

Rethinking Rural Tourism through Local Wisdom and Collective Agency: A Community-Based Approach to Sustainable Development

 <https://doi.org/xxxxxx>

Ivonny Yeany Rahanra¹, Iriane Sosiawaty Ponto¹, Julia Theresia Patty¹, Jeanly Waisapy¹

¹Universitas Pattimura, Jalan Ir. M. Putuhena, Ambon 97233, Indonesia

Abstract

This study critically reconceptualizes rural tourism development by integrating local wisdom and collective agency within a community-based framework for sustainable development. It addresses the persistent shortcomings of top-down, project-oriented tourism models that marginalize local communities and weaken long-term sustainability. A qualitative approach was employed using a community-based participatory research (CBPR) design combined with a case study strategy, positioning community members as co-producers of knowledge. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and focus group discussions, and analyzed using an inductive thematic approach with triangulation and member checking to ensure validity. The findings indicate that the integration of local wisdom into tourism practices, supported by strong collective agency, significantly enhances participation, strengthens local institutions, and promotes sustainability across economic, social, and cultural dimensions. Communities that actively engage in decision-making and embed cultural values in governance exhibit higher resilience and ownership. The study develops an integrative conceptual model linking local wisdom as a normative foundation, collective agency as a transformative force, and community institutions as operational mechanisms. This model advances community-based tourism by emphasizing community-driven transformation.

Keywords: Collective Agency, Community-Based Tourism, Local Institutions, Local Wisdom, Participatory Governance



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 CC-BY International license

Article Info:

Correspondence E-Mail:
ivonny.rahanra@gmail.com

Received manuscript: 12/02/2025

Final revision: 28/03/2025

Approved: 10/04/2025

Online Access: 25/04/2025

Published: 10/05/2025

How to cite: Rahanra, I. Y., Ponto, I. S., Patty, J. T., & Waisapy, J. (2025). Rethinking rural tourism through local wisdom and collective agency: A community-based approach to sustainable development. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (JPPM)*, 1(2), 103-122. <https://doi.org/xxxxxx>

Copyright © by the Authors

RESEARCH  ACCESS
ARTICLE

Publisher: PT. Sarana Mandiri Investama
RT 07 RW 03 Desa Salamrejo Kec. Karangan, Kab. Trenggalek, Provinsi Jawa Timur, Indonesia

E-mail:
selectaedukasi@journal@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Rural tourism has long been positioned as a strategic pathway for stimulating local economies, diversifying livelihoods, and reducing spatial inequalities between urban and rural regions. Across many developing contexts, it is frequently promoted as a low-barrier development model capable of leveraging existing cultural and natural assets while fostering inclusive growth. Yet, despite its promise, the empirical reality reveals a more complicated landscape (Berto, 2018; Kartika & Fajri, 2019). A significant number of rural tourism initiatives struggle to achieve long-term sustainability, often collapsing once external funding or institutional support is withdrawn. This pattern is not incidental. Rather, it reflects deeper structural issues embedded in how rural tourism is conceptualized and implemented, issues that warrant critical reflection and rethinking.

One of the most persistent challenges lies in the dominance of top-down development approaches that prioritize rapid economic returns over social embeddedness. In many cases, rural communities are positioned as passive beneficiaries rather than active agents in shaping tourism trajectories. Such dynamics not only weaken local ownership but also generate forms of dependency that undermine sustainability (Lukman et al., 2025; Moayerian et al., 2022). Empirical studies across Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America have shown that externally driven tourism projects often fail to align with local socio-cultural contexts, resulting in resistance, disengagement, or superficial participation (Kubickova & and Campbell, 2020; Moscardo, 2023). Even when participatory mechanisms are formally introduced, they frequently operate within constrained institutional frameworks that limit genuine community influence (Hu & Ngai, 2021; S. S. Rahman & Baddam, 2021).

Compounding this issue is the marginalization of local wisdom as a foundational element in tourism development. Rural communities possess rich reservoirs of knowledge, values, and practices that have evolved over generations, shaping their interactions with the environment and social organization. However, these knowledge systems are often overlooked or commodified in ways that strip them of their meaning and agency (Ghaisani & Afifi, 2022; Pattaray, 2024). The result is a paradox: while cultural authenticity is marketed as a key attraction, the very processes that produce and sustain it are eroded. This disconnection raises critical questions about whose knowledge counts in development processes and how local epistemologies can be meaningfully integrated into tourism governance.

At the same time, the concept of community-based tourism (CBT) has emerged as an alternative paradigm that seeks to address some of these limitations by emphasizing participation, empowerment, and local benefit-sharing. A substantial body of literature has documented the potential of CBT to enhance community resilience, strengthen social capital, and promote equitable development outcomes (Ghaisani & Afifi, 2022; Perbawasari et al., 2019). However, closer examination suggests that CBT, in practice, often falls short of its transformative aspirations. Participation is frequently reduced to consultation, and empowerment remains unevenly distributed across community groups (Basyar et al., 2025; Prasiasa et al., 2023). Moreover, CBT frameworks tend to focus on institutional arrangements and economic impacts, paying comparatively less attention to the underlying social processes that enable communities to act collectively and strategically.

In this regard, recent scholarship has begun to turn toward more nuanced understandings of agency, particularly the idea of collective agency as a key driver of community transformation. Collective agency refers to the capacity of individuals to act together in a coordinated and purposeful manner to shape their social and economic conditions (Prasiasa et al., 2023; Wilson, 2018). Within rural tourism contexts, this perspective shifts the analytical focus from participation as a procedural requirement to agency as a dynamic and relational process. Studies have shown that communities with strong collective agency are better able to negotiate with external actors, adapt to changing market conditions, and sustain local initiatives over time (Pasanchay & Schott, 2021; Ulfa et al., 2021). Yet,

despite its relevance, the integration of collective agency into tourism studies remains limited and fragmented.

Parallel to these developments, there has been growing recognition of the importance of integrating local knowledge systems into sustainable development frameworks. Scholars have argued that local wisdom is not merely a cultural artifact but a living system of knowledge that informs decision-making, resource management, and social cohesion (Hidayati & Siregar, 2024; Singgalen & Simange, 2018). In the context of tourism, this implies moving beyond surface-level representations of culture toward deeper engagement with the values and practices that underpin community life. However, operationalizing this integration remains a challenge. Existing approaches often lack clear mechanisms for translating local knowledge into actionable strategies within tourism development processes.

