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Abstract
Increasing tourism in Indonesia has significant improvement. In North Minahasa there is a super-priority destination known as Likupang. There are three places Marinsow, Pulisan, and Kinunang that focus on tourism development in Likupang. The purpose of this study is to examine the level of residents’ perceived benefits, perceived cost, attitude, and support toward tourism development in Likupang. Through a quantitative survey involving 304 samples, the present study analyzes SPSS statistics. This result indicates that the level of perceived benefits is very high (6.2). Next, the result for the perceived cost as the residents is a medium level (3.8). Moreover, the attitudes of residents are very high level (6.8). The last, the residents’ support for tourism development is very high level (6.9). The residents support tourism development in their areas. They feel more advantage from tourism development. If they have perceived the cost of that; they still support tourism development.
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INTRODUCTION

The tourism industry in Indonesia has shown constant growth. Evidence of tourism growth can be seen in the number of tourists, profitability, and social, cultural, and environmental footprints reaching almost every part of the world (Cholik, 2017). The tourism sector in Indonesia covers various aspects, including tourist attractions, tourism areas, tourist transportation services, food and beverage services, accommodation provision, organizing entertainment and recreational activities, organizing meetings, incentive trips, conferences and exhibitions, tourist information services, tourism consulting services, tour guide services, water and spa tours (Law of the Republic of Indonesia, 2020). Furthermore, the government is very supportive of business tourism in each region. Law of the Republic of Indonesia (2020) Number 11 on Job Creation Article 67 announced that concerning convenience permits the business tourism sector for the community, especially business actors. Tourism activities such as shopping, mobility, accommodation, and other activities will include tourists and residents as crucial actors in bottom-up urban transformation (Putro & Azkarifa, 2020).

Despite the significant developments in the tourism industry, movements against tourism are also emerging, especially from tourist destinations that attract large numbers of tourists. These are primarily supported by adverse effects such as over-tourism, tourist gentrification, or tourism phobia (e.g., Perkumienė & Pranskūnienė, 2019; Phi, 2020; González-pérez, 2019; Milano et al., 2019). Furthermore, Kurniawan & Primawardani (2021) stated that an imbalance occurs in local communities, specifically in the opportunities and conveniences of tourism development in Labuan Bajo, Komodo, Indonesia. The policy discrimination by the government is more inclined to be given to companies in carrying out their duties tourism business rather than to local communities. Likupang is the main target in tourism development. The Likupang super-priority tourism is supported by tourist villages built through the Government Regulation Ministry budget, namely the Marinsow tourist village, Pulisan village, Kinunang village by provide them with homestay (Diah, 2021). In promoting tourism, the Likupang Tourism Festival 2021 activity has been carried out on October 30 – 31, 2021 at Paal Beach,
Likupang, North Sulawesi (Ayu Nirala Marselly, 2021). Additionally, Wut et al. (2021) stated that from 1985 to 2020 spanning 36 years, only limited articles were published about tourism development.

This study aims to examine the mean level of residents’ perceived benefits, perceived cost, attitude, and support toward tourism development, intending to use this information to demystify the detrimental effects of tourism in local communities. A precise knowledge of the phenomenon, in which negative and positive consequences are assessed based on locals’ views, may assist planners in avoiding negative attitudes toward tourist growth and, as a result, reducing future conflicts between inhabitants and visitors (Cardoso & Silva, 2018).

