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## GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adhirasa</td>
<td>The name of Madurese leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBD</td>
<td>Regional budget (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batik</td>
<td>A cloth that is traditionally made using a manual wax and dye technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPEDA</td>
<td>Regional development planning board/Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPD</td>
<td>The Village Discussion Board (Badan Permusyawaratan Desa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPWS</td>
<td>The board of the Suramadu Bridge development (Badan Pengembangan Wilayah Suramadu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bupati</td>
<td>Head of Kabupaten (Region/Regency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato</td>
<td>The traditional philosophy that respects father, mother, guru and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camat</td>
<td>Head of Kecamatan (Sub District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desa</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinas</td>
<td>A specific technical local agency/board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disporabudpar</td>
<td>Youth, Sport and Culture Board (Dinas Pemuda, Olahraga, Kebudayaan dan Pariwisata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbudparpor</td>
<td>Culture, Tourism, Youth and Sport Board (Dinas Budaya Pariwisata dan Olahraga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disperindag</td>
<td>The Industry and Trading Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusun</td>
<td>Rural hamlet (A village consists of several Dusun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPN</td>
<td>National Tourism Destination (Destinasi Pariwisata Nasional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRD</td>
<td>Local Representative Board at the provincial or regional level (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerbang Salam</td>
<td>The Development Movement of Islamic Society/Gerakan Pembangunan Masyarakat Islam (a Motto of Pamekasan Region)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrah</td>
<td>A traditional music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorer Teacher</td>
<td>Temporary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDR</td>
<td>Indonesian Rupiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamu</td>
<td>Traditional medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabupaten</td>
<td>Region/Regency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kas Desa</td>
<td>The village treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacong-Jebbing</td>
<td>Tourism ambassador promoting the regions of Madura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampung</td>
<td>The same meaning as Dusun (Rural Hamlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecamatan</td>
<td>Sub District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelurahan</td>
<td>The lowest tier in Indonesia’s administrative structure (The same level as Desa/Village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepala Desa</td>
<td>Head of Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kers</td>
<td>Traditional weapon (a dagger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirab</td>
<td>Traditional walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>Head of household/family (Kepala Keluarga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koran</td>
<td>The sacred book of Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota/Kotamadya</td>
<td>Municipality (The same level as Kabupaten/Region/Regency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPPN</td>
<td>The National Tourism Development Areas (Kawasan Pengembangan Pariwisata Nasional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyai</td>
<td>Guru/Religious leader/Teacher/Respected person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Province (Propinsi) and Region (Kabupaten/Kotamadya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok-alok</td>
<td>A kind of traditional music performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lurah</td>
<td>Head of Kelurahan (Village)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Macan Cave : Tiger Cave
Madurese Residents : Madura Island Residents
Musholla : Small Mosque
MTF : Majapahit Travel Fair. An East Java tourism promotional fair designed to bring buyers/investors and sellers together
Nyai : Wife of kyai or a name for Women Muslim Gurus
Pecaton : Land in lieu of salary
Perpres : Presidential Decree (Peraturan Presiden)
PK 5 : Sellers in Temporary Stalls (Pedagang Kaki Lima)
PKK : Empowerment Family Welfare (Pemberdayaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga)
Pembinaan : Training
Pengajian : An activity of reading the Koran
Pesantren : Islamic boarding school
Petik Laut : A traditional ceremony to thank God for good fortune and ask for safety, mostly carried out by fishermen
Pokdarwis : Tourism Awareness Groups (Kelompok Sadar Wisata)
Produk Unggulan : Quality or leading products
RIPPARNAS : National Tourism Plan (Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Nasional)
RIPP : Provincial Tourism Plan (Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Tingkat Propinsi)
Rippda : Regional Tourism Plan (Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Daerah)
Rokat Tase’ : A traditional ceremony carried out by fishermen to ask God for abundant supplies of fish
Rokat Sabeh : A traditional ceremony conducted after harvest
Rukun-Tetangga/RT : Neighbourhood solidarity unit
Rukun-Warga/RW : Community solidarity unit
Santri : Student of pesantren
Satpol PP : Security officer (Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja)
Silatuhrrahim : Muslim fraternity
Sub DTW : A sub area of DTW (Tourist Destination Area/Daerah Tujuan Wisata)
Taman Rekreasi Kota/TRK : The name of a park in Bangkalan
Vihara : A place for Buddhists to pray
Wallikotamadya : Head of Kotamadya (Municipality)
Warung : Small store
Wudhu : The activity of cleaning parts of the body before praying
ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to critically explore the meanings of tourism held by residents in the context of tourism planning in Madura Island, Indonesia. The thesis reviews and critiques the literature on tourism planning and resident perception studies, particularly as they have been applied in developing countries. This review recognises that much of this literature overlooks the complex processes that shape the meanings that residents assign to tourism and that ultimately reinforce power inequities among residents. This thesis employs symbolic interactionism as an empirical framework in order to focus specifically on how these complex meanings interact with the social, political and cultural landscapes to reinforce patterns of engagement and disengagement among residents in the tourism planning processes in developing countries. To achieve this aim, a qualitative research design was employed in the study of Madura Island. In-depth interviews were conducted with residents and local tourism officers. Review of tourism planning and policy materials at national, regional and local levels were also undertaken to contextualise the data drawn from the interviews. Thematic analysis of the data revealed that the meanings residents assigned to tourism could be broadly categorised as ‘business opportunities gained and lost’, ‘a source of disempowerment’, ‘a threat to culture’ and ‘an opportunity to share religious and cultural values’. However, a more critical analysis explores the extent to which these meanings of tourism were underpinned by the hegemony of a central political and cultural philosophy: Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato (father, mother, guru and government) which has been claimed to influence life on Madura Island. The findings of this study challenges the relevance of the structure and order of this philosophy and concludes by considering the implications of this for participatory planning on Madura Island and developing countries more broadly.
Prelude