Taken together, these strands of literature point to an emerging but still underdeveloped intersection between community-based tourism, local wisdom, and collective agency. While each has been explored in relative isolation, their combined potential to reshape rural tourism development has yet to be fully articulated. It is within this space that the present study situates itself, seeking to move beyond fragmented perspectives toward a more integrated and context-sensitive framework.

What becomes increasingly evident is that the sustainability of rural tourism cannot be understood solely in terms of economic performance or institutional design. Rather, it is deeply contingent upon the ways in which communities mobilize their internal resources, negotiate external influences, and construct shared visions of development. In many cases, the absence of such integrative processes explains why well-intentioned interventions fail to produce lasting change. This observation opens up a critical line of inquiry: how might rural tourism be reimagined if local wisdom and collective agency were not peripheral considerations but central organizing principles?

Responding to this question, the present study seeks to develop a conceptual and empirical model of rural tourism that foregrounds the interplay between local wisdom, collective agency, and community institutions. By adopting a community-based participatory research approach, the study not only examines these dynamics but also engages communities as active contributors to knowledge production. In doing so, it offers a perspective that is both analytically rigorous and grounded in lived experience.

Ultimately, the contribution of this research lies in its effort to reframe rural tourism as a socially embedded and collectively driven process. Rather than treating communities as sites of intervention, it recognizes them as agents of change with the capacity to shape their own development trajectories. This shift, while subtle, carries significant implications for how rural tourism is studied, practiced, and governed.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative research approach grounded in a community-based participatory research (CBPR) design, as it seeks not only to understand rural tourism

practices but also to engage the community as an active partner in knowledge production. A qualitative approach is particularly appropriate in this context because the research explores complex social processes, such as the enactment of local wisdom and the formation of collective agency, that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measurement alone. These processes are deeply embedded in lived experiences, cultural meanings, and social interactions, requiring interpretive depth and contextual sensitivity (Fafurida et al., 2025; Isabel et al., 2025). The CBPR orientation further strengthens this approach by emphasizing co-learning, mutual respect, and the democratization of knowledge between researchers and community members (Diece et al., 2024; Hermawan, 2024).

The research was conducted in a rural tourism village that has been actively developing community-based tourism initiatives while still maintaining strong cultural traditions and local governance structures. The selection of this site was intentional and based on two main considerations. First, the village represents a dynamic intersection between tradition and development, where local wisdom continues to shape everyday practices. Second, it has experienced both the opportunities and tensions associated with externally driven tourism programs, making it a relevant setting for examining how collective agency emerges and operates in real contexts. This purposive selection aligns with the logic of qualitative case study research, which prioritizes depth over breadth and seeks to generate rich, contextually grounded insights (Agustina et al., 2019; Lee & Jan, 2019).

The informants in this study were selected using purposive and snowball sampling techniques to ensure the inclusion of diverse perspectives within the community. A total of 20 informants participated in the research, consisting of village officials, traditional leaders, local tourism managers, small business actors, youth representatives, and women's group members. These individuals were chosen because of their active involvement in tourism-related activities and their knowledge of local social dynamics. The inclusion of varied social actors was essential to capture the relational nature of collective agency, which is not confined to a single group but emerges through interactions across different segments of the community (Elgammal, 2022; Yusra et al., 2022).

Data collection was carried out through a combination of in-depth interviews, participant observation, and focus group discussions (FGDs). In-depth interviews allowed the researcher to explore personal experiences, perceptions, and narratives related to tourism development, local values, and community participation. Participant observation was conducted by engaging directly in community activities, including tourism operations and cultural events, enabling the researcher to observe how local wisdom is practiced and negotiated in everyday contexts. Meanwhile, FGDs were used to facilitate collective reflection and dialogue among community members, providing insight into shared meanings, tensions, and aspirations. The integration of these methods was not merely technical but intentional, as it allowed for a more holistic understanding of both individual and collective dimensions of social life (Sharma et al., 2024; Zielinski et al., 2020).

To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, this study employed triangulation at multiple levels. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing information obtained from different informants across social roles, while method triangulation involved cross-validating data collected through interviews, observations, and FGDs. In addition, member checking was used as a reflexive process in which preliminary interpretations were shared with participants to confirm their accuracy and resonance with lived realities. This approach not only enhances validity but also aligns with the ethical principles of CBPR by recognizing participants as co-interpreters of knowledge.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reframing Rural Tourism: From Project-Based Intervention to Community-Embedded Practice

The empirical findings of this study reveal a gradual yet significant shift in how rural tourism is understood and practiced at the community level. Initially, tourism development in the research site followed a project-based logic, largely driven by external actors such as government agencies and development programs. These interventions were typically structured around short-term targets, visitor numbers, infrastructure development, and promotional activities, without sufficiently embedding themselves in the social fabric of the community. As a result, participation often took on a procedural character, where community members were involved in implementation but had limited influence over decision-making processes. This pattern resonates with longstanding critiques of top-down development models, which tend to prioritize efficiency and scalability over local ownership and contextual relevance (Gardiner et al., 2022; Scherer & Thelen, 2020).

Insights from in-depth interviews illustrate how such approaches were experienced by community members. One informant, identified as AR (a local youth organizer), reflected that “programs came with clear instructions, but not always with understanding of how we live and organize ourselves.” Similarly, MN (a women’s group member) noted that while tourism initiatives initially created enthusiasm, “people participated because they were invited, not because they felt it was theirs.” These narratives point to a form of participation that is externally mobilized rather than internally generated, often resulting in limited continuity once external support diminishes. This aligns with findings from Yoshida & Kato (2023), who argue that externally initiated tourism projects frequently struggle to sustain local engagement beyond the project cycle.

However, the data also reveal an emergent reorientation driven from within the community itself. Over time, local actors began to question the relevance and sustainability of externally imposed models, leading to a more reflexive engagement with tourism development. This shift did not occur abruptly but evolved through everyday practices, informal discussions, and collective reflection facilitated through community meetings and participatory forums. In these spaces, community members began to articulate their own priorities, drawing on local knowledge and shared experiences as a basis for redefining

tourism practices. This process reflects what Sonuç (2023) describe as transformative development, where change is not merely about adopting new interventions but about reconfiguring the underlying relationships, values, and power dynamics that shape development trajectories.

