

Approaches to Indonesia Cultural Tourism Policy: Stakeholders' Perspectives on The Cultural Tourism Governances in Bayan

Ahmad Mujafar Syah and Dini Hajarrahmah

Graduate Research Assistant – Boston University Department of Administrative Sciences
Boston University 808 Commonwealth Avenue, Mezzanine Boston, MA 02215, United States

Corresponding author: syah.ahmadmujafar@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received
23 March 2019

Accepted
02 September 2019

Available online
30 September 2019

ABSTRACT

In support to the initiative of Indonesia government on the priority destinations project (ten new Bali) where Mandalika in Lombok Island is being endorsed as one of “New Bali” targeted development destination, the research is aimed to analyze the effective roles of national and regional government on the development of cultural tourism destination in Bayan Village, North Lombok administrative region, as it is one of the alternative tourism attractions in Lombok Island. For the purpose of objectivity, this research has limited the source and scope of the observation only from related stakeholders and Lombok local tourism government thus the research employed an in-depth interview through designated stakeholders clusters. The research examined and summarized the finding from the stakeholders' perspectives that have either direct or indirect concerns toward Bayan Village's development from which; a proposed recommendation on a tourism policy framework for cultural destination was concluded. Based on our finding, the situation where the development initiated both by national and regional tourism government in Lombok did not show a fair distribution to all promising destinations especially Bayan Village in North Lombok as one of cultural tourism assets in North Lombok.

Keywords: Cultural tourism destination, cultural tourism governance, tourism policy, stakeholder perspectives.

INTRODUCTION

Current Standing of Bayan Tourism Administration

Resonating the priority tourism initiative of “Ten New Bali” back in 2016 which one of its targeted destinations is

Mandalika in Lombok, this research went over and extended the examination of another source of destination in Lombok and endeavored the finding on how the stakeholders perceived the cross-governmental and non-governmental

incorporations and impacts between the emerging national's destinations tourism initiative and continuous development of respective supporting tourism areas within a destination. Bayan in North Lombok is a true heritage destination and cultural tourism asset both national and regional tourism government needs to develop. Bayan has all it takes to be of the most prominent cultural tourism destinations in Lombok offering culture, history, eco-tourism, and it exhibits a real life of one of the oldest Indonesian tribe in their nature with the uniqueness of its ancient belief in Islamic practices where the oldest ancient mosque and traditional Sasak tribe houses are being preserved and exhibited. In addition to those, the geographical fact about Bayan village is that the center of this cultural village lies between the strategic point-of entries to Rinjani National Park (Sembalun & Senaru) making this village very much accessible by the tourists especially for those who are transiting prior to or after the Rinjani's tracking.

Bayan as one of cultural destinations in Lombok have been advocating their needs toward the fairness implementations of Lombok' tourism policy and cooperation that touches upon the holistic development support both priority destination and the alternative

ones. Despite different perspectives gained from different stakeholders being interviewed in this research, almost all of the local stakeholders in Bayan Village, due to their strong ties to cultural, family and community, expect the tourism's policy realization to have a deployed impact to all tourism areas in Bayan rather than pulling the local people in Bayan to find a living in emerging destinations within Lombok. This is of course shown contrast perspectives, which will be explained in the finding sections, when the external stakeholders of Bayan spoke up the critical objectives of tourism policy in Lombok and how Indonesia government is very well informed about the essential role of alternative and cultural tourism in a certain destination like Bayan.

Research Objective

Inspired by the previous studies on tourism policy, this research main objective is to evaluate the regional tourism policy in Bayan Village, North Lombok based on several field observations on the stakeholders' perspectives. This study also aims to explore the social and political issues behind the policy implementation processes administered by the North Lombok government and how the cross-governmental and non-governmental bodies synergize the work on the field.

The findings from this study would provide a better understanding to tourism policy researchers and regional tourism policy decision makers about how the government decentralizes, incorporate and comply with the regional tourism plan, regulation and community engagement for a cultural destination area that results in a fair and sustainable overall growth in Bayan Village, North Lombok. This research would also propose a better policy formulation and practice from the extracted policy formulation theory in order to provide a better tourism policy recommendation that can be applied in tourism research of other Indonesia destinations that touch upon the empowerment of locals' socioeconomic growth within the establishment of cultural tourism as alternative growth factors.

