Factor Analysis of Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC) Implementation on The Development of Nature-Based Tourism Villages in Bali Province

Luh Linna Sagitarini[1], Made Sudiarta[2], and Ayu Dwi Yulianthi[3]

[1,2,3] Tourism Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Bali, Indonesia
linnasagitarini@pnb.ac.id

Abstract. This study examines how integrated marketing communication influences the administration of nature-based tourism villages and determines the extent to which it directly affects these villages. These elements include advertising, sales promotion, direct marketing, public relations, sponsorships, exhibitions, packaging, merchandising, and sales management concerning the management of Bali's nature and environment-based tourist villages, as well as the factors that have the greatest impact on this management. Using the following criteria (1) Pioneering, (2) Developing, (3) Advanced, and (4) Independent appropriate strategies and priorities can be established for the development of Nature/Environment Based Tourism Villages in Bali Province. The study approach makes use of a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies, descriptive methods are used to pick up to five tourist communities that fit the inclusion criteria through purposive sampling. The Tourism Village manager gathered primary data by having residents complete questionnaires, and other reports that were pertinent to the research analysis were used to gather secondary data. Software called Smart PLS, a variant-based structural equation analysis (SEM) tool that can simultaneously evaluate measurement and structural models, is used to analyze influencing factors. The influence shaper IMC internal factors viz categories village tour was determined by SEM analysis of the influence internal factors (IMC) category tour. Internal factors (F1) of 0.521 or 52.1% substantially influence tourism (Y).

Keywords: Category Village Tour, Integrated Marketing Communication, Village Tourism

1 Introduction

Tourist villages are characterized by their cultural value and strong traditional attributes (Dewi et al., 2013) and maintain authenticity in their traditions and culture (Soemarno 2010). The development of tourist villages can stimulate business opportunities related to village tourism, preserve local natural, cultural, and environmental wisdom, and positively impact the economic welfare of village communities. Additionally, it supports the enhancement of tourist village facilities, including homestays, culinary experiences, natural tourism, and craft exhibitions (Suharti et al., 2023). Bali Province,

A. A. N. G. Sapteka et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Green Tourism Applied Science - Social Applied Science 2024 (ICoSTAS-SAS 2024)*,
Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 308,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-622-2_68

with its significant potential for tourist villages, currently has 238 registered tourist villages. Of these, only 30 are categorized as developed and independent. Specifically, there are 101 tourist villages in the pioneering category, 107 in the developing category, 27 in the advanced category, and 3 in the independent category (Merdeka.com, 2023). According to Dewi, tourist villages represent a model of community-based and sustainable tourism development (Dewi et al., 2013). Furthermore, Zakaria and Suprihardjo describe a tourist village as a rural area endowed with unique characteristics that make it a viable tourist destination (Zakaria & Suprihardjo, 2014).

According to Siregar & Rakhman (2022), developing culture-based tourist villages offers the advantage of generating both material profits and non-material benefits. Additionally, tourist satisfaction is significantly influenced by their sensory experiences, feelings, thoughts, actions, and social connections (Sagitarini, 2016). Ecotourism, defined as tourism that leverages natural resources as attractions, is more prevalent in rural areas compared to urban settings. This is because rural areas typically offer more abundant natural resources. Effective ecotourism supports environmentally sustainable development by integrating economic, social, and environmental aspects, preserving tourism potential, enhancing tourism promotion (Aji, 2021), and consolidating various tourism assets into a cohesive tour package (Rahmatillah et al., 2019).

In the context of developing tourism marketing, especially for nature or environment-based tourist villages, (Smith & Zook, 2011) identify several key integrated marketing communication (IMC) factors with significant influence, including: 1. advertising; 2. sales promotion; 3. direct marketing; 4. public relations; 5. sponsorships; 6. exhibitions; 7. packaging; 8. merchandising; and 9. sales management. Effective tourism village management should focus on (1) community empowerment to manage and develop tourist attractions in line with community-based tourism principles (Garrod 2001); (2) identifying tourism potential (Fandeli 2002; Revida, 2021); (3) ensuring adequate supporting facilities (Nuryanti, 1993); (4) providing good accessibility (Priasukmana & Mulyadin, 2001); (5) establishing robust institutions (Mardikanto & Soebiato, 2015); and (6) implementing effective tourism marketing strategies (Sutiksno, 2020).