Participant observation further revealed that this transformation was closely tied to the reactivation of local social structures and cultural norms. Rather than relying solely on formal project mechanisms, the community increasingly turned to customary practices of deliberation and mutual cooperation to organize tourism activities. For instance, decisions regarding the use of communal land for tourism purposes were no longer dictated by external project guidelines but negotiated through traditional forums that emphasized consensus and collective responsibility. This shift signifies a movement from compliance-based participation toward what may be termed community-embedded practice, where tourism development becomes integrated into the broader social life of the village.

The implications of this shift are evident in how responsibilities and roles are distributed within the community. As shown in Table 1, there is a clear contrast between the earlier project-based approach and the emerging community-embedded model.

Table 1 Transformation of Rural Tourism Practices: From Project-Based to Community-Embedded Approaches

Aspect	Project-Based Approach	Community-Embedded Practice
Decision-making	Externally directed	Locally negotiated
Participation	Procedural and invited	Organic and self-initiated
Knowledge base	Technical and external	Experiential and local
Sustainability	Dependent on projects	Rooted in community ownership
Institutional role	Administrative	Socially embedded

Source: Author’s analysis (2025)

The table underscores how the transformation is not merely operational but fundamentally epistemic, involving a shift in whose knowledge counts and how decisions are legitimized. In this emerging model, local wisdom and lived experience are not supplementary but constitutive of tourism governance. This resonates with Nenotek et al. (2025), who emphasizes that sustainable practices are more likely to endure when they are grounded in locally embedded knowledge systems.

Importantly, this transition also redefines the role of external actors. Rather than acting as primary drivers, they become facilitators who support locally defined agendas. As noted by HL (a village official), “we still need support, but now we decide what kind of support we need.” This subtle yet profound shift reflects an increasing assertion of collective agency, where the community does not reject external engagement but repositions itself as an active interlocutor rather than a passive recipient.

Local Wisdom as a Living Normative System in Rural Tourism Governance

The findings of this study indicate that local wisdom operates not merely as a symbolic or aesthetic component of rural tourism, but as a living normative system that actively shapes governance practices, decision-making processes, and everyday interactions within the community. Rather than being preserved in static forms or performed solely for visitors, local wisdom is continuously reproduced through social relations, customary institutions, and collective practices. This dynamic character allows it to function as what may be understood as a normative infrastructure, a value-based foundation that both guides and constrains how tourism is developed and managed within the village context.

Empirical insights from the field reveal that community members consistently refer to customary norms when navigating tourism-related decisions. For instance, decisions regarding resource use, such as the allocation of communal land or the management of natural attractions, are not determined solely by economic considerations but are mediated through culturally embedded principles of balance, reciprocity, and collective benefit. One informant, identified as BT (a traditional leader), explained that “tourism cannot go beyond what is considered proper in our customs; if it does, it will not last.” This statement reflects a deeply internalized understanding that legitimacy in development practices derives not from formal regulations alone but from their alignment with shared cultural values. Such findings resonate with Mantra et al. (2023), who emphasizes that local knowledge systems function as adaptive frameworks that regulate human–environment interactions in sustainable ways.

This normative dimension is also evident in how the community organizes social responsibilities within tourism activities. Roles are often distributed not based on market efficiency alone but through considerations of social inclusion and moral obligation. For example, certain groups, such as women’s associations or youth collectives, are entrusted with specific functions that align with their social roles within the community. According to NL (a member of a women’s group), “we are involved not because we were assigned, but because it is part of how we contribute to the village.” This form of engagement reflects a moral economy in which participation is embedded in social expectations and collective identity, rather than being driven purely by individual incentives. Such practices illustrate how local wisdom sustains not only social cohesion but also a sense of shared ownership over tourism initiatives.

Moreover, the study finds that local wisdom plays a critical role in shaping the community’s interaction with external actors, including tourists. Rather than adopting a purely service-oriented approach, the community frames tourism encounters as spaces of cultural exchange governed by mutual respect. Visitors are implicitly expected to adhere to local norms, and their experiences are structured in ways that reflect community values. As noted by SR (a local tourism manager), “we do not just show what we have; we invite visitors to understand how we live.” This orientation challenges dominant tourism paradigms that prioritize commodification and consumer satisfaction, instead positioning tourism as a relational practice grounded in cultural integrity. In this sense, local wisdom acts as both a

filter and a guide, determining what aspects of culture can be shared and how they are presented.

The internalization of these values into tourism governance also contributes to more context-sensitive and resilient institutional arrangements. Unlike externally imposed models that often rely on standardized procedures, the governance practices observed in this study are flexible and adaptive, shaped by ongoing dialogue within the community. This adaptability is particularly important in responding to emerging challenges, such as fluctuations in visitor numbers or tensions between economic and cultural priorities. By grounding decision-making in locally recognized norms, the community is able to navigate these challenges without undermining its social fabric. This finding aligns with recent discussions on endogenous development, which highlight the importance of locally embedded institutions in fostering sustainable and contextually appropriate outcomes (Pardosi et al., 2024).

Conceptually, the evidence suggests that local wisdom should be understood not as an external input to tourism development but as an integral system that structures the very logic of governance. Framing it as a normative infrastructure allows for a more nuanced appreciation of its role in shaping both possibilities and limits within development processes. It defines what is considered acceptable, desirable, and legitimate, thereby influencing not only what is done but how and why it is done. This perspective moves beyond instrumental views of culture and instead recognizes its constitutive role in organizing social life and collective action.

Importantly, this normative infrastructure is neither rigid nor exclusionary. While it provides a stable foundation, it also accommodates reinterpretation and negotiation as the community engages with new experiences and external influences. This dynamic quality ensures that local wisdom remains relevant in a changing context, enabling the community to integrate innovation without losing its cultural grounding. As reflected by AD (a village official), “we adapt, but we do not abandon what defines us.” This statement captures the essence of how local wisdom operates in practice, not as a constraint on development, but as a guiding framework that ensures its continuity and meaning.

