

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Perception of Stakeholders to Tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang, North Sulawesi, Indonesia

Bernhard Tewal

Lecturer, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia

Joice R.T.S.L. Rimper

Lecturer, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia

Florensia B. Tewal

Lecturer, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia

Ferdinand J. Tumewu

Lecturer, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia

Abstract:

Tourism is one of the leading sectors of development programs in North Sulawesi. Various efforts have been made by local governments to promote the tourism sector, among others by developing Bukit Kasih Kanonang as an attractive tourist destination. This study aims to determine the perception of three group of stakeholder (visitors, residents and entrepreneurs) on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang, and to analyze whether or not there is any significant difference between their perceptions. This researches is a descriptive comparative research. Data collection was done by distributing questionnaires to respondents, interviews with community leaders and management board, and observation. The sample of the study was 163 respondents, consisting of three groups of stakeholders: 43% of visitors, 39% residents, and 18% entrepreneurs. Sampling is done by accidental sampling technique. Data were analyzed by statistic approach: validity test, reliability test, calculating mean score of each item, and different test of two independent sample groups. Result of data analysis found: 1) Visitor's perception toward tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang differ significantly with perception of residents and entrepreneurs. 2) Residents and entrepreneurs have no significant difference in their perception of tourism. 3) The three stakeholder groups differ in 7 items from 21 perceived items: art and cultural attractions (noon), information service facilities, shopping facilities, accommodation facilities, toilets and bathroom facilities, health facilities, and play / recreation facilities. 4) The perception of Bukit Kasih Kanonang tourism by visitor is lower than the perception of residents and entrepreneurs.

Keywords: *Tourism, perception, stakeholders, descriptive comparative, different test*

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Tourism is one of the leading sectors of development programs in North Sulawesi. The local government seeks to develop this tourism industry because they are aware of its role in mobilizing the community's economy. According to Muharto et al.(2017), the tourism development become very important in order to increase the national income as well as the regional income in improving people's welfare and prosperity, to expand employment and to encourage regional development. This causes many regions competing one another to introduce their tourism potential in order to attract tourist visits as much as possible.

Tourism development is multi-sectoral and has broad multiplier effects. Developed tourism industry, in turn, will stimulate the arising activities of other sectors such as increasing demand for foodstuffs (stimulating agriculture, fishery, livestock and trade sector), increasing demand for accommodation and transportation (moving the services sector) and so on. In addition, tourism plays a role in overcoming unemployment and poverty. Therefore, the development of tourism as an industry becomes important and strategic in the context of development.

Various efforts continue to be done by the local government to develop this tourism and one of them is to arrange tourist destination to be favourable and fun to visitors. In addition, the development of tourism destination should have a positive impact on local communities such as economy, social and environment. According to Satria (2009), a tourist area is said to be good and successful when optimally based on the following four aspects: 1) maintaining its environmental sustainability; 2) improving the welfare of the community in the region; 3) ensure visitor satisfaction, and 4) improve the

integration and unity of community development around the area and its development zone. One of the popular tourist icons in North Sulawesi is Bukit Kasih Kanonang. To further develop Bukit Kasih Kanonang in order to be an attractive tourist spot, it is necessary to know and understand stakeholder perceptions of its current existence.

Tourism researchers have studied the perceptions of many stakeholder groups on the tourism aspects that a destination offers or the impacts of its tourism activities. Tourism stakeholders investigated their perceptions, including: community leader (Aref & Redzuan, 2009), resident/local community (Nicholas et al., 2009; Ming & Wong, 2006; Mohammadi et al., 2010; Eshliki & Kaboudi, 2012; Lee, 2013; Lagarensa & Walansendow, 2015), tourist/traveller (Boonsirichai, 2002; Ranjanthran & Mohammed, 2011; Murphy et al., 2000, Rajesh, 2013). In addition to investigating the perceptions of individual stakeholder groups, there are a number of researchers who study the perceptions of multiple stakeholder groups such as retailers, residents, transportation operators, lodging operators, travel agents and tour operators, restaurant owners and realtors (Omar et al., 2013), local residents and tourists (Szell, 2012), residents, entrepreneurs, government officials, and tourists (Byrd et al., 2009; Kruja & Hasaj, 2010). Furthermore, the aspects of tourism perceived are: quality of the infrastructure and the environment (Boonsirichai, 2002), social, economic and environmental impacts (Aref & Redzuan, 2009; Mohammadi et al., 2010; Eshliki & Kaboudi, 2012; Ghaderi & Henderson, 2012), tourism product (Ranjanthran & Mohammed, 2011), sustainable tourism development and its impacts (Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2008; Kruja & Hasaj, 2010), tourist destination (Boonsirichai, 2002), world heritage site (Omar et al., 2013). It is clear here that tourism researchers use different stakeholder groups in their studies and even they differ in the perceived aspects of tourism.

