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ABSTRACT

The concept of educational tourism developed as a consequence of the saturation of applying learning methods in a rigid and formal room. Yogyakarta as a student and cultural city has several educational tourism objects, one of which is the Taman Pintar or Smart Park. Taman Pintar Yogyakarta as the most comprehensive science centre in Southeast Asia offers various educational tourism program packages. The objective of this study is to analyze Taman Pintar management model by conducting a survey of 200 visitors with data analyzed by SEM-PLS method. Based on data analysis, the results show that tourist demand affect products availability significantly, but did not affect management performance and variation of tourism activities. Meanwhile, management performance did not directly affect the level of tourist experience but through variation of tourism activities. In terms of product availability, almost all products have been available, unless tourism attractions related to learning a new language.

Keywords: Management, Educational, Demand, Experience.

Introduction

The Special Region of Yogyakarta has been well known as a tourism destination. This province is one of the primary destinations after Jakarta, Bali and Batam. The results of the annual questionnaire of Dialogue on Tourism Market in Yogyakarta to several cities in Java since 2009 shows that study tour to Yogyakarta is the main choice for visitors outside Jakarta and Bali (Harian Kedaulatan Rakyat, 2012). In recent years, the study tour activities grown rapidly in Yogyakarta. The study tour as a regular agenda of several schools and colleges has been able to boost tourism and encouraged the economic movement of people in Yogyakarta. The visit of thousands of student from outside the region through the study tour program during school holidays has been able to increase the excitement of small artisans to improve its products. Many service businesses can be enterprise opportunities such as culinary, accommodation, transportation, tour guide, and information services as well as handicraft industry.

From the description above, it can be seen that educational tourism has the
important role of increasing tourism in Yogyakarta. Educational tourism product management becomes very important aspect to address strategic issues today, i.e. developing the tourism management in favour of the sustainability of local economic development. Pattern of uneven spatial and seasonality of tourist visits have led management of tourism destination making not inappropriate strategies.

The successful management of educational tourism products are measured from a number of tourists who had obtained quality experience and new knowledge in educational tourism activities. This experience was determined by both primary and secondary suppliers. The primary suppliers include attractions and events, human resources, affinity travel planners, and tour operators. Secondary suppliers consist of transportation service, hospitality service, and marketing organization (Ritchie, 2003). The combination of both suppliers forms the educational tourism experiences of tourism products consumed by the tourists as well as becomes a parameter for the successful management of tourism destinations.

So far have not been many studies on educational tourism management model, so that the development of educational tourism mostly relies on a trial-and-error approach. Such approach is risky because it can provide inaccurate information about the objective reality in the field. Studies on tourism in Yogyakarta are more focused on partial products and plan of tourism development. These studies are at macro level and still important, but they are not able to produce a whole description of management in a thematic product such as educational tourism. Weak information basis made educational tourism development unsustainable or at least inefficient in the future and potentially having negative impact on the tourism development in Yogyakarta.

The concept of educational tourism refers to a tourism that applies a non-formal education in providing knowledge for tourists with tourism and learning activities by a fun method. In this case the learning process can be more quickly understood and remembered. One of the factors for the emergence of the concept of educational tourism is the saturation of applying the learning methods in a rigid and formal room. The forms of educational tourism activities include learning the history, learning the art, learning the culture, learning the language, conferences, and visiting some colleges or schools. It is expected that such various activities can support the formal learning activities in schools and be a means to deepen the understanding in the learning process.

In terms of market segments, educational tourism has a market segment that consists of all students in formal and informal educations from preschool to college levels. Educational tourism plays a role as a means of improving academic standards (Smith, 2013), so that a study tour program becomes a routine event, a part of the curriculum in schools or even an extracurricular activity. Therefore, the objective of this study was to analyze an educational tourism management model in Taman Pintar, by examining the effects of variables with each other and of the indicators on each variable.
Literature Review

Study tour has the different characteristics from those of other tourism activities. The educational tourism activity vary, from getting to know the schools, customs, learning the language to seminar and research activities (Yuan, 2008). Most education tourists are the students who take some advantage of their vacation for travelling and getting knowledge. The activities in educational tourism among others conferences, research, national and international student exchanges, school visit, language school and study tour, which are organized both formally and informally in natural and artificial tourist destination (Ritchie, 2003).

