between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects. The research method used is a descriptive method and comparative method. The technique of collecting data was carried out through observation, interviews, and questionnaires. The sample taken was 96 respondents with unknown population formula and the sampling technique used the purposive sampling method. The data processing technique was carried out using validity tests, reliability tests and normality tests which were then processed using descriptive analysis methods and t-test differences (independent samples t-test) with the help of IBM SPSS Statistics 26. The results showed that the tourism components in Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects consisted of tourist attractions and activities; accommodation; tourist facilities and services; transportation facilities and services; other infrastructure; and institutional elements as a whole have "good" criteria with the highest average ratio owned by Situ Bagendit 1. This shows that there is a difference between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects, namely the variables of tourist attractions and activities, tourist facilities and services, transportation facilities and services, as well as institutional elements. Meanwhile, those that show similarities between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects are accommodation and other infrastructure variables.

Keywords: Tourism Components, Situ Bagendit, T-test

Korespondensi: Wati Susilawati. Universitas Garut. Email: w.susilawati@uniga.ac.id

Submitted: July 2022, **Accepted:** August 2022, **Published:** September 2022

ISSN: 1412 - 3681 (printed), ISSN: 2442 - 4617 (online), Website: <http://journal.feb.unpad.ac.id/index.php/jbm>

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the leading sectors for economic contribution in Indonesia. Tourism is a set of socioeconomic activities that happen by or for tourists (Zaei & Zaei, 2013). This is supported by Indonesia's location with a variety of natural and cultural tourism offerings. Tourism is one type of industry that can produce rapid economic growth in providing employment, living standards and stimulating other productivity sectors (Wahab, 2003). One of the tourist attractions in Indonesia is Situ Bagendit which is located in Garut Regency, West Java. Situ Bagendit is divided into two parts, namely Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2, these two tourist destinations are in the same area with different managers. Situ Bagendit 2 is a newer tourist destination compared to Situ Bagendit 1, but Situ Bagendit 2 is more difficult to reach because it is not traversed by public transport.

Besides the difficulty of transportation to get to the Tourism Village of Situ Bagendit 2, the public's interest is still large and even exceeds the pioneers in Situ Bagendit 1. This can be seen in the table where the comparison of the number of tourists who come to the two places is not too large.

One of the things that affect the number and satisfaction of migrants to tourist destinations is the tourism component. There are several opinions regarding the tourism components used in the research, but most of them essentially include six things, namely tourist attractions and activities, accommodation, tourists facilities and services,

transportation facilities and services, infrastructure, and institutional elements (Andrianto & Sugiyama, 2016; Zaei & Zaei, 2013).

Table 1. Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 Number of Visitors

Month	Situ Bagendit 1		Situ Bagendit 2	
	Domestic	Foreign	Domestic	Foreign
January	12.330	15	Closed	
February	16.663	11		
March	16.854	14		
April	<i>Lockdown</i>		<i>Lockdown</i>	
May				
June	1.200	0	1.895	0
July	3.572	0	2.424	0
August	4.195	0	2.992	0
September	2.527	0	2.172	0
October	3.024	0	3.054	0
November	Revitalizat ion	Revitali zation	5.374	0
December			4.976	0
Jumlah	60.365	40	22.887	0
Total	60.405		22.887	

Source: Dinas Pariwisata dan Kebudayaan Kabupaten Garut & Ketua Pengelola Desa Wisata Situ Bagendit 2, 2020.

Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 attractions both have their own characteristics. For this reason, the interests and perceptions of tourists who visit these two attractions have different views. This could be due to one of the components in it, for example, they visit because of the attractive tourist attractions, the clean and comfortable tourist objects, or maybe because of the ease of transportation to get to the tourist attraction, it can vary according to each person's perception. respectively. Based on the background that has been described, the researchers are interested in conducting research on describing

and comparing Tourism Components of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2.

LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Muharto (2020) suggest that the basic components of tourism are interconnected with one another, which can be grouped as follows:

Tourist Attractions and Activities

The tourist attractions and activities in question are in the form of all things related to the natural environment, culture, characteristics of an area and other activities related to tourism activities that attract local and foreign tourists to visit a tourist attraction, such as: theme parks, natural areas, cultural, indigenous, educational, and events (all types)

Accommodation

What is meant by accommodation here are various kinds of hotels and various other types of facilities related to services for tourists who intend to spend the night during their tour. Such as: motels, serviced apartments, camping grounds, farm stays, guest houses, bed & breakfasts, backpackers, caravan parks, cabins, houseboats, resorts.

Tourist Facilities and Services

The tourism facilities and services referred to here are all the facilities needed in planning tourist areas, including tour and travel operations (welcoming services). These facilities include restaurants, shops

selling souvenirs, specialty shops, banks, grocery stores, money changers and other financial service facilities, tourist information offices, personal services, health care facilities, public security facilities and travel facilities. for entry and exit such as immigration and customs offices.

Transportation Facilities and Services

The transportation facilities and services in question include transportation access from tourist areas and to tourist areas, internal transportation that connects the main attractions of tourist areas and development areas, including all types of facilities and services related to all types of transportation, whether land, water, and transportation. air.

Infrastructure

Infrastructure referred to is the provision of clean water, electricity, sewerage, drainage, and telecommunications. Telecommunication such as telephone, telegram, telex, facsimile, and radio.

Institutional Element

The institutional elements in question are the institutions needed to develop and manage tourism activities, including manpower planning and education and training programs, formulating marketing strategies and promotion programs, structuring public and private sector tourism organizations, regulations and legislation related to tourism, determining policies investment for the

public and private sectors, and controlling economic, environmental, and socio-cultural programs.

RESEARCH METHODS

Table 2. Score Criteria

Score	Criteria
96-172	Extremely Poor
173-249	Very Poor
250-326	Poor
327-403	Good
404-480	Very Good

This study uses a descriptive method to determine the components of tourism as well as a comparative method to test the differences in the components of tourism in Bagendit 1 and 2 tourism objects. Comparative tests will be carried out on each tourism component indicator, namely tourist attractions and activities, accommodation, tourist facilities and services, transportation facilities and services, other infrastructure, and institutional elements.

The population in this study were visitors to Situ Bagendit 1 before the revitalization and Situ Bagendit 2 before the pandemic. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling with the purposive sampling method.

The measuring instrument used is a questionnaire using a Likert scale with five levels of answers. This measuring instrument has 56 items with all items having a calculated r-value that is greater than r-table and has reliability above 0.05. The description of the data will be done by adding up the scores and then entering the 5 assessment criteria presented in table 2.

Then a comparative test was performed using a t-test with two independent samples using IBM SPSS Statistics 26 (IBM Corp, 2019). Then a decision was made if the value of Sig. (2-tailed) > Alpha 0.05 then H₀ is accepted, meaning that there is no difference in average and if the value of Sig. (2-tailed) < Alpha 0.05 then H₀ is rejected, meaning that there is an average difference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3. Respondent Demographic

	Frekuensi	Persentase
Jenis Kelamin		
Perempuan	39	41%
Laki-Laki	57	59%
Rentang Usia		
<17 tahun	5	5%
17-25 tahun	39	41%
26-40 tahun	30	31%
>40 tahun	22	23%
Jumlah	96	

Overall respondents in this study amounted to 96 people with the majority being male. Most respondents are also 17-25 years old and only 5 people are less than 17 years old.