This study examines the perceptions of stakeholders on aspects of tourism offered Bukit Kasih Kanonang, which from the literature review has not been done. Therefore a tourist destination has many stakeholders, this study is only limited to the three groups of stakeholders, namely: 1) visitors, 2) residents and 3) entrepreneurs.

1.2. Research Purposes

The aims of this research are: 1) to determine the perception of visitors, residents and entrepreneurs on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang, and 2) to analyze whether or not there is any significant difference between their perceptions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Perception

Every normal human has a perception of an object or event that is around it through the use of their senses. Perception is a process by which individuals organize and interpret their sensory impressions in order to give meaning to their environment (Robbins & Judge, 2013: 166). The key to understanding perception is to recognize that it is a unique interpretation of the situation, not an exact recording of it. In short, perception is a very complex cognitive process that yields a unique picture of the world, a picture that may be quite different from reality (Luthans, 2011: 135). According to Tewal et al. (2017: 101), different individuals can see the same thing but understand it differently. Robbins and Judge (2013, 167) further suggests three factors operate to shape and sometimes distort perception. These three factors are: 1) in the perceiver (attitudes, personality, motives, interests, experience, expectations); 2) in the object or target, being perceived (novelty, motion, sounds, size, background, proximity, similarity); and 3) in the context of the situation in which the perception is made (time, work setting, social setting).

In the context of tourism, Murphy (2000) defined perception is an idea to mirror short and simple positive evaluation toward tourist experience while travelling. In exact terms, perception means what the individuals determine based on visual and audio observation and experience from the surrounding environment.

2.2. Stakeholders

Each organization has a number of stakeholder groups that determine the organization's existence. Freeman (1984: 46) defined a stakeholder as any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives. Donaldson and Preston (1995) refined this definition, stating that to be identified as a stakeholder, the group or individual must have a legitimate interest in the organization. Understanding the behavior and actions of stakeholders in their interaction with the organization is important to the management, so that they can manage it well in order to contribute to the achievement of organizational goals. De Lopez (2001: 48) explains that, 'stakeholder management essentially consists of understanding and predicting the behavior and actions of stakeholders and devising strategies to ethically and effectively deal with them'. According to Berman et al (1999), stakeholders can be viewed as instrumental in improving commercial performance and maximize profits.

Philips, Freeman, and Wicks (2003) pointed out that stakeholder approach is not only tied to companies but can be applied to other forms of business and even organizations in general. Taking this into account, Kruja and Hasaj (2010) said that the stakeholder approach can be adapted for tourism destinations as well. In the field of tourism, Richardson & Fluker (2004) defined stakeholders as those who have an interest in, or who are affected by tourism, which include travel and tourism companies, governments and host communities.

2.3. Stakeholders Perception on Tourism

Researchers have studied the perception of stakeholders on various aspects of tourism as previously stated above. Mohammadi et al (2010) in their research in Kermanshah, Iran found that a high percentage of respondents acknowledged and appreciated the positive impact of tourism on local people, whether social impacts, economic and environmental impacts. Local people have a positive perception of the social impacts of tourism, followed by environmental impacts and economic impacts. Positive social impacts of tourism because they can meet tourists and show their ancient heritage. Positive economic impacts of tourism as they gain job opportunities and drive regional economies. The positive environmental impacts of tourism because they believe that tourism will provide an incentive to restoration of its ancient heritage. Furthermore, Boonsirichai (2002) in his research on the island of Samui, Thailand found that Thai tourists and returning tourists tended to feel the quality of Samui island is lower than foreign tourists and who first visited. He suggested that infrastructure and environmental services on the island of Samui should be improved, developed and maintained, especially in four areas including accessibility, road conditions and safety, cleanliness and prices of goods and services.

