*PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*
*ISSN 2454-5899*

*Astawa & Putri Suardani, 2017*

*Volume 3, No.2, pp. 1804-1821*

*Date of Publication: 30th October, 2017*

*DOI-https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.32.18041821*

*This paper can be cited as: Astawa, I., & Suardani, A. (2017). Spatial Carrying Capacity in Kuta Tourism Area for Revisiting Tourists. PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3(2), 1804-1821.*



# SPATIAL CARRYING CAPACITY IN KUTA TOURISM AREA FOR REVISITING TOURISTS

**I Ketut Astawa**
*Tourism Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Badung, Indonesia*
ketutastawa@pnb.ac.id

**Anak Agung Putri Suardani**
*Accounting Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Badung, Indonesia*
anakagungputrisuardani@gmail.com

## Abstract

*Kuta is the pioneer of tourism starts from the early 20th century when Bali was recently discovered as a tourism area. The community relies largely on tourism revenues, yet carrying capacity and revisiting tourists research has not been done. This study therefore, attempts to analyze (1) influence of congestion/density, (2) influence of cleanliness, (3) influence of land and (4) influence of design/layout respectively on revisiting tourists. Data collected through questionnaires and conducted at 80 tourists in Kuta tourism area. Multiple regression analysis used in this study. The analysis showed that congestion/density has a positive and significant effect on revisiting tourists. Cleanliness, land, and design/layout has a positive effect but not significant. The positive impact of socioeconomic are rising incomes, increasing employment, and knowledge for the local community. While the negative impacts such as consumptive lifestyles, the population density, and less land. Further research needs to be done to assess the*



`

*economic aspects, develop future research projects relating to environmental tourism areas and revisiting tourists' behaviors.*

**Keywords**

Spatial Carrying Capacity, Density, Social-Economy, Revisiting Tourists

## 1. Introduction

Indonesia is a developing country which is interested in developing the tourism industry in the development sector. The tourism industry can increase incomes, increase employment and can absorb a lot of manpower. A significant part of the income for touristic suppliers in the region is realized by local and neighboring residents. Local and regional population plays a major role in the maintenance and innovation of the recreational infrastructure (Iryani, 2014; Anikó, 2017).

Focus of this research is in Kuta tourism area, Bali. Tourist visits to Kuta continue to increase as well as the construction of tourism support facilities continue to grow. Tourists who visit to Bali repeatedly still remain interested to visit again because of Bali as a world tourism icon. Previous research showed that with growing concerns regarding environmental issues such as global warming, habitat depletion and destruction, many individuals now realize that their purchasing decisions directly influence the environment (Lee et. al, 2010; Jeon et al, 2015). According to Gustin and Weaver (1996), the traveler apparently expects the hotel industry to pay attention to environmental concerns, and to operate within sustainability. About 85 percent of leisure travelers consider themselves environmentally conscious according to the 2008 National Leisure Travel Monitor survey (Crocker, 2008). About 34 percent of business travelers answered that they look for ecologically friendly hotels, and 38 percent have researched green hotels (Causing, 2008).

Bali is a small island with a population of nearly 4 million people and has an area of 5,632 km2, has limited physical and environmental carrying capacity. As the development of Tourism in Bali, the number of tourists' visit are increasing. Increased tourist visits are making the tourism industry adds products or facilities that can support the development of tourism. Where such activities can damage the quality of the tourist environment and also can reduce the level of security and comfort of tourists during their stay in the tourist destination. Santoso et al (2014) found that policies, plans and programs in masterplan should consider the environment



`

carrying capacity through SEA (Strategic Environment Assessment). Using comparative analysis, SEA in masterplan of East Java Province has not fully described how the environmental capacity could accommodate spatial activities. Lane (2010) conclude that carrying capacity assessment (CCA) is a vital tool by which to measure the inherent local and regional productive limits for a given area of land. From a spatial planning perspective, CCA informs not only the size of any development but also the systemic processes involved in its design. Our level of consumption has been driven more by consumer desire than any physical environmental constraints. Therefore, as a tourist destination, Bali should make a plan to anticipate the lack of land and minimize the negative impacts that may occur on the environment.