METHODOLOGY

The qualitative analysis that will be conducted would be in the form of a case study on tourism stakeholders' participations, tourism policy and its incorporation in support to destination and community development of Bayan Village in North Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. This case study mainly seeks: how tourism stakeholders in Lombok and Bayan Village in particular view and evaluate what policies are being well implemented

and what are not from the regional government that is currently in power and mainly conducting the tourism policy tasks. From this qualitative study, the researchers expect to be able to test and improve the preliminary hypotheses and construct the new model of regional tourism policy structures and practices for Bayan Village that can also be applied to other Indonesia's destinations.

The data and information in this research will be collected through several methods. Literature findings, in-depth interview and discussion with key persons in government, NGOs, local scholars and communities as well as document review, would be employed to gain information for the qualitative analysis. The data of Lombok tourism statistics will be obtained mainly from the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, Indonesia Statistics Bureau and line ministries, such as Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Cooperative Small and Medium Enterprises, Ministry of Public works and Ministry of Acceleration Development of Backward Regions. The research and data collection were done within the period of fifteen months started on May 2017 to August 2018.

The respondents in this research collected to twenty-six (26) participants and are classified into four (4) different groupings: 1. The stakeholders in NGO grouping that includes three (3) different respondents from “Genpi Lombok and Sumbawa”; 2. The stakeholders in scholar grouping includes five (5) different respondents from Institute Technology Bandung, Universitas Gadjah Mada and Universitas Mataram; 3. The stakeholders in government officials grouping includes three (3) different respondents from national tourism ministry of Indonesia, the tourism department officer in North Lombok, and the transportation department in North Lombok; 4. The stakeholders in the local communities and tourism industry grouping include fifteen (15) different respondents where five (5) respondents came from Bayan Tribe Communities, four (4) respondents came from Bayan and Rinjani tourism industry people, three (3) respondents came from Bayan’s farmer communities, two (2) from Bayan’s tourism and social development communities and one (1) from the secretary of Bayan’s village government.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cultural Tourism

The notion of cultural tourism both in the late history or today’s understanding, according to Smith (2003)

is all about the history and heritage of a certain destination with its people. And as Smith (2003) added, the cultural tourism also touches people’s contemporary lives and how they live in accordance to their past upbringing and values. Richard (2001a: 7) ascertained, “not just the consumption of the cultural products of the past, but also contemporary culture or “the way of life” of a people or region. Cultural tourism can therefore be seen as covering both “heritage tourism” (related artefacts of the past) and “art tourism” (related to contemporary cultural production).” According to Zeppel and Hall (1992), cultural tourism can be classified into two categories of visitation motives; “heritage and arts tourism”. Nonetheless, in many contexts of cultural tourism studies, the heritage and arts are being formed as an entity of what the cultural tourism could offer as its distinguished package. “The arts and heritage are inextricably linked, and it is almost impossible to distinguish between them, particularly in the context of indigenous communities where the distinction between past, present, and future is not as clear-cut or linear as in Western societies.” (Smith 2003: 30). A technical definition of cultural tourism according to (Richards 1996: 24) “all movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as museums, heritage

sites, artistic performances and festival outside their normal place of residence.”

Linking the Stakeholders' Perspectives with a Tourism Public Policy Construct

Freeman (1984) defines a stakeholder as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives”. Donaldson and Preston (1995) refined Freeman’s definition stating that to be identified as a stakeholder the group or individual must have a legitimate interest in the organization or activity. Research has been conducted on stakeholders, stakeholder identification and involvement in business management, which focuses on the management and power of stakeholders (Clarkson, 1995; Donald & Preston, 1995; Freeman, 1984). Research on stakeholder right to be involved irrespective of their level of power has been conducted (Carmin, Darnall, & Mil-Homens, 2003; Curry, 2001; Steelman, 2001). Research on stakeholder groups and the significance of their interests has been published (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Davis & Morais, 2004; De Lopez, 2001; Gunn, 1994; Gursoy et al., 2002; Yuksel et al., 1999). Research on stakeholders and their role in tourism development meets with identifying four stakeholder categories: tourists, residents, entrepreneurs and local government officials (Goeldner & Ritchie,

