



STRATEGIES FOR DEVELOPING THE POTENTIAL OF VILLAGE TOURISM IN GUNUNGSARI AND KEDUMULYO VILLAGES, PATI REGENCY

Okta Yuripta Syafitri^{1)*}, Mohamad Soleh Nurzaman¹⁾, Aria Ganna Henryanto²⁾

¹⁾Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

²⁾Department of Management, University Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

*Corresponding author: okta.yuripta@ui.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received : 22 December 2021

Revised : 30 October 2023

Accepted : 8 November 2023

Keywords

Rural Development;
Village Tourism;
SWOT Analysis

JEL classification

R58; L83; M10

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore and develop the tourism potential of Gunungsari and Kedumulyo Villages in Pati Regency to enhance local welfare and address challenges related to poverty and inequality. By employing a SWOT analysis, the research identifies the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with tourism development in these villages. The study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative assessments of local conditions with quantitative evaluations through the Internal Factor Analysis Summary (IFAS) and External Factor Analysis Summary (EFAS) matrices. The findings reveal that Gunungsari Village, with IFAS and EFAS scores of 3.75 and 3.64 respectively, exhibits a more effective tourism development strategy compared to Kedumulyo Village, which scores 3.42 for IFAS and 3.34 for EFAS. The results suggest that Gunungsari Village should pursue a Weakness-Opportunity (WO) Strategy, leveraging its strengths to overcome weaknesses and capitalize on opportunities. Conversely, Kedumulyo Village is recommended to adopt a Weakness-Threat (WT) Strategy to mitigate threats while addressing its weaknesses. These strategic recommendations are crucial for transforming these villages into developed or independent entities with sustainable tourism practices.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.



1. INTRODUCTION

The global tourism landscape is undergoing a significant shift, with mass tourism gradually giving way to alternative tourism that emphasizes nature, culture, and the unique lifestyles of local communities. This shift presents a substantial opportunity for rural areas, particularly villages that are rich in cultural diversity, traditions, culinary specialties, and handcrafted souvenirs made by local artisans. These elements provide a distinct value proposition for tourists seeking more meaningful and immersive experiences.

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) highlighted in 2018 that this trend towards alternative tourism is driven by tourists' evolving preferences (OECD, 2018). Modern travelers increasingly seek out experiences that enhance their knowledge, offer adventure, and provide learning opportunities. These experiences often involve direct interaction with local communities, such as those found in rural tourism or Village Tourism.

In Indonesia, the majority of tourism assets are located in rural areas, each with its own unique blend of natural beauty and cultural heritage. According to data collected by the Central Bureau of Statistics of Indonesia in 2018, there are approximately 1.734 tourist villages across Indonesia (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2018). Despite this, the vast potential of these villages has not been fully harnessed to address pressing socio-economic issues, such as poverty and unemployment, which predominantly affect rural areas. For instance, as of September 2019, the rural poverty rate stood at 12.60%, rising to 12.82% by March 2020 (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2020). Additionally, rural unemployment saw an increase from 3.45% in 2019 to 3.55% in 2020 (Jayani, 2020). These figures underscore the urgent need for development initiatives that prioritize village-level progress.

In 2019, Central Java was designated as one of Indonesia's national tourism destinations, with Pati Regency being recognized as a strategic integrated tourism area. Its location along the northern coast of Java and proximity to the Pantura national road, which connects major cities like Jakarta, Semarang, and Surabaya, enhances its strategic importance (Pemerintah Kabupaten Pati, 2019).

Gunungsari Village and Kedumulyo Village in Pati Regency exemplify rural areas with untapped tourism potential. Despite their promising attractions, these villages have not yet succeeded in elevating their Village Development Index (IDM) status to that of developed or independent villages. This highlights a critical gap in the current literature: the need for a comprehensive strategy to develop village tourism that aligns with local values and culture. Such a strategy is crucial for improving community welfare and ensuring sustainable rural development (Ćurčić et al., 2021; Istiqomah et al., 2020).