Table 4. Results

Components	Situ Bagendit 1		Situ Bagendit 2	
	Score Average	Criteria	Score Average	Criteria
Attractions and tourist activities	363.22	Good	343.44	Good
Accommodation	241.67	Very Poor	243.67	Very Poor

Tourist facilities and services	373	Good	356,84	Good
Transportation facilities and services	385.62	Good	348.15	Good
Infrastructure	343.67	Good	349.5	Good
Institutional Element	357.67	Good	340.67	Good
Total Average	344.14	Good	330.38	Good

Based on the table 4, the highest score for Situ Bagendit 1 was 385.62 on the dimensions of transportation facilities and services with good criteria, while the highest score for Situ Bagendit 2 was 356.84 on the dimensions of tourist facilities and services with good rating criteria. This means that Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 have their respective advantages, both in terms of transportation facilities and services and tourism facilities and services that they have. Although the highest score of Situ Bagendit 2 does not exceed the score of Situ Bagendit 1 on the dimensions of tourism facilities and services, overall of the six tourism components owned by Situ Bagendit 2, it is tourism facilities and services that are considered the best by respondents than other dimensions. While the lowest scores for Bagendit Tourism Objects 1 and 2 are on the accommodation dimensions of 241.67 and 243.67 with very poor assessment criteria for both. This is because the respondents' responses to each item of the statement of accommodation dimensions of Bagendit Tourism Object 1 and 2 are assessed differently by respondents such as providing the

closest lodging, lodging around the tourist attraction area of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 which are difficult to find, as well as lodging provided at Situ Bagendit 1 and 2, are not guaranteed. Although Situ Bagendit 2 already provides lodging in the form of homestays, there are still many tourists who do not know it.

In the dimensions of attractions and tourist activities, Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 have good criteria with a score of 363.22 for Situ Bagendit 1 while 343.44 for Situ Bagendit 2. From these results, it can be seen that the score obtained by Situ Bagendit 1 is greater than Situ Bagendit 2 with a difference of 19.78. This difference indicates that there are advantages that Situ Bagendit 1 has from several statement items, both in terms of natural beauty, diversity of attractions, culture, characteristics, amusement parks, and recreational facilities it has.

Good criteria on both Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 indicate that overall the respondents gave a good assessment of the two attractions and felt interested in the attractions and tourist activities owned by the two places. This is in accordance with the results of previous research, that the attraction indicator is in the high category, which means that tourists feel attracted to tourist attractions and indicates that attractions or tourist attractions are one aspect of meeting visitors satisfaction (Setyanto & Pangestuti, 2019; Wanda & Pangestuti, 2018). The results of previous research conducted by Ristiani (2020) also obtained good assessment criteria regarding attractions with one of the same research objects at Situ Bagendit 1 with several statement items

regarding various playgrounds with guaranteed safety from these rides and presenting natural beauty. Attractiveness is the most important attribute than other attributes such as facilities, perception, affordability, and awareness of halal that it can be concluded that visitors see attractiveness as the highest preference while awareness of halal as the lowest preference (Susilawati et al., 2020).

In the accommodation component of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2, the criteria are very poor with a score of 241.67 for Situ Bagendit 1 while 243.67 for Situ Bagendit 2. From these results, it can be seen that the score obtained by Situ Bagendit 2 is greater than Situ Bagendit 1 with a difference of 2.00. This difference indicates that there is a slight advantage that Situ Bagendit 2 has. A poor assessment of accommodation at the two attractions indicates that tourists are not satisfied and do not know about the inn and most tourists do not stay at the two attractions but only visit to enjoy the beauty and atmosphere of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2. Poor accommodation also found in another tourist attractions like Gemah Beach (Setyanto & Pangestuti, 2019). This can happen because the tourist attraction in its implementation does not require accommodation for tourists who want to stay for a long time (Nugroho & Sugiarti, 2018).

In the dimensions of tourist facilities and services, Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 have good criteria with a score of 373 for Situ Bagendit 1 while 356.84 for Situ Bagendit 2. From these results, it can be seen that the score obtained from Situ Bagendit 1 is

greater than Situ Bagendit 2 with a difference of 16.16. This difference indicates that there are advantages that Situ Bagendit 1 has regarding ticket booths, souvenirs, food and beverage shops, health facilities, security facilities, tourist information centers, worship facilities, and its resting place. Good criteria also happened in other tourist attractions like Gemah Beach and Labuan Sait Beach (Putra & Sunarta, 2018; Setyanto & Pangestuti, 2019). This is in accordance with the results of previous research conducted by Ristiani (2020) who obtained good assessment criteria regarding the dimensions of amenity with one of the same research objects, Situ Bagendit 1 in which there are several items of the same statements regarding facilities. worship, worship equipment, food/drink stalls, and shelter.