Collective Agency and the Dynamics of Community Participation

The findings of this study underscore that community participation in rural tourism cannot be adequately understood through procedural indicators alone, such as attendance in meetings or involvement in program activities. Rather, what emerges as normative is the community’s capacity to act collectively in shaping decisions, negotiating interests, and directing the trajectory of tourism development. This capacity, referred to here as collective agency, is not a static attribute but a dynamic and relational process that evolves through interaction, shared experiences, and ongoing negotiation among community members. In line with the methodological approach of this study, these dynamics were observed through a combination of in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and focus group discussions, allowing for a nuanced understanding of how agency is enacted in everyday contexts.

At the empirical level, collective agency becomes visible in how different actors within the village engage with one another across formal and informal spaces. Traditional leaders, youth groups, women's associations, small business actors, and village officials do not operate in isolation; rather, their interactions form a web of relationships through which decisions are deliberated and legitimized. One informant, identified as DK (a village official), noted that "decisions are not made by one group alone; they emerge from discussions that involve many voices, even if it takes time." This emphasis on deliberation reflects a shared commitment to consensus-building, where the process of decision-making is as important as the outcome itself. Such practices resonate with the concept of relational agency, which highlights the importance of collaboration and mutual responsiveness in addressing complex social challenges (Nurhadi et al., 2022; M. S. U. Rahman et al., 2022).

However, the formation of collective agency is not without tension. The data reveal that differences in interests, generational perspectives, and access to resources often create friction within the community. For instance, younger actors tend to advocate for innovation and market expansion, while traditional leaders emphasize cultural preservation and social harmony. Rather than leading to fragmentation, these differences are negotiated through iterative dialogue, often facilitated by culturally embedded mechanisms of mediation. As expressed by HT (a youth representative), "we do not always agree, but we continue talking until we find a way that respects everyone." This iterative process of negotiation is critical in transforming individual preferences into collective decisions, illustrating that collective agency is built not on uniformity but on the capacity to manage diversity constructively.

Participant observation further revealed that collective agency is deeply embedded in routine practices rather than confined to formal forums. Community work activities, cultural events, and informal gatherings serve as important spaces where trust is built, information is shared, and collective intentions are formed. These interactions create what may be described as a social infrastructure of participation, where agency is continuously reproduced through everyday engagement. In this sense, participation becomes less about compliance with institutional requirements and more about active involvement in shaping communal life. This finding aligns with Harfst et al. (2025) view of agency as temporally embedded and socially constituted, as well as with more recent perspectives that frame agency as emerging from relational networks rather than individual autonomy alone.

To further illustrate the dynamics of collective agency observed in this study, Table 2 summarizes key patterns identified across different community actors and their roles in decision-making processes.

The table highlights that collective agency is distributed across multiple actors, each contributing distinct yet interconnected roles. Importantly, no single group dominates the process; instead, agency emerges through the interplay of these roles, creating a balanced and adaptive governance structure. This distributed nature of agency enhances the community's ability to respond to changing conditions while maintaining internal cohesion.

Table 2 Dynamics of Collective Agency in Rural Tourism Governance

Actor Group	Primary Role	Form of Engagement	Contribution to Collective Agency
Traditional leaders	Cultural guardians	Norm-setting and mediation	Ensuring cultural legitimacy
Youth groups	Innovation drivers	Idea generation and mobilization	Introducing adaptive strategies
Women’s groups	Social cohesion	Organizing and service provision	Strengthening inclusivity
Local entrepreneurs	Economic actors	Resource mobilization	Linking tourism with livelihoods
Village officials	Institutional facilitators	Coordination and regulation	Bridging formal and informal systems

Source: Author’s analysis (2025)

Another critical dimension of collective agency identified in this study is its transformative potential. Beyond enabling participation, collective agency allows communities to redefine their position in relation to external actors. Rather than passively implementing externally designed programs, the community actively negotiates the terms of engagement, aligning external inputs with locally defined priorities. As expressed by SL (a local entrepreneur), “we now see ourselves as partners, not just recipients.” This shift reflects a growing confidence and strategic capacity within the community, enabling it to assert its interests while remaining open to collaboration.

Conceptually, these findings suggest that collective agency in rural tourism should be understood as a relational and transformative capacity that extends beyond participation. It involves the ability to coordinate action, manage differences, and generate shared visions that guide development processes. By situating agency within networks of relationships and practices, this study contributes to a more grounded understanding of how communities navigate complexity and uncertainty in pursuit of sustainable outcomes. This perspective reinforces recent arguments that sustainability transitions are not merely technical processes but deeply social transformations that depend on the collective capacities of local actors (Chien et al., 2024; Rocca & Zielinski, 2022).

Strengthening Community Institutions: Bridging Values and Practices

The findings of this study highlight that the sustainability of rural tourism is closely tied to the strength and adaptability of community institutions, which function as a critical bridge between local values and everyday practices. Rather than operating as merely administrative structures, these institutions emerge as socially embedded arenas where local wisdom is translated into concrete actions and where collective agency is organized and sustained. This dual role becomes particularly evident in how institutions mediate between normative expectations rooted in cultural traditions and the practical demands of managing tourism activities in an evolving socio-economic environment.

Empirical observations indicate that local institutions in the village are not confined to formal governance bodies such as village administrations or tourism management boards. Instead, they encompass a broader constellation of formal and informal arrangements, including customary councils, community groups, and kinship-based networks. These overlapping institutional forms create a layered governance system in which authority and legitimacy are negotiated rather than imposed. As noted by an informant, RS (a village elder), “formal rules are important, but they must follow what is already understood and accepted in our customs.” This statement reflects a key insight from the data: institutional effectiveness is not determined solely by formal legitimacy, but by the extent to which institutions resonate with locally embedded norms and values.

The interaction between formal and informal institutions plays a crucial role in organizing participation and maintaining social cohesion. Formal institutions often provide the structural framework for coordination, such as planning meetings, financial management, and external partnerships. However, it is the informal institutions, rooted in trust, reciprocity, and shared cultural understanding, that enable these structures to function effectively in practice. For example, participant observation revealed that community meetings are not purely procedural spaces but are deeply influenced by customary norms of deliberation, where consensus is prioritized over majority voting. This process, while sometimes time-consuming, fosters a sense of collective ownership and reduces the likelihood of conflict. Such findings align with Priatmoko et al. (2021) notion of “institutional bricolage,” where formal arrangements are continuously adapted and reshaped through local practices and meanings.