The novelty in this research uniquely targets nature-based tourism villages in Bali, a region renowned for its diverse and rich natural environment. By concentrating on these specific types of tourism destinations, the study provides insights into how IMC strategies are applied within the context of nature and environment-focused tourism, which is a relatively underexplored area. This research explores a wide range of elements, including advertising, sales promotion, direct marketing, public relations, sponsorships, exhibitions, packaging, merchandising, and sales management. This comprehensive approach allows for a holistic understanding of how these diverse IMC components interact and influence the management of nature-based tourism villages. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, integrating both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This combination enhances the depth and breadth of the analysis. Qualitative data from tourism village managers and quantitative data from structured questionnaires provide a well-rounded view of the impact of IMC on tourism management. The problem formulation in this research is: Integrated factors marketing

Which communications influence the management of nature/environment-based tourism villages in Bali Province?

2 Methodology

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining both qualitative and quantitative techniques. Qualitative methods were used to assess the implementation of Integrated Marketing Communication (IMC), the tourism village management model, and the categorization of tourist villages through questionnaires. The responses were then scored on a scale of 1 to 4, allowing for quantitative analysis of the data. According to Sugiyono (2013), this method is designed to describe or provide an overview of the research object using collected data or samples as they are, without additional analysis or generalization of conclusions.

The research was conducted across Bali Province, including tourist villages in various districts and cities, from March to November 2024. The sample comprised the following tourism villages based on the availability and willingness of the managers: (1) Sangeh Tourism Village; (2) Petang Tourism Village; (3) Munduk Tourism Village; (4) Sudaji Tourism Village; (5) Penglipuran Tourism Village; and (6) Pinge Tourism Village.

Data analysis was performed using Smart PLS software, which is a computer-based tool for Partial Least Squares (PLS) analysis. PLS is a variant-based structural equation modeling (SEM) technique that allows for simultaneous testing of both measurement and structural models. The measurement model is employed to evaluate validity and reliability.

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Result

Normality Test Results. The variables F1 (IMC) and Y (Tourism Village Category) were assessed for normality using a critical skewness ratio criterion of ±2.58 at a 0.01 significance level. The results indicate that all three variables exhibit a normal distribution, as the critical skewness ratio is below the absolute value of 2.58. This confirms that the structural equation model applied in this research is appropriate.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to evaluate the model's fit and potential modifications. The CFA results show that all examined constructs and indicators related to Y (Y1-Y6) have a Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI) of ≥ 0.90. This indicates that these indicators are valid and effectively represent the unidimensionality of the constructs under investigation, making them suitable for hypothesis testing.

Additionally, validity and reliability tests reveal that the construct coefficient reliability exceeds 0.70, further affirming the robustness and reliability of the model's results. Assessment of normality (group number 1) is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Assessment of normality (group number 1)

Variables	Min	Max	Skew	Cr	Kurtosis	Cr
X1 (advertising)	2.000	4.000	1.185	3.422	2.453	3.541
X2 (sales promotion)	2.000	3.000	-0.408	-1.179	-1.833	-2.646
X3 (direct marketing)	2.000	4.000	0.066	0.191	1.540	2.222
X4 (public relations)	2.000	4.000	1.364	3.937	4.663	6.730
X5 (sponsorship)	2.000	4.000	-0.033	-.0096	0.844	1.218
X6 (exhibitions)	2.000	3.000	-1.094	-3.159	-0.802	-1.158
X7 (packaging)	2.000	4.000	0.332	0.958	3.183	4.594
X8 (merchandising)	1.000	3.000	0.446	1.287	6.943	10.022
X9 (selling & sales management)	2.000	3.000	0.583	1.684	-1.660	-2.396
X10 (social media and websites)	2.000	3.000	4.695	13.553	20.042	28.928
Y1 (assessment potency village tour)	2.000	3.000	0.324	0.936	-1.895	-2.735
Y2 (governance assessment village tour)	2.000	3.000	0.080	0.231	-1.994	-2.877
Y3 (assessment marketing village tour)	2.000	3.000	-1.666	-4.809	0.775	1.119
Y4 (assessment infrastructure village tour)	2.000	3.000	-1.218	-3.515	-0.518	-0.747
Y5 (assessment innovation village tour)	2.000	4.000	0.000	0.000	1.167	1.684
Y6 (assessment continuity village tour)	2.000	3.000	-.980	-2.829	-1.040	-1.501
Multivariate					45.472	4.947