In fact, tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area has grown rapidly can be seen from a row of commercial buildings that sell handicraft items, souvenirs and shops that provide goods and services that can be found along the streets of Seminyak, Legian, and Kuta.

The Room Occupancy Rate of star-rated hotels in Badung regency in January 2013 averaged 67.28 percent, increase 2.96 points compared to 64.32 percent in December 2012. The average length of stay of foreign and domestic guests at star-rated hotels in Badung regency in January 2013 reached 3.79 days. This figure rose 0.6 points compared to the average length of stay of guests in December which reached 3.19 days (source from badungkab.bps.go.id).

Kuta district has an area of 17.52 Km2 which consists of 5 villages with a population of 38.771 people. Kuta village which has an area of 7.23 Km2 consists of 13 Banjars with a population of 12 587 inhabitants. Legian village has an area of 305 hectares which consists of three Banjars. These areas are full of tourism facilities such as hotels, restaurants, spas, villas, malls, and so forth. This area is a very popular area by the tourists so that investors are competing to build tourism facilities in this area so that congestion and density was unavoidable.

The development of tourism facilities is expected to have a positive impact on the community in the area where the development is carried out such as improving the economy, opening more jobs, and can prosper the community. In addition, it is expected that the development can provide benefits for the preservation of nature, culture and the environment. But in fact, with the development of tourism many negative impacts are felt such as the depletion of natural resources, socio-cultural issues, and environment. Dealing with the development of tourism, Rahmafitria (2017) indicate that the development should consider natural resources capacity and the quality of local community human resources as the management.



`

The development of uncontrolled tourism facilities can cause environmental damage, so there is a need to limit the number of visitors and the construction of supporting facilities (carrying capacity). Carrying capacity is defined as follows: The maximum number of people who can use a site without an unacceptable alteration in the physical environment, without an unacceptable decline in the quality of experience rained by visitors, and without an unacceptable adverse impact on the society, economy, and culture of the tourism area" (Inskeep, 1991). So, the meaning of carrying capacity is the limits or ceilings that should not be passed in the development and development of tourism.

Spatial carrying capacity in a region is an important factor to be considered in order to develop tourism facilities such as restaurant, money changer, lodging, hotels, villa, home stay, bungalow and parking area. Therefore, every effort to utilize natural resources for development activities must be environmentally friendly (Soemarwoto, 1987). Carrying capacity is considered to minimize the negative impacts that can occur in a tourist area such as environmental damage due to development density and visitors, in addition carrying capacity needs to be considered in order not to happen excess capacity on a tourist area that can cause discomfort from the community around the area and also for the tourists. Problems to be examined in this research are as follows:

- What is the condition of spatial carrying capacity in Kuta tourism area?
- How is the influence of spatial carrying capacity on revisiting tourists?
- How is the socio-economic impact of the development of tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area?

This study is to examine whether Kuta tourism area is still interesting for revisiting tourists. The finding of this study may be useful for tourism stakeholders in Bali or in Kuta tourism area in particular.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Tourism and Tourists

Based on UU No. 10/2009 on tourism, which is meant by tourism is a wide range of tourism activities supported by various facilities and services provided by the community, entrepreneurs, government and local government. According to Kodyat (1983) tourism is a journey from one place to another, temporary, done by individuals or groups, in an effort to seek



`

balance or harmony and happiness with the environment in the social, cultural, natural and scientific dimension. Henniker and Kraft in the international association of scientific expert in tourism defined the tourism is the sum of phenomena relationship arising from the travel and stay of none residence, and so far, they do not lead the permanent residence and are not connected with earning activity (Rokasita, 2015).

According to Wahab (1985) explains tourism is one kind of new industry capable of generating rapid economic growth in the provision of employment, income generation, living standards and stimulate other productivity sectors. As a complex sector, tourism also encompasses classic industries such as handicrafts and souvenirs, lodging, transportation economically also seen as industry.