Educational tourism management is a complex activity because it involves a wide range of elements, including resources, times, and quality, which are all connected by a complex linked. Resources managed in the educational tourism consists of two types. First, human resources, i.e. individuals being engaged in the creation of educational tourism products such as architects, designers, surveyors, tourism workers, traders, suppliers, and other parties involved. Second, materials, i.e. all materials needed as parts of the educational tourism development processes such as materials for building, landscape, parking and walkway, furnitures and the core elements of tourism attraction (Swarbrooke, 2002). Product management in developing educational tourism destination begins with new ideas and initiatives closely related to tourism attraction and service (Godfrey and Clarke, 2000). The suitability of products is seen as a response to increase the number of tourists with special interests, including educational tourists. In this case, tourism destinations are more focused on the products offered to differentiate them from other tourism products and compete in a highly competitive tourism environment (Sharpley and Telfer, 2002).

In the management of educational tourism products, a model is required to provide information that is oriented to the future, indicates the alternative courses of action to be evaluated before being implemented, and provides the solutions in accordance with the existing potentials and problems. It has the main objective of facilitating a systematic thinking as well as descriptive, predictive, and normative functions (Rakhmat, 2001). Some tourism models can be presented to provide an overview and a reference in formulating educational tourism product management model in Yogyakarta. Related research of tourism management model, among others; management with competitiveness and attractiveness approach (Vengesayi, 2003), competitiveness approach with indicators of strengths and weaknesses (Dwyer, 2003), and stakeholder perspective approach (Yoon, 2002).

The tourism management model developed by Vengesayi (2003) used the competitiveness and attractiveness approach and consisted of five propositions. The first is formed by a relationship between attractions, combination of tourist activity, and attractiveness and competitiveness. The second is formed by a relationship between the level of tourism support facilities and management capabilities associated with attractiveness and competitiveness. The third is formed by density, security, human resource capacity, cooperation level, and competition between destinations as elements that build the environment. The fourth is formed by a relationship between the
environment as a place where the tourism product is enjoyed and the attractiveness and competitiveness of destinations. And the fifth is formed by a relationship between destination ability to attract tourists and to compete internationally with the high image and experience of price.

The tourism management model with competitiveness according to Dwyer (2003) includes several variables, namely: resources, situational conditions, and competitiveness. The resources affect the situational conditions, including market management and demand, and vice versa the situational conditions also affect the existing resources. Destination management is applied to increase attractiveness of key resources, strengthen the quality and effectiveness of enabling factors and resources, one of which through marketing, that are able to bring tourist demands.

According to Yoon (2002), a tourism destination can be managed using a stakeholder perspective model. The tourism stakeholders’ support for the planning and development of tourism is a key element for long-term successful operations, management, and sustainability of tourism destinations. The assumption used in this model is that community as a tourism stakeholder is likely to participate in the development of tourism if they believe that they will benefit without any cost. The model is constructed using five variables, i.e. the impact of tourism development, environmental behavior, position in community, preference in tourism attraction development, and support to destination competitiveness strategy.

The three examples of tourism management models above emphasize on competitiveness and role of stakeholders, while market demand as an important factor in educational tourism has not been taken into account. Demand of educational tourism market affects the competitiveness and involvement level of investors. Market demand as a key factor for the successful tourism management becomes reference for researcher in designing an educational tourism management model in Taman Pintar with a “market product” approach. The basic assumption of this approach is that if demand for educational tourism market is high, then the management of educational tourism products will increase also. The concept of “product market” means that the educational tourism market and product is interdependent and form the framework of the interaction of buyers and sellers in educational tourism. The proposed model of educational tourism product management is presented in Figure 1.