In the infrastructure component, Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 tourism objects obtained good criteria with a score of 343.67 for Situ Bagendit 1 while 349.5 for Situ Bagendit 2. From these results, it can be seen that the score obtained from Situ Bagendit 2 is slightly higher than Situ Bagendit 1 with a difference of 5.83. This difference indicates that there is a slight advantage that Situ Bagendit 2 has regarding clean water facilities, electricity network facilities, and their toilets/WC. The assessment of other infrastructure that falls into this good category is in accordance with previous research conducted by Setyanto & Pangestuti (2019) and Putra & Sunarta (2018) who got a good category regarding amenities, in which there were items stating the availability of clean water, electricity, and

toilets at each of the tourist objects they studied. In the components of the institutional elements of the tourist attraction Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 obtained good criteria with a score of 357.67 for Situ Bagendit 1 while 340.67 for Situ Bagendit 2. From these results, it can be seen that the score obtained Situ Bagendit 1 is slightly higher than Situ Bagendit 2 with a difference of 17. This difference indicates that there are advantages that Situ Bagendit 1 has regarding Human Resources and their promotional programs. The assessment of institutional elements that fall into the good category is in accordance with previous research conducted by Wanda & Pangestuti (2018) and Putra & Sunarta (2018) which obtained a good category regarding the institutions studied in their respective tourist objects. This result is also in accordance with previous research conducted by Ristiani (2020) who obtained good assessment criteria regarding the dimensions of ancillary service with one of the same research objects, namely Situ

Bagendit 1 with a statement item regarding information about Situ

Bagendit which can be obtained via the internet. Based on the overall assessment of the six tourism components, when compared to the score between Situ Bagendit 1 and 2, the highest average between the two is Situ Bagendit 1 with a score of 344.14, while the score obtained by Situ Bagendit 2 is 330, 38. This means that the average overall tourism component of the two attractions has a difference of 13.76. Although Situ Bagendit 1 is superior to Situ Bagendit 2, overall both of them have good criteria according to respondents' assessments. This means that the majority of respondents assess the overall tourism component of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 although the scores obtained for the accommodation dimension are both considered not good by the respondents but do not dampen the interest of tourists to visit Situ Bagendit 1 and 2.

Table 5. T-Test Results

		<i>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</i>		<i>t-test for Equality of Means</i>						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Atraksi dan Kegiatan-kegiatan Wisata	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	0,411	0,522	2,912	190	0,004	1,854	0,637	0,598	3,110
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			2,912	188,1	0,004	1,854	0,637	0,598	3,110
Akomodasi	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	0,099	0,753	-0,180	190	0,858	-0,062	0,348	-0,748	0,623
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			-0,180	189,711	0,858	-0,062	0,348	-0,748	0,623
Fasilitas dan Pelayanan Wisata	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	1,593	0,208	2,319	190	0,021	3,198	1,379	0,478	5,918
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			2,319	187,429	0,021	3,198	1,379	0,477	5,918
Fasilitas dan Pelayanan Transportasi	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	6,776	0,010	5,102	190	0,000	5,073	0,994	3,112	7,034
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			5,102	174,834	0,000	5,073	0,994	3,111	7,035
Infrastruktur Lain	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	0,297	0,586	-0,733	190	0,465	-0,365	0,498	-1,346	0,617
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			-0,733	189,036	0,465	-0,365	0,498	-1,346	0,617
Elemen Kelembagaan	<i>Equal variances assumed</i>	1,145	0,286	2,108	190	0,036	1,063	0,504	0,068	2,057
	<i>Equal variances not assumed</i>			2,108	186,908	0,036	1,063	0,504	0,068	2,057