On the 10th of June 2009, the Surabaya-Madura Bridge, also known as the Suramadu Bridge, was officially opened. The 5.4 kilometre bridge constructed over the Madura Strait of Indonesia connects Bangkalan on the island of Madura, which is situated off the northeastern coast of Java, to the Javanese Mainland. Madura Island comprises an area of approximately 5,422 square kilometres, with a population of 3,570 million. The majority of the Madurese population are devout Sunni Muslims. Madura Island is administratively part of the East Java Province, and is divided into four regencies, or regions, Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan, and Sumenep.

Prior to the opening of the Suramadu Bridge, the geographic location of Madura Island meant that the island was isolated from the Indonesian mainland, with a ferry being the main method of transportation to or from the island. The opening of the bridge – the longest in South East Asia and proudly regarded by the Indonesian Government as an Indonesian mega infrastructure project – has enabled and vastly improved the flow of transportation to and from Madura Island. As a result, tourism, particularly domestic tourism by Indonesian locals, has started to emerge and grow on the island. Indeed, one important government aim was to link East Java to Madura Island for the purpose of boosting the regional economy, including the development of tourism on the island. Since the opening of the bridge, the government has encouraged and implemented many tourism plans and visitors from all over Indonesia now come to the island.

Madurese people have long been characterised by Indonesians from elsewhere as being rough, rude, extroverted, temperamental, impolite, and crude, and this has resulted in the perception of them as frightening or ‘to be avoided’ (Jonge 1995). Coupled with the knowledge that poverty and chronic unemployment are significant issues for residents of Madura Island, I was originally compelled to discover the reasons why people from elsewhere would visit the island. However, what emerged in the early stages of my research was that while the government is busy implementing tourism plans, they seem to have forgotten a very important aspect of tourism development, that is, what tourism means to the Madurese residents living on the island. How do people who live in a location that has never operated as a tourism destination feel about tourism, about tourists, and about their involvement (or lack of involvement) in tourism planning and development processes? These questions emerged with the recent opening of the Suramadu Bridge, stimulating my interest in the multifaceted nature of tourism development and the articulation of meanings attached to tourism by residents of Madura Island.
CHAPTER 1
RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM:
AN EMERGING ISSUE ON MADURA ISLAND

1.1 Introduction

Tourism in Indonesia is a fast growing industry. According to the Indonesian Statistical Bureau, the total number of international visitor arrivals had increased by 9.24 per cent in 2011. The number of international tourists coming to Indonesia for the three years between 2009 and 2011 was 6,323 million, 7,002 million and 7,649 million, respectively (Statistics Indonesia 2012). Overall, in 2011, the Indonesian travel and tourism economy generated IDR640,798 billion. It contributed around 8.8 per cent of Indonesia’s 2011 GDP, with 2.6 per cent of the entire Indonesian work force engaged in tourist employment, and generated 8.7 per cent of total export earnings (World Travel and Tourism Council 2012). The growth in tourism has meant that it is now the country’s fourth most important generator of foreign exchange after oil/gas, palm oil and latex (Kementrian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif Republik Indonesia 2012). The growth of tourism has been significant, as the minister of tourism and creative economy maintained, it has always been greater than the growth of Indonesia’s economy overall (Prihtiyani 2012).

In the East Java Province of Indonesia, recent tourism developments have taken place making it an ideal context for studying tourism planning and the impacts of tourism on local residents. In part, this study investigates how tourism development has progressed on Madura Island since the opening of the Suramadu Bridge. Specifically, this study investigates the meanings which are attached to tourism by residents of Madura Island and the promise of tourism as a way forward for this island.