**Figure 1. A Hypothetic Model of Educational Tourism Product Management**
Educational tourism becomes a means of improving academic standards in education (Smith, 2013), so that educational tourism travel become a strong motivation in order to develop education. Strong motivation lead to tourist demand and becomes an opportunity for the managers of destinations to meet those needs. The demand gives a clear picture for the managers of educational tourism in designing products to be produced for meeting the market demand and leading to tourist demand to visit a tourism destination (Vengesayi, 2003). Performance management can be seen from the availability and feasibility of product, including main facilities, additional facilities, services, and support services. The product availability that is adequate in quality and quantity affected variation in tourism activity designed by managers. Management process involved various stakeholders through several stages of management, including: scanning, planning, implementation, and evaluation (Woodside and Martin, 2007). Various educational tourism activities are designed to create educational and experience of learning. Various study tour activities to Israel are designed to increase students’ knowledge of Israel’s history, geography, language, religion and culture, through visiting the important sites, involvement in excavations by archaeologists, learning the Israel songs and dances, and following the conference (Cohen, 2008). Educational tourism activities greatly vary ranging from getting to know the schools and cultures, learn the language, attending the symposium or seminar to following the research projects (Wang, 2008).

Methodology

The study examined a model that is built by five latent variables, i.e: tourist demand ($\xi_1$), products availability ($\xi_2$), management performance ($\eta_1$), variation of tourism activities ($\eta_2$), and level of tourist experience ($\eta_3$), which is shown in Figure 2.

![Analysis Model](Resource: Field Survey (2016))

**Figure 2. Analysis Model**

The quantitatif data were obtained by conducting a survey of 200 visitors in Taman Pintar and measured by a four-point likert scale (Riduwan, 2009). Sample was selected using purposive random sampling. The analytical method used was the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with an analysis tool of Partial Least Square (PLS). The model is specified via drag & drop by drawing the structural model for the latent
variables and by assigning the indicators to the latent variables (Monecke and Leisch, 2012). Data analysis was performed in two ways, i.e.: goodness of fit and test of significance using bootstrapping. Goodness of fit test consist of goodness of fit test for outer model (convergent validity, average variance extracted (AVE), discriminant validity, composite reliability, cronbach alpha) and inner model (R square and Q square). In order to validate the overall or aggregate performance between measurement and structural model, can be used GFI obtained from AVE multiplied by R² (Tanenhaus et al., 2005). The rule of thumb goodness of fit can be seen on Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Rule of Thumb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convergent validity</td>
<td>Loading factor &gt; 0.5-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminant validity</td>
<td>√AVE &gt; 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>&gt; 0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R square</td>
<td>0.67 (strong), 0.33 (moderate), and 0.19 (weak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q square</td>
<td>0.02 (small), 0.15 (fair), and 0.35 (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.1 (small), 0.25 (fair), dan 0.38 (large)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The next stage, after goodness of fit test and models meet the criteria is significance test using bootstrapping. Bootstrapping is modification techniques through resampling data that represent the true population (Davidson dan Hinkley, 2006). The statistical test is significant when value of t-statistic > t-table which is 1.96. The relationship influence between variables is in the range -1 to +1, interpreted weak to excellent (Sarwono, 2006) (Table 2).

Table 2. The Strenght of Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koefisien</th>
<th>The Strenght of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0 – 0.25</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.25 – 0.5</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.5 – 0.75</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.75 – 0.99</td>
<td>Very Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources: Sarwono (2006)
Results

Data analysis of 200 respondents at Taman Pintar using SmartPLS version 2.0 generate structural dan bootstrapping model. Structural models used to feasibility test of the model, while bootstrapping model as a significance test to analyze the effect of relationship between variables. Analysis of structural model using PLS method can be seen in the Figure 3.

Figure 3. Structural Model of Taman Pintar

Figure 3 had shown values of data analysis used to goodness of fit of model, i.e : loading factor ($\lambda$), average variance extracted (AVE), variables correlation, composite reliability ($\rho$), cronbach alpha ($\alpha$), and R square ($R^2$). The value shown in table 3 and 4.

Table 3. loading factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist Demand ($z_i$)</th>
<th>Products Availability ($z_j$)</th>
<th>Management Performance ($\eta_i$)</th>
<th>Variation of Tourism Activity ($\eta_j$)</th>
<th>Level of Tourist Experience ($\eta_m$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>Y1 0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>Y2 0.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>X10</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>Y3 0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>X11</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>Y4 0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>X12</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>Y5 0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>X13</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>Y6 0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>Y7 0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y8 0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y9 0.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y10 0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y11 0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y12 0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y13 0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14 0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y15 0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y16 0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y17 0.601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource : Field Survey (2016)
Table 4: AVE, Composite Reliability, Cronbach’s Alpha, dan R Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>√AVE</th>
<th>ρc</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Products Availability (ζ₂)</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Performance (η₁)</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.1685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Demand (ζ₃)</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Tourist Experience (η₂)</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.2181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of Tourism Activity (η₃)</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.4287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource: Field Survey (2016)

After analysis data of goodness of fit, performed modification process using bootstrapping techniques. Structural model of bootstrapping process can be seen in Figure 4.