Another critical dimension of community institutions identified in this study is their role in managing conflict and negotiating competing interests. As rural tourism expands, it inevitably introduces new forms of differentiation, particularly in access to resources and economic opportunities. The data reveal that tensions may arise between different groups, for instance, between those directly involved in tourism enterprises and those who are less engaged. However, rather than escalating into open conflict, these tensions are often mediated through institutional mechanisms that emphasize dialogue and restorative practices. One informant, identified as YM (a local entrepreneur), explained that “when there is disagreement, we bring it back to the community forum, because that is where we can find solutions that everyone can accept.” This reliance on collective forums underscores the importance of institutions as spaces for negotiation, where diverse interests can be reconciled within a shared normative framework.

Equally important is the role of community institutions in ensuring the equitable distribution of benefits derived from tourism. The study finds that distribution mechanisms are not solely guided by market principles but are shaped by social considerations, including fairness, inclusion, and communal responsibility. For instance, certain revenues generated from tourism activities are allocated to support community-wide needs, such as cultural events or infrastructure maintenance. This practice reflects a collective orientation that prioritizes long-term social cohesion over short-term individual gain. As expressed by LT (a

member of the village administration), “tourism should benefit the whole village, not just a few people.” This perspective resonates with broader discussions on inclusive development, which emphasize the importance of equitable benefit-sharing as a foundation for sustainability (Ahmad & Balisany, 2024; Janjua et al., 2021; Zhu, 2023).

The strengthening of these institutional arrangements is not a one-time process but an ongoing collective effort. The study shows that institutional capacity is continuously developed through learning-by-doing, reflection, and adaptation. Community members actively evaluate their practices, identify challenges, and adjust their approaches accordingly. This iterative process is facilitated by the participatory research design of the study, which creates spaces for dialogue and co-learning. In this sense, institutions are not static entities but evolving systems that grow in response to both internal dynamics and external pressures. This perspective is consistent with recent scholarship that views institutions as dynamic and relational constructs, shaped through continuous interaction and practice (Apriyanti et al., 2024; Chan et al., 2021).

Interlinkages Between Participation, Institutional Capacity, and Sustainability Outcomes

The analysis of this study reveals that participation, institutional capacity, and sustainability outcomes are not independent variables, but mutually reinforcing elements that co-evolve through everyday practices and social interactions within the community. Rather than following a linear causal pattern, the relationship between these elements is better understood as a relational configuration, where changes in one dimension shape and are shaped by transformations in the others. This insight emerged from the thematic analysis of interview transcripts, field observations, and focus group discussions, where recurring patterns pointed to a consistent interplay between how communities participate, how institutions function, and what kinds of outcomes are ultimately achieved.

At the level of participation, the findings indicate that the depth and quality of community involvement are closely linked to the presence of collective agency. Participation that is self-initiated, dialogical, and embedded in local norms tends to generate stronger commitments and more sustained engagement. This, in turn, enhances the capacity of local institutions to function effectively. As noted by an informant, FR (a youth organizer), “when people feel they are part of the process, they are more willing to take responsibility for the results.” This statement reflects a shift from participation as attendance toward participation as ownership, where individuals see themselves as integral to the success of tourism initiatives. Such forms of engagement contribute to the strengthening of institutional capacity by fostering trust, accountability, and shared responsibility.

Institutional capacity, in this context, extends beyond technical competencies or formal organizational structures. It encompasses the ability of local institutions to coordinate actors, mediate interests, and adapt to changing circumstances. The study finds that institutions characterized by flexibility, inclusiveness, and cultural legitimacy are more capable of translating community participation into tangible outcomes. For instance, village forums that integrate customary deliberation with formal planning mechanisms are better

able to reconcile diverse perspectives and produce decisions that are widely accepted. According to ML (a village official), “our strength is not just in having rules, but in how we make decisions together.” This highlights that institutional capacity is as much about process as it is about structure, aligning with recent perspectives that emphasize the relational and adaptive nature of governance systems (Herstanti, 2024; Ye et al., 2024).

The implications of these dynamics become particularly visible when examining sustainability outcomes. The data suggest that villages with high levels of collective agency and strong institutional capacity tend to demonstrate more balanced and resilient forms of development. Economically, they are able to diversify income sources and reduce dependency on external support. Socially, they maintain cohesion and inclusivity, ensuring that benefits are distributed across different groups. Culturally, they preserve and revitalize local traditions by embedding them into tourism practices rather than treating them as commodified assets. One informant, identified as SN (a local entrepreneur), observed that “tourism works well here because it grows from what we already value, not from what is imposed from outside.” This perspective underscores the importance of alignment between development practices and local value systems in achieving sustainability.

To illustrate these interconnections more clearly, the study identifies several recurring relational patterns, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3 Interlinkages Between Participation, Institutional Capacity, and Sustainability Outcomes

Dimension	Key Characteristics	Observed Outcomes
Community Participation	Inclusive, self-initiated, dialogical	Strong ownership, sustained engagement
Institutional Capacity	Adaptive, culturally embedded, coordinative	Effective governance, conflict mediation
Sustainability Outcomes	Economically viable, socially inclusive, culturally grounded	Long-term resilience and continuity

Source: Author’s analysis (2025)

The table highlights that sustainability outcomes are not merely the end result of development interventions, but the product of ongoing interactions between participatory processes and institutional arrangements. Importantly, these relationships are recursive. For example, positive outcomes, such as increased income or strengthened social cohesion, reinforce community participation by building confidence and motivation. Similarly, successful institutional practices enhance legitimacy, encouraging further engagement from community members. This cyclical dynamic suggests that sustainability is not a fixed state but an emergent property of continuous interaction and adaptation.

Another important finding is that disruptions in one dimension can have cascading effects on the others. For instance, when participation becomes exclusionary or dominated by specific groups, institutional trust tends to erode, leading to weaker coordination and less

equitable outcomes. Conversely, when institutions fail to mediate conflicts effectively, participation may decline as community members become disengaged. These observations reinforce the idea that balance and alignment across all three dimensions are critical for sustaining rural tourism initiatives.