Omar et al. (2013) in their study revealed that the majority of respondents (consists of various stakeholder groups, excluding tourist) know the status of George Town as a World Heritage Site and think that the status will have a positive impact on local businesses, on the conservation and restoration of heritage buildings, and on the general well-being of George Town residents. Many agree that the restoration and conservation of heritage buildings are important in sustaining George Town's heritage status. Nevertheless, half of the respondents perceive that tourist activities could threaten the heritage values of George Town. Meanwhile, the level of stakeholder involvement in tourism planning and development is rather low. Only half of them are satisfied with the present management of heritage and tourism in George Town. Banki & Ismail (2014) in their research at Obudu Mountain found differences in perceptions of the impact of tourism and sustainable tourism development between local government employees and all stakeholder groups, residents and all stakeholder groups, tourism entrepreneurs and all stakeholder groups, tourists and all stakeholder groups, and tourism students and all stakeholder groups. This study indicate that there were differences in perception of the impacts of tourism in eleven of the sixteen items and in three of the fourteen items for how tourism should be sustainably developed. The variation in differences was very evident for increases in alcoholism, prostitution and sexual permissiveness, and the need for family-owned tourism businesses to be encouraged for the sustainable development of Obudu Mountain Resort.

Research conducted by Byrd et al. (2009) on tourism perceptions of various groups of stakeholders in rural eastern North Carolina found that there are differences in the perception of the impact of tourism between them. This difference occurs in seven of the nine questions. Differences were identified between the entrepreneurs and government officials, residents and governmental officials, residents and entrepreneurs, and residents and tourists. One of their findings is the difference in perceptions of tourism impact between entrepreneurs and local government officials in three items: tourism development increases a community's quality of life, tourism development improves the community's appearance, and enhanced tourism improves the economy. Andriotis (2005) in his research found that there were not many differences between residents and entrepreneurs in their perceptions of the impacts of tourism in Crete. The study of Puczko & Ratz (2000) which was based on residents and tourists found statistically significant differences between the two groups in their perceptions of the physical impacts of tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary.

Based on the description above, it can be formulated hypothesis for this study as follows:

- Hypothesis 1. There is a difference of perception between visitors and residents to the tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.
- Hypothesis 2. There is a difference of perception between visitors and entrepreneurs to the tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.
- Hypothesis 3. There is a difference of perception between residents and entrepreneurs to the tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.

3. Research Method

This type of research is categorized as descriptive comparative research (Silalahi, 2010: 35), it means to compare the same variable for different samples. Data collecting is done through questionnaires to respondents, interview with community leaders and management board, and observation of their destination. Questionnaires are arranged in two parts, first relating to the identity of the respondent and the second about the respondent's perception of the tourism aspects offered by Bukit Kasih Kanonang (21 items), including security and convenience (6 items, statement 1-6), art and cultural attraction (2 items, statement 7-8), facilities (10 items, statement 9-18), product prices and entrance fee (3 items, statement 19-21). Measurement of stakeholders' perceptions for each item statement using scale Likert with five points as follows: very good = score 5, good = score 4, good enough = score 3, bad = score 2, and very bad = score 1.

The sample of this study is limited to three groups of stakeholders: 1) visitors; 2) residents; 3) entrepreneurs. Sampling is done by accidental sampling technique, meaning that the sample of this study are those who at the time of collecting data willing to be respondents. The sample size is 163 respondents, consist of 70 visitors (43%), 63 residents (39%), and 30 entrepreneurs (18%).

Data analysis using statistical techniques: validity test, reliability test, calculating mean score of each item, and t-test of two independent samples. Validity and reliability tests are used to find out valid and reliable self-developed questionnaires. The questionnaire is said to be valid when $r \geq 0.30$ and reliable when Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.60 (Sugiyono, 2012: 88). The

calculating mean score of each item is done to compare perceptions between stakeholders groups by looking at the three rating categories: Low = 1.0 - 2,3; Medium = 2.4 - 3.7; High = 3.8 - 5.0. Furthermore, t-test of two independent samples were used to verify hypotheses, by comparing the mean score of the two samples. According to Sarwono (2009: 140), the requirements that must be met for this t-test is that both samples have the same variant.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Respondents Description

The sample respondents in this study were 163 people, consisting of three groups of stakeholders: 70 visitors, 63 residents, and 30 entrepreneurs. The visitor respondents dominated by male 51.4%, aged 46 to 55 years old 38.6%, high school 41.4%, and married 70.7%. The residents respondents dominated by female 55.6%, aged 36 to 45 years old 34.9%, high school 34.9%, and married 87.2%. Entrepreneur respondents dominated by female 66.7%, aged 31 to 40 years 36.7%, and high school 56.7%, and married 90%.