1.2 The Madura Island Context

Administratively, Madura Island is part of East Java Province. It consists of four regions: Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan, and Sumenep. Three maps are presented below. Figure 1.1 shows the location of Madura Island as part of the Indonesian archipelago. Figure 1.2 shows the location of Madura Island off the north eastern coast of Java, and Figure 1.3 illustrates the island and the location of its four regions.
Figure 1.1 Map of Indonesia


Figure 1.2 Map of East Java and Madura Island

Source: East Java (n.d.)
Madura Island comprises an area of approximately 5,422 square kilometres, with a population of 3,570 million according to 2010 census (Statistics East Java n.d.). The island is quite isolated because it is separated from Java Island by Madura Strait. A public ferry was once the only way to access the island. As a consequence, Madura Island has been confronted with a significant number of obstacles to development, such as high levels of poverty and unemployment. In comparison to other regions in East Java, all regions in Madura have the highest percentage of people living under the poverty line. In 2010, in Bangkalan Region, 28.12 per cent of the total population were living in poverty, while in Pamekasan and Sumenep, percentages were little different, 22.47 per cent, and 24.61 per cent, respectively (TNP2K 2011). Even worse, in Sampang, 32.47 per cent of people were living in poverty. These high percentages have positioned Sampang as the poorest region in East Java, while Bangkalan, Pamekasan and Sumenep are not far behind (TNP2K 2011).

Economically, Madura has always depended on agriculture. However, due to relatively poor soils and dry climate, Madura’s agriculture has very low productivity (Rachbini 1995). This, along with other problems such as limited economic activities, rapid migration and an isolated location, has contributed to Madura’s status as a marginal and largely forgotten island (Rachbini 1995).
In terms of religion, the population of Madura Island is predominantly Islam (99.5 per cent) (Statistics East Java n.d.). There is, therefore, a cultural uniqueness that warrants some further explanation. In particular, one of the foundations of life for the Madurese people is the philosophy of *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato*. While this philosophy is not Islamic per se, the interconnectedness between the way Islam permeates life on Madura Island is reflected in this philosophy.

The meaning of this philosophy is subject to varied interpretation. According to some scholars, this philosophy reveals that the important figures in Madurese community are *Buppa’* (father), *Babbu’* (mother), guru, and government (Muthmainah 1998; Rozaki 2004). However, others have a slightly different interpretation. According to Rifai (2007), *Buppa’* is the acronym of *bhu* (*ibu* /mother) and *pa* (*bapak* /father); suggesting the obedience to mother, then to father. Varied interpretations are also applied to what is meant by guru. For some, guru refers to ‘*tokoh panutan*’ (leader) (Muthmainah 1998; Rozaki 2004), in particular, the informal leaders within the community. For others, guru can refer to ‘*sesepuh*’ (respected person) or *kyai* or teacher (religious teacher) (Rifai 2007). Also, some do not suggest a hierarchal order within the philosophy (Muthmainah 1998), while others claim that the philosophy indeed reflects layers of respect (Rifai 2007; Rozaki 2004). Rifai (2007, p. 416) refers to this layer of respect as ‘*tangga kuasa*’ or ‘the ladder of respect’. For the purpose of this thesis, *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato* means respect given by the residents to father, mother, guru and government, in that hierarchical order. Such interpretation is common and widely recorded by Madurese scholars (Rifai 2007). The ‘ladder of respect’ is illustrated in Figure 1.4.
Figure 1.4 The ‘Ladder of Respect’ in Madurese Philosophy

![Diagram of the 'Ladder of Respect' in Madurese Philosophy](image)


The cultural philosophy manifested in local customs (such as social and religious practices) are inseparable from gender relations (Robinson 2009). Gender and kinship relations in Indonesia are varied, with its inclination towards matrilineality and matrilocality (Dube 1996). The matrilineality principle refers to ‘reckoning descent in the female line through the mother’, while matrilocality refers to ‘living with the wife’s kin’ (Dube 1996, p. 7). These principles give power to women (and mothers) to be ‘structurally, culturally, and affectively central’ (Siapno 2002, p. 62) within Indonesian society. Indeed, in Java and Madura Island ‘the male role within the family is less significant than that of the woman’ (Robinson 2008, p.16). This complexity of gender relations in Indonesia can lead to the negotiation of gender roles, which potentially emerge in the context of tourism development (Wilkinson & Pratiwi 1995).

Several scholars argue that tourism has the potential to be a means for improving regional economies, especially through its ability to generate employment, export earnings and revenue for both the government and individuals (Cornelissen 2005; Sharma, Dyer, Carter & Gursoy 2008). Even though the Indonesian Government ranks tourism as a priority of its development sector, this approach has not been applied consistently to all regions. In Madura, only a meagre number of tourism establishments existed (Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi Jawa Timur 2007). The number of accommodation offerings in Bangkalan and Sampang remained the same between 2005 and 2007. A slight increase was found in Pamekasan where offerings increased from 10 to 11 and in Sumenep where they increased from 5 to 7 (Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi Jawa Timur...
2007). The number of recreational amenities that had potential to be developed as tourist attraction was also small (48 total in the four regions) (Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi Jawa Timur 2007). In light of this, it is not surprising that Madura Island is considered the least popular destination in East Java both for overseas and domestic tourists (East Java Tourism Board 2009). Compared to other regions in East Java, international arrivals in Madura have always been very low. In 2007, Bangkalan, Sampang and Sumenep attracted only 164, 116, and 51 overseas tourists, respectively, while no one visited Pamekasan (Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi Jawa Timur 2007).