Social Exchange Theory

Divergence of the resident attitude and support of a positive relationship between personal benefit and the support of tourism is needed by social exchange theory (Shtudiner et al., 2018; Olya & Gavilyan, 2017). Also, the researchers Lai et al., (2020) used the social exchange theory (SET) as the “theoretical framework to support the relationship between residents’ perceptions of tourism’s impact on their life satisfaction and their attitudes toward tourists” (p.3); explained resident’s attitudes (Woosnam et al., 2018). Also, Rasoolimanesh et al. (2015) described the social exchange theory as a process of exchange among residents and tourists. Furthermore, García et al. (2015) explained the social exchange theory of the basic theoretical that when the residents get the advantage without improper cost, they will arrange to work for the tourist. Social exchange theory using to measure the study of the Northeast Travel and Tourism Research Association (NETTRA) which contains four potential predictors of pro-tourism behavior that the residents at least 18 years of age to reach the population this research team classify 61 group communities which focus on residents in various parts of Georgia held on the social network as Facebook and Reddit and using online Qualtrics after the second posting of the survey in this study have got result 485 respondents for analysis and this research using SEM to analyzed the data and the result revealed that perceived positive and negative tourism the strongest significantly predictors of pro-tourism behavior. So, the recommend to manage tourism in communities when advancing communication strategies to further increase residents’ pro-tourism. (Barr & Woosnam, 2022).

Perceived Benefits

The researcher Moynul and Rahman (2016) evidenced that job opportunities, infrastructure development, increased income, economic benefit, recreation, business initiatives, and education system have significant positive relationships with the standard of living of the local community. Also, he stated that increased price level, traffic, noise, pollution, and cultural development do not have significant positive relationships with the standard of living of the local community. Researcher Papastathopoulos et al. (2019) researched UAE and found that they have a strong and positive perception of tourism’s overall social, cultural, and economic impacts, and the residents support tourism development. In the study from Kusherdyana (2021), there is no difference in perception of tourism based on gender and the positive impact they felt as improvement of infrastructure, the public facility, the opportunity of occupation, and investment for residents. In addition, the residents were very welcome in the international situation; a study in Costa Blanca (Spanish) showed that the education level tends to be better (Gonzalez et al., 2019).

Perceived Costs

Congestion is one of the negative impacts of tourism and the residents’ attitude about the increasing tourist will not lead them into conflict (Huy, 2020). A result study by Şorcaru et al., (2022) has a negative effect between the perceived cost and attitude toward tourism development caused that related to the increase of waste products.
Economic dependence on tourism development and give impact on the residents as the economic prosperity is greater positive and lower negative of tourism. (Gursoy et al., 2019). Also, the researcher Govender et al., (2021) explained that “residents’ have negative perceptions towards tourism, they are most likely to reject tourism developmental plans and activities”.

Attitude toward Tourism Development

Individual advantage from tourism improvement, particularly the understood social values within the handle of exchange for inhabitants, includes a noteworthy part on favorable demeanors toward tourism improvement (Baker & Ramaprasad, 2021). In general, the residents were emphatically slanted toward tourism, and its advancement as the community has a positive attitude of mind toward socio-cultural and financial benefits would result in a generally superior quality of life (Ramseook-Munhurrun & Naidoo, 2011). The perceived benefits of residents have the most vital relationship with the attitude toward tourism; the visitors will come back based on how they are treated by residents rather than how residents see visitors (Govender et al., 2021). Investigating perceptions and attitudes about tourism impacts is a fundamental step in tourism arranging, pointing at the arrangement of an agreeable tourism item for both residents and tourists (Huy, 2020).

In the study in rural communities, Bajrami et al. (2020) found the residents’ attitudes; they emphasized the importance of focusing on the local community as a significant role in tourism development, especially in regions that want to enhance their economy by developing sustainable tourism. Nevertheless, the unique study from Jun et al. (2016) findings indicate that “when most residents heavily rely on tourism in terms of jobs and income creation, even though they understand negative impacts of tourism, they still support tourism development.”. The researcher Shen et al. (2022) continued the statement that tourism companies doing charity to form a good reputation can improve their attitude toward tourism development. Also, tourism companies will support tourism development. Furthermore, Peters et al., (2018) found that more residents are willing to support it because of the more positive residents’ attitudes toward tourism development. Next, according to Harun et al., (2018) residents get more advantages the more they will support it.