Resources: Field Survey (2016)

Figure 4. Structural Model of Bootstrapping

The path coefficient value generated from bootstrapping process can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Path Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistical</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>The Strength of Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Availability (ζ₂) ⇒ Product Management (η₁)</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Management (η₁) ⇒ Level of Tourist Experience (η₂)</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Management (η₁) ⇒ Variation of Tourism Activity (η₃)</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>8.541</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Demand (ζ₃) ⇒ Product Availability (ζ₂)</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Demand (ζ₃) ⇒ Product Management (η₁)</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Demand (ζ₃) ⇒ Variation of Tourism Activity (η₃)</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of Tourism Activity (η₃) ⇒ Level of Tourist Experience (η₂)</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>3.017</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource: Field Survey (2016)
Discussion

Taman Pintar Profile

Taman Pintar Yogyakarta is the most comprehensive Science Centre in Southeast Asia as it includes some discipline of sciences, including the history, physics, biology, mathematics, and chemistry. It was established in 2003 on the strategic area of 1.2 ha at Jl.Panembahan Senopati No. 1-3 Yogyakarta, 55122. The Park became a center for technology-based sciences, was built with the concept of integrated area development, and provide spaces for expression. The tourism area of Taman Pintar consists of several areas, including: Playground, early childhood education in the West and East areas, Planetarium, Craft Village, Theater Science and Library, Oval building, box building, food court, and souvenir counter.

Playground Area covers all the open land areas that serve as reception and game zones. In this areas there are various learning zones, such as: maritime zone, my scenic village, color spectrum, dancing water park, hummed wall, pulley system, tree house, rocking bridge, teeter, labyrinth, stone forums, president tread, peace gung, Replika of Mini Rocket, Health zone, and traffic zone. On the playground area there is a planetarium, a building of early childhood education, and on the east side of the playground area, there is Craft Village, which presents traditional nuance tourism creativity, such as making batik, painting pottery, and painting T-shirt. The main attractions of Taman Pintar Yogyakarta are Oval and Box building. Both Oval and Box buildings displays various tourism attractions in favor of learning materials, ranging from the phases of water life, ancient life to civilized life.

The market segment of Taman Pintar is mostly dominated by school-age tourists. Number of tourists in Taman Pintar from 2008 to 2015 was 7,744,260 people, where the average number of tourist per year was 968,032, as shown in Figure 5.

Visitor Number of Taman Pintar Yogyakarta

![Visitor Number of Taman Pintar Yogyakarta from 2008 to 2015]

Sources: Taman Pintar (2016)

Figure 5. Visitors Number of Taman Pintar Yogyakarta from 2008 to 2015
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The peak tourist visit was in 2010, while the lowest one was in 2008. In the 2008 was the third year of a five-year development phase, so that the visitors have still relatively few, namely, 749,609 people. Furthermore, in 2009 the Municipal Government of Yogyakarta made institutional arrangements, so that the Technical Management Unit of Taman Pintar was changed to be the Management Office and the increasing service was followed by increase in the number of visitors with peak in 2010, i.e. 1,127,922 people. In 2011 and 2012, the number of tourists in Taman Pintar decreased again, because renovation was carried out in some areas for increasing the tourism attraction.

Goodness of Fit Test of Outer Model

Based on output of PLS shows that all the indicators of each variable is valid, because it meets the criteria of validity, loading factor more than 0.5, AVE greater than 0.5, and AVE squared value of each variable is greater than 0.7. Meanwhile, test of reliability showed five variables is reliable, because it has composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha greater than 0.6 (Table 3 and 4).