While previous studies have extensively discussed the development of rural tourism in various regions, there is a noticeable gap in research focused on strategic development within specific villages like Gunungsari and Kedumulyo. Existing literature often generalizes the potential and challenges of rural tourism without delving into the unique characteristics and needs of individual villages (Gao et al., 2019; Lubis et al., 2020; Mujanah et al., 2015; Yopy & Sitingjak, 2018). This study aims to fill this gap by providing a detailed examination of the potential of Gunungsari and Kedumulyo villages and proposing tailored strategies for their tourism development.

The selection of Gunungsari and Kedumulyo villages as case studies is deliberate and strategic. These villages were chosen not only because of their unexploited tourism potential but also due to their socio-economic challenges, which are representative of many rural areas in Indonesia. By focusing on these villages, the study intends to offer insights and strategies that could be replicated in similar rural settings, thereby contributing to the broader discourse on rural tourism development and poverty alleviation in Indonesia.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research adopts a qualitative case study approach to investigate the underdevelopment of tourism in Gunungsari and Kedumulyo villages in Pati Regency, Central Java. The main objective is to identify the key factors hindering these villages' progress toward becoming developed or independent in tourism and to propose strategies that align with local cultural values to optimize their tourism potential. Additionally, the study assesses how enhancing village tourism can improve the overall welfare of the local community.

A case study approach was chosen to provide an in-depth exploration of the unique circumstances in Gunungsari and Kedumulyo. The research was conducted directly in the field, involving multiple visits to the villages to ensure that the data collected is both relevant and reflective of real-world conditions, thereby enhancing the study's validity. Purposive sampling was used to select respondents with significant knowledge and involvement in the villages' tourism activities. These included the Village Head, Village Officials, members of the Pokdarwis (tourism awareness group), Village-owned enterprise (BUMDesa) managers, tourism village management groups, and local village assistants. These participants were chosen based on their roles and influence in the development of village tourism, ensuring the comprehensiveness and insightfulness of the data.

Data collection involved structured interviews with the selected respondents, focusing on the central research questions: identifying the key factors influencing the current status of tourism development, exploring potential strategies for improvement, and assessing the impact on local welfare. The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured questionnaire, allowing for flexibility in probing deeper into specific areas of interest while maintaining consistency across interviews. Additionally, field observations were made to complement the interview data, providing context and additional insights into the villages' physical and social environments, which are crucial for understanding the challenges and opportunities in developing tourism.

The collected data was analyzed using a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis framework to systematically assess the internal and external factors affecting tourism development in Gunungsari and Kedumulyo. The SWOT analysis was further refined through the use of IFAS (Internal Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) and EFAS (External Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) matrices. These matrices provided a detailed examination of the strategic factors and their interactions, forming a solid foundation for developing actionable strategies (Rangkuti, 2015; Susanto et al., 2019).

The qualitative data from the interviews and observations were also subjected to thematic analysis, identifying recurring themes and patterns related to the research questions. These themes informed the SWOT analysis and subsequent strategy development. The combination of purposive sampling, structured interviews, field observations, and comprehensive data analysis techniques ensures the robustness and validity of this research. By focusing on the specific context of Gunungsari and Kedumulyo villages, this study not only proposes strategies for enhancing their tourism potential but also contributes to the broader literature on rural tourism development in Indonesia. The findings and strategies derived from this research could serve as a model for other rural areas facing similar challenges.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Gunungsari Village Internal Factors Analysis and External Factors Analysis

The research into the potential development of village tourism in Gunungsari and Kedumulyo Villages, Pati Regency, revealed a complex interplay of internal and external factors. The SWOT analysis, which examines Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats, provided a comprehensive understanding of the strategic options available for optimizing the tourism potential in these villages. The structured interviews and subsequent scoring led to the creation of IFAS (Internal Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) and EFAS (External Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) matrices for Gunungsari Village, which enabled the identification of key strategic priorities as seen on Table 1 and Table 2 on the next page.