According to Smith in Kusumaningrum (2009), explaining that tourists are people who are not working, or are on vacation and volunteer to visit other areas to get something else. Based on law No. 10/2009 on tourism, which means tourists are people who do the tour. Based on the WTO (in Kusumaningrum, 2009) divides tourists into three parts:

- A visitor is any person who relates to any other state in which he has a residence, on the grounds of doing the work provided by the state he visits.
- A traveler is any person who resides in a State without regard to his nationality, visits to a place in the same state for more than 24 hours whose travel destinations may be classified as follows: (1) Utilizing leisure time for recreation, leisure, health, education, religious and sports. (2) Business or visiting family.
- Excursions or excursionists are temporary visitors who stay less than 24 hours in the visited country, including people who are traveling by cruise ship.

**2.2 Spatial**

Spatial structure is a form of space and spatial structure arranged in national, regional and local. Nationally (Indonesia) called the National Spatial Plan, which is specified in the provincial spatial plan, and the spatial plan needs to be elaborated into the Urban Spatial Plan. Space is defined as a container that includes land space, sea space, and air space, including space in the earth as a single territory, where humans and other living beings, perform activities, and maintain their survival.

Spatial in term of tourism development, physical limitations may be a determining factor in setting limits. These may include limited water supply, a fragile ecology (both flora and fauna)



`

to be protected, the capacity of roads to allow increased traffic, the number of rooms or the amount of entertainment facilities available or desirable, the amount of labor available, etc. A detailed inventory of natural and man-made attractions and the location and number of support facilities is needed to determine the physical limitations. From this information existing maximum visitor numbers able to be handled can be determined. Detailed analysis of the physical effects of existing numbers will then determine future capacities. Better environmental management system will allow greater numbers of visitors.

Based on the law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 4 of 2011 on Geospatial Information, spatial is the spatial aspect of an object or event that includes location and position.

**2.3 Carrying Capacity**

Carrying capacity (carrying capacity) is defined as the maximum population that can be supported by a particular habitat indefinitely without damaging the productivity of the habitat permanently (Rees and Wackernagel, 1996).

According to O'Reilly in Hunter (1995) there are two aspects in terms of carrying capacity. First, the concept of carrying capacity is related to the ability of a destination or region to absorb the impact of a development or development of tourism before its negative impact becomes real. Secondly, in relation to the perception of tourists, where the number of tourists who come to a tourist destination down because psychologically has exceeded the limits of negative perceptions that can be tolerated by tourists so that the destination is not interesting anymore for tourists. Both understanding of the carrying capacity above clearly shows the scope of supply (destination) that is physical and demand (tourists) that is psychological.

The limits of the ability to supply resources and to assimilate pollutants as well as social tensions are called carrying capacity. According Soemarwoto (2009), seen from an environmental perspective, Mathieson and Wall (1982 in William and Gill, 2004) define carrying capacity as "the maximum number of people who can use an unacceptable decline in the quality of the experience gained by visitors ".

Understanding from a social perspective, carrying capacity is defined by Ap & Crompton (1998 in William and Gill, 2004) as "... a destination's ability to absorb tourist without unacceptable negative effects."…level at which inappropriate impacts occur are dependent on values determined by the community as opposed to the visitor".



`

The definitions above substantively contain the following principles: 1) the maximum limit of people or tourists who can take advantage of an area or destination; 2) without having a physical adverse effect on the destination; 3) decrease the quality of travel experience felt by tourists, or 4) negatively, socially, economically, and culturally acceptable impacts on the destination.

According to Inskeep (1991) variable criteria can be divided into two that can be used to measure carrying capacity, namely 1) the indigenous physical and socioeconomic environment and 2) the tourism image and tourist product. The indigenous physical and socioeconomic environment refers to the capacity of a managed destination without causing damage to the physical environment (natural and man-made) and causing economic and socio-cultural problems to local communities. This concept also requires a balance of tourism development and nature conservation which can be identified by:

- Physical environment variable
  1. The acceptance level will be the visual impact and congestion
  2. Ecological handling plan before the damage occurs
  3. Conservation of vegetation and animals both land and sea
  4. Acceptable air, water, and sound pollution levels
- Economic variables
  1. The number of optimum tourists that are economically beneficial
  2. The most optimum level of employment for local people.
- Socio-cultural variables
  1. The level of tourism development that can be absorbed without disrupting the life or lifestyle and socio-cultural activities of the community
  2. The level or number of tourists who can assist the maintenance and conservation of belief systems, arts, crafts, customs, traditions, and cultural heritage without resulting in degradation of values
- Infrastructure variable
  1. The adequacy and availability of transportation facilities and services
  2. Adequacy and availability of water supply facilities, electricity, household waste and solid waste (heavy), and telecommunications
  3. Adequacy and availability of other public facilities such as health and safety facilities