Support for tourism development

Shaping of perceptions of residents impacts the support of tourism development (Stylidis et al., 2014). Perceived benefits assumed that support tourism. The researchers Nugroho and Numata (2020) revealed that “perceived economic benefits and community involvement exerted the greatest influence on resident support of tourism development.” Also, the study in Qinyan, China, an ancient town by Qin et al. (2021) showed that the resident’s support for tourism was affected by perceived personal benefits and positive tourism impact. They revealed that “residents with a lower tolerance for tourism were more sensitive to negative tourism impacts and thus tended to express lower support for tourism development.” Residents’ perception in Girona supported tourism development; it had shown that those who personally benefit from tourism and those closer to their societies were very supportive of tourism (Rua, 2020). Borobudur is one of the prime destinations in Indonesia; the study from Kusherdyana (2021) revealed that residents around Borobudur Temple Tourist Destinations found that they are very supportive and want to contribute to the development of tourism. Moreover, Rasoolimanesh and Jaafar (2016) revealed that residents positively perceive supporting tourism development to conserve Bujang Valley. Furthermore, the perception of residents in Bahoi Village found that the average residents support the development of natural tourism because it impacts them as there is additional income (Towoliu et al., 2018).

The perception of the residents in research by Musinguzi (2011) revealed that tourism had failed to alleviate poverty as most residents expected because the tourist does not stay for a long time in Allday’s residents, which leads to little or no benefits
from tourists to alleviate poverty. Still, their perception and attitude toward tourism are optimistic they anticipate that tourism will alleviate poverty in the future. Also, the researcher Moraru et al. (2021) revealed that residents like tourism activity showed growth and progress in tourism in Constanta, Romania. Three dimensions that significantly support tourism are respondents with solid psychological empowerment and perceived more positive impacts of tourism.

Respondents who perceived more negative effects were less likely to find support for local tourism development. Fascinatingly, whether or not people had personal economic benefits from tourism did not look as if to matter in terms of being supportive or experiencing more favorable or less unfavorable impacts (Neuts et al., 2021). Previous studies suggest that residents’ support is a function of their measurement of the potential economic, socio-cultural, and environmental costs of tourism development (Gursoy et al., 2019). Also, the study from S.M. Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar, (2016) the result of investigated the negative perception of having negative support for tourism development. Furthermore, Sánchez-Teba et al., (2019) found that a negative perception affects the negatively residents’ happiness. Next, the negative impact of environmental and sociocultural tourism negatively affected resident support (Guo, 2022).

Research Question
1. What is the mean level of tourism development benefits perceived by residents in Likupang?
2. What is the mean level of tourism development perceived cost by residents in Likupang?
3. What is the mean level of residents’ attitude toward tourism development in Likupang?
4. What is the mean level of the residents’ support for tourism development in Likupang?

Tourism is “people taking trips away from home and the industry” (Hunt & Layne, 1991). Also, according to the dictionary O.E.D (1974) in Leiper (1979) that “the theory and practicing of touring, traveling for pleasure.” Tourism is one part that the support of the government to generate regional revenue and growth of employment chances, besides making known national and cultural regional identity; Expanding and exploiting the potential of that area will be able to develop tourism (Rawung et al., 2019). The small island economy depends on Maldives’ tourism case (Adedoyin et al., 2021). Research by Lin et al. (2019) revealed that “10 of 29 regions experienced tourism-led growth (TLG) from 1978 to 2013 and 9 regions experienced economy-driven tourism growth (EDTG).” Regions with less-developed economies are more likely to experience tourism-led and economy-driven tourism growth. Furthermore, larger economic sizes and covering larger geographic areas are more likely to experience tourism-led growth. Tourism is the central part of the effect of climate change, and increasing tourism could help in the preservation of wilderness areas (Pröbstl-Haider et al., 2021; Ingólfsdóttir & Gunnarsdóttir, 2020).