One effort to solve the problems in Madura has been the building of the Surabaya-Madura Bridge (called the Suramadu Bridge – see Plate 1.1) to link East Java and Madura Island. Following a number of years of construction, the Suramadu Bridge opened on June 10, 2009. Both central and local governments (provincial and regional governments) predicted that the opening of the Suramadu Bridge would provide a brighter future for all regions in Madura (Risqon 13 February 2009), because it would allow a greater flow of transport, goods and people (BPWS 2006) and the ensuing tourism that comes with it.

Plate 1.1 Suramadu Bridge

Source: Riacestalily (2012)
A significant rise in arrivals to Madura Island, especially to the bridge area, has possibly been triggered by curiosity to see what the bridge looks like, the attraction of crossing the bridge and the ease of access the bridge provides (Kurniawan 2010). Considering that the bridge is the most significant project completed by the Indonesian Government in recent times (“Suramadu” 2009), it is not surprising that the Bridge has become a magnet for visitors. News articles with headlines such as: ‘Better to be fined than not take pictures at Suramadu Bridge’, also clearly describes the excitement the bridge has generated (“Ditilang” 2009).

Following the opening of the bridge, both the central and local governments have become enthusiastic about taking planned approaches for Madura Island. Soon after the opening, under the management of Badan Pengembangan Wilayah Suramadu (BPWS) - the board formed by the central government to take charge of the Suramadu area development, the area around the bridge will be subject to several development projects. BPWS is currently preparing a process to develop a rest area at the side of the bridge. This 35ha rest area will be complete with various tourist facilities such as a food court, cafes, souvenir stalls, a parking area, playgrounds and a mosque. This will be accompanied by the development of a Madura Island tourism information centre and Islamic centre. This prestigious project is predicted to cost IDR110 billion (AUD$120 million) (Faz & Yop 2011).

The confidence in tourism as a way to promote prosperity on Madura Island is also apparent in the status attributed to Sumenep and Pamekasan, two designated Kawasan Pengembangan Pariwisata Nasional (KPPN) (National Tourism Development Areas) 2010-2025, as part of Destinasi Pariwisata Nasional (DPN) (National Tourism Destination) in the Surabaya-Madura area (RIPPARNAS/The National Tourism Plan 2010-2025). In addition to these developments, the government has been motivated to support a long term plan to revitalise the Ujung-Kamal Ports as new tourist destinations (Wibowo 2011). Prior to the construction of the Suramadu Bridge, Kamal Port in Bangkalan, Madura, was the transport link with Ujung Port in Surabaya, Java. Himpunan Ahli Pengelolaan Pesisir Indonesia (HAPPI) – The Organisation for Indonesian Coastal Experts, note that since the bridge has been opened to the public, the activity in Kamal Port has dramatically decreased to only twenty per cent of its previous levels (Wibowo 2011). This is a worrying situation which has led to the loss of hundreds of jobs. In response to this situation, HAPPI has proposed a revitalisation program for the Ujung-Kamal Ports area over three years, from 2011 to 2014. This revitalisation program is particularly concerned with creating a new tourist area in the coastal areas or on each side of the bridge both in Surabaya (Java Island) and Bangkalan (Madura Island). More specifically, it will develop a tourist
information centre, providing cruise and port facilities, regulation of the Madura Straits, and development of other physical and social facilities in Surabaya and Bangkalan (Wibowo 2011). Also, since most souvenir sellers currently occupy temporary stalls, the Bangkalan Government and the East Java Provincial Government are proposing to build a rest area in the Suramadu area, to provide more permanent places for sellers (Kurniawan 2010).

Another recent plan for Madura is that of infrastructure improvement. In general, Madura has suffered from poor infrastructure for a long time (Rachbini 1995), so the government will provide another IDR110 billion (AUD$ 120 million) to improve road access from Bangkalan Region to Sumenep Region (“Madura” 2011). Bearing in mind that the Suramadu Bridge should be supported by better access, the central government ambitiously planned to finish the project by late 2011. As Achsanul, a legislative member from the Madura elected area, stated, ‘The road improvements have to finish by the end of this year’, and ‘Suramadu bridge will be nothing without better infrastructure in Madura’ (“Madura” 2011). This goodwill from the government is influenced by the view that better roads and traffic access will definitely lead to more investment in Madura.