2003). Freeman (1984) states that an organization has relationships with several groups and individuals e.g., employees, customers, suppliers, and members of the communities, governments, stating that: “Stakeholder is any group or individual who can affect, or is affected by, the achievement of a corporation’s purpose. Stakeholders include employees, customers, suppliers, stockholders, banks, environmentalists, government and other groups who can help or hurt the corporation. A stakeholder should denote those groups which make a difference in an organization is (by definition) any group or individual who can affect or be affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” (Freeman, 1984). In the correlation between government and tourism policy, Sabatier (1999) mentioned that the process of policy making takes into account the conduct where issues are being brought to related government to solve. “Government traditionally formulates alternatives and select policy solutions based on consultations” (Kerr, 2003).

In the correlation between government and tourism policy, Sabatier (1999) mentioned that the process of policy making takes into account the conduct where issues are being brought to related government to solve. “Government

traditionally formulates alternatives and select policy solutions based on consultations” (Kerr, 2003). And, this is what this research is aiming to conduct and exercise the input from the stakeholder prior shaping the policy proposal. Hall (1994) mentioned that government would enact both legislation for the sake of the destination development and generate the right policy making for the empowering the general economic and regulatory parameters within the industry. Hall (1994) added that the efforts to government tasks within the regional tourism policy would include the work of provision of infrastructure, planning, protection of environment, zoning policy, training, and education for the locals. Thus, the policy participation should also take a strategic ownership throughout the process of tourism policy making. According to Holloway (1998), the emerging growth of tourism industry is the reflection of alliances, voluntary and partnership that happens between business, communities and public sectors playing an active role in defining the policy, driving the initiatives and evaluating and solving the challenges and sharing mutual benefit. The policy analysis and research framework, after the finding of stakeholders’ perspectives on the target issues of the research area, this research is constructed by reflecting the flow of work

to a guiding framework idea of public policy analysis for tourism by Kerr (2003) that seeks out the most adequate tourism policy analysis and research approaches where the stakeholders’ perspectives build upon the strategic linkage of the proposed policy approach.

Tourism Public Policy and Public Administration

Despite the emerging research interest in the tourism public policy, government interventions and public sectors’ influences on the tourism development policy-making process and its relation to a right practice proposal of public administration, (Richter, 1983;1989), according to Jenkins et al., (2014), tourism, however, as one of the sectoral areas of public policy has not been gaining sufficient scholarly concerns if it is compared to several extent of public policy and political science literature. And, there are relatively small numbers of research being conducted to analyze the right theories of tourism (Jenkins et al., 2014). With the nature of tourism as a catalyst to the development of a national economy and the utilization machine towards the national workforces, it is inevitable that tourism context should be held accountable and it is relatively imperative as an integrated public

administration management studies (Coles & Hall, 2011). With the facts that not all the policy dimensions of tourism are the cores assessments of the tourism research (Benckendorff & Zehrer, 2013), there have been several studies in tourism and its relation to public policy and administration that are discussing certain focus of perspectives and tourism's interrelation with several studies to gaining some new approaches. (Church, 2004; Hall & Jenkins, 2004; Airey & Chong, 2010; Halkier, 2010; Dredge & Jenkins, 2012; Kernnell & Chaperon, 2013). The finding within the studies of public policy and public administration on the context of European tourism according to Devine and Devine (2011) are predominately discussing about the roles of state government on tourism and how for some extents, its roles are being driven by policy approaches enabling a less intervention of regional public entities. Learning from the Nordic tourism perspectives (Hall 2014), this is saying a new concept of public policy and administration approach in the tourism development endeavors that the state government is not a single power of political network and thus the civic engagement, public and local interest, democratic adaptation, as well as culture and community-based tourism planning, are entitled to the scope of public policy

studies despite not necessarily correlated focus of public policy analysis and tourism management (Hall, 2008; Bramwell, 2014; Zapata, 2014).

