



# Thammasat Institute of Area Studies

WORKING PAPER SERIES 2018

*Community Based Tourism In Creating Impacts For Rural  
Communities: A Case Study Nglanggeran Tourist Village  
In Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

*Irwita Erlangga*

December 2018

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY

# PAPER NO. 08 / 2018

Thammasat Institute of Area Studies, Thammasat University  
Working Paper Series 2018

*Community Based Tourism in Creating Impacts For Rural Communities: A  
Case Study Nglanggeran Tourist Village in Yogyakarta, Indonesia*

Irwita Erlangga

Thammasat Institute of Area Studies, Thammasat University  
99 Moo 18 Khlongnueng Sub District, Khlong Luang District,  
Pathum Thani, 12121, Thailand

This publication of Working Paper Series is part of Master of Arts in Asia-Pacific Studies Program, Thammasat Institute of Area Studies (TIARA), Thammasat University. The view expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Institute.

For more information, please contact Academic Support Unit, Thammasat Institute of Area Studies (TIARA), Pathumthani, Thailand

Telephone: +02 696 6605

Fax: + 66 2 564-2849

Email: [academic.tiara@gmail.com](mailto:academic.tiara@gmail.com)

Language Editors: Mr Mohammad Zaidul Anwar Bin Haji Mohamad Kasim  
Ms. Thanyawee Chuanchuen

TIARA Working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. Comments on this paper should be sent to the author of the paper,

Mr. Irwita Erlangga, Email: [ri.erlangga@gmail.com](mailto:ri.erlangga@gmail.com)

Or Academic Support Unit (ASU), Thammasat Institute of Area Studies, Thammasat University

## Abstract

This paper aims to provide an explanation of how the process of creating contributions to the community in the community-based tourism model in Nglanggeran. In recent years, the Indonesian Government has developed the potential of local resources through tourist villages. Before the government used this strategy, the Nglanggeran tourism village had been formed and driven by the community. This tourism village developed and began to show its existence as one of the best community-based tourism villages. The CIPP evaluation model is used to assess the process of achieving community-based tourism goals. Therefore, information extraction is carried out through in-depth interviews with stakeholders involved, including village communities, government, companies and academics. Furthermore, the results of the analysis show that tourism activities are cross-sectoral activities and many stakeholders are involved. Limited capital and human resources are a weakness of the community-based tourism committee. These stakeholders are present to complement the role of community-based tourism committees to be able to encourage community empowerment. On the other hand, a series of ex-ante policies from the central government have no effect on the management of the Nglanggeran tourist village. Some of these policies seem to strengthen the legality of tourism activities managed by the community.

**Keywords:** Community-Based Tourism, CIPP Evaluation Model, rural community, community empowerment

## **1. Introduction**

Several studies related to community-based tourism (CBT) discuss about measuring success (Goodwin & Santili, 2009; Kibicho, 2008); contribution to development (Sandmeyer, 2005; Blackstock, 2005; Lapeyre, 2010; Zapata *et al*, 2011; López-Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares, & Pavón, 2011); entrepreneurship (Sebele, 2010; Sánchez & Andersen, 2015). Besides, assessment of success tends to be subjective and casuistic depending on several factors that are unique to a particular situation (Okazaki, 2008; Goodwin & Santili, 2009). Every tourist village has a certain situation where the influencing factors are difficult to equate with other tourist villages. These variations in situations and factors clearly have consequences in standardizing the assessment of the success of CBT.

Hence, Tosun (2000) suggest to further examine the role of external actors and the development of participatory tourism approach strategies in developing countries. In addition, Tosun (2005) also propose to to analyze how decision making can be achieved through developing community participation. Besides, Tolkach and King (2015) advocate for further study of the networking process by CBT entrepreneurs with other stakeholders in order to generate benefit for community. Some of the recommendations above show that there is still a gap between literature and practice. Specifically regarding power relations and participation of stakeholders in collaboration scheme. Therefore this study emphasizes the empowerment process to create benefits for the communities in developing countries.