Table 1. Weighting of IFAS

| Internal Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Value | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|-------------|
| STRENGTH | | | | |
| Topography of Gunungsari Village | 4.2 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Natural Resources Potential | 4.2 | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| Socio-cultural Potential | 3.8 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Management of natural resource potential as a source of village revenue | 3.8 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Capacity and performance of the Gunungsari Village Government | 4.0 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| BUMDesa as a village tourism management business entity | 4.0 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| BUMDesa Saving and Loan in providing access to capital | 4.2 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Religious Activities | 4.4 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 0.136 |
| Role of Religious Figures and Leaders | 4.4 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Access to clean water | 3.8 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Health infrastructure | 3.8 | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| Education infrastructure | 4.0 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Equitable distribution of village tourism management results | 4.4 | 0.05 | 3.8 | 0.190 |

The table above continued on the next page.....

The table below is a continuation of the image from the previous page.....

| Internal Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Value | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| WEAKNESS | | | | |
| Geography of Gunungsari Village | 3.6 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 0.136 |
| Community Participation | 3.6 | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| Worship infrastructure | 3.6 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Access to sanitation needs | 3.6 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Proper and standardized waste management | 3.0 | 0.03 | 4.0 | 0.120 |
| Disability Friendly Infrastructure | 2.6 | 0.03 | 4.0 | 0.120 |
| Village human resources for village tourism management | 3.0 | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.114 |
| Seminars and counseling on village tourism potential | 2.8 | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.114 |
| Applicative training in the field of tourism | 3.2 | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.114 |
| Participation in tourism promotion activities | 3.4 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Social media as a promotional platform | 3.6 | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Digitalization of sales of typical village products | 3.4 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Goods and services industry | 3.4 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| TOTAL | 95.8 | 1 | | 3.75 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

As can be seen in Table 1, Gunungsari Village with a total weighted IFAS score of 3.75, demonstrates a moderate ability to utilize its internal strengths. The equitable distribution of village tourism management results, health infrastructure, and natural resources potential are key strengths. However, Gunungsari Village faces significant weaknesses in its community participation, digitalization of sales of typical village products capacity to manage natural resources, government performance, and the development of Village-owned enterprise (BUMDesa) business units. The lack of proper waste management and insufficient infrastructure for health and sanitation also pose challenges. Then for the EFAS matrix can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 2. Weighting of EFAS

| External Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Value | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|
| OPPORTUNITY | | | | |
| Central Java Provincial Regulation No. 02 2019 | 3.4 | 0.08 | 4.0 | 0.320 |
| Central Java Governor Regulation No. 53 of 2019 | 3.2 | 0.07 | 3.6 | 0.252 |
| Pati District Regulation No. 02 of 2018 | 3.2 | 0.07 | 3.8 | 0.266 |
| Perbup No. 27 of 2020 | 4.2 | 0.09 | 3.8 | 0.342 |
| Pati District Tourism Office | 3.6 | 0.08 | 3.8 | 0.304 |
| Village Fund | 4.0 | 0.09 | 3.6 | 0.324 |
| Third Party Fund | 3.2 | 0.07 | 3.6 | 0.252 |
| Dry Season | 4.0 | 0.09 | 3.4 | 0.306 |
| Transitional Season | 3.4 | 0.07 | 3.6 | 0.252 |
| Conservation and Revitalization | 4.2 | 0.09 | 3.4 | 0.306 |
| THREAT | | | | |
| Special funds for Tourism Villages | 1.6 | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| Rainy Season | 2.0 | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| Regulation of natural resource mining | 2.0 | 0.04 | 2.8 | 0.112 |
| Regulation of tree felling | 2.0 | 0.04 | 3.2 | 0.128 |
| Regulation of waste management of industrial and tourism activities | 2.0 | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| TOTAL | 46 | 1 | | 3.64 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

From the Table 2, the EFAS matrix with a weighted score of 3.64, highlights the village's ability to capitalize on opportunities provided by regional regulations and the support of the Pati District Tourism Office. However, threats such as the rainy season and stringent environmental regulations pose risks to the village's tourism development.