Based on the output in the table 5, it is known that the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances on the components of attractions and tourist activities is 0.522 and greater than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the variance of the data on the dimensions of attractions and tourist activities between Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is homogeneous. So that the interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances assumed table. Based on the output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) the variable of attractions and tourism activities is 0.004 which is smaller than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected, which means that there are differences in attractions and tourist activities between Bagendit 1 and 2 tourism attractions. This means that between Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 there are differences in attractions and tourist activities between one another, whether it is the difference in natural beauty, the diversity of attractions owned by each object, culture, characteristics of each, amusement parks, and facilities. recreation owned. The test results show that each tourist attraction must have a different attractions. These attractions must have their own characteristics in order to have competitiveness as a tourist destination and it is needed that each tourist attractions to have characteristics that have differentiation as a tourist destination (Nugroho & Sugiarti, 2018).

The test result also shows that attraction is one aspect to meet visitor satisfaction and attract tourists' attention to visit a tourist destination.

Attractions also play an important role in improving the image quality of the tourist attraction. Attraction is something unique that is owned by each tourist attraction with different uniqueness (Abdulhaji & Yusuf, 2016; Aprilia et al., n.d.; Ismail & Rohman, 2019; Putra & Sunarta, 2018; Ristiani, 2020; Wanda & Pangestuti, 2018). Besides, attractions also have an influence on tourists' decision to visit that natural tourist attractions have a very strong influence and have a very positive relationship on tourist decisions to visit a tourist destination (Ramdani & Adiatma, 2018).

Based on the output in the table 5, it is known the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances on the accommodation component was obtained at 0.753 which is greater than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the variance of the accommodation dimension data between Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is homogeneous. So that the interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances assumed table. Based on the output table, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) the accommodation variable is 0.858, which is greater than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is accepted, which means that there is no difference in accommodation between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects.

Accommodation is various kinds of hotels and various types of other facilities related to services for tourists who intend to spend the night during their tour (Zaei & Zaei, 2013). The test results show that the accommodations owned by Situ

Bagendit 1 and 2 are the same, both are considered not good by the respondents. This is because Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 have not provided adequate accommodation around the tourist attraction area. The quality of accommodation owned by each tourist attraction is very important and will affect tourist satisfaction. If tourist satisfaction is high, it will lead to an intention to revisit rural tourism destinations (Chin et al., n.d.).

Accommodations owned by each tourist destination are certainly different, especially accommodation in tourist villages which are usually in the form of homestays. This theory is in accordance with previous research that accommodation is defined as lodging owned by a tourist destination that is different from other destinations such as accommodation owned by a tourist village which usually consists of a residence rented out by residents. local area and located near a tourist village or commonly known as a homestay (Nugroho & Sugiarti, 2018). Respondents' assessment of this accommodation dimension was considered not good because most respondents did not know of any lodging provided at Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 and most of these respondents did not spend the night at the two attractions.

Based on table 5, it is known the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for the component of tourism facilities and services is 0.208 which is greater than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the variance of the data on the dimensions of tourism facilities and services between

Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is homogeneous or the same. So that the interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances assumed table. Based on the output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) the variable of tourism facilities and services is 0.021 which is smaller than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected, which means that there are differences in tourist facilities and services between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects. and beverages, health facilities, security facilities, tourist information centers, places of worship and places of rest and several other welcoming services.

Tourist facilities and services are all the facilities needed in planning tourist areas including tour and travel operations (welcoming services). These facilities include restaurants and various other types of places to eat; shops to sell souvenirs or souvenirs, and handicrafts; specialty shops; grocery store; tourist information office; health service facilities; etc (Zaei & zaei 2013). In accordance with the results of interviews conducted with the manager of Bagendit 2 Tourism Object, Mr. Nandang Parosa who said that Bagendit 2 still does not have complete souvenirs and does not have characteristics but in the near future it will certainly provide various souvenirs to serve as souvenirs for tourists. when visiting. Situ Bagendit 2 also does not provide a tourist information center office like Situ Bagendit 1, but if there are tourists who need information services or others, they can contact officers around the tourist attraction area. The difference between the two

attractions can be seen from the mean difference or the average difference obtained, which is 3,198. This value shows the difference between the average tourist facilities and services at Bagendit 1 and Bagendit 2 Tourism Objects.