Hall (2013) delivered his thought that so often, the focus on tourism policy research has a sole identification to certain tourism's networks without getting to deeper critics toward networks' values and their actions. Similarly, an uncritical focus on the tourism development potential of public-private partnerships in areas such as urban regeneration, place marketing, events, and attractions as a magic solution in much of the tourism literature, has often meant that some of the broader debates about the implications of such partnerships for communities and democratic decision-making has often gone unrecognized (Jerkin & Stolk, 2003; Gonzales, 2011; Heeley 2011; Zapata & Hall, 2012; Jordan et al., 2013). Thus, Hall (2008) explained that one of the most interesting approach in the tourism public administration studies is the community-based approaches and as the tourism public administration's practice goes broader in the develop countries, "the focus on economic development and destination competitiveness has often been approached via the lens of innovation (Svensson, 2005; Hall 2008). The national and local state is recognized as having an important role in tourism innovation via its

public policy settings (Hall, 2009b; Halkier, 2010).

FINDING

Current Implementations and Approaches to Cultural Tourism Public Policy Establishment in Bayan Village, North Lombok, in West Nusa Tenggara Indonesia

From the in-depth interviews that were being conducted to four different group of stakeholders; NGOs group, scholars group, government officials groups and local community and tourism industry in Bayan Village group, the findings found out that the current implementations and approaches to both tourism public policy and cultural tourism administration establishment in Bayan Village have not yet been formed strategically due to several opinions. The former member of tourism research at the Institute Technology Bandung and a current advisor of several tourism NGOs for Indonesia said:

During my tenure at the development project in Bayan back than in 2012-2015, I found some bitter facts that Bayan was threated merely as an ordinary village. They (the communities) have so much potentials and assets but so far, the

institutions that supported Bayan comes from private like the one I did with British Council and Bank Mandiri. We did several training for all households, built small library, local swimming pool near the cultural forest, and meeting venue for cultural event.

And in regards to the government's initiation on "Ten New Bali" which one of its priority destinations are in Lombok, the author exercised the national government acknowledgement and focus about Bayan Village as a cultural destination from the perspectives of a former chief of tourism research in Institute Technology Bandung. He explained the current governance program the national tourism ministry is currently administering as summarized below:

I have no capacity to tell you how much this initiation (Ten New Bali) impact on the establishment of North Lombok, where Bayan tribe is residing, owing to the fact that my area of assignment is in the capital, Jakarta. However, from so many meetings with the tourism minister, I can at least tell you that even though the initiation of Ten New Bali doesn't touch all areas of Lombok and North Lombok in particular, it is (Ten New

Bali project in Lombok) going to have a great impact as it is developed. Why? Because, it is very logic, the establishment of destination in Mandalika in Central Lombok will automatically impact all areas of Lombok, as all tourists will be exhibited not only by Mandalika but overall Lombok area. I am confident that Lombok would have a great impact through tourism and North Lombok in particular, would manage to grow along the way despite the development has not touched upon the alternative areas like Bayan, yet.

As he added in his interview explanation:

This is basically politic. The ministry of tourism and research organization like us cannot rely on what the regulation has said because sometimes the political networks and elites define more on certain important projects. However, I strongly believe that within the tourism administration, both national and provincial, would encourage the regulations for alternative, cultural tourism like we have in Bayan North Lombok.

With tourism policy and protection to cultural assets in Bayan Village that have not been fully enacted, the information from the national government officer at the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy in Jakarta explained from the perspective of the complexity in the autonomy structure that Indonesia government has long mandated enabling the power allocations in tourism management to the regional and local governments. She delivered her perspectives as follows:

Within our authorities of the ministry of tourism, we have some limitations. The reasons are right now, we are bounded by the autonomy, which means that all works are being deployed accordingly based on respective area and governance within respective destination. Another reason is, we are currently ranked third among other public ministries levels, which means that we do not have many capacities to build or allocate budget. In addition to destination promotion, which the priority areas are also being assigned by the minister, we focus on creating and evaluating the regulation, coordination, and facilitation. We do can, build physical infrastructures but it must

use special allocation of budget with almost rare for Bayan at this moment. The national tourism authority cannot really interrupt the KLU (North Lombok) owing to decentralization. We do not have anything. We just coordinate and promote and, prepare the destination and its communities. That's why we cannot touch a lot Bayan. So, the local government is becoming so vital.