Gunungsari Village SWOT Analysis

However, threats such as the rainy season and stringent environmental regulations pose risks to the village's tourism development. The SWOT analysis further identified the interaction of these internal and external factors, with the highest priority strategy being the Weakness-Opportunity (WO) strategy, scoring 7.53 as seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Weighting of SWOT Questionnaire Results of Gunungsari Village

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | S = 3.74 | W = 3.78 |
| O = 3.65 | SO = 7.39 | WO = 7.53 |
| T = 3.54 | ST = 7.28 | WT = 7.32 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

Based on the Table 3 above, the priority strategies are arranged based on the highest to lowest value of the strategy combination. This strategy focuses on addressing weaknesses by leveraging opportunities, such as utilizing third-party funds to improve amenities and infrastructure, and promoting tourism through coffee-based educational packages. The table 4 is the table of Gunungsari Village SWOT Strategy Alternative Sequence.

Table 4. Gunungsari Village SWOT Strategy Alternative Sequence

| Priority | Strategy | Weighting |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| I | Weakness – Opportunity (WO) | 7.53 |
| II | Strength – Opportunity (SO) | 7.39 |
| III | Weakness – Threat (WT) | 7.32 |
| IV | Strength – Threat (ST) | 7.28 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

Based on the table 3 and 4 above, the alternative strategy that can be recommended is the Weakness-Opportunity (WO) Strategy, which is a strategy to overcome weaknesses by taking advantage of opportunities with the following alternative strategies.

First of all is infrastructure enhancement. Utilize third-party funds to improve essential infrastructure, such as health clinics, sanitation facilities, and parking areas, to accommodate the needs of tourists. Enhancing these amenities will not only improve the visitor experience but also support the overall growth of the tourism sector.

Second, community empowerment and economic development. The village's status as a coffee producer offers a unique opportunity to create educational tourism packages centered around coffee production. These packages can provide an immersive experience for tourists while boosting the sales of locally produced coffee and other village products. This strategy aligns with the WO approach, which seeks to turn weaknesses into strengths by tapping into existing opportunities.

Third, human resource development. Collaborating with the Pati District Tourism Office to improve the skills of tourism managers through targeted training programs is essential. Emphasizing digital literacy and social media use for promotion can significantly enhance the village's tourism marketing efforts.

Kedumulyo Village Internal Factors Analysis and External Factors Analysis

The structured interviews and subsequent scoring led to the creation of IFAS (Internal Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) and EFAS (External Strategic Factor Analysis Summary) matrices for Kedumulyo Village, which enabled the identification of key strategic priorities which can be seen in table 5 and table 6 on the next page, starts with the weighting of IFAS first.