Whilst, some scholars (Arieta, 2010; Purbasari & Asnawi, 2014; Harun, 2014; Lestari, Armawi & Muhamad, 2016) contend that CBT model have adopted by few tourist villages in Indonesia. Based on those studies, there is one unique case that is quite interesting to be studied further namely Nglanggeran tourist village. This tourist village was established before the government issued a policy related to the development of tourism potential through community empowerment. In addition,

the government also launched a series of policies related to retribution and villages which directly or indirectly could affect tourism villages. However, beyond the range of the policy there are some pretty prestigious achievement. Recently this tourist village received recognition from UNESCO as one of the Geo-park sites and as the best Tourism Village of ASEAN Community-Based Tourism.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Community-based Tourism**

Prabhakaran, Nair and Ramachandran (2014) argues community participation in tourism activities through working directly provide economic benefits at the household level. However, consideration of how the mechanism of community participation within the framework of CBT is more important to be discussed further. Kibicho (2008) argues that if the use of community development approaches in tourism projects will get support from the community. Community involvement in the development and operation process directly creates a degree of project ownership. Zapata et al. (2011) found that the community was considered a work partner but tended to be passive in the top-down community-based tourism model. Besides, Mayaka, Croy and Cox (2018) mentioned that the community is the main actor who actively participates in rural tourism development.

### **2.2. CIPP evaluation model**

Stufflebeam (1971) argues that proactive evaluative decision making is through the CIPP model. As evaluation model, CIPP contains four basic components of a program activity namely Context, Input, Process and Product. This evaluation model is intended as a basis for decision-making oriented to planned changes. It can be simplified that the basic concept of evaluation carried out for improvement does not prove a thing. In addition, some scholars (Stufflebeam, Madaus & Kellaghan, 2002;

Hakan & Seval, 2011) argue that the model can be used to evaluate programs and projects in various disciplines. There are several scientific articles (Rungsirattanawong, 2011; Aristrawati, 2015; Phumsathan, Manowaluilou & Udomwitid, 2016; Panca & Putra, 2016; Sastrawan, Paturusi & Arida, 2017) explaining how tourism programs are evaluated through the CIPP model. However, there were only a few articles (Rungsirattanawong, 2011; Sastrawan, Paturusi & Arida, 2017) which discussed the evaluation of community-based tourism programs using the CIPP model. With the limitations of the literature, the contextualization of the CIPP model in this study will be adjusted according to those two articles.

### **3. Methods**

The community empowerment process was examined using the CIPP evaluation model in this study. In order to know the dynamics of the empowerment process through a community-based tourism framework, in-depth interviews were conducted with the stakeholders involved. The informants to be interviewed are not limited to members of the rural community, but also to the CBT committee, and other institutional partners. Information through interviews is an important foundation of research findings in this study. In addition, primary data is also obtained through field observations which are then used to cross-check the results of interviews. Each stakeholder has their own views or experiences on the empowerment process in a community-based tourism model.

## **4. Result and Discussion**

### **4.1. Tourism Awareness Group (*Pokdarwis*) as holding group**

The community is a key actor in the community-based tourism model. Since the beginning of its development, village communities have an important role. The community is involved in the tourist village of Nglanggeran because it is based on

community activities that are used as an attraction. Communities become more independent and rely on their own abilities to develop tourist attractions. Therefore, it can be concluded that village communities are the main actors of tourism activities. Based on informant interviews summarized in the table below, it appears that the important role in tourism in Nglanggeran Tourism Village is in the community.