4.2. Test of Validity and Test of Reliability Questionnaire

The questionnaire of this research has been tested the validity and reliability as shown in Table 1. The results of validity test show that all items of statement are valid, because the lowest correlation coefficient = 0.387 \geq 0.30 in the statement 8: art and cultural attractions (noon). Furthermore, the reliability test results show Cronbach's alpha = 0.938 \geq 0.60 and hence all items of statements are reliable.

No.	Statement	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	No.	Statement	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
1	Location and facilities arrangement	.871	12	Accommodation facilities	.865
2	Easy entry to the location	.874	13	Toilet and bathroom facilities	.797
3	Road conditions	.871	14	Restaurant facilities	.893
4	Cleanliness conditions	.507	15	Facilities of worship	.865
5	Security conditions	.865	16	Health facilities	.573
6	Convenience of service	.865	17	Play / recreation facilities	.779
7	Art and cultural attractions (noon)	.488	18	Electricity facilities	.557
8	Art and cultural attractions (night)	.387	19	Prices of food	.628
9	Resting area facilities (lodge / room)	.795	20	Prices of goods and souvenirs	.519
10	Information service facilities	.743	21	Entrance fee of location	.519
11	Shopping facilities	.870	Cronbach's Alpha		.938

Table 1. Result of Validity and Reliability Test

4.3. History of Tourism Development of Bukit Kasih Kanonang

Bukit Kasih Kanonang is located in Kanonang Village area, Kawangkoan Subdistrict, Minahasa Regency which is about 55 Km from Manado. This tourist spot was developed by the people of Kanonang in 1999 as a place of prayer and worship of Christians in the outdoor atmosphere. Furthermore, in 2002 this place received the attention of local governments, especially the Governor of North Sulawesi Province Drs. Adolf Jouke Sondakh who is the son of Kanonang Village by organizing and building various facilities and tourist icons. Based on interviews with some local community leaders, this place is called "Bukit Kasih Kanonang" for two reasons:

- It is said that in this hill area the ancestors of Minahasa people named Toar and Lumimuut settled and made love. Then from these two people born offspring Minahasa tribe.
- This place becomes a symbol of the manifestation of love and peace of mankind, regardless of religious, tribal and skin color differences. This symbol is expressed by the construction of five adjacent houses of worship and the construction of five-sided towers which is a reflection of the five religions recognized in Indonesia at that time.

This tourist spot located in the tropical hills with steep walls and often foggy. Uniquely, this tourist spot is above the geothermal source produced from Mount Soputan which is one of the active volcanoes in North Sulawesi. Therefore it is not

surprising if in this tourist area, we can smell the sulfur and see the existence of white smoke that pokes from the cracks of stone walls, from around the building and even from behind the casting stairs. At the bottom of the hill there is also a sulfur crater or natural hot water pool with a high enough temperature so often used food vendors to boil corn, yams, nuts and eggs are then sold.

Bukit Kasih Kanonang is a place for nature tour which has an area of about 38 Ha, including the protected forest above it. The air around this location is quite cool because of the influence of the forest on this hilltop. In this area by the local government has built various icons such as:

- Bukit Kasih Tower. The tower has five sides with a height of 22 meters which is a symbol of harmony / tolerance of the religious community. On each side of the tower there are relics or sculptures of important teachings of every religion that exists. This monument is located at the base of the hill adjacent to the hot spring pool.
- House of worship. In addition to the five-sided tower as a symbol of religious harmony / tolerance, on this hill is built separately worship house of all religions in Indonesia that is church for Protestant Christianity, chapel/church for Catholic Christianity, mosque for Islam, monastery for Buddhism, and temple for Hinduism. Then with the recognition of Kong Hu Cu religion, then in 2015 also built temples. All these houses of worship are open to visitors and they work in this tourist area to pray and / or worship. To reach these houses of worship must climb a thousand stairs.
- Relief Toar and Lumimuut. According to local myth, it is said that the ancestors of the Minahasa people are Toar and Lumimuut. These two persons are mothers (Lumimuut) and children (Toar) who make love and produce offspring called the Minahasa people. Their faces are immortalized in the form of a relief on one of the steep walls of this hill.
- Monument of the Cross. On the other side of this hill has been built upon a Cross monument as high as 53 meters. To reach this monument must climb two thousand stairs.
- Protection Forest. At the peak of Bukit Kasih Kanonang there is a protected tropical forest. This protected forest is rich with flora and fauna so that it becomes a place of research of related scientists.