Geographically, North Sulawesi located between 00˚15’51” N – 05˚34’06” N and 120˚07’00” E -127˚10’30” E. based on territory administration, North Sulawesi province has 11 districts and four cities, namely; Bolaang Mongondow, South Bolaang Mongondow, East Bolaang Mongondow, North Bolaang Mongondow, Archipelago Sangihe, Archipelago Siau Tagulandang Biaro, Archipelago Talaud, Minahasa, South Minahasa, Southeast Minahasa, North Minahasa, Bitung, Manado, Kotamobagu, Tomohon. (Lediknas, n.d.). Nevertheless, according to the Governor of North Sulawesi from Badan Pusat Statistik (2021), the data of domestic tourist trips from 2018 total 4,313,069 people, and in 2019 there were 6,899,359 people and showed an increase with entire 2,586,290 people, and in 2020 there was a decrease to 4,529,332 people; showing that amounted 2.370.027 decline from 2019 to 2020.
METHOD

In particular, this study utilized quantitative and primary data, which were collected through a questionnaire. This study was collected via a questionnaire survey with the locals and the method of snowball sampling. The respondents were approached in 3 villages, namely Marinsow, Pulisan, and Kinunang. The survey was implemented between April, May, and July 2022.

The data analysis process begins with descriptive statistics in SPSS statistics the purpose of descriptive statistics is to find out the mean level of perceived benefits, perceived cost, attitude, and support toward tourism development in Likupang.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Research Object Characteristics

Likupang is the one of super priority destinations of tourism located in North Minahasa. There are 3 (three) villages that have a big impact on tourism development known as Marinsow, Pulisan, and Kinunang. The residents in three villages have their homestay, hut on the beach, and bistro as the source of their income. The total homestay is 217 units spread over the area of Marinsow, Pulisan, and Kinunang. The tourism workers comprise only the residents, other villages are not permitted to work in this area.

Respondent Demographic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>13-25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>di atas 45</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>50.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Marinsow</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pulisan</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinunang</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 1 the respondents’ background information on gender, the total number of respondents who filled out the questionnaire was 304 residents. From the demographic data related to this gender and the highest percentage are women N=177 (58.22 %). Furthermore, there are four age groups of respondents. The largest age group is the age group above 45 N=150 (50.33%). Next, the residences of the respondents include Marinsow, Pulisan, and Kinunang. The largest number of residents from the data is Kinunang with the number of respondents N=111 (36.51).

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The result of the Descriptive Statistical Analysis provides the basis to answer research questions number one to four.

The Level of Perceived benefits of Tourism Development

Regarding research question number one, “what is the level of tourism development perceived benefit by residents?”, the mean level of variable perceived benefit was analyzed and interpreted. Based on the descriptive statistic results, perceived benefits had an average mean of 6.2 (See table 2). This result indicates that the level of
perceived benefits is Very High. The highest mean level in Perceived Benefits is PB 4 with an average of 6.66 with the statement that tourism development improves the appearance of the local area. Following PB 5 (6.60) the residents strongly agree with the item statement that tourism development improves the infrastructure in the tourism area, also PB 8 (6.44) agrees with the statement of increasing the resident’s pride in the local culture, PB 1 (6.39) agree with the statement of tourism development creates employment opportunity for the residents, PB 7 (6.28) agree with the statement of tourism development provides opportunities for socializing, PB 2 (6.16) agree with the statement of tourism development provides opportunities for local businesses, PB 3 (6.06) agree with this item that tourism development increase standard of living due to tourist spending to the community, PB 6 (5.81) agree with the items of tourism development makes residents feel uncomfortable living in a tourist hotspot, PC 5 has run with reverse, so the interpretation of this item is the residents mostly agree with the tourist’s hotspot in their place as the tourism place. Based on table 6 shows that...
The Level of Attitude Towards Tourism development