`

The tourism image and tourist product referring to the capacity of the number of visitors or tourists aligned or in accordance with the tourism products offered, the type of environment, and nature of the destination and the cultural experience desired by tourists so that they get satisfaction from the activities of their tour. If the image of the destination and the tourism product offered is degraded, then the quality and popularity will also decrease. Variables that can be used as the determination of the capacity or the optimum level of a destination are:

- Physical variable
    1. Hygiene in general and pollution level as low as possible from the destination and surrounding natural environment
    2. Lack of density, clutter and congestion including variations of tourist attractions
    3. The attractiveness of the destination includes the quality and character of architectural design
    4. Maintenance of ecological systems and natural attractions (flora and fauna)
- Economic variables
    1. Travel costs and value for money
- Socio-cultural variables
    1. Quality of local arts, crafts, food, artistic performances
    2. Hospitality and friendship of the local community
    3. Intrinsic interest from local community including its culture
- Infrastructure variable
    1. Standard of facilities and transportation services
    2. Standard of basic facilities (water, electricity, telephone, etc.)
    3. Standard of other public facilities

According to Inskeep, each destination or area of tourism is unique and the variables used to measure carrying capacity should be specifically tailored to the characteristics of the destination. Some variables are qualitative and some quantitative. Generally, carrying capacity calculations should take into account seasonal factors in tourism.



`

# 3. Methodology

Research location is in Kuta tourism area. In this study the dependent variable is revisiting tourists (Y) and the independent variable is spatial carrying capacity: congestion/density ($X_1$), cleanliness ($X_2$), land ($X_3$) and design/layout ($X_4$).

Primary data used in this study is the result of filling questionnaires by respondents (tourists in the tourist area of Kuta). Secondary data used in this study is the number of tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area from 2010-2016, the level of visits to Kuta tourism area during the year 2010-2016. For the purposes of quantitative analysis, the answers are scored, very agree/very know/very positive given score 5; agree/know/positive given score 4; disagree/enough know/never/negative given score 3; strongly disagree/do not know/never given score 2; and score 1 for neutral.

Respondent sample of tourists is non-probability sampling and technique used is incidental sampling. Respondent is anyone (tourists) who have visited Bali at least for the second visit. Sample size is determined by using the formula 15 or 20 times to the independent variable (Hair, 1998), so there are 80 respondents (20 x 4 indicators). The data were collected by questionnaire. Data is analysed by multiple linear regression (Ghozali, 2005):

$$Y = a + b1X_1 + b2X_2 + b3X_3 + b4X_4 + e \quad (1)$$

# 4. Findings and Discussion

## 4.1 Profile of respondents

Respondent characteristic is explained into six categories: gender, age, residence, occupation, education and visit frequency. In brief, the characteristic of respondent showed that 55% respondents are male and the age mostly from 25 to 34 years old. Majority of the respondent are from Australia. Educational background is mainly from higher education and most of them are professional. Finding also showed that more than 60 percent respondent have visited Kuta tourism area from 2 until 8 times. The six categories in more detail is showed in Table 1.