The test results show that in each tourist attraction, it must have different tourist facilities and services according to the characteristics possessed by the tourist destination. These results are in accordance with previous research which states that each tourist destination must have different tourist facilities and services, but to serve the needs of tourists when visiting, each destination completes it according to the characteristics possessed by the destination (Nugroho & Sugiarti 2018).

Tourist facilities and services make it easier for tourists to meet their needs while in tourist destinations and affect the comfort and satisfaction of tourists when visiting and the image of the tourist attraction Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 (Abdulhaji & Yusuf, 2016; Aprilia et al., n.d.; Putra & Sunarta, 2018; Setyanto & Pangestuti, 2019; Wanda & Pangestuti, 2018). However, this result is not in line with research conducted by Ismail & Rohman (2019) which states that facilities do not have a significant role in visitor satisfaction because the value obtained by facilities is smaller than other variables.

Based on table 5, it is known the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for the components of transportation facilities and services of 0.010 is smaller than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the variance of the data on the

dimensions of transportation facilities and services between Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is not homogeneous. So that the interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances not assumed table. Based on the output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) the variable of transportation facilities and services is 0.000 which is smaller than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected, which means that there are differences in transportation facilities and services between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects. , transportation costs, travel time, distance traveled, availability of transportation facilities, directions, vehicle parking and all types of facilities and other tourist services. According to the observations, the road conditions to get to Situ Bagendit 1 are better than Situ Bagendit 2. The existence of Situ Bagendit 2 which is far from the highway makes it difficult for many tourists who do not use private vehicles to get to the tourist attraction due to limitations in the provision of transportation facilities. general. In contrast to Situ Bagendit 1 which is on the edge of the highway which makes it easier for tourists to get to these attractions, public transportation is quite adequate.

This difference can be seen from the value of the mean difference or the average difference obtained, which is 5.073. This value shows the difference between the average facilities and transportation services at Bagendit 1 and Bagendit 2 Tourism Objects.

The results of the study indicate that the facilities and transportation services in each tourist attraction are certainly different. These transportation facilities and services play an important role in achieving easy access to tourist objects. Easy accessibility for visitors will affect the visitor's mood because if the visitor's mood is not good because the accessibility is difficult then it will have an impact on the level of visitor satisfaction after their visit (Abdulhaji & Yusuf, 2016; Nugroho & Sugiarti, 2018; Setyanto & Pangestuti, 2019; Wanda & Pangestuti, 2018).

The quality of accessibility that each tourist attraction has is very important and will affect tourist satisfaction. If tourist satisfaction is high, it will lead to an intention to revisit rural tourism destinations (Chin et al., n.d.; Ristiani, 2020). However, this research is not in line with research conducted by Ismail & Rohman (2019) which states that accessibility does not have a significant role in visitor satisfaction. Accessibility also affects the interest of tourists to visit a tourist destination that in addition to natural factors, road infrastructure to tourist areas also affects the interest of tourists who want to visit tourist destinations (Ramdani & Adiatma, 2018).

Based on the output in table 5, it is known the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for infrastructure components is 0.586 which is greater than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the data variance of other infrastructure dimensions between Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is homogeneous. So that the

interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances assumed table. Based on the output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) other infrastructure variables are 0.465, which is greater than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is accepted, which means that there are no differences in infrastructure between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects. This means that overall infrastructure owned by the two is the same. The similarity of the two tourism objects can be seen from the statement item indicators assessed by respondents, such as clean water facilities, electricity network facilities, and toilets in Situ Bagendit 1 and 2. This can be seen from the mean difference value. or the average difference obtained is -0.365. The negative value obtained indicates that the first group (Situ Bagendit 1) has a lower mean than the second group (Situ Bagendit 2). This value shows the difference between the average of other infrastructure in Bagendit 1 and Bagendit 2 Tourism Objects.