Goodness analysis. Goodness analysis results of Fit, SEM Model against criteria: Chi-square, χ^2 significance probability, CMIN/DF, Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), and The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is Good, everything meets the evaluation requirements as presented in Table 2.

3.2 Discussion

Influence results in internal factors (IMC) and factors external (management village tourism) towards category village tour. Table 5 presents the findings of the SEM analysis conducted to ascertain the direction of the relationship between the exogenous independent variables, internal factors (IMC) and external factors, management of village tours, and the endogenous dependent variable, village tourism.

Table 2. Goodness of fit, SEM model

No	Criteria	SEM model	Cut of value	Evaluation
1	Chi-square χ 2	488.762	Relatively small	Good
2	Significance probability	0.26	$\geq$ 0.05	Good
3	CMIN/DF	0.598	$\leq$ 2.00	Good
4	GFI	0.86	$\geq$ 0.85	Good
5	CFI	0.98	$\geq$ 0.90	Good
6	TLI	0.97	$\geq$ 0.90	Good
7	RMSEA	0.02	$\leq$ 0.08	Good

3.3 Discussion

Influence results in internal factors (IMC) and factors external (management village tourism) towards category village tour. Table 3 presents the findings of the SEM analysis conducted to ascertain the direction of the relationship between the exogenous independent variables, internal factors (IMC) and external factors, management village tour, and the endogenous dependent variable, village tourism.

Table 3. Path coefficient (path coefficients)

Connection Variable			Estimate	S.E	CR	P	Label
Y (category village tour)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.716	0.565	-3.038	0.002	par_19
Y (category village tour)	←	F2 (management village tour)	1.941	0.795	2.441	0.004	par_20
Y1 (assessment potency village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	1.000				
Y2 (governance assessment village) tourism)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.129	0.097	1.330	0.004	par_1
Y3 (direct marketing)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.067	0.070	0.950	0.002	par_2
X4 (public relations)	←	F1 (IMC)	1.000				
X3 (direct marketing)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.037	0.421	-2.465	0.014	par_6
X2 (sales promotion)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.006	0.422	-.014	0.003	par_7
X1 (advertising)	←	F1 (IMC)	1.000				
Y4 (assessment sapras village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.063	0.077	-.821	0.011	par_10
Y5 (assessment innovation village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.226	0.114	-1.984	0.047	par_11

Y6 (assessment continuity village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.304	0.123	2.464	0.014	par_12
X5 (sponsorship)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.574	0.444	-1.295	0.035	par_13
X6 (exhibitions)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.320	0.380	.843	0.001	par_14
X7 (packaging)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.551	0.349	-1.580	0.002	par_15
X8 (merchandising)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.059	0.272	.217	0.008	par_16
X9 (selling & sales management)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.829	0.424	-1.955	0.031	par_17
X10 (social media and websites)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.187	0.170	-1.098	0.002	par_18

Table 4. Standardized regression weights: (Group number 1-Default model)

			Estimate
Y (category village tour)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.521
Y (category village tour)	←	F2 (management village tour)	0.442
Y1 (assessment potency village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	1.227
Y2 (governance assessment village)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.157
Y3 (direct marketing)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.105
X4 (public relations)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.551
X3 (direct marketing)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.407
X2 (sales promotion)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.002
X1 (advertising)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.477
Y4 (assessment infrastructure village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.089
Y5 (assessment innovation village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.279
Y6 (assessment continuity village tour)	←	Y (category village tour)	0.410
X5 (sponsorship)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.207
X6 (exhibitions)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.134
X7 (packaging)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.254
X8 (merchandising)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.034
X9 (selling & sales management)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.318
X10 (social media and websites)	←	F1 (IMC)	0.175