**Table 1 Role of community groups**

Community Group	Role	Activities
<i>Pokdarwis</i>	Management	Maintain cleanliness of the tourist attraction
		Home-stay reservation
		Manage and develop tourism activities
		Local transport for tourist
	Guide	Guide trips in Ancient Volcano and outbound activities
Art Group	Management	Providing art training
	Spokesperson	Providing art training for tourists
Farming Group	Management	Manage agricultural tourism areas
	Spokesperson	Agricultural tourism training
Culinary Group	Supplier	Providing food for tourists
	Spokesperson	Culinary training for tourists
Home-stay Group	Supplier	Provide home-stay and interact with tourist
	Spokesperson	Training for tourists in local wisdom

Source: Author's own analysis

Based on the table above there are several community groups involved in tourism activities. When examined further, managerial functions were under the *Pokdarwis* so that they became a holding group for rural communities. However, in handling general routine activities, the community as a whole is also involved. The



involvement of community groups only occurs in the management of tourism activities. Group management is carried out independently without intervention from *Pokdarwis*. In addition, they are also free to network and collaborate with various parties to increase capacity in accordance with the scope of community activities. As stated by the spokesperson:

*“we provide flexibility to community groups so that they can increase their respective capacities.”* (M, Oct 25, 2018)

This opinion was then reinforced by other spokespersons:

*“To partner with third parties, we are adjusting to the institutions we have ... the institutional flexibility used, there are people who are more likely to be placed in it”* (SH, Oct 23, 2018)

This opinion shows that institutional flexibility is very important to encourage networking and capacity building. *Pokdarwis* has an important role in developing tourism village potential as an alternative form of village community development. But with limited resources, making the flexibility of the institution an important thing. This flexibility makes it easier for community groups to reach stakeholders who directly or indirectly have an impact on rural communities. Therefore, this study then examined the stakeholders and their role for the Nglanggeran community as presented in the following table:

**Table 2 The role of other stakeholders**

Stakeholder	Role	Activities
Ministry of Tourism	Policy Maker	Formulate and issue provisions for tourism activities
	Capacity building program	Provide assistance on tourism management training, home-stay training, guide training, culinary training, and art training
	Physical assistance program	Provide assistance for developing tourist attraction, accommodation and amenity

Stakeholder	Role	Activities
Ministry of Village, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration	Policy Maker	Formulate and issue regulation to provide legal standing for Village Owned Enterprise
Ministry of Agriculture	Assistance	Provide farm-related assistance
Yogyakarta Provincial Government (service below)	Non-physical assistance program	Provide right to use (land use) of the ancient volcano
	Facilitator	Facilitate the promotional activities
Gunungkidul Regency Government (service below)	Policy Maker	Formulate and issue provisions for retribution of tourism place, Detail Engineering Design, Master plan and Site Plan
	Physical assistance program	Provide assistance for developing road construction and road sign
	Facilitator	Facilitate the promotional activities
	Assistance	Provide farm-related assistance Provide assistance on tourism management
Nglanggeran Village Government	Policy Maker	Formulate and issue provisions for tourism activities as business unit of Village Owned Enterprise
	Assistance	Give consideration and direction in decision making
		Administrative service
Traveloka (travel agent)	Business Partner	Promote travel packages
Bank Mandiri	Assistance	Provide assistance on amenity
Pertamina	Assistance	Provide assistance on agricultural seeds
Bank Indonesia	Assistance	Provide training in cocoa processing
Community Service Program (from different university)	Non-physical assistance program	Provide for management training, language training and hospitality training
	Physical assistance program	Provide assistance on amenity
Lecture,	Assistance	Provide recommendation, policy brief and technical

Stakeholder	Role	Activities
researcher and student (from different university)		assistance

Source: Author's own analysis

#### 4.2. Dynamics of relationships between stakeholders.

Collaboration between stakeholders as described in the table above indirectly shows the dynamics that occur in relationships between stakeholders. Each stakeholder has its own work domain and interests in the development of Nglanggeran tourism village. For example, the law on regional retribution. The real implication is that there is a decrease in the number of visitors at the beginning of the implementation of the law which resulted in the emergence of community resistance to the law. But the resistance does not last long. Over time and there is a change in mindset from *Pokdarwis* to suppress negative excesses from overcapacity, then the regulation is then accepted. The change in mindset is the result of group evaluations with the internal stakeholders involved.