`

**Table 1:** *The characteristic of respondent*

| No | Variable | Category | Number | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Gender | Female | 36 | 45 |
| | | Male | 44 | 55 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |
| 2 | Age | < 24 | 11 | 14 |
| | | 25-34 | 32 | 40 |
| | | 35-44 | 15 | 19 |
| | | 45-54 | 10 | 13 |
| | | 55-64 | 7 | 9 |
| | | 65-74 | 3 | 4 |
| | | >74 | 2 | 3 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |
| 3 | Residence | USA | 6 | 7.5 |
| | | Australia | 31 | 38.8 |
| | | Brazil | 2 | 2.5 |
| | | Canada | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | England | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | France | 3 | 3.8 |
| | | Germany | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | Indonesia | 21 | 26.3 |
| | | Italy | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | Japan | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | Lithuania | 2 | 2.5 |
| | | Malaysia | 7 | 8.8 |
| | | New Zealand | 2 | 2.5 |
| | | Russia | 1 | 1.3 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |
| 4 | Occupation | Management | 19 | 23.8 |
| | | Operation | 10 | 12.5 |
| | | Professional | 43 | 53.8 |
| | | Others | 8 | 10.0 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |
| 5 | Education | Primary School | 5 | 6.3 |
| | | High School | 14 | 17.5 |
| | | Tertiary | 61 | 76.3 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |
| 6 | Visit frequency | 2 - 8 | 52 | 65 |
| | | 9 - 15 | 14 | 17.5 |
| | | 16 - 22 | 6 | 7.5 |
| | | 23 - 29 | 1 | 1.25 |
| | | 30 - 36 | 2 | 2.5 |
| | | 37 - 43 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 44 - 50 | 5 | 6.25 |
| | | Total | 80 | 100 |

### 4.2 Condition of spatial carrying capacity in Kuta tourism area

In addition to tourists, local people and transportation are part of the density that occurs in Kuta tourism area. Most residents have private vehicles and are reluctant to use public



`

transportation because they have not been able to provide good service. There are several types of vehicles commonly found in Kuta tourism area such as, motorcycle taxi, car, sarbagita trans bus, komotra, bus, and taxi. Population density in this region reached 36,392 people/km$^2$. According to law number: 56 of 1960, divide the classification of population density into four, as shown in Table 2. Based on this category it can be said that Kuta tourism area is included in a very crowded category where the density in this area exceeds 401 persons/km$^2$.

**Table 2:** *The Classification of Population Density*

| **Population Density Per Square Kilometer** | **Area Class** |
|---|---|
| a. Until 50 | is not densely populated |
| b. 51 to 250 | less dense |
| c. 251 sampi 400 | is quite densely populated |
| d. 401 and up | is very densely populated |

Source: UU No: 56/1960.

### 4.3 Output

**Table 3:** *The influence of congestion, cleanliness, land design/layout on revisiting tourists*

| **ANOVA** | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 2.647 | 4 | .662 | 3.345 | .014 |
| | Residual | 14.840 | 75 | .198 | | |
| | Total | 17.487 | 79 | | | |

| **Coefficients** | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.281 | .534 | | 4.269 | .000 | | |
| | Congestion/Density | .225 | .076 | .318 | 2.946 | .004 | .971 | 1.029 |
| | Cleanliness | .066 | .090 | .097 | .733 | .466 | .650 | 1.539 |
| | Land | .131 | .106 | .151 | 1.233 | .221 | .754 | 1.326 |
| | Design/Layout | .046 | .091 | .059 | .502 | .617 | .831 | 1.204 |



`

Data were tested using ANOVA and followed by multiple regression. The p value <0.05 were consider significant. In this study p value for ANOVA model is 0.014, it means significant, showed in table 3. The results of each variable coefficient can be explained as follows:

### 4.3.1 The influence of congestion/density toward revisiting tourists

The results of hypothesis ($H_1$) has proved there is influence between congestion/density on revisiting tourists. The results have obtained t value of 2, 946 with the significance level 0.04 is smaller than 0.05, thus $H_a$ accepted and $H_0$ rejected. This test statistically proves that congestion/density has a positive effect on revisiting tourists. This means that the congestion/density makes respondents complain to revisit but in fact respondents said they would return to visit with the hope that the government trying to deal with the congestion problem that occurred in Kuta tourism area.

$$Y = 2{,}281 + 0{,}225\ X_1 + 0{,}066\ X_2 + 0{,}131\ X_3 + 0{,}046\ X_4$$

### 4.3.2 The influence of cleanliness on revisiting tourists

The results of hypothesis ($H_2$) has proved that there is no influence between cleanliness with revisiting tourists. The result of t value is 0,733 with the level of significance 0.466 is greater than 0.05, thus $H_a$ rejected and $H_0$ accepted. This test statistically proves that cleanliness does not have a positive effect on revisiting tourists. This means that there is no influence between the cleanliness variable on revisiting tourists to Kuta tourism area.