From the perspectives of our respondent at the national tourism ministry in Jakarta, we found out that the uniformity of tourism public policy in the cultural destinations cannot really be governed and oversight by the national tourism administration, despite the notion of national authority. And as she added in her interview:

We are, from the national level has some barriers to directly reach the establishment Bayan Village due to us as a system, have so many levels of authorities that are more entitled to this job. Not to mention the department of village and culture in that area (province). If we talk about Bayan, we need to see first: The local government commitment about the development of its tourism

because, one of the tourism stakeholder is community. They are the host, the owner and the protector of their destinations as known as "Sapta Pesona". And Bayan, I cannot talk specifically about Bayan but the program about the development of "Tourism Villages" we used to work together with the Ministry of Village back then in 2009 – 2014, we were entitled budgets from PNPM Mandiri Pariwisata - for the development of "Tourism Community". The budget (APBN) was given directly to the community in all destinations, until the statute of village autonomy socialized, the budget stopped. This budget for "Tourism Village Organizer" for all physics, educations, etc. And, even though we haven't touched Bayan as priority areas, since 2016, we work with the ministry of Village to construct the policy implementations and have the best use of the budget for the development of the villages - specifically the "tourism villages". For pilot project, we only have 30 villages until now where we do not have Bayan in there, yet. The ministry of village works more for physical work, infrastructure, product development and tourism workers empowerment. While the

ministry of tourism work on the level of certification, community engagement (Sadar Wisata), promotion, and tourism business development such as proposing the homestay project, hospitality investments, culinary trainings, and overall digital promotion on the Indonesian Tourism Exchange.

The complexity in defining the right networks toward the approach to cultural tourism public policy establishment in Bayan Village, North Lombok was also explained by a scholar from the University of Mataram, a state university in Lombok:

In spite of a clear awareness of national, provincial and regency government about Bayan's cultural competitiveness, however, due to the provincial government's focus on the tourism development in Lombok is mainly directed to the major areas of attractions like those in the main cities of resorts areas, it is unfortunate that at this moment, the platforms that directs both policy initiatives and local government budget for a tourism development initiative in Bayan are still so poor. This is also because the regional tourism department in North Lombok where cultural Bayan village is

located is considered still so young which was established in no more than a decade. However, the challenge in defining the right approaches to North Lombok's tourism public policy is clear now. I, as a local scholar, would urge a prompt response of Bayan community to engage in community-based tourism development because I believe that is what we can do and most matter at the moment.

The approach toward the tourism public policy construct that protects Bayan is apparently still facing long-way efforts to gain public and tourism's networks attentions. This is, as scholars from Gadjah Mada University gave the information on political issues, national regulations, and current zoning regulation along Rinjani National Park area:

The KSPN or as known as "The Strategic Destinations for National Tourism Development" for Lombok - Rinjani and Sembalun areas has actually been initiated and is being published by the government of Indonesia - the Ministry of Tourism. However, after a careful reading, we haven't found Bayan, the area between Sembalun, Rinjani and Senaru (in North Lombok) in that

KSPN. Bayan doesn't belong to either cultural area or commercial tourism area. This makes Bayan have a difficult time in gaining both supports in material and human development for their area. And from the political perspective, Bayan, geographically has not yet considered potential by all levels of government and/or private sectors, as it does not really support what the market demands are currently requesting. This also owing to the fact the overlapped issues between the government officials that set up different regulations for Bayan, merely for their sectoral interest, makes Bayan faces difficult days of development on its regional policy and cultural area protection. The current standing of government regulations is being enacted in a respective manner where the regulations on the cultural assets are done alone by the ministry of education and culture, the environment, seas and forests are regulated and administered by the ministry of environment and forestry, the infrastructures along Bayan are regulated by the ministry of infrastructure and the tourism regulations in general are administered by the ministry of

tourism. Having said that, the complexity in identifying which policy approaches and from which ministry should Bayan refers to is becoming real.