Figure 1: The Bukit Kasih Tower icon



Figure 2: The Worship Houses Icons of All Religions in Indonesia and Protected Forest



Figure 3: Monument of the Cross Icon



Figure 4: The Relief of Toar and Lumimuut Icon

4.5. Mean Score of Each Item of Perception between Stakeholders Group

The result of the calculation of the mean score of each tourism item offered by Bukit Kasih Kanonang as perceived by the three stakeholder groups is presented in Table 2. The data shows that from 21 items perceived there are 7 different items between them, that is statement 7 (art and cultural attractions (noon)), 10 (information service facilities), 11 (shopping facilities),12 (accommodation facilities),13 (toilet and bathroom facilities),16 (health facilities), and 17(play / recreation facilities).Differences in perception between visitors and residents there are 5 items, namely statements 10, 11, 12, 16 and 17; between visitor and entrepreneurs there are 7 items, namely statement 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17; between resident and entrepreneurs there are 2 items, namely 7, and 13.Management of Bukit Kasih Kanonang and local governments need to improve low and medium perceptions of items by stakeholders, while high perceived items should be maintained.

No.	Statement	Visitors		Residents		Entrepreneurs	
		Mean score	Rating category	Mean score	Rating Category	Mean score	Rating Category
1	Location and facilities arrangement	4,0	High	4,0	High	4,0	High
2	Easy entry to the location	4,1	High	4,1	High	4,0	High
3	Road conditions	3,9	High	4,0	High	4,0	High
4	Cleanliness conditions	3,1	Medium	3,7	Medium	3,4	Medium
5	Security conditions	4,0	High	4,1	High	3,9	High
6	Convenience of service	3,9	High	4,1	High	3,9	High

No.	Statement	Visitors		Residents		Entrepreneurs	
		Mean score	Rating category	Mean score	Rating Category	Mean score	Rating Category
8	Art and cultural attractions (night)	1,3	Low	1,5	Low	1,4	Low
9	Resting area facilities (lodge / room)	3,6	Medium	3,8	Medium	3,8	Medium
10	Information service facilities	3,7	Medium	4,0	High	3,9	High
11	Shopping facilities	3,5	Medium	4,0	High	4,0	High
12	Accommodation facilities	2,3	Low	2,6	Medium	3,1	Medium
13	Toilet and bathroom facilities	3,4	Medium	3,7	Medium	3,8	High
14	Restaurant facilities	2,7	Medium	2,7	Medium	3,3	Medium
15	Facilities of worship	3,9	High	4,2	High	3,9	High
16	Health facilities	2,0	Low	2,7	Medium	2,4	Medium
17	Play / recreation facilities	3,4	Medium	3,8	High	3,8	High
18	Electricity facilities	3,8	High	4,2	High	4,0	High
19	Prices of food	3,9	High	4,2	High	4,0	High
20	Prices of goods and souvenirs	3,9	High	4,2	High	4,0	High
21	Entrance fee of location	4,1	High	4,2	High	4,0	High

Table 2: Mean Score of Each Tourism Item Perceived By Stakeholders

4.6. The Difference Test of Mean Score of Tourism Perception among Stakeholder Groups

4.6.1. Visitors and Residents

Data Table 4 shows the test of equality variance obtained $F = 0,003$ with significance level, $p = 0,959 \geq \alpha = 0,05$ meaning there is no difference of variance between visitors and residents. This result is eligible to test different mean score of two independent samples. Furthermore, different test mean score of tourism perception between visitors and residents obtained the value $t = -5,838$ with a significance level of $p = 0,000 \leq \alpha = 0,05$. Thus hypothesis 1 which states there is differences in perception between visitors and residents on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang proven convincingly. Furthermore, the mean score of visitors' perception = 70.29 with standard deviation= 4.825 and the mean score of residents' perception = 75.13 with standard deviation = 4.720. This indicates that visitors have a lower perception than residents of tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.