### 4.3.3 The influence of land on revisiting tourists

The results of hypothesis ($H_3$) has proved that there is no influence between land with revisiting tourists. The result of t value is 1.233 with the level of significance 0.221 is greater than 0.05, thus $H_a$ rejected and $H_0$ accepted. This test statistically proves that land has no positive effect on revisiting tourists. This means that there is no influence between land variables on revisiting tourists to Kuta tourism area.

### 4.3.4 The influence of design/layout on revisiting tourists

The results of hypothesis ($H_4$) has proved there is no influence between the design/layout with revisiting tourists. The result of t value is 0.502 with the level of significance 0.617 is greater than 0.05, thus $H_a$ rejected and $H_0$ accepted. This test statistically proves that the



`

design/layout has no positive effect on revisiting tourists. This means that there is no influence between design/layout variables on revisiting tourists to Kuta tourism area.

### 4.4 Socio-economic impacts arising from the development of tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area

The tourism sector is a potential sector to be developed as one source of local revenue. The development of tourism in Kuta tourism area is expected to contribute to economic development. The development of tourism is also expected to encourage and accelerate the economic growth of people around the tourist area. The average income of local people around Kuta tourism area is presented in Table 4.

**Table 4:** *Average Income of Local Communities Year 2014 – 2016*

| Type of Work | Average Income in Rupiah | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Farmers | 45,000,000 | 36,000,000 | 34,000,000 |
| Fisherman | 57,600,000 | 54,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| Entrepreneur | 90,000,000 | 120,000,000 | 130,000,000 |
| Craftsman/Small Industry | 44,400,000 | 54,000,000 | 55,000,000 |
| Lawyer | 120,000,000 | 120,000,000 | 120,000,000 |
| Private employees | 45,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 65,000,000 |
| Employees of Government | 36,000,000 | 36,000,000 | 36,000,000 |
| Government employees | 36,000,000 | 36,000,000 | 36,000,000 |
| Retired civil servants | 40,500,000 | 40,500,000 | 40,500,000 |
| Mechanic | 32,400,000 | 36,000,000 | 38,000,000 |
| Private Doctor | 120,000,000 | 144,000,000 | 150,000,000 |
| Midwife | 24,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 33,000,000 |
| Others | 27,600,000 | 30,000,000 | 32,000,000 |
| Total | 718,500,000 | 796,500,000 | 796,500,000 |

Source: processed results of the research

The agricultural sector has decreased by 9,000,000 rupiahs in 2015. The decrease of income also occurred in fishermen in Kuta tourism area of 3,600,000 rupiahs. The decline in the role of the sector means that the agricultural and fishery sectors are still less rapid in delivering value compared to other sectors, especially those sustained by the tourism industry.

The rapidly growing of tourism industry is driving the growth of entrepreneurs, craftsmen/small industries, and private employees who are increasing incomes. Entrepreneurs have increased income by 30,000,000 rupiahs from 2014. Income from craftsmen/small



`

industries increased by 9,600,000 rupiahs. For private employees increased by 15,000,000 rupiahs. On average, revenue in 2015 and 2016 is stable.

The development of tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area caused various impacts. The positive economic impacts for the people in the Kuta tourism area are the increasing of business field by 87 business units per year with the type of souvenir shop, increasing the employment in line with the increasing number of businesses in Kuta tourism area, the number of staff needed is increased, increase public income, and encourage the growth of the community trade sector such as opening kiosks to sell food and beverages, handicrafts, and souvenir around Kuta tourism area. Positive social impacts such as broadening people's insight about the nations of the world, encouraging the increasing education and skills of the community.

The social impact according to Cooper (1993) arises because the tourism industry involves three things: tourists, local people, and the relationship of tourists and society. Socio-cultural impacts arise in the event of an interaction between tourists and the community when (1) the tourists need the product and buy it from the community along with the demands as it wishes, (2) tourism brings an informal relationship and the tourism entrepreneur changes the spontaneous attitude of society into commercial transactions, and (3) tourists and the society face to face and exchange information or ideas, leading to new ideas. Negative social impacts in Kuta tourism area such as, the occurrence of commercialization, the blurring of identity and historical value, the occurrence of population density, and the urgency of local communities. As a result of negative economic impacts such as the development of consumptive lifestyles, the tightening of price competition, and encouraging the emergence of inflation.