The test results show that the infrastructure owned by Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 is almost the same, although there are slight differences, but overall both have similarities in terms of clean water facilities, electricity network facilities, and toilets availability. Respondents' responses regarding the condition of the toilets owned by Situ Bagendit 1 are considered less clean, this is because these conditions are not well maintained. Indeed, it is not only at Situ Bagendit 1, this poorly maintained toilet condition can also be found in almost all public facilities that

for the benefit of tourists, many tourist destinations provide public toilets around the tourist destination. However, not all toilets available in public facilities can be maintained properly (Soeswoyo et al., 2019).

Based on the output in table 5, it is known the value of Sig. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances for the institutional element component is 0.286 which is greater than the value of 0.05, it can be interpreted that the variance of the institutional element dimension data between Situ Bagendit 1 and Situ Bagendit 2 is homogeneous. So that the interpretation is guided by the values contained in the Equal variances assumed table. Based on the output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) institutional element variable of 0.036 is smaller than the Alpha value of 0.05. So it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected, which means that there are differences in institutional elements between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects. what both of them do is promotion through brochures and social media. In accordance with the results of interviews conducted with the manager of the Bagendit 2 Tourism Object, Mr. Nandang Parosa who said that the difference from the institutional elements between Situ Bagendit 1 and 2, namely the management of Situ Bagendit 1 was in the hands of the local government and the authority was delegated to the Garut Regency Tourism and Culture Office and other parties. The private sector, as well as the applicable regulations. Meanwhile, the institutional elements of the Bagendit 2 tourism object whose ownership status is under the management of the

Sukaratu Mandiri BUMDes and the applicable regulations. This difference can be seen from the mean difference value or the average difference obtained, which is 1.063. This value shows the difference between the average institutional elements in Bagendit 1 and Bagendit tourism objects 2.

The test results show that the institutional elements owned by each tourist attraction are certainly different. Every tourist destination, including one of the tourist villages, certainly develops because of organizational support which can be in the form of policies or support from all related parties for the proper implementation of tourism activities. For the implementation of tourism activities, of course there are policies, assistance and organizational support in it such as tourist villages whose implementation is supported by government policies both regional and central, private parties and all related parties (Nugraha & Sugiarti, 2018). The existence of institutional elements that regulate Situ Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects makes it easier for them to manage and provide a sense of comfort because managers already have a description of their respective duties so that tourism activities can run smoothly that if the manager already has a clear job desk, it will provide a sense of comfort and ease in beach management (Putra & Sunatra, 2018).

CONCLUSION

Based on the data obtained, the tourism component in Bagendit Tourism Objects 1 and 2 which consists of attractions and tourist activities; accommodation;

tourism facilities and services; transportation facilities and services; other infrastructure; and institutional elements as a whole have "good" criteria with the highest average ratio owned by Situ Bagendit 1. There are differences between Bagendit 1 and 2 Tourism Objects, namely the variables of attractions and tourist activities, tourist facilities and services, transportation facilities and services, and institutional elements. Meanwhile, accommodation and other infrastructure variables did not show a significant difference.

For the managers of Situ Bagendit 1 and 2, they can make improvements and manage more on things that are still considered not good or not good so that they can attract more tourists and also retain existing tourists, especially on accommodation components by adding more suitable accommodation so tourist can choose to stay in if needed.