The observation also managed to extract the perspectives from the a project manager of a local NGO in Lombok and, the regency government officer of North Lombok where the former head of tourism department in the regency of North Lombok and now, a current chief of transportation department for the same regency. Both respondents delivered similar thoughts as the followings:

The implementation toward the policy-making for the tourism destinations in the regency of North Lombok, despite the young age of the tourism department in this region, unfortunately was not being strategically planned due to the newly formed of this regency governance. As we are now giving our main focus to the "Gili Islands" where most tourists would come and spend nights, the regency tourism regulation for other destinations has not been fully published unless the "regulation for the retribution of tourism regions". Within the regions in North Lombok namely Bayan,

Gangga, Khayangan, Tanjung, and Pemenang, the regency regulation pertaining to cultural tourism likewise, has not been initiated. The protection toward the cultural communities and their cultural assets are still being managed by respective cultural network like in Bayan Community. This is of course, with the help of regulations by several national ministries like the ministries of culture and education for the protection of "Ancient Mosque" in Bayan and the ministry of infrastructure for the overall controls of physical development in all areas under the North Lombok Region. Nonetheless, the North Lombok tourism department, has not initiated anything pertaining to tourism policy and regulation unless the regulation for the retribution of tourism regions.

The process to tourism public policy and government's clear guidance on the empowerment of cultural Bayan communities has been long waited by the people of Bayan. As the interviews were pointed to cultural leaders, farmers, locals and tourism business owners in Bayan, they explained their opinions on the current tourism development implementations in Bayan and how they

are going with the strategic approaches to develop their regions. They also delivered what legal efforts they are expecting from the government for their communities' overall growth:

We thanked NGOs and private (British Council, AMAN, Bank Mandiri) for initiating the general development in Bayan that involves human resources empowerment, farmers' trainings, children's nutrition's, tourism product development and physical supports. Those private and NGOs have fully unlocked our potentials and awareness about the tourism competitiveness we have as a community. And with a gradual tourism development efforts being done by our local government, with government's capacity as the developer in the physical areas of Bayan such as roads, sanitations, public educations and tourism promotion to Rinjani National Park, we have constructed our own community-based approach to maintain our tourism, nature and cultural assets. This is at least, something that we have to do while waiting for a local government to really allocate the budget for our development. Bayan's business

community, together with cultural leaders and local people come together as a network to promote and preserve Bayan under the cultural conduct and regulations. This is really what we call as “community-based work”. What we, as a cultural community expect is a real communication between government and locals on how to allocate the budget for the “homestay” planning.

DISCUSSION

Model of the Component Parts to a Heterogeneous Approach to Cultural Tourism Destination in Bayan Village



Model framework adopted from Kerr (2003)

The adoption of the a heterogonous approach that includes only specific networks, participants and framework of analysis is expected to meet the most

adequate structure of cultural tourism policy construct for Bayan Village in North Lombok. An approach would define more cohesive resultant relationship between those participating bodies in managing the tourism policy administration and long –term action plan. “It also takes into account the transition form government to governance, where institutional and sectorial processes become contingent on each other and on their context.” (Kerr, 2003). The Model of the component parts to heterogeneous approaches to cultural tourism destination in Bayan Village as adopted from the “Scottish Tourism Policy Decision-Making” by Kerr (2003), clearly defines the most appropriate integration of a resultant relationship for the development of cultural tourism destination, as it is an asset of alternative tourism in North Lombok area. The approach would manage a clear identification of job descriptions via strategic integration of all tourism-development related Indonesia national ministries or local government to work hand in hand in fulfilling the gap in regulating Bayan as a destination. From the stakeholders’ perspectives gained from the observation, it is also critical that the approach would suggest the solution toward the disputes of overlapped regulations that are being issued by respective ministries naming the Ministry

of Tourism and Creative Economy; Indonesia Statistics Bureau; the Ministry of Finance; the Ministry of Cooperative Small and Medium Enterprises; the Ministry of Public Works; the Ministry of Acceleration Development of Backward Regions; the Ministry of Forestry; the Ministry of Education and Culture; the provincial government of West Nusa Tenggara; the local government of North Lombok. It caused the policy implementation ineffectiveness and confusion on the regional level and limited intervention avenues on the national level of government (the ministry of tourism of Indonesia).