Table 5. Weighting of IFAS

| Internal Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| STRENGTH | | | |
| Geographical position of kedumulyo village | 0.04 | 4.0 | 0.160 |
| Topographical condition of kedumulyo village | 0.05 | 3.3 | 0.165 |
| Natural resource potential | 0.05 | 3.3 | 0.165 |
| Socio-cultural potential | 0.05 | 3.5 | 0.175 |
| Level of community participation | 0.05 | 3.8 | 0.190 |
| Infrastructure supporting religiosity needs | 0.04 | 3.1 | 0.124 |
| Religious activities | 0.05 | 2.6 | 0.130 |
| Role of religious figures and leaders | 0.05 | 2.8 | 0.140 |
| Access to clean water | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Village human resources as potential local human resources | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Infrastructure in education and religion | 0.05 | 3.0 | 0.150 |
| Social media as a platform for promotion | 0.04 | 3.8 | 0.152 |
| WEAKNESS | | | |
| Management of natural resource potential as a source of village revenue | 0.04 | 3.5 | 0.140 |
| Capacity and performance of Kedumulyo Village Government | 0.04 | 3.5 | 0.140 |
| BUMDesa business units in the tourism sector | 0.02 | 3.5 | 0.070 |
| BUMDesa business unit in the savings and loan sector | 0.02 | 3.3 | 0.066 |
| Access to sanitation for basic needs of tourists | 0.04 | 3.3 | 0.132 |
| Proper and standardized waste management | 0.03 | 3.6 | 0.108 |
| Basic infrastructure in the health sector | 0.03 | 3.5 | 0.105 |
| Basic infrastructure for people with disabilities | 0.02 | 3.5 | 0.070 |
| Seminars and counseling on village tourism potential | 0.04 | 3.5 | 0.140 |
| Applicative training in tourism | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.114 |
| Participation in tourism promotion activities | 0.04 | 3.5 | 0.140 |
| Digitalization of sales of typical village products | 0.03 | 3.8 | 0.114 |
| Industry of goods and services | 0.04 | 3.6 | 0.144 |
| Equitable distribution of the results of village tourism management | 0.03 | 3.3 | 0.099 |
| TOTAL | 1 | | 3.42 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

As can be seen in Table 5. Kedumulyo Village with a total weighted IFAS score of 3.42. demonstrates a moderate ability to utilize its internal strengths. The village's geographical and topographical conditions. coupled with a high level of community participation. are key strengths. However. similar to Gunungsari. Kedumulyo faces significant weaknesses in its capacity to manage natural resources. government performance. and the development of Village-owned enterprise (BUMDesa) business units. The lack of proper waste management and insufficient infrastructure for health and sanitation also pose challenges. Then for the EFAS matrix can be seen in table 6 below.

Table 6. Weighting of EFAS

| External Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------------|
| OPPORTUNITY | | | |
| Central Java Provincial Regulation No. 02 of 2019 | 0.08 | 3.50 | 0.280 |
| Central Java Governor Regulation No. 53 of 2019 | 0.08 | 3.60 | 0.288 |
| Pati Regency Regional Regulation No 02 of 2018 | 0.07 | 3.50 | 0.245 |
| Regent Regulation No 27 of 2020 | 0.08 | 3.30 | 0.264 |
| Pati District Tourism Office | 0.08 | 3.80 | 0.304 |
| Village Fund | 0.08 | 3.50 | 0.280 |
| Dry Season on tourist visits | 0.08 | 2.60 | 0.208 |
| Transitional or Pancaroba Season on tourist visits | 0.08 | 2.80 | 0.224 |
| Environmental Conservation and Revitalization Activities Challenge | 0.07 | 3.10 | 0.217 |

The table above continued on the next page

The table below is a continuation of the image from the previous page.....

| External Strategy Factors Analysis Summary | Weight | Rating | Score (BxR) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|
| THREAT | | | |
| Special Fund Allocation for Tourism Villages from the Provincial Budget | 0.05 | 3.80 | 0.190 |
| Third Party Funds such as. Sponsorships and CSR | 0.05 | 3.50 | 0.175 |
| Rainy Season factors on tourist visits | 0.05 | 3.00 | 0.150 |
| Regulation on natural resource mining | 0.05 | 3.50 | 0.175 |
| Regulations on the existence and sustainability of the village's natural potential | 0.05 | 3.30 | 0.165 |
| Regulations on proper and standardized waste management | 0.05 | 3.60 | 0.180 |
| TOTAL | 1 | | 3.34 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

From the table 6. the EFAS matrix for Kedumulyo Village with a score of 3.34. shows that the village can take advantage of existing opportunities. such as regional regulations and the support of the Pati District Tourism Office.