The discussion above demonstrates the government’s strong belief and expectation that the bridge, and the tourism it will herald (“Wisata” 2009), will make a difference to the island by boosting the island’s economy. As was maintained by the Indonesian President, Susilo Bambang Yudoyono, ‘The Suramadu Bridge should be able to strengthen the economy of Madura’ (Kurniawan 2010). However, there are several significant challenges associated with tourism development in Madura: first, there has been an enduring local stereotype associated with Madura residents, that is, they are believed to be temperamental and have other negative characteristics (Jonge 1995), which has discouraged tourists from visiting Madura (Hannigan 2007); second, there has been little positive support from the local residents (Musyawir 2007). Indeed, increasing opposition to tourism is evident. When the Sumenep government wanted to develop Lombang Beach as a tourist destination, the local community were distressed. Some protested by sitting on the beach and openly stating that they were against tourism development in their area (Musyawir 2007). Such anecdotes sit in contrast to the support shown for tourism development on Madura Island from those in leadership positions. What is clear is that the perceptions of residents emerge inconsistently and largely anecdotally and an empirical examination of such perceptions has yet to be conducted.
While tourism development on Madura Island is being promoted and the voice of residents is either being ignored or only partly heard, some argue that a participatory approach has not been adopted by Indonesia, instead, decision-making and control remains firmly in the government’s hands (Erb 2000), because the government believes it knows what is best for its people (Raka 2000). Officials are reluctant to listen to, consult with, or involve local people in the decision-making process (King 1999). Timothy (1999) argues that this is because the government planners think that the population is uneducated and unable to make informed decisions. Thus, this situation is problematic in parts of Indonesia where on one hand, tourism development is being encouraged, but on the other hand, the perceptions and voices of residents are largely unexamined. This thesis focuses on Madura Island, Indonesia, where such issues have begun to emerge. Such an examination is timely. This study sheds light not only on tourism planning and development on Madura Island, but also more broadly on tourism development in other parts of Indonesia and other developing nations. Furthermore, this thesis provides critical insights into the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and considers the implications for participatory planning on Madura Island and developing countries.

1.3 Tourism in Developing Countries

Tourism has become one of the world’s largest and fastest growing industries over the past two decades (Cornelissen 2005; Walpole & Goodwin 2000). Despite unprecedented global events such as national political revolutions, global economic instability and large scale natural disasters, the global tourism industry continues to perform solidly with 3 per cent growth in direct Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and generated a rise of 1.2 million jobs in 2011 (World Travel and Tourism Council 2012). Globally, in 2011, tourism contributed US$6.3 trillion in GDP and employed 255 million people (WTTC 2012). The growth in tourism is also evident in the statistics compiled by the World Tourism Organisation (WTO) which showed that international tourist arrivals have increased from 227 million in 1980 to 528 million in 1995, and 983 million in 2011 (WTO 2012). These figures are expected to grow by 3.3 per cent each year on average from 2010-2030 (WTO 2012).

This significant growth in tourism is the product of several global trends, including the rapid growth of populations and their movement, globalisation of capitalism and advances in communication technology, as well as transportation (Choi & Sirakaya 2005; Mowforth & Munt 2009; Smith 2001b). This growth of tourism has also been spread to developing countries, as visitors flow from developed countries (Graburn 1989; Shaw & Williams 2002).
The terms ‘developing countries’, ‘the Third World’, ‘underdeveloped countries’, ‘poor countries’, ‘the Global South’ and ‘less-developed countries’ are often used interchangeably (Tosun 2000). This thesis uses the term developing countries as this is the term most commonly used by United Nations organisations such as the World Tourism Organisation. Harrison (1992) also argues that the ‘second world’, which refers to the nations of Eastern Europe have already disappeared as they only existed in a period of colonialism. Therefore, the term ‘Third World’ is no longer considered appropriate (Harrison 1992).

The scope of what constitutes developing countries is also subject to broad interpretation and debate (Oppermann & Chon 1997; Telfer & Sharpley 2008; Tosun 2000). According to Telfer and Sharpley (2008, p. 5), the term developing countries embraces ‘all nations states that are not generally recognised as being developed, including transitional economies of the former ‘Second World’ and contemporary, centrally planned economies’. For the purposes of this study, the definition of developing countries used by The World Bank is adopted. This definition defines developing countries and includes all countries as having an annual Gross National Income (GNI) per capita equivalent to US$12,475 or less. These countries include low-income countries (GNI per capita US$ 1,025 or less), lower-middle-income countries (GNI per capita from US$1,026 to US$4,035) and upper-middle-income countries (GNI per capita from US$4,036 to US$12,475). Indonesia had a per capita GNI of US$2,940 in 2011 (The World Bank 2012). Indonesia is therefore a developing country with a lower-middle-income economy (The World Bank 2012).

Telfer and Sharpley (2008) have proposed there are several reasons for developing countries adopting tourism as their means of development. Firstly, tourism is seen as an industry which is growing rapidly as well as a safe development option; secondly, through tourist expenditure, international investment in tourism infrastructure, and promotion, tourism is considered a tool for transferring wealth; thirdly, tourism potentially offers more opportunities for backward linkages throughout the local economy; fourthly, tourism can be developed via ‘free’ infrastructure, such as existing natural or man-made attractions, beaches or heritage sites; and finally, there are no barriers for international tourism, for example, there are no limitations in terms of places to visit and how much money to spend in a destination (Telfer & Sharpley 2008).