4.6.1.1. Group Statistics

Perception	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Value of Perception Visitors	70	70,29	4,825	,577
Residents	63	75,13	4,720	,595

Table 3

4.6.1.2. Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Value of Perception								95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Equal variances assumed	,003	,959	-5,838	131	,000	-4,841	,829	-6,482	-3,201
Equal variances not assumed			-5,845	130,079	,000	-4,841	,828	-6,480	-3,203

Table 4 : Different Test Results of Visitors and Residents Samples

4.6.2. Visitors and Entrepreneurs

Data Table 6 shows the test of equality variance obtained by $F = 0,042$ with significance level, $p = 0,838 \geq \alpha = 0,05$ meaning there is no difference of variance between visitors and entrepreneurs. This result is eligible to test different mean score of two independent samples. Furthermore, different test mean score of tourism perception between visitors and entrepreneurs with t-test obtained the degree of significance, $p = 0.000 \leq \alpha = 0.05$. Thus, hypothesis 2 which states there is a difference of perception between visitors and entrepreneurs to tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang proven convincingly. Furthermore, the mean score of visitors' perceptions = 70.29 with standard deviation = 4.825 and the mean score of entrepreneurs' perception = 74.47 with standard deviation = 5,029. This indicates that visitors have a lower perception than entrepreneurs on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.

4.6.2.1. Group Statistics

Perception	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Value of Perception Visitors	70	70,29	4,825	,577
Entrepreneurs	30	74,47	5,029	,918

Table 5

4.6.2.2. Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Value of Perception									
Equal variances assumed	,042	,838	3,921	98	,000	-4,181	1,066	2,065	6,276
Equal variances not assumed			3,856	52,930	,000	-4,181	1,084	2,006	6,356

Table 6 : Different Test Results of Visitors and Entrepreneurs Samples

4.6.3. Residents and Entrepreneurs

Data Table 8 shows the test of equality variance obtained $F = 0,030$ with significance level, $p = 0,862 \geq \alpha = 0,05$ meaning there is no difference of variance between residents and entrepreneurs. This result is eligible to test different mean score of two independent samples. Furthermore, different test mean score of tourism perception between residents and entrepreneurs with t-test obtained the degree of significance, $p = 0.538 \geq \alpha = 0.05$. Thus hypothesis 3 which states there is differences in perceptions between residents and entrepreneurs on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang not proven convincingly. Furthermore, the mean score of residents' perception = 75.13 with standard deviation = 4.720 and the mean score of entrepreneurs' perception = 74.47 with standard deviation = 5,029. This indicates that residents have a higher perception than entrepreneurs on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.

4.6.3.1. Group Statistics

	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Value of Perception Residents	63	75,13	4,720	,595
Entrepreneurs	30	74,47	5,029	,918

Table 7

4.6.3.2. Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Value of Perception									
Equal variances assumed	,030	,862	-,618	91	,538	-,660	1,069	-2,784	1,464
Equal variances not assumed			-,604	53,983	,549	-,660	1,094	-2,853	1,533

Table 8: Different Test Results of Residents and Entrepreneurs Samples

4.7. Discussion

The perception of visitors, residents and entrepreneurs on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang are generally quite good. This is supported by the rating of the mean score of each item, of which most of the items are perceived as high ranked (10 items for visitors, 14 items for residents, and 13 items for entrepreneurs) and middle grade (7 items for visitors, 5 items for residents, and 6 items for entrepreneurs). However, there are also some items that are rated low and this should be improved by the manager and local government (4 items for visitors, 2 items for residents, and 1 item for entrepreneurs). The items that need to be improved include art and cultural attractions (noon), art and cultural attractions (night), lodging facilities and health facilities. These improvements are intended to make this tourist destination an interesting and fun destination for visitors in the future. If this is not the case then it will damage the imaging and can impact on the decrease of visitors. In addition, for items that are medium rated as being upgraded and high-ranked items should be maintained for sustainability.

Result of the difference test mean score show that residents and entrepreneurs share the same perception of tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang, but their perceptions differ significantly with visitor perceptions. Visitors have a lower perception than residents and entrepreneurs. This difference in perception can be due to many things and one of them is their experience. Visitors perceive tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang is based on their experience of visiting other tourist destination. Thus visitor perception becomes an important input for managers and local government in making tourism development policies in Bukit Kasih Kanonang. Visitors need to be satisfied or served with the best, because their experience will determine whether or not the desire to visit again or invite others to visit.