## 5. Conclusion

The conclusion from previous discussion that congestion/density variable has a positive effect on revisiting tourists. This means that the congestion/density makes respondents complain to revisit, but in fact respondents said they would return to visit with the hope that the government trying to deal with congestion problem occurred in Kuta tourism area. Variables of cleanliness, land, and design/layout have a positive but not significant effect on revisiting tourists. This means that there is no influence between the variables of cleanliness, land, and design/layout to revisiting tourists in Kuta tourism area. In short period, Kuta tourism area is still interesting for revisiting tourists.



`

Various impacts caused by the development of tourism facilities in Kuta tourism area. The positive economic impacts for the people in Kuta tourism area are increasing business field, increasing employment, increasing public income, and encouraging the growth of the community trade sector. Positive social impacts such as broadening people's insight about the nations of the world, encouraging the increasing education and skills of the community. Negative social impacts in Kuta tourism area such as, the occurrence of commercialization, the blurring of identity and historical value, the occurrence of population density, and the urgency of local communities. As a result of negative economic impacts such as the development of consumptive lifestyles, the tightening of price competition, and encouraging the emergence of inflation.

Based on the conclusion mentioned earlier, suggestions that can be given in this research are: 1) the government should conduct guidance and inspection to Kuta tourism area to monitor the tourism facilities which have no license, 2) to improve road infrastructure, increase public transportation with quality and services that can make its users feel safe and comfortable; 3) provide decent parking space in Kuta tourism area to reduce parking on roads causing congestion; 4) foster tourism industry stakeholders, especially hotels and restaurants to implement better waste management system (solid or liquid). Further research should add other variables such as economic variables, socio-cultural and infrastructure that can affect revisiting tourists because with the increasing revisiting tourists will affect both the socio-economic conditions of society.

## Reference

Anikó, H. U. S. Z. (2017). Experience Oriented Exploitation Of The Natural And Cultural Resources Of Mosonmagyaróvár And Its Surroundings, A Hungarian Micro-Region. People: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3(2).

Clausing, J. (2008). Survey: Boomers more likely to go green in business travel. Travel Weekly, 67(2), 22.

Crocker, M. (2008). Among leisure travellers surveyed, nearly everyone professes to be green. Retrieved August, 12, 2008.

Dinas Pariwisata Provinsi Bali. Statistik Kedatangan Wisatawan Nusantara dan Asing ke Bali. http://www.disparda.baliprov.go.id/id/Statistik2.



`

Ghozali, Imam. (2005). Aplikasi Analisis Multivarians dengan Program SPSS. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro

Gustin, M. E., & Weaver, P. A. (1996). Are hotels prepared for the environmental consumer? Hospitality Research Journal, 20(2), 1-14.

Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., and Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hunter, Colin. (1995). Key Concept for Tourism and The Environment in Hunter, Colin & Howard Green. 1995. Tourism and Environment. New York: Routledge.

Inskeep, Edward. (1991). Tourism Planning: an integrated and sustainable development approach. Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Iryani, B. S., Yulistyawati, K. (2014) Statistik Profil Wisatawan Nusantara (Profil Penduduk Indonesia yang Melakukan Perjalanan). Indonesia, Jakarta: Kementerian Pariwisata.

Jeon, S. M., Jeong, W., & Kim, D. (2015). The Effects Of Green Hotel Practices On Hotel Image, Visit Intention, And Word-Of-Mouth: Focusing On The Moderating Roles Of Consumer Environmental Worldviews. People: International Journal of Social Sciences, 1(1).

Kodyat, H. (1983). Sejarah Pariwisata dan Perkembangnannya di Indonesia. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakarta.