Regarding research question number three, “what is the mean level of residents’ attitude toward tourism development?”, the mean level of variable attitude towards tourism development was analyzed and interpreted. Based on the observation of variable attitude toward tourism had an average mean of 6.8 means based on table 4 the result of variable attitude is Very High Level. The highest value in the mean level of attitude in tourism development is AD 6 (6.95) the statement that their community should become more of a tourist destination and most respondents answered strongly agree. Following with AD 5 (6.94) strongly agree with the statement that the resident believes tourism should be actively encouraged in their local area. Next, AD 8 (6.91) the statement that they believe it is crucial to managing the growth of tourism in their local area. After that AD 7 (6.87) the statement they believe the tourism sector will continue to play a major role in the economy of the community. Thereafter, AD 2 (6.80) with item that tourism helps their community grow. Then, AD 1 (6.72) the item that tourism is one of the most important industry for their community. Moreover, AD 4 (6.67) explain they are proud in promoting tourism in their community. After that SD 2 (6.94) the statement they support the government effort in promoting tourism in their community. Following with SD 3 (6.96) strongly agree with the statement that the resident believes tourism plays an important economic role in their community. The summary statistics of attitude toward tourism development can be found in Table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Subcontracts</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>AD 1</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>10.020</td>
<td>-3.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism</td>
<td>AD 2</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>35.847</td>
<td>-5.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>AD 3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>-2.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>AD 4</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>13.546</td>
<td>-3.680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism development</td>
<td>AD 5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>12.171</td>
<td>-3.754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>AD 6</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>14.309</td>
<td>-4.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism development</td>
<td>AD 7</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>44.910</td>
<td>-6.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>AD 8</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>15.899</td>
<td>-3.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Level of Support Towards Tourism development

Regarding the research question number four, “what is the mean level of the local residents’ support for tourism development?” mean level of variable support towards tourism development was analyzed and interpreted. Based on the observation of variable Support toward tourism had average mean 6.9 it means based on table 5 the result of variable support is Very High Level. The highest value in mean level of support in tourism development is SD1 (6.97) the statement that they support the development of tourism as it is vital to my community. Following with SD 3 (6.96) strongly agree with statement that they support tourism and would like to see it become important part of their community. Next, SD 6 (6.95) the statement that they support the government effort in promoting tourism in their community. After that SD 2 (6.94) the statement they support government programs in developing their local area as a tourist destination. Thereafter, SD 5 (6.76) with item that their community should try to attract more tourists. Finally, SD 4 (6.58) mention that they support new tourism facilities that will attract more tourism in their community. The summary statistics of support can be found in table 5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Subcontracts</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>SD 1</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>115.382</td>
<td>-9.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism development</td>
<td>SD 2</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>80.527</td>
<td>-8.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>SD 3</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>39.153</td>
<td>-6.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism development</td>
<td>SD 4</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>10.863</td>
<td>-3.479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support toward</td>
<td>SD 5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>21.319</td>
<td>-4.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourism development</td>
<td>SD 6</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>17.062</td>
<td>-4.353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

The highest mean level in Perceived Benefits is the statement that tourism development improves appearance of the local area. It shows with new bridge, high road, and their village is more organized. Residents mostly agree with improving the infrastructure in the tourism area; showed with more homestay and new building. Also, the resident’s pride in the local culture, because more event held in their place and perform the culture. Furthermore, creates employment opportunity and more opportunity in socializing for the local residents. Next, only the residents can run their business in tourism areas.

Perceived cost of residents in increasing congestions doesn’t occurred because they have high street, congestions happened few years ago and the government solved with high street. So, the visitors and local residents not having problem with congestion. Instead of, the residents very support to attract more tourist come into their place. The residents stated that increasing produces waste products in their place but they have a solution with TPS3R. Also, residents don’t feel the pollution because of many trees and clean air. There is no increasing crime in Likupang in fact more save; they maintain security together for the convenience of visitors and hope that visitors can come back again.

Local resident very welcome and support toward tourism as a host of community in tourism development because they feel the more advantage they have; as they believe that tourism its crucial to manage the growth, also tourism sector will continue to be main in the economy in their community.
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