Kedumulyo Village SWOT Analysis

However. external threats. including the lack of special funds for tourism and the impact of the rainy season on tourist visits. need to be carefully managed. The SWOT analysis identified the Weakness-Threat (WT) strategy as the most critical. scoring 6.96 as can be seen in table 7 below.

Table 7. Weighting of SWOT Questionnaire Results of Kedumulyo Village

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | S = 3.34 | W = 3.51 |
| O = 3.30 | SO = 6.64 | WO = 6.81 |
| T = 3.45 | ST = 6.79 | WT = 6.96 |

Source: Processed data. 2021

Based on the table 7 above. the priority strategies are arranged based on the highest to lowest value of the strategy combination. The table 8 is the table of Kedumulyo Village SWOT Strategy Alternative Sequence.

Table 8. Kedumulyo Village SWOT Strategy Alternative Sequence

| Priority | Strategy | Weighting |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| I | Weakness – Threat (WT) | 6.96 |
| II | Weakness – Opportunity (WO) | 6.81 |
| III | Strength – Threat (ST) | 6.79 |
| IV | Strength – Opportunity (SO) | 6.64 |

Source: Processed data (2021)

Based on table 7 and 8 above, for Kedumulyo Village the alternative strategy that can be recommended in the short term is the Weakness - Threat (WT) Strategy, which is a strategy to survive by reducing internal weaknesses and avoiding challenges with the following strategies.

First of all is organizational regeneration and legalization. Revitalizing the Village-owned enterprise (BUMDesa) organization and legally registering it with the village ministry is a crucial step. Establishing a dedicated tourism business unit within Village-owned enterprise (BUMDesa) will allow for more professional management of tourism potential. Additionally, creating a savings and loan unit will provide necessary capital for SMEs in the village, fostering economic growth.

Second, adaptation to seasonal challenges. The rainy season poses a significant threat to tourist numbers. To address this, Kedumulyo Village should consider diversifying its tourism offerings by developing 'living in the village' experiences, where tourists can engage in daily activities with local residents or participate in educational and conservation-focused tours. This strategy not only maintains tourist interest during low seasons but also promotes sustainable tourism practices.

Third, human resource development and financial management. Given the lack of special funds for tourism development, it is essential to maximize the efficient management of existing resources. Developing a human resource program that focuses on the digital economy and sustainable natural resource management will empower village officials and tourism managers to better handle the challenges and opportunities that arise.

Integration with Existing Literature

The findings from this study are consistent with existing literature on rural tourism development, which emphasizes the importance of leveraging local strengths and addressing weaknesses through targeted interventions. The results align with the work of Ristić et al. (2019), who argue that capitalizing on local strengths and addressing weaknesses through targeted interventions contributes to sustainable development in rural settlements.

Moreover, the emphasis on human resource development and the professionalization of tourism management echoes the findings of Reggers et al. (2016) who stated that stakeholder collaboration through Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and community-based tourism (CBT) can foster a sound capacity-building mechanism, leading to a sustainable eco-trekking industry driven by communities and supported by tour operators and philanthropic giving. The strategies recommended in this study, particularly those related to infrastructure development and community empowerment, are in line with the broader body of research that advocates for a holistic approach to rural tourism that balances economic, social, and environmental objectives.

Critical Analysis and Limitations

While the strategies proposed in this study are based on a thorough analysis of the data, there are limitations that should be considered. The reliance on structured interviews and SWOT analysis, while useful, may not fully capture the complexity of the social and cultural dynamics at play in these villages. Additionally, the study's focus on internal and external factors through the IFAS and EFAS matrices may overlook the interconnectedness of these factors and their broader implications for rural tourism development.

Furthermore, the study does not extensively explore the potential challenges of implementing the recommended strategies, particularly in terms of resource allocation and community buy-in. Future research could benefit from a more in-depth examination of these challenges, as well as the development of more nuanced strategies that consider the diverse needs and perspectives of different stakeholder groups within the villages.