Another example is the Agricultural Technology Park (TTP) program. This program is a program of the Agricultural Research and Development Agency (under the Ministry of Agriculture) that works with one of the Universities and is aimed at increasing farmers' income on the basis of technological innovation. The Nglanggeran case is focused on post-harvest processing. Whereas Bank Indonesia in collaboration with the Gunungkidul Regency Agriculture Service provides a post-harvest processing assistance program, especially cocoa commodities. At a glance, the two programs can be complementary. But in practice, as if there were two chocolate processing culinary groups competing in the same market. Even though it is located in the Nglanggeran tourist area, TTP is not integrated in tourist villages. It is different from

the assistance program from Bank Indonesia that goes through culinary community groups that are automatically synchronized with community-based tourism.

One key to dealing with dynamics in the process of collaboration between stakeholders is the communication forum. *Pokdarwis* has a forum for internal communication with relevant stakeholders. This communication forum has an agenda to discuss the dynamics that arise in the management of tourist villages. The decision-making mechanism through deliberation is the only method used in this forum. This method represents the value of the *Pancasila* democracy. When the deliberations have reached consensus among stakeholders, the dynamics or friction that occurs in the previous process will not continue. Moreover, the position of the tourism village became a business unit under the Village Owned Enterprise which directly placed the Village Government as a main administrator. However, the Government is committed to continuing to encourage village tourism village to be managed by the community.

## **5. Conclusion**

Internal and external stakeholders are interested in participating in tourism activities developed in Nglanggeran Tourism Village. Ensuring that local communities are involved and play a central role in tourism management is one of the important keys in the sustainability of community-based tourism. The direct implication is that the community feels most of the benefits and uses. In addition, this study found that institutional adaptation is needed for a series of policies by stakeholders. Tourism as a business unit must be sensitive to the expected environmental changes that occur. Response to these changes is an important key to competing. The strategy for adaptation is realized by a communication forum between internal stakeholders.

An important lesson from this case is that the participation and involvement of various stakeholders greatly influences the existence and sustainability of tourist

villages. Participation is an important key. Moreover, the involvement of rural communities to be more important than the role of various stakeholders for community-based rural tourism is sustainable. Although it is undeniable that external stakeholders still have a stake in community-based rural tourism. But with the magnitude of the role of the community, it is expected that the benefits received will be directly proportional.

## Bibliography

- Arieta, S. (2010). Community Based Tourism Pada Masyarakat Pesisir; Dampaknya Terhadap Lingkungan dan Pemberdayaan Ekonomi. *Jurnal Dinamika Maritim*, 2(1).
- Aristrawati, N. L. P. (2015). Evaluasi Parade “Ogoh-Ogoh” Sebagai Pendukung Pengembangan Pariwisata Budaya Di Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Master Pariwisata (JUMPA)*, 2(1), 42-60.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.24843/JUMPA.2015.v02.i01.p03>
- Blackstock, K. (2005). A critical look at community based tourism. *Community Development Journal*, 40(1), 39-49. doi:10.1093/cdj/bsi005
- Goodwin, H., & Santili, R. (2009). Community-based Tourism: A success? (ICRT Occasional Paper No. 11). Leeds: ICRT and GTZ
- López-Guzmán, T., Sánchez-Cañizares, S., & Pavón, V. (2011). Community-based tourism in developing countries: a case study. *Tourismos*, 6(1).
- Hakan, K., & Seval, F. (2011). CIPP evaluation model scale: development, reliability and validity. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 592-599.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.146>
- Harun, Z. (2014). Model Strategi Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Melalui Pengembangan Pariwisata yang Berbasis Komunitas Lokal: Kasus di Kota Padang Panjang. *Jurnal Antropologi: Isu-Isu Sosial Budaya*, 16(1), 99-106.
- Kibicho, W. (2008). Community-based Tourism: A Factor-Cluster Segmentation Approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), 211-231.  
doi:10.2167/jost623.0
- Lapeyre, R. (2010). Community-based tourism as a sustainable solution to maximise impacts locally? The Tsiseb Conservancy case, Namibia. *Development Southern Africa*, 27(5), 757-772. doi:10.1080/0376835X.2010.522837
- Lestari, G., Armawi, A., & Muhamad, M. (2016). Partisipasi Pemuda Dalam Mengembangkan Pariwisata Berbasis Masyarakat Untuk Meningkatkan