In addition, developing countries face challenges such as rapid population growth, high unemployment, low per capita income, increasing social and regional disparities, and a
generally high dependency on industrialised countries, which have motivated them to participate in tourism (Oppermann & Chon 1997). Governments in developing countries encourage tourism investment because of the assumption that it will contribute to economic development (Hall 1995) as well as to the social and psychological well-being of its residents (Ap 1992).

Even though tourism has increasingly been seen as a fast track to development in developing countries (Glasson, Godfrey & Goodey 1995; Telfer & Sharpley 2008), the tourism development process does not always work well. A tourism development dilemma, as noted by Telfer and Sharpley (2008), is often unavoidable. On one side, tourism has the potential to stimulate economic and social development, but on the other, tourism may only serve local elite, privileged residents or multinational corporations and may have a very high social and economic cost.

In developing countries, tourism is typically implemented through a top-down planning approach (Liu & Wall 2006; Teye, Sirakaya & Sönmez 2002), and decision making is mostly based on the interventions of government agencies and large multinational tourism firms (Liu & Wall 2006). As a result, the dominance of external, often foreign capital and the marginalisation of local people is common (Dola & Mijan 2006; Hampton 2003; Liu & Wall 2006).

Local communities in developing countries often gain only small advantages from tourism (Hampton 2003; Mowforth & Munt 2009). This has been attributed to local people being exploited and having little power to control the tourism development process. They have few opportunities to match the financial resources available to external investors and have views which are hardly ever heard (Mowforth & Munt 2009). In fact, local communities in developing countries are frequently excluded from tourism development, particularly in decision making and the management of tourism projects (Teye et al. 2002).

Such a picture of tourism development in developing countries paints a stark contrast to the participatory tourism planning approaches to tourism that have been championed primarily in the Global North. Participatory tourism planning promotes goodwill through cooperation with local communities and is seen as an essential and central focus of tourism development (Choi & Sirakaya 2006; Murphy 1985). The involvement and participation of the residents in the area is fundamental to successful tourism planning (Hall 2008). Murphy (1985) was one of the first scholars to promote the importance of the involvement of community in tourism initiatives. The
main idea of the participatory tourism approach espoused by Murphy (1985) is that each host community is supposed to determine the goals of the community so as to ensure that tourism satisfies local needs and interests. This approach recognises that social, cultural, and environmental considerations need to be included in planning and that tourism should serve both tourists and local residents. Thus, local residents should also derive benefits from tourism planning (Murphy 1985; Tosun 2005).

The following section describes the context in which tourism planning and development has been undertaken in Indonesia generally, in East Java and Madura Island specifically. The discussion focuses explicitly on national, provincial and regional planning strategies to provide an understanding of how tourism planning in Indonesia and Madura Island has progressed.

1.4 Institutional Arrangements in Indonesia

In the 1990s, a decision was made to decentralise the institutional arrangements of Indonesia. The main principle of Indonesia’s decentralisation is the transfer of major degrees of authority and responsibilities directly from the central government to regional/local governments (Alm, Aten & Bahl 2001). Thus, one of the outcomes of the decentralisation should result in greater responsiveness on the part of the local government towards local participation and needs (Alm et al. 2001; Grindle 2007). As a result, a set of laws were introduced, including Law 22/1999 (which was subsequently replaced by Law 32/2004) on Regional Governance and Law 25/1999 (which was subsequently revised by Law 33/2004) on Fiscal Balance. This has consequently brought significant changes in the government’s administrative structure, and subsequently, tourism planning and development.

The government in Indonesia consists of four tiers; the central government (headed by the President), local governments which consist of provincial government, regional government or urban municipalities, rural districts and villages (Alm et al. 2001). The central government is recognised as the government, while the provincial government, regional government and urban municipalities are recognised as local governments and are inclusive of rural districts and villages. The administration of government in Indonesia is presented in Figure 1.2 and explained below.

Indonesia consists of 33 provinces. The provinces are headed by the Governor and are subdivided into regions (kabupaten) and municipalities (kota). The regional government, which
is at the same administrative level as the urban municipality, is headed by the *Bupati* and *Walikotamadya*, respectively. Regions or municipalities are further divided into sub-districts or *kecamatan* (headed by the *Camat*). The *kecamatan* are again divided into village groupings (either *desa* or *kelurahan*). The *kelurahan* do not have the right to manage their own affairs, while the *desa* do. The *kelurahan* are headed by a *Lurah*, who is accountable to the *Bupati/Walikotamadya* through the *Camat* (Law 32/2004, article 127). In contrast, *desa* elect their own village head (*Kepala Desa*) and are accountable to the village board (*BPD*) (Law 22/1999, article 95-103). The *kelurahan* are primarily located in urban areas while the *desa* are found more in rural areas. Furthermore, a village is divided into numerous *dusun* (rural hamlets) and citizen-groups (*Rukun-Warga (RW)*) which are further divided into several neighbourhood-groups (*Rukun-Tetangga (RT)*). The institutional arrangements of Indonesia create implications for tourism planning. This will be discussed in the next section.
Figure 1.5 The Organisational Structure of the Indonesian Government