The collaboration of all related institutional bodies in Bayan would lead to a defined assessment of group networks where all physical or human development projects that support the development in Cultural Village of Bayan would be able to refer to the right stakeholders outlook. At this rate, an understanding about how big the interventions the government that involves in Cultural Village of Bayan's development could pass and how much shares of power they need to prioritize to non-governmental group networks, would structure the right flow of work and investment scheme in developing Bayan. In other words, the public sectors' elasticity to open arenas toward the mutual collaborations is being held imperative as <http://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eot>

a new way of practice in Indonesia's public administration on the tourism sector. Proposing a group network under the scheme of Indonesia's tourism public administration means giving a less portion of public intervention toward the regulatory policy process and decision and giving open hands culture in their public governance's realm. For the case of Bayan Cultural Village in North Lombok, the proposed approach would give a realization avenue toward the practice of governance in replace to government.

The last to expect from the proposed heterogeneous approach toward the emerging development case of Bayan Cultural Village tourism's public policy is the construct of the advocacy policy. This is then being proposed and explained briefly through the adoption of public-private partnership practices in constructing the policy stream pipelines (Kerr, 2003) which from this logic, the participants in the approach including the group networks, elites and government, may have a full access to a right acknowledgement in the management-know-how of the policy interchanges processes. Knowing how the policy interchange would work and compensate every needing destination towards the investment scheme, regulation-making, human development process, the creation of independent network on specific

destination, and the fairness budget allocation for destination development, are all beneficial agendas of this heterogeneous approach. Let us say the development of Mandalika, a priority destination in Lombok that is being chosen under the project of “Ten New Bali”.

CONCLUSION

Under the policy stream and networks that allow the interchanges of policy and regulatory processes, there will be bigger opportunities for Bayan in gaining more exposures and development where in this scenario, all related stakeholders including elites are being well informed about Bayan’s existence and its rich cultural assets. The expectation from this cycle of approach can reflect a snowball effect, which in turn, government as a focal administrator of Bayan’s development, would put Bayan as a destination partners of Mandalika in their partnership agenda under a legal regulatory policy that is being formed together with all related ministries. This would bring Cultural Village of Bayan as an alternative support, in the cultural destination context, offering Lombok’s tourism a wide variety of attractions for tourists and at the same time, driving forward the development of Bayan

Cultural Village as a whole asset of a national or regional destination.

REFERENCES

- Airey, D., & Chong, D. (2010). National Policy-makers for Tourism in China, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37: 295-314.
- Andereck, L., Valentine, M., Knopf, C. & Vogt, A. (2005). Resident’s perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Benchkendorff, P., & Zehrer, A. (2003). A network Analysis of Tourism Research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43: 121-149
- Bramwell, B. (2014). Local Participation in Community Tourism. A Critical and Relational Assessment’ in Alan Lew, C. Michael Hall & Allan Williams (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Carmin, J., Darnall, N. & Mil-Homens, J. (2003). Stakeholder involvement in the design of U.S. voluntary environment programs: Does sponsorship matter? *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(4), 527-543.
- Church, A. (2004). Local and Regional Tourism Policy and Power’ in Alan Lew, C. Michael Hall & Allan Williams (eds) (2007), *A Companion to Tourism*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Clarkson, M. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluation corporate social performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (1), 92-117.