REFERENCES

- Abdulhaji, S., & Yusuf, I. S. H. (2016). Pengaruh Atraksi, Aksesibilitas, dan Fasilitas Terhadap Citra Objek Wisata Danau Tolire Besar di Kota Ternate. *Jurnal Penelitian Humano*, 7(2).
- Andrianto, T., & Sugiama, G. (2016). The Analysis of Potential 4A's Tourism Component in the Selasari Rural Tourism, Pangandaran, West Java. *Proceedings of the Asia Tourism Forum. 2016 - the 12th Biennial Conference of Hospitality and Tourism Industry in Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/atf-16.2016.21>
- Aprilia, E. R., Sunarti, & Pangestuti, E. (n.d.). Pengaruh Daya Tarik Wisata Dan Fasilitas Layanan Terhadap Kepuasan Wisatawan Di Pantai Balekambang Kabupaten Malang. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 51(2), 16–21.
- Chin, C.-H., Law, F.-Y., Lo, M.-C., & Ramayah, T. (n.d.). The Impact of Accessibility Quality and Accommodation Quality on Tourists' Satisfaction and Revisit Intention to Rural Tourism Destination in Sarawak: The Moderating Role of Local Communities' Attitude. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*.
- IBM Corp. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0*. IBM Corp.
- Ismail, T., & Rohman, F. (2019). *The Role Of Attraction, Accessibility, Amenities, And Ancillary On Visitor Satisfaction And Visitor Attitudinal Loyalty Of Gili Ketapang Beach*. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Teori Terapan*.
- Muharto. (2020). *Pariwisata Berkelanjutan: Kombinasi Strategi Dan Paradigma Pembangunan Berkelanjutan*. Deepublish.
- Nugroho, W., & Sugiarti, R. (2018). Analisis Potensi Wisata Kampung Sayur Organik Ngeplak Sutan Mojosoong Berdasarkan Komponen Pariwisata 6A. *Jurnal Pariwisata Dan Budaya*, 35–40.
- Putra, P. K., & Sunarta, I. N. (2018). Identifikasi Komponen Daya Tarik Wisata Dan Pengelolaan Pantai Labuan Sait, Desa Adat Pecatu, Kabupaten Badung. *Jurnal Destinasi Pariwisata*, 6(2), 292–298.
- Ramdani, D., & Adiatma, D. (2018). Pengaruh Atraksi Wisata Alam dan Motivasi Wisatawan terhadap Keputusan Berkunjung Wisatawan ke Kawasan Wisata Ciwidey dan Pangalengan. *Jurnal Wacana Ekonomi*, 18, 1–7. <https://doi.org/https://journal.uniga.ac.id/index.php/JA/article/view/463>
- Ristian, R. (2020). *Pengaruh Pengembangan Components of Tourism terhadap Tourist Satisfaction serta Dampaknya pada Revisit Intention di Situ Bagendit*. Universitas Garut.
- Setyanto, I., & Pangestuti, E. (2019). Pengaruh Komponen Destinasi Wisata (4A) Terhadap Kepuasan Pengunjung Pantai Gemah Tulungagung. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 72(1), 157–167. <https://doi.org/http://administrasibisnis.studentjournal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jab/article/view/2850>
- Soeswoyo, D. M., Rahardjo, S., & Asparini, P. S. (2019). Tourism Components and The Perspective of Hospitality Industry in Supporting Sustainable Urban Tourism Development. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 259(Isot 2018), 101–106.
- Susilawati, W., Alamanda, D. T., Maoludin, A., & Ramdani, R. M. (2020). Evaluasi Kesadaran Wisatawan Lokal Mengenai Wisata Halal Pemandian Air Panas Garut. *Jurnal Altasia*, 2(2),

- 199–207.
- Wahab, S. (2003). *Manajemen Kepariwisata*. Pradnya Paramitha.
- Wanda, I. B. K., & Pangestuti, E. (2018). Pengaruh Pengembangan Komponen Destinasi Wisata Terhadap Kepuasan Pengunjung (Survei pada Pengunjung Situs Trowulan. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis (JAB)*, 55(3), 83–91.
- <https://doi.org/http://administrasibisnis.studentjournal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jab/article/view/2307>
- Zaei, M. E., & Zaei, M. E. (2013). The Impacts of Tourism Industry on Host Community. *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Research*, 1(2), 12–21. <https://www.eajournals.org/journals/>