Based on the results of interviews with the Head of Bukit Kasih Kanonang Management Agency there are several obstacles in improving the imaging of this sights, among others: 1). Limitations of operating income. One of the operational income sources of this resort is the sale of admission tickets. Admission price is low, at which time this research is conducted only Rp.1.000, -, per person, Rp.3.000, - per two-wheeled vehicle, Rp.10.000, - per four wheel vehicle minibus and Rp.15.000, - per four-wheeled vehicle buses and others; 2). Lack of local government attention. This can be seen from the lack of budget provided by the local government for the development of this tourism spot to be more interesting; 3). The low awareness and sense of belonging from the local community towards this tourist spot. They still throw garbage carelessly, although the Bukit Kasih management has provided trash cans in certain areas; 4). Lack of public interest to invest on this tourism spot. This condition causes the lack of supporting facilities of tourism such as lodging, art and cultural attractions.

4.8. Limitation of Research

This study has several limitations as follows: 1). Stakeholders investigated were just three groups: visitors, residents and entrepreneurs; when there are many other tourism stakeholders in Bukit Kasih Kanonang such as local governments, researchers, environmentalists, and others. 2). The sample size of respondents is relatively small because only 163 people for three groups of stakeholders, so the results obtained may not be maximized. 3). The perceived aspect of tourism is relatively limited, for example, not achieving the social, economic and environmental impacts of tourism activities in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis and discussion as described, the conclusions can be drawn:

- The perception of stakeholders on tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang is relatively good, Although, there are several things that still need to be improved such as art and cultural attractions for both day and evening, lodging and health facilities.

- Visitors have a lower perception than the perception of residents and entrepreneurs with respect to tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.
- Residents and entrepreneurs have no significant difference in their perception of tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang.
- The visitor's perception of tourism in Bukit Kasih Kanonang differs significantly with the perception of residents and entrepreneurs.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the above findings, it can be suggested some recommendations for the Management of Bukit Kasih Kanonang and the local government of North Sulawesi in policy making:

- It is necessary to increase the arts and cultural attractions, lodging facilities and health through cooperation with private parties or other communities.
- It is necessary to review the entry tariff applied because it is very low, making it difficult to manage this local tourist spot well.
- There needs to be a budget allocation by the local government that is adequate for the development and conservation of these tourist place in a sustainable manner.
- Need to invite investors to build a variety of supporting facilities in these attractions to be more creative for the convenience of visitors.

6. References

- i. Andriotis, K. (2005). Community Groups' Perceptions of and Preferences for Tourism Development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29(1), 67-90.
- ii. Aref, F. & Redzuan, M. (2009). Community Leader' Perception toward Tourism Impacts and Level of Community Capacity Building in Tourism Development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(3), 208-213.
- iii. Banki, M. B. & Ismail, H. N. (2014). Multi-Stakeholder Perception of Tourism Impact and Ways Tourism Should be Sustainability Developed in Obudu Mountain. *Developing Country Studies* 4(3), 37-48.
- iv. Berman, S. L., Wicks, A. C., Kotha, S. & Jones, T. M. (1999). Does Stakeholder Orientation Matter? The Relationship Between Stakeholder Management Models and Firm Financial Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 488-506.
- v. Boonsirichai, M. (2002). Tourist' Perceptions of Samui Island, Thailand as a Tourist Destination. A Research Paper for Master of Science Degree in Hospitality and Tourism, The Graduate College, University of Wisconsin - Stout.
- vi. Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E. & Dronberger, M. G. (2009). Comparison of Stakeholder Perceptions of Tourism in Rural Eastern North Carolina, *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 693-703
- vii. De Lopez, T. T. (2001). Stakeholder Management for Conservation Projects: A case study of Ream National Park, Cambodia, *Environmental Management*, 28(1), 47-60.
- viii. Donaldson, T. & Preston, L.E. (1995). The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (1), 65-91.
- ix. Eshliki, S. A. & Kaboudi, M. (2012). Perception of Community in Tourism Impacts and their Participation in Tourism Planning: Ramsar, Iran. *Journal of Asian Behavioural Studies*, 2(5), 51-64.
- x. Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- xi. Ghaderi, Z. & Henderson. (2012). Sustainable Rural Tourism in Iran: A Perspective from Hawraman Village. *Tourism Management Perspective*, 2, 47-54.
- xii. Kruja, D. & Hasaj, A. (2010). Comparisons of Stakeholders' Perception towards The Sustainable Tourism Development and Its Impacts in Shkodra Region (Albania). *Turizam*, 14 (1): 1-12.
- xiii. Lagarensa, B. E. S. & Walansendow, A. (2015). Exploring Residents' Perceptions and Participation on Tourism and Waterfront Development: The Case of Manado Waterfront Development in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(2), 223-237.
- xiv. Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence Analysis of Community Resident Support for Sustainable Tourism Development. *Tourism Management*, 34, 37-46.
- xv. Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Twelfth Edition. McGraw-Hill/Irwin: New York.
- xvi. Ming, G. A. & Wong, P. P. (2006). Residents' Perception of Tourism Impacts: A Case Study of Homestay Operators in Dachangshan Dao, North-East China. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(3), 253-273.
- xvii. Mohammadi, M., Khalifah, Z & Hosseini, H. (2010). Lokal People Perceptions toward Sosial, Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism in Kermanshah (Iran). *Asian Social Science*, 3(11), 220-225.
- xviii. Muharto, Tewel, B., Mandey, S. L., & Tumbel, A. (2017). Competitiveness and the Increasing Strategy of Competitiveness in Tourism Sector of Ternate City, North Maluku Province. *Journal of Life Economics*, 4(14), 11-32.