Table 4 illustrates that X1 (advertising) has a very strong influence on IMC, with a coefficient of 0.447. Online advertising, a form of digital marketing, is similar to other advertising methods, such as those using the YouTube platform or other media. However, utilizing online advertising requires initial promotional funding. Sales promotion has a minimal impact on IMC, with a coefficient of 0.002, indicating a very low direct effect on the formation of IMC. Sales promotions, which aim to attract

tourists by offering tourism products like selfie photo spot packages or time-limited coupons/ vouchers, have a negligible influence in this context.

Direct marketing (X3) shows a significant influence on IMC, with a coefficient of 0.407. Direct marketing is increasingly becoming an important channel for reaching customers, driven partly by the high costs associated with traditional market outreach and a growing sales force. Sales through traditional direct marketing channels, such as catalogs, direct mail/posting, and telemarketing, are expanding rapidly, with direct mail sales contributing to this growth in consumer markets.

The impact of public relations on IMC is 0.551. Public relations, according to Amstrong & Philip (2012), is the umbrella term for a variety of initiatives intended to preserve or strengthen a business's reputation or line of goods. Sponsorship shows an influence of 0.207 on IMC, indicating a moderately strong effect. Sponsorship activities involve investing in events or causes to achieve various company objectives, particularly in increasing brand awareness, strengthening brand image, and boosting sales volume. These activities can include supporting sports events, music concerts, festivals, exhibitions, and cause-oriented initiatives such as environmental protection or charitable fundraising (Widiastuti & Agustini, 2022).

Exhibitions have an influence of 0.134 on IMC, reflecting a moderate effect. Village tours can capture travelers' interest through promotional events such as cultural festivals, art exhibitions, or other special events that highlight unique aspects of the village. Exhibition events or festivals held in nearby cities or districts can effectively promote the village and attract tourist interest.

Packaging has an influence of 0.254 on IMC, indicating a strong effect. In today's competitive business environment, packaging has evolved from its traditional role of merely protecting goods to becoming a powerful marketing tool. It plays a crucial role in attracting consumer attention and differentiating products from competitors. Merchandising has an influence of 0.034 on IMC, indicating a relatively small effect. Merchandising strategies encompass various approaches that a company can employ. Effective merchandise marketing strategies can drive direct sales and attract consumer attention. For example, in village tourism, consumers may evaluate factors such as cleanliness, accessibility, and discounts or offers on products within the village. Additionally, this approach includes setting targets for the sales team and providing instructions and motivation to achieve these goals. Sales management shows a strong influence on IMC, with a coefficient of 0.318.

Social media and websites have an influence of 0.175 on IMC, reflecting a strong effect. Social media platforms serve as a bridge for exchanging ideas, knowledge, and communication between users. The rise of social media has shifted marketing from traditional push models to conversational approaches. This shift impacts customer purchasing decisions through content such as blog reviews, tagging, account comments, and more.

4 Conclusion

Based on the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis of the influence of internal factors (IMC) and external factors (tourism village management) on the categorization of tourism villages, the findings indicate that IMC internal factors significantly impact the tourism village category (Y), with an influence coefficient of 0.521, representing 52.1%. The influence of specific IMC components is detailed as follows: a) Advertising: Exhibits a very strong influence on IMC; b) Sales Promotion: Demonstrates a very low direct influence on IMC indicating a minimal effect on IMC formation; c) Direct Marketing: Shows a substantial influence on IMC; d) Public Relations: Has a strong influence on IMC; e) Sponsorship: Displays a moderately strong influence on IMC; f) Exhibitions: Indicates a moderately strong influence on IMC; g) Packaging: Demonstrates a strong influence on IMC; h) Merchandising: Has a relatively small influence on IMC; i) Sales Management: Shows a strong influence on IMC; Social Media and Websites: Exhibits a strong influence on IMC. These findings illustrate the varying degrees of impact that different IMC components have on the formation and categorization of tourism villages.