- Ketahanan Sosial Budaya Wilayah (Studi di Desa Wisata Pentingsari, Umbulharjo, Cangkringan, Sleman, DI Yogyakarta). *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*, 22(2), 137-157.
- Mayaka, M., Croy, W. G., & Cox, J. W. (2018). Participation as motif in community-based tourism: a practice perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(3), 416-432.
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A Community-Based Tourism Model: Its Conception and Use. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), 511-529.  
doi:10.1080/09669580802159594
- Panca, I. M. A. A., & Putra, I. N. D. (2016). Evaluasi Pengembangan Desa Budaya Kertalangu Denpasar Sebagai Daya Tarik Wisata. *Jurnal Master Pariwisata (JUMPA)*, 2(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.24843/JUMPA.2016.v02.i02.p10
- Phumsathan, S., Manowalulou, N., & Udomwitid, S. (2016). *Moving Away From Mass Tourism To Creative Tourism—How To Get Started A Case Study: Creative Tourism Development Of Trat Province, Thailand*. Paper presented at the 6th ADVANCES IN HOSPITALITY & TOURISM MARKETING & MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE.
- Purbasari, N., & Asnawi, A. (2014). Keberhasilan Community Based Tourism di Desa Wisata Kembangarum, Pentingsari dan Nglanggeran. *Teknik PWK (Perencanaan Wilayah Kota)*, 3(3), 476-485.
- Prabhakaran, S., Nair, V., & Ramachandran, S. (2014). Community Participation in Rural Tourism: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 290-295.  
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.298
- Rungsrirattanawong, N. (2011). *The Evaluation Of Ecotourism Management Planning By The Local Community Of Klong Khone Mangrove Conservation Center, Tambon Klong Khone*. Mahidol University.
- Salazar, N. B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 9-22.  
doi:10.1080/09669582.2011.596279

- Sánchez, N. C., & Andersen, C. F. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship within Community Based Tourism in a Latin American Context-A case.
- Sandmeyer, A. E. (2006). *Community-based ecotourism and sustainable community development: Exploring the relationship*.
- Sastrawan, I. G. A., Paturusi, S. A., & Arida, N. S. (2017). Evaluasi Pengembangan Potensi “Ancient Track One” Dengan Model CIPP Di Desa Wisata Bedulu Dan Desa Buruan Kabupaten Gianyar. *Jurnal Master Pariwisata (JUMPA)*. doi:10.24843/JUMPA.2017.v04.i02.p10
- Sebele, L. S. (2010). Community-based tourism ventures, benefits and challenges: Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Central District, Botswana. *Tourism Management, 31*(1), 136-146. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.005
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Ohio State Univ, C. E. C. (1971). *The Relevance of the Cipp Evaluation Model for Educational Accountability*.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., & Kellaghan, T. (2002). Evaluation models : viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation.
- Tolkach, D., & King, B. (2015). Strengthening Community-Based Tourism in a new resource-based island nation: Why and how? *Tourism Management, 48*, 386-398. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.013
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management, 21*(6), 613-633. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00009-1
- Tosun, C. (2005). Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the Developing World. *Geoforum, 36*(3), 333-352. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2004.06.003
- Zapata, M. J., Hall, C. M., Lindo, P., & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from Nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism, 14*(8), 725-749. doi:10.1080/13683500.2011.559200