These findings support a shift toward viewing rural tourism development as a systemic process, where social, institutional, and economic elements are deeply intertwined. This perspective resonates with emerging approaches to sustainability transitions, which emphasize the importance of relational dynamics and collective capacities in driving transformative change (Dodds et al., 2018; Prianta & Sulistyawati, 2024). By foregrounding the interdependencies between participation, institutional capacity, and sustainability outcomes, this study provides a more holistic understanding of how rural tourism can move beyond fragmented interventions toward integrated and enduring practices.

An Integrative Model of Community-Based Rural Tourism: Linking Local Wisdom, Collective Agency, and Institutional Practice

The synthesis of findings in this study culminates in the formulation of an integrative conceptual model that repositions rural tourism as a socially embedded and collectively driven process. This model brings into a coherent analytical framework three interdependent elements identified throughout the research: local wisdom as a normative foundation, collective agency as a transformative social force, and community institutions as operational mechanisms. Rather than treating these elements as discrete variables, the model conceptualizes them as dynamically interconnected dimensions that continuously shape and reinforce one another in the governance and practice of rural tourism.

At its core, the model begins with local wisdom, which functions as a normative infrastructure that defines the boundaries of what is considered legitimate, appropriate, and desirable within the community. As demonstrated in earlier findings, local wisdom is not a static repository of tradition but a living system of values that informs decision-making, guides social interactions, and regulates resource use. Its role in the model is foundational, as it provides the ethical and cultural orientation upon which all other processes are built. One informant, identified as BT (a traditional leader), articulated this succinctly: “without our values, tourism would have no direction.” This underscores that development practices gain meaning and legitimacy when they are rooted in shared cultural understandings, a point widely emphasized in studies on endogenous development and local knowledge systems (Everett & Parakoottathil, 2018; Rembulan et al., 2020).

Building upon this normative base, collective agency emerges as the central driving force that translates values into action. The findings reveal that agency is not simply an individual capacity but a relational achievement, produced through ongoing interactions among community members. It is through collective agency that local wisdom is mobilized, negotiated, and adapted to new contexts. For instance, decisions about tourism management are not merely reflections of tradition but are actively constructed through dialogue, contestation, and consensus-building processes. As expressed by HT (a youth representative),

“we use our traditions, but we also reinterpret them together to fit current needs.” This highlights the dynamic character of agency, which allows communities to remain rooted in their values while responding to changing circumstances. In this sense, collective agency serves as the bridge between normative principles and practical action, aligning closely with recent conceptualizations of relational agency in sustainability transitions (Chan, 2023; Ranasinghe & Cheng, 2018).

The third component of the model, community institutions, operates as the operational interface through which both local wisdom and collective agency are enacted in concrete terms. Institutions provide the organizational structure, rules, and processes that enable coordinated action, conflict resolution, and resource distribution. However, as the findings consistently show, their effectiveness depends on their ability to remain embedded within the community’s normative and relational fabric. Institutions that are disconnected from local values or that fail to accommodate participatory dynamics tend to lose legitimacy and effectiveness. Conversely, institutions that are adaptive, inclusive, and culturally grounded are able to sustain collective action over time. An informant, ML (a village official), emphasized this point by noting that “our institutions work because they reflect how we think and how we relate to each other.” This suggests that institutions are not merely technical arrangements but socially constructed arenas where values and agency converge.

What distinguishes this integrative model from conventional community-based tourism frameworks is its emphasis on the dynamic interplay between these three elements. Traditional approaches often prioritize participation and benefit-sharing but tend to treat them as procedural or outcome-oriented components. In contrast, the model proposed in this study foregrounds the processes through which participation is generated, sustained, and transformed. It recognizes that meaningful participation arises not from formal inclusion alone but from the alignment of normative values, collective capacities, and institutional practices. This alignment creates a reinforcing cycle: local wisdom shapes the direction of collective action, collective agency activates and adapts these values, and institutions stabilize and scale these practices within the community.

Moreover, the model introduces a transformative dimension that extends beyond incremental improvements in tourism management. By emphasizing the co-evolution of values, agency, and institutions, it highlights the potential for rural tourism to become a vehicle for broader social change. This includes strengthening community identity, enhancing social cohesion, and fostering more equitable forms of development. As noted by SN (a local entrepreneur), “tourism has changed not only our economy, but also how we work together as a community.” This observation points to the transformative capacity of tourism when it is grounded in collective processes rather than external prescriptions.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the reconceptualization of rural tourism development requires a fundamental shift from externally driven, project-based interventions toward a

community-embedded paradigm grounded in local wisdom and collective agency. Rather than positioning communities as passive beneficiaries, the findings demonstrate that sustainable rural tourism emerges when local value systems are internalized as living normative frameworks and when communities possess the relational capacity to act collectively in shaping decisions and practices. In this context, sustainability is not merely an outcome of economic optimization, but a product of culturally grounded governance, socially negotiated participation, and institutionally mediated practices. The study's principal contribution lies in advancing an integrative conceptual model that systematically links local wisdom as a normative foundation, collective agency as a transformative force, and community institutions as operational mechanisms. This model extends beyond conventional community-based tourism frameworks by emphasizing community-driven transformation rather than procedural participation alone. Consequently, the study offers a context-sensitive and scalable analytical lens for understanding and advancing rural tourism development as a socially embedded and locally governed process.

ETHICAL STATEMENT AND DISCLOSURE

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles, including informed consent, protection of informants' confidentiality, and respect for local cultural values. Special consideration was given to participants from vulnerable groups to ensure their safety, comfort, and equal rights to participate. No external funding was received, and the authors declare no conflict of interest. All data and information presented were collected through valid research methods and have been verified to ensure their accuracy and reliability. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) was limited to technical assistance for writing and language editing, without influencing the scientific substance of the work. The authors express their gratitude to the informants for their valuable insights, and to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and conclusions of this article.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, M. D. P., Budhi, M. K. S., Utama, M. S., & Yasa, I. G. W. M. (2019). The influence of government role, community participation and social capital on the quality of destination and community welfare in the tourism village of Badung Regency Province of Bali. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 92(8), 235–251. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2019-08.26>
- Ahmad, F. A., & Balisany, W. M. Khalid. (2024). Sustainable Tourism Management and Ecotourism as a Tool to Evaluate Tourism's Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals and Local Community. *OTS Canadian Journal*, 2(4), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.58840/838qdx22>
- Apriyanti, M. E., Sumaryoto, & Meirinaldi. (2024). The Importance of Tourism Infrastructure in Increasing Domestic and International Tourism. *International Journal of Research in Vocational Studies (IJRVOCAS)*, 3(4), 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.53893/ijrvocas.v3i4.46>
- Basyar, M. R., Mardiyanta, A., & Setijaningrum, E. (2025). Multi-Stakeholder Analysis in