4. CONCLUSION

The study highlights the distinct potentials and challenges of Gunungsari and Kedumulyo Villages in developing village tourism. Gunungsari, with a higher IFAS score (3.75), is well-positioned to leverage its natural resources and socio-cultural assets. However, weaknesses like insufficient waste management and limited community participation need addressing. The recommended strategy is the Weakness-Opportunity (WO) approach, focusing on infrastructure improvement, community empowerment, and human resource development.

Kedumulyo, with an IFAS score of 3.42, faces more significant internal challenges, particularly in managing natural resources and government performance. The EFAS score (3.34) indicates the village can capitalize on regional regulations and support. However, external threats such as the rainy season and limited tourism funds necessitate the Weakness-Threat (WT) strategy. This strategy includes revitalizing BUMDesa, adapting tourism offerings to seasonal challenges, and enhancing financial management.

Overall, both villages require tailored approaches that consider local strengths and weaknesses. Future research should explore the implementation challenges of these strategies and engage more deeply with the social and cultural dynamics influencing rural tourism development.

5. REFERENCES

- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2018). *Hasil Pendataan Potensi Desa (Podes) 2018*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). *Persentase Penduduk Miskin (P0) Menurut Daerah, 2020*.
- Ćurčić, N., Svitlica, A. M., Brankov, J., Bjeljac, Ž., Pavlović, S., & Jandžiković, B. (2021). The Role of Rural Tourism in Strengthening the Sustainability of Rural Areas: The Case of Zlakusa Village. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6747. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13126747>
- Gao, C., Cheng, L., Iqbal, J., & Cheng, D. (2019). An Integrated Rural Development Mode Based on a Tourism-Oriented Approach: Exploring the Beautiful Village Project in China. *Sustainability*, 11(14), 3890. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU11143890>
- Istiqomah, Adawiyah, W. R., Praptapa, A., Kusuma, P. D. I., & Sholikhah, Z. (2020). PROMOTING LOCAL POTENTIAL AS A STRATEGY TO DEVELOP TOURISM VILLAGE. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 31(3), 1113–1118. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.31324-547>
- Jayani, D. H. (2020). *Angka Pengangguran di Desa Meningkat*. Katadata.
- Lubis, H., Rohmatillah, N., & Rahmatina, D. (2020). STRATEGY OF TOURISM VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT BASED ON LOCAL WISDOM. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 9(2), 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.23887/JISH-UNDIKSHA.V9I2.22385>
- Mujanah, S., Ratnawati, T., & Andayani, S. (2015). The strategy of tourism village development in the hinterland Mount Bromo, East Java. *Journal of Economics, Business, and Accountancy / Ventura*, 18(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.14414/JEBAV.V18I1.385>
- OECD. (2018). *OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 2018*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/tour-2018-en>
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Pati. (2019). *LAPORAN KINERJA INSTANSI PEMERINTAH LKjIP*.
- Rangkuti, F. (2015). *Analisis SWOT: Membedah Kasus Bisnis*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Reggers, A., Grabowski, S., Wearing, S., Chatterton, P., & Schweinsberg, S. (2016). Exploring outcomes of community-based tourism on the Kokoda Track, Papua New Guinea: a longitudinal study of Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(8–9), 1139–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1145229>
- Ristić, D., Vukočić, D., & Milinčić, M. (2019). Tourism and sustainable development of rural settlements in protected areas - Example NP Kopaonik (Serbia). *Land Use Policy*, 89, 104231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104231>
- Susanto, A., Susanto, A. D., & Bastari, A. (2019). FORMULATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF AN ORGANIZATION USING A SWOT ANALYSIS. *JOURNAL ASRO*, 10(3), 131–137. <https://doi.org/10.37875/asro.v10i3.171>
- Yopy, M., & Sitingjak, M. F. (2018). Developing performance excellence guidance for rural tourism (case study: wangun lestari village, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia). *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 126, 012064. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/126/1/012064>