- xix. Murphy, P., Pritchard, M. P., & Smith, B. (2000). The Destination Product and Its Impact on Traveller Perceptions. *Tourism Management*, 21(1): 43-52.
- xx. Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B. & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' Perception of A World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 390-412.
- xxi. Omar, S. I., Muhibudin, M., Yussof, I., Sukiman, M. F. & Mohamed B. (2013). George Town, Penang as a World Heritage Site: The Stakeholders' Perception. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 91, 88-96.
- xxii. Phillips, R., Freeman, R. E. & Wicks, A. C. (2003). What Stakeholder Theory is Not. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 13 (4), 479-502.
- xxiii. Puczko, L., & Ratz, T. (2000). Tourist and Resident Perceptions of the Physical Impacts of Tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary: Issues for Sustainable Tourism Management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(6), 458-477.
- xxiv. Rajesh, R. (2013). Impact of Tourist Perceptions, Destination Image and Tourist Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Conceptual Model. *PASOS. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 11(3), 67-78.
- xxv. Ranjanthran, M & Mohammed, B. (2011). 'Domestic Tourism: Perception of Domestic Tourist on Tourism Products in Penang Island. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 1(2), 795-816.
- xxvi. Richardson, J. I. & Fluker, M. (2004). *Understanding and Managing Tourism*. Frenchs Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- xxvii. Robbins, S. P. & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. Fifteenth Edition, Pearson. Boston.
- xxviii. Sarwono, J. (2009). *Statistik Itu Mudah: Panduan Lengkap Untuk Belajar Komputasi Statistik Menggunakan SPSS 16*. Penerbit Andi. Yogyakarta.
- xxix. Satria, D. (2009). Strategi Pengembangan Ekowisata Berbasis Ekonomi Lokal Dalam Rangka Program Pengentasan Kemiskinan Di Wilayah Kabupaten Malang. *Journal of Indonesian Applied Economics*, 3(1), 37-47.
- xxx. Silalahi, U. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Sosial*. Penerbit PT. Refika Aditama. Bandung.
- xxxi. Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Penerbit Alfabeta, Bandung.
- xxxii. Tewal, B., Adolfini, Pandowo, M. H. Ch. & Tawas, H. N. (2017). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Penerbit CV. Patra Media Grafindo. Bandung.
- xxxiii. Szell, A. B. (2012). *Attitudes and Perceptions of Local Residents and Tourists toward The Protected Area of Retezat National Park, Romania*. Thesis. Faculty of The Graduate College, Western Michigan University.
- xxxiv. Zamani-Farahani, H. & Musa, G. (2008). Residents' Attitudes and Perception towards Tourism Development: A Case Study of Masooleh, Iran. *Tourism Management*, 29(6), 1233-1236.