- Building Tourism Resilience: Collaborative Governance Implementation in the Majapahit House Heritage Area, Indonesia. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 6(1), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp6010005>
- Berto, A. R. (2018). The Capitalization of Backpacking Tourism Culture in Indonesian Films. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 3(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v3i1.143>
- Chan, J. K. L. (2023). Sustainable Rural Tourism Practices From the Local Tourism Stakeholders' Perspectives. *Global Business Finance Review*, 28(3), 136–149. <https://doi.org/10.17549/gbfr.2023.28.3.136>
- Chan, J. K. L., Marzuki, K. M., & Mohtar, T. M. (2021). Local Community Participation and Responsible Tourism Practices in Ecotourism Destination: A Case of Lower Kinabatangan, Sabah. *Sustainability*, 13(23), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313302>
- Chien, P. M., Ritchie, B. W., Maruyama, N., Oguchi, T., & Kock, F. (2024). Understanding intergroup conflict between residents and tourists: a social identity perspective. In *Research Handbook on Tourism, Complexity and Uncertainty* (pp. 8–26). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802203486.00010>
- Diece, C. A., Kristianto, Y., & Yanthy, P. S. (2024). Management Strategy for the Erau Festival as a Cultural Tourism Attraction in the Kutai Kartanegara Ing Martadipura Sultanate, East Kalimantan. *Asian Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 4(03), 1596–1621. <https://doi.org/10.63922/ajmesec.v4i03.1038>
- Dodds, R., Ali, A., & Galaski, K. (2018). Mobilizing knowledge: determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(13), 1547–1568. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1150257>
- Elgammal, I. (2022). What if the local community is already well-off enough? Stakeholders' conflicts over sustainable tourism development in remote communities. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 15(4), 493–510. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPMD-02-2021-0020>
- Everett, S., & Parakoottathil, D. J. (2018). Transformation, meaning-making and identity creation through folklore tourism: the case of the Robin Hood Festival. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 13(1), 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2016.1251443>
- Fafurida, F., Solihah, D. M., & Marpaung, G. N. (2025). Tourism-Induced Environmental Degradation ASEAN Countries: Causes and Consequences. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 15(3), 629–634. <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.19143>
- Gardiner, S., Vada, S., Yang, E. C. L., Khoo, C., & Le, T. H. (2022). Recreating history: The evolving negotiation of staged authenticity in tourism experiences. *Tourism Management*, 91(5), 104515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104515>
- Ghaisani, C. O., & Afifi, S. (2022). The implementation of digital marketing communication strategy in cultural tourism: a case study in Yogyakarta. *The Indonesian Journal of Communication Studies*, 15(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.31315/ijcs.v15i1.6095>
- Harfst, J., Sandriester, J., Mildeberg, S., Dotzblasz, S., & Grochowska, A. (2025). Policies on industrial heritage tourism as a tool for sustainable regional development? A Central and Eastern European analysis. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 18(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2025.2464499>
- Hermawan, D. (2024). Bandung as a Creative City in Indonesia: The Role of Community in Developing a Creative Tourism Urban Village Initiative. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies*, 4(1), 59–72.

- <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijeass.v4i1.2177>
- Herstanti, G. (2024). Analyzing the Impact of Publicity and e-WOM on Indonesian Tourists' Visit Intention to Seoul through Destination Awareness and Preference: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach. *Journal of Applied Data Sciences*, 5(4), 2143–2158. <https://doi.org/10.47738/jads.v5i4.531>
- Hidayati, A. F., & Siregar, Y. A. (2024). Commodification of Local Culture in The Development of Wayang Villages Tourism. *Bai*, 1(2), 176–191. <https://doi.org/10.30598/baileofisipvol1iss2pp176-191>
- Hu, Y., & Ngai, P. (2021). Organizational Communications in Developing Ethnic Tourism: Participatory Approaches in Southwest China. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, 21(2), 123–142. <https://doi.org/10.3727/109830421X16191799472006>
- Isabel, P., Benito, Z., Maria E., M.-C., & Gutiérrez, A. (2025). The role of service and transport infrastructures in shaping tourist visitation patterns in the Ebro Delta. *Applied Mobilities*, 15(3), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23800127.2025.2469196>
- Janjua, Z. ul A., Krishnapillai, G., & Rahman, M. (2021). A Systematic Literature Review of Rural Homestays and Sustainability in Tourism. *Sage Open*, 11(2), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211007117>
- Kartika, T., & Fajri, K. (2019). Rasi (Cassava Rice) as an Authentic Product of Cireundeu in Supporting Gastronomic Tourism. *Proceedings of the 1st NHI Tourism Forum*, 67–71. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0009430600670071>
- Kubickova, M., & and Campbell, J. M. (2020). The role of government in agro-tourism development: a top-down bottom-up approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(5), 587–604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1551338>
- Lee, T. H., & Jan, F.-H. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 70(5), 368–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.003>
- Lukman, J. P., Yudartha, I. P. D., Ktaviani, K. C., Dewi, N. P. D. S., Widiyanti, S., & Adristari, T. P. (2025). The Development of Cultural Ecotourism-Based Tourism: The Role of Village Governments in Managing Sustainable Tourism in Badung Regency. *Baileo: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, 2(2), 242–255. <https://doi.org/10.30598/baileofisipvol2iss2pp242-255>
- Mantra, I. B. N., Suparsa, I. N., & Handayani, N. D. (2023). Cultural and Wellness Tourism: The Potential of Yoga, Meditation and Self-Purification Ceremony. *Soshum: Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 13(2), 109–119. <https://doi.org/10.31940/soshum.v13i2.109-119>
- Moayerian, N., McGehee, N. G., & Stephenson, M. O. (2022). Community cultural development: Exploring the connections between collective art making, capacity building and sustainable community-based tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 93, 103355. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103355>
- Moscardo, G. (2023). Tourism governance for rural community well-being: challenges and creative opportunities. In *Handbook on Tourism and Rural Community Development* (pp. 286–300). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800370067.00030>
- Nenotek, S. A., Paramarta, I. M. S., Sjoien, A. E., Beeh, N., Cornelis, A. R., & Benu, N. N. (2025). The linguistic landscape for sustainable and inclusive tourism: insight from Timor Tengah Selatan, Indonesia. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 12(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2441579>
- Nurhadi, I., Sumarti, T., Hadi Dharmawan, A., & S Damanhuri, D. (2022). Cultural Commodification and Ethical Transition of Tourism Development: A Case in Osing