Source: Government Regulation 41/2007 on Local Government Organisation, Alm et al. (2001), Author’s translation and modification
1.4.1 Implications for Tourism Planning

Decentralisation impacts and shapes the way tourism planning is developed in Indonesia. According to Law 10/2009, tourism in Indonesia is directed by the Tourism Master Plan. The Tourism Master Plan consists of:

- The National Tourism Plan (RIPPARNAS) created by the central government
- The Provincial Tourism Plan (RIPP) created by the provincial government
- The Regional Tourism Plan (RIPPPDA) created by the regional or municipal government

The structure of the Tourism Master Plan of Indonesia is presented in Figure 1.3 below.

**Figure 1.6 The Structure of Master Tourism Plan of Indonesia**

![Diagram of the Tourism Master Plan]

Source: Law 10/2009

The RIPPARNAS have become a foundation and provide general directions for the local governments in planning and developing tourism in their area. The legislation maintains that the tourism development plan at the provincial and regional levels should be aligned consistently with the RIPPARNAS. Given that Madura Island is administratively a part of East Java Province, the tourism development plans of the regions of Madura should be aligned with the tourism development plans of East Java Province (RIPP of East Java). Furthermore, both the tourism development plans of East Java Province and the regions should be aligned with the RIPPARNAS. To ensure the consistency of plans, the local governments have been encouraged to develop coordination with the tourism minister (The Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy).
Moreover, the development of tourist attractions in all the regions of Madura Island (Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan and Sumenep) focuses on three aspects; natural, cultural and man-made attractions (Government Rule 50/2011, article 14). These three categories will also be further developed into several other types of tourism such as adventure tourism, marine tourism, farm tourism and so forth (The explanation of Government Rule 50/2011 on RIPPARNAS 2012-2025). The tourist attractions in these four regions are presented in Table 1.1, below.

**Table 1.1** Sites and Experiences Identified as Tourist Attractions in the Regional Plans of Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan and Sumenep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangkalan</th>
<th>Sampang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural Tourism: Siring Kemuning Beach, Rongkang Beach, Geger Mountain</td>
<td>1. Natural Tourism: Southern Sub Section of Development I Areas: Camplong Beach and Lebar Cave, Northern Sub Section of Development IV Areas: Nepa Monkey Forest and Toroan Waterfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Man-made Tourism: <em>Taman Rekreasi Kota</em> (TRK), Family Tourism PK-5 (Street Vendors Shopping Area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pamekasan</th>
<th>Sumenep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural Tourism: The Flame, Jumiang Beach, Talang Siring Beach, Batu Kerbuy Beach</td>
<td>1. Natural Tourism: Lombang Beach, Slopeng Beach, Sea Garden, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Man-Made Tourism: <em>Batik, Keris</em> &amp; Mask Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RIPPDA for the Regions of Bangkalan, Sampang, Sumenep, *Disperindag* (Industry and Trade Board) of Pamekasan Region
The introduction of Law 32/2004 on Regional Governance has subsequently been working towards changes in the functional responsibilities of local governments. By means of Law 22/1999, local governments have been given authority by the central government over areas such as public works, health, education, agriculture, communication, industry and trade, zoning, capital investment, environment and employment promotions. In addition, under Law 32/2004, the local governments’ responsibilities have been broadened to cover areas such as public order and peace, the facilitation of cooperatives and small to medium businesses, social affairs and a range of mandatory affairs as instructed by this law (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah Kabupaten Sampang 2005).

The affairs of tourism, as instructed by Law no. 32/2004 on Regional Governance and Law no. 10/2009 on Tourism, have been decentralised from the central government to local government. Thus, local government has full autonomy to manage the affairs of tourism in its own area and the funding provider for tourism at the local level is sourced from the APBD (Regional Development Budget) of each local government. In this case, tourism development on Madura Island has become the responsibility of each of the Madura regional governments, funded by the APBD (Regional Development Budget) of each local government as well as from the APBD of East Java province. Also, as stated earlier, while each of the local governments has the authority to decide what is best for its area by creating and implementing a regional tourism approach, this approach has to remain consistent with broader tourism approaches. Thus, for each of the regions of Madura Island, tourism development plans should be consistent with the planning approaches of both East Java province and the central government.