Kusumaningrum, Dian. (2009). Persepsi Wisatawan Nusantara Terhadap Daya Tarik Wisata Di Kota Palembang. Tesis PS. Magister Kajian Pariwisata. Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Lane, M. (2010). The carrying capacity imperative: Assessing regional carrying capacity methodologies for sustainable land-use planning. Land Use Policy, 27(4), 1038-1045.

Lee, J. S., Hsu, L. T., Han, H., & Kim, Y. (2010). Understanding how consumers view green hotels: how a hotel's green image can influence behavioural intentions. Journal of sustainable tourism, 18(7), 901-914.

Madjid, Arief Zuchrizal. (2014). Analisis Daya Dukung Wilayah dalam Pengembangan Industri Besar dan Sedang. Jurnal Ilmiah. Malang: Universitas Brawijaya. (29 Januari 2015, 10:16 PM)

Muta'ali, Luthfi. (2011). Environmental Carrying Capacity Based on Spatial Planning. Indonesian Journal of Geography. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada. (5 Februari 2015, 6:21 PM)



`

Pariwisata Indonesia Vol. 6 No. 6. Yang Hendak Dicapai Tahun 2015. https://books.google.co.id/. (15 Maret 2015, 20:04)

Pranoto, Alfatana Bharayat. (2007). Hubungan Kepadatan Pemukiman Dengan Ketersediaan Infrastruktur. Program Pasca Sarjana Magister Teknik Sipil- Konsentrasi Infrastruktur. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro. (8 Juni 2015,14:00 PM)

Rahmafitria, F., Wirakusuma, R. M., & Riswandi, A. (2017). Development Of Tourism Potential In Watersports Recreation, Santirah River, Pangandaran Regency, Indonesia. People: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3(1).

Rees, W., & Wackernagel, M. (1996). Urban ecological footprints: why cities cannot be sustainable—and why they are a key to sustainability. Environmental impact assessment review, 16(4-6), 223-248.

Rokasita, N. (2015). The Tourism Potency of Benteng Kuto Besal Plaza Palembang (Doctoral dissertation, Politeknik Negeri Sriwijaya).

Rossi Evita, I Nyoman Sirtha, I Nyoman Sunartha. (2012). Dampak Perkembangan Pembangunan Sarana Akomodasi Wisata Terhadap Pariwisata Berkelanjutan di Bali. Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata. Denpasar: Universities Udayana. (16 Juni 2014, 6:05 PM)

Santoso, E. B., Erli, H. K. D. M., Aulia, B. U., & Ghozali, A. (2014). Concept of carrying capacity: Challenges in spatial planning (Case study of East Java Province, Indonesia). Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 135, 130-135.

Schroll, H., Andersen, J., & Kjærgård, B. (2012). Carrying Capacity: an approach to local spatial planning in Indonesia. The journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies, 11(1), 27-39.

Soemarwoto, Otto. (2009). Analisis Mengenai Dampak Lingkungan Edisi ke-13. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Som, A. P. M., Marzuki, A., Yousefi, M., & AbuKhalifeh, A. N. (2012). Factors influencing visitors' revisit behavioral intentions: a case study of Sabah, Malaysia. International Journal of marketing studies, 4(4), 39.

Sugiyono. (2012). Metode Penelitian Bisnis. Bandung: Alfabeta.



`

Surya Diarta, I Ketut. (2012). Carrying Capacity *Dalam Perencanaan Pariwisata Berkelanjutan*. Seminar Tantangan Pembangunan Kepariwisataan Bali Berkelanjutan. Program Doktor (S3) Pariwisata. Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.

Undang-Undang No. 56 PRP tahun 1960) Tentang Penetapan Luas Tanah Pertanian Presiden republik Indonesia.

Wahab, Saleh, Ph.D. (1985). Manajemen Pariwisata. PT. Pradya Paramitha.Jakarta.

Weaver, David. (2006). Sustainable Tourism. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.

William P, Gill A. (1998). Tourism Carrying Capacity Management Issues. W.F. Theobald (Ed). Global Tourism: The Next Decade 231-246. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Williams, P. and Gill A.M. (2004). "Addressing destination carrying capacity challenges through growth management" Chapter 10 in W. Theobald (ed) Global Tourism Boston: Butterworth Heinemann, pp. 194-212.



`