- Community, Indonesia. *Sodality: Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*, 10(1), 24–43. <https://doi.org/10.22500/10202238564>
- Pardosi, J., Putra, I. M., & Pretty, B. (2024). Exploration and Existence of Local Wisdom as An Effort to Build Sustainable Tourism in Samosir Regency. *Komunitas: International Journal of Indonesian Society and Culture*, 16(1), 92–110. <https://doi.org/10.15294/komunitas.v16i1.4000>
- Pasanchay, K., & Schott, C. (2021). Community-based tourism homestays' capacity to advance the Sustainable Development Goals: A holistic sustainable livelihood perspective. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 37(5), 100784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100784>
- Pattaray, A. (2024). Leveraging Local Wisdom as Social Capital for Sustainable Tourism: A Case Study of the Ponan Tradition in Poto Village, Sumbawa, Indonesia. *TourismSpectrum: Diversity & Dynamics*, 1(2), 104–114. <https://doi.org/10.56578/tsdd010204>
- Perbawasari, S., Sjachro, D. W., Setianti, Y., Nugraha, A. R., & Hafiar, H. (2019). Government Marketing Public Relations Strategy in Preparing Halal Tourism in Priangan Region. *MIMBAR: Jurnal Sosial Dan Pembangunan*, 35(1), 89–103. <https://doi.org/10.29313/mimbar.v35i1.4134>
- Prasiasa, D. P. O., Widari, D. A. D. S., & Susanti, P. H. (2023). Authenticity and Commodification of Creative Industry Products in The Tourism Sector, Bali. *Mudra Jurnal Seni Budaya*, 38(3), 85–100. <https://doi.org/10.31091/mudra.v38i3.2285>
- Prianta, P. A., & Sulistyawati, A. (2024). Development Of The Ogoh-Ogoh Parade From A Religious Ritual To A Tourist Attraction In Bali. *Journey : Journal of Tourismpreneurship, Culinary, Hospitality, Convention and Event Management*, 7(1), 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.46837/journey.v7i1.194>
- Priatmoko, S., Kabil, M., Purwoko, Y., & Dávid, L. D. (2021). Rethinking Sustainable Community-Based Tourism: A Villager's Point of View and Case Study in Pampang Village, Indonesia. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3245. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063245>
- Rahman, M. S. U., David, S., Michael C., S., & and Ratna, N. N. (2022). Social and cultural capitals in tourism resource governance: the essential lenses for community focussed co-management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(11), 2665–2685. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1903016>
- Rahman, S. S., & Baddam, P. R. (2021). Community Engagement in Southeast Asia's Tourism Industry: Empowering Local Economies. *Global Disclosure of Economics and Business*, 10(2), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.18034/gdeb.v10i2.715>
- Ranasinghe, R., & and Cheng, L. (2018). Tourism-induced mobilities and transformation of indigenous cultures: where is the Vedda community in Sri Lanka heading to?*. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(5), 521–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2017.1393081>
- Rembulan, C. L., Helmi, A. F., & Riyono, B. (2020). The fluid power: constructing the concept of power in community-based tourism in Indonesia. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 14(4), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-03-2020-0041>
- Rocca, L. H. D., & Zielinski, S. (2022). Community-based tourism, social capital, and governance of post-conflict rural tourism destinations: the case of Minca, Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 43(12), 100985. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2022.100985>

- Scherer, E., & Thelen, T. (2020). On countryside roads to national identity: Japanese morning drama series (asadora) and contents tourism. *Japan Forum*, 32(1), 6–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09555803.2017.1411378>
- Sharma, A., Saulais, L., & Huang, Y. (2024). Sustainable consumer choices – critical reflection on hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 36(6), 1784–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2022-0998>
- Singgalen, Y. A., & Simange, S. M. (2018). Livelihood and Rural Tourism Development in Coastal Area North Maluku Province Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 156(6), 012010. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/156/1/012010>
- Sonuç, N. (2023). Culture, Tourism, and Sustainability (Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Tourism, Social Sustainability of Tourism, Socio-cultural Sustainability of Tourism). In S. O. Idowu, R. Schmidpeter, N. Capaldi, L. Zu, M. Del Baldo, & R. Abreu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Sustainable Management* (pp. 1083–1089). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-25984-5_457
- Ulfa, K., Zaenuri, M., Rahmawati, D. E., Rassanjani, S., Mukhrijal, M., & Imanullah, A. (2021). Branding Strategy “The Light Of Aceh” Through E-Tourism On Sustainable Tourism Development in Aceh Province. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 8(3), 110. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jgpp.v8i3.11034>
- Wilson, A. (2018). International tourism and (linguistic) accommodation: Convergence towards and through English in tourist information interactions. *Anglophonia*, 25(25), 987–1000. <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.1377>
- Ye, J., Qin, Y., & Wu, H. (2024). Cultural heritage and sustainable tourism: unveiling the positive correlations and economic impacts. *Current Psychology*, 43(47), 36393–36415. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-07070-6>
- Yoshida, M., & Kato, H. (2023). Housing Affordability Risk and Tourism Gentrification in Kyoto City. *Sustainability*, 16(1), 309. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16010309>
- Yusra, K., Lestari, Y. B., & Hamid, M. O. (2022). Teacher agency and the implementation of CEFR-like policies for English for tourism and hospitality: insights from local vocational high schools in Indonesia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 23(3), 233–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1965739>
- Zhu, Y. (2023). Memory, homecoming and the politics of diaspora tourism in China. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(1), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1844286>
- Zielinski, S., Kim, S., Botero, C., & Yanes, A. (2020). Factors that facilitate and inhibit community-based tourism initiatives in developing countries. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(6), 723–739. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1543254>