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of Indonesia, which has provided the Bali State Polytechnic DIPA Research Grant.

References

Aji, R. R. (2021). Pengembangan pariwisata alam dalam mendukung pembangunan berkelanjutan di Desa Wisata Pentingsari. *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota, 16*(2), 9-17.

Amstrong, G., & Kotler, P. (2012). *Dasar-dasar pemasaran*. Jakarta: Prenhalindo.

Dewi, M. H., Fandeli. C., & Baiquni, M. (2013). Pengembangan desa wisata berbasis partisipasi masyarakat lokal di Desa Wisata Jatiluwih Tabanan Bali. *Kawistara 3*(2),177-226.

Fandeli, C. (2002). *Perencanaan kepariwisataan alam*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gajah Mada.

Garrod, B. (2001). *Local participation in the planning and management of ecotourism: A revised Model Approach Bristol*. England: University of the West of England.

Mardikanto, T., & Soebiato, P. (2015). *Pemberdayaan masyarakat*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Merdeka.com. (2023). Desa wisata di Bali bertambah jadi 238, hanya 30 masuk kategori maju dan mandiri. *Https://www.Merdeka.Com/Peristiwa/Desa-Wisata-Di-Bali-Bertambah-Jadi-238-Hanya-30-Masuk-Kategori-Maju-Dan-Mandiri.Html*.

Nuryanti, W. (1993). *Concept, perspective and challenges: Laporan konferensi internasional pariwisata budaya*. Yogyakarta.

Priasukmana, S., & R. M. Mulyadin. (2001). Pembangunan desa wisata: Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Otonomi Daerah. *Info Sosial Ekonomi, 2*(1), 37–44.

Rahmatillah, T. P., Insyan, O., Nurafifah, N., & Hirsan, F. P. (2019). Strategi pengembangan desa wisata berbasis wisata alam dan budaya sebagai media promosi Desa Sangiang. *Jurnal Planoearth, 4*(2), 111-116.

Revida, E., Purba, S., Permadi, L. A., Putri, D. M. B., Tanjung, R., Djumaty, B. L., Suwandi, A., Nasrullah, Simarmata, J., Handiman, U. T., Nuria, H., Simanjuntak, M., Purba, B., & Sudarmanto, E. (2021). *Inovasi desa wisata: Potensi, strategi dan dampak wisata*. Medan: Penerbit Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Sagitarini, L. L. (2016). Analisis pendekatan experiential marketing yang menciptakan kepuasan tamu menginap di hotel kawasan wisata Lovina. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan, 12*(2),114-125.

Siregar, N. A. M., & Rakhman, P. (2022). Strategi desa wisata berbasis budaya. *Patrawidya,* 23(1), 31–44.

Smith, P. R., & Zook, Z. (2011). *Marketing communications: Integrating offline and online with social media*. London: Kogen Page.

Soemarno. (2010). *Bahan kajian Mk. Ekonomi Sumberdaya Alam*. Malang: PDIP PPS FPUB.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metodelogi penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suharti, L., Sirine, H., & Martono, S. (2023). Developing a sustainable tourism village model: An exploratory study. *Jurnal manajemen dan kewirausahaan, 25*(1), 63-82. doi: 10.9744/jmk.25.1.63-82.

Sutiksno, D. U., Revida, E., Munsarif, M., Simarmata, H. M., Saputra, D. H., Purnomo, A., Sudirman, A., Sisca, S., Napitupulu, D., & Purba, S. (2020). *Tourism marketing*. Medan: Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Widiastuti, T., & Agustini, P. M. (2022). *Strategi branding destinasi desa wisata*. Universitas Bakrie Press.

Zakaria, F., Suprihardjo, R. D. (2014). Konsep pengembangan kawasan desa wisata Desa Bandungan Kecamatan Pakong Pamekasan. *Jurnal Teknik Pomits, 3*(2), 245-249.