Goodness of Fit Test of Inner Model

The ability of the model describes the information contained in the data categorized as large (Table 1), seen from the Q2 value 0.681. While the overall performance of a combination of measurements and structural model is expressed strong (Table 1), could be seen from GFI value of 0.368. Goodness of fit test of inner model can be observed by R2 and Q2 value. The higher the value, the more fit of mode to the data. The R^2 value of product availability is 0.14, indicated influence of tourist demand on product availability is 14.11%, while the other percentage is explained by other variables such as the budget and infrastructure. Budget becomes an important variable in explaining the variable availability of products in Taman Pintar, covering; State budget, budgets, ticket sales, rental rooms, government subsidies, and cooperation with other private parties. Management performance is affected by tourist demand and products availability at 16.85%, while the rest influenced by staff competence and quality services in Taman Pintar management. Level of tourist experience is affected by tourist demand, product availability, and variations of tourism activities at 21.81%, while the other percentage is influenced by the availability of adequate time to enjoy the sights. The third influence above is weak, because below 0.33 (Table 1). While the influence of tourist demand, product availability, and performance management to variations of tourism activities is quite strong, which is 0.42. Meanwhile, other factors that affect the variation of tourism activities is cooperation with any stakeholder. The case in line with Yoon opinion (2002), which is tourism destination can be managed using a stakeholder perspective model.

Researchers built a model by adopting Vengesayi (2003) and Dwyer (2003). Researcher adopt several indicators, consist of management performance, tourism activities and tourist experiences as part of Vengesayi model and product availability, management performance, and tourists demand as part of Dwyer model. Destinations have ultimate control of integrating various educational tourism activity as a result of the initiative and creativity to improve education and learning experiences for tourists. The
availability of products or resources owned by a destination greatly affect the management and tourists demand, and vice versa. Destination management increase the attractiveness of the availability of products and raises the demand of tourists.

Bootstrapping Significance Test
If feasibility test of model have met the criteria, then performed significance test to determine the relationship between variables. The value of path coefficient influence of tourists demand on products availability is 0.412 and t statistical 3.148, showed there is a positive and significant correlation between the two variables. The higher tourists demand, the higher products availability. The tourist demand consist of educational tourism attraction and supporting facilities, become a reference for managers to improve traveler satisfaction by meeting its demand. The value of path coefficient influence of products availability on management performance at 0.450 and t statistical 3.843, indicated there is a positive and significant correlation between two variables. The higher products availability, the higher management performance of educational tourism products at Taman Pintar. The path coefficient of management performance to variations of tourism activities at 8.541. The higher management performance, the more tourism activities is generated. Meanwhile variation of tourism activities also significantly affect to level of tourism experience at 3.017. The more varied tourist activities offered, the higher experience gained by tourism. The path coefficient of management performance on level of tourism experience at 1.020, it means an increasing in management performance at this model has no significant effect on level of tourism experience directly. The high management performance unable to improve tourism experience when they can't enjoy different kinds of tourist attractions have offered. The main obstacles faced by travelers is the availability of sufficient time in tourism visits, due to most of Taman Pintar's visitors is study tour group with a relatively dense agenda. In this case, coordination between tour operator and Taman Pintar manager is needed in designing the right travel package to enhance travel experience of education. Tourist demand does not affect to management performance and variation of tourism activities, which is t statistical respectively are 0.769 and 1.294. Tourist demand do not give much impact to management performance and variation of tourism activities at Taman Pintar. Management performance of Taman Pintar is more influenced by internal factors are state budget, while the variety of tourism activities affected by the cooperation with various parties, such as PT Sarihusada Generasi Mahardhika (SGM) and Sanata Dharma University.

Based on the results and discussion above, can be concluded the measurement of model was valid and reliable. In view of the aspect of relationship between variables, tourist demand had a significant effect on products availability, but insignificant effect on management performance and variation of tourism activity. Meanwhile, the products availability had insignificant relationship with management performance. Management performance had insignificant relationship with the level of tourist experience and variation of tourism activity. Finally, variation of tourist activity could significantly affect to the level of tourist experience. Tourism activity related to learning a new language as part of the educational tourism activities is a need of tourists, but have not been developed by Taman Pintar. This matter can be input for manager to design new
tourism packages related to the development of language skills, for example, by making language laboratory or create a variety of interactive games that boost language skills for visitors.

The limitation of this research is there are some variables have not been discussed. Several R² value of variables is still low, for example R² of product availability at 0.1411. The tourist demand only contributed 14.11% on variance in product availability, the remaining is explained by other variables. Therefore, further research can be conducted on other variables that might have an even greater contribution.
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