- Coles, T., & Hall, M. (2011). Rights and Regulation of Travel and Tourism Mobility. *Journal of Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 5:1-27.
- Curry, N. (2001). Community participation and rural policy: representativeness in the development of Millennium Greens. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management Forum*, 46, 170-178.
- Davis, S. & Morais, P. (2004). Factions and enclaves: small towns and socially unsustainable tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 3-10.
- De Lopez, T. (2001). Stakeholder management for conservation projects: a case study of Ream National Park, Cambodia. *Environmental Management*, 28 (1), 47-60.
- Devine, A., & Devine, F. (2011). Planning and Developing Tourism within a Public Sector Quagmire: Lessons from and for small countries. *Tourism Management*, 32: 1253-1261.
- Donaldson, T. & Preston, L. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20 (1), 65-91.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2003). Federal-state Relations and Tourism Public Policy, New South Wales, Australia: Current Issues in Tourism, 6: 415-443.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy Networks and the Local Organization of Tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27: 269-280.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2012). Australian National Tourism Policy: Influences of Reflective and Political Modernisation. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 9: 231-251.
- Freeman, E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Toronto: Pitman.
- Goeldner, R. & Ritchie, B. (2003). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gonzales, S. (2011). Bilbao and Barcelona "in motion". How Urban Regeneration "models" Travel and Mutate in the Global Flow of Policy Tourism. *Urban Studies*, 48: 1397-1418.
- Gun, A. (1994). *Tourism Planning: Basic Concept Cases*. Taylor and Francis, Washington D.C.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C. & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), 79-105.
- Halkier, H. (2010). EU and Tourism Development: Bark or Bite? *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 10: 92-106.
- Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism Planning*, 2nd Edition: Pearson, Harlow.
- Hall, C. M. (2011b). A Typology of Governance and its Implications for Tourism Policy Analysis; *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19: 437-457.
- Heeley, J. (2011). Public: Private Partnership and Best Practice in Urban Destination Marketing. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11: 224-229.
- Holloway, J. C. (1998). *The Business of Tourism*. New York. Longman.

- Jenkins, J., & Stolk, P. (2003). Statutory Authorities Dancing with Enterprise: WA Inc., the Western Australian Tourism Commission and the "global dancer affair": *Annals of Leisure Research*, 6: 222-244.
- Jenkins, J., Hall, M., & Mkono, M. (2014). Tourism and Public Policy: Contemporary Debates and Future Directions' in Alan Lew, C. Michael Hall & Allan Williams (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism*, John Wiley & son, Chichester.
- Jordan, E J., Vogt, C. A., Kruger, L.E., Grewe, N. (2013). The Interplay of Governance, Power and Citizen Participation in Community Tourism Planning: *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 5: 270-288.
- Kernell, J., & Chaperon, S. (2013). Analysis of the UK Government's 2011 Tourism Policy. *Cultural Trends*, 22: 278-284.
- Kerr, W. R. (2003). *Tourism Public Policy, and the Strategic Management of Failure. An Imprint of Elsevier Science*. Alloway, U.K. Pergamon.
- Map of Gunung Rinjani National Park. Retrieved on December 2, 2017 from www.site.google.com
- Richards, G. (1996). *Cultural Tourism in Europe*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Richards, G. (2001a). The Development of Cultural Tourism in Europe, in Richards, G. (ed.) *Cultural Attractions and European Tourism*, Wallingford: CABI, pp. 11-35.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1999). *Theories of the Policy Process, Theoretical Lenses on Public Policy*. Boulder, Colorado. Westview Press.
- Smith K. M. (2003). *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. Routledge, New York.
- Steelman, A. (2001). Elite and participatory policy-making: Finding balance in a case of national forest planning. *Policy Studies Journal*, 29 (1), 71-89.
- Svensson, B. (2005). A Governance Perspective on Destination Development: Exploring Partnership, Clusters and Innovation System: *Tourism Review*, 60: 32-37.
- Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B. & Yuksel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interviews and tourism planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 20, 351-360.
- Zapata, M. J. (2014). Community Impacts, Partnerships and Tourism People' in Alan Lew, C. Michael Hall & Allan Williams (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Tourism*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Zeppel, H. and Hall, C. M. (1992). Arts and Heritage Tourism, in Weiler, B. and Hall, C.M. (eds) *Special Interest Tourism*, London: Belhaven Press, pp. 47-65.