Furthermore, Law 32/2004 has raised another very significant issue regarding tourism development: the power sharing between the central, provincial and regional/local governments. This sharing of powers is reflected in the share of the responsibilities for tourism between the central government, the provincial government and the regional/municipality government, as presented in Table 1.2, below.
Table 1.2 The Authority of the Central Government and the Local Governments in Relation to Tourism

| The Central Government  
| (Law 10/2009, article 28) |
| The Provincial Government  
| (Law 10/2009, article 29) |
| The Regional/Municipalities Government  
| (Law 10/2009, article 30) |
| 1. To create a national tourism development master plan |
| 2. To create cross-regional and cross provincial development of tourism |
| 3. To organise international cooperation |
| 4. To set national attractions |
| 5. To set national tourism destinations |
| 6. To set a norm, standard, guidelines and systems of supervision in the management of tourism |
| 7. To develop policies on human resources development in tourism |
| 8. To maintain and develop national assets |
| 9. To facilitate national tourism promotion |
| 10. To provide ease of support to tourists |
| 11. To provide information related to security and safety to tourists |
| 12. To empower communities |
| 13. To monitor and evaluate the implementation of tourism management |
| 14. To allocate the budget for tourism |
| 1. To draft master plan for development and tourism of the province |
| 2. To coordinate the organisation of tourism in the area of the province |
| 3. To carry out the registration of tourism businesses |
| 4. To establish the provincial tourist attractions |
| 5. To facilitate the promotion of tourism destinations in the area of the province |
| 6. To maintain assets of the province |
| 7. To allocate the budget for tourism |
| 1. To draft a master plan for development and tourism of the regions |
| 2. To establish regional tourist attractions |
| 3. To set tourism destinations in regions/municipalities |
| 4. To set potential tourist attractions for regions/municipalities |
| 5. To carry out the registration of tourism businesses |
| 6. To manage tourism management in regions/municipalities |
| 7. To facilitate and promote tourist destinations in its areas |
| 8. To organise training and research in regional scope |
| 9. To maintain destinations in its areas |
| 10. To conduct training for tourism awareness group (pokdarwis) |
| 11. To allocate the budget for tourism |

Source: Law 10/2009

Given that the local government is a key player in local destination management (Eckardt & Shah 2006), it is important to know which key government agency is responsible for tourism development at the regional level. In the region of Bangkalan, tourism is under the management of
Disporabudpar (The Youth, Sport, Culture and Tourism Board). Similarly, in Sampang and Sumenep, tourism is the responsibility of Disbudparpora (Culture, Tourism, Youth and Sport Board). Unlike the three other regions, tourism in Pamekasan is managed under Disperindag (the Industry and Trading Board). This different arrangement in relation to the responsibility for tourism across the island’s regions is closely related to the fact that the tourism development of the Pamekasan Region may not have been considered a priority by the Pamekasan and Indonesian Government. Therefore, it does not necessarily need to have a specific body for this matter (Law 10/2009, article 22).

Furthermore, there is another formal organisation which is also involved in tourism development on Madura Island called BPWS (Badan Pengembangan Wilayah Suramadu or the Board of the Suramadu Bridge Development). It was formed by the central government through the Presidential Decree (Perpres) 27/2008. The BPWS primarily aims to develop and manage the Suramadu Bridge area on both sides of the bridge - Surabaya (Java Island) and Bangkalan (Madura Island).

In addition to providing the context in which tourism planning and development has been undertaken in Indonesia and Madura, the institutional arrangements of tourism in Indonesia contributes to an understanding of the context in which the meanings assigned to tourism by the residents. However, this context is not static. The implementation of these arrangements in tourism is dynamic and to understand this, it is important to engage with those who are responsible for this implementation. In addition, what tourism means to residents is likely to be shaped and influenced by others with whom residents interact and engage.

1.5 Research Aim, Significance and Approach

The aim of this study is to investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and how those meanings develop. Given this aim, the objectives of this study are to:

1. Describe the tourism planning context of Madura Island;
2. Investigate the meanings assigned to tourism by Madura Island residents;
3. Critically examine the influences that shape the meanings of tourism held by Madura Island residents.
The study is significant in the following ways: First, the findings of this study could be meaningful in informing the government or tourism planners of the perceptions of residents about tourism. Increased understanding of the resident perceptions of tourism will be a key to developing and implementing successful tourism initiatives appropriate for Madura Island residents in the future. Second, this thesis focuses on Madura Island in East Java where tourism development issues have only recently begun to emerge and where residents’ perceptions of tourism development and what tourism means to them remains unexamined. Such an examination is timely, and will shed light not only on tourism development on Madura Island, but also more broadly on tourism development in developing nations. Third, the study has the potential to be a very significant one in the absence of similar studies in the Madura Island context. Most studies of tourism in Indonesia have focused on popular tourist areas such as Bali and Yogyakarta (see Chapter 2 and 3). Few studies have been conducted on Madura Island, especially in regard to tourism. Thus, this study will provide a positive contribution to knowledge and understanding of tourism planning, particularly with regard to the contribution of residents to tourism planning.

To address the aim and objectives of this study, this thesis draws on both primary and secondary sources of data. In order to gain an in-depth and nuanced understanding of the perceptions of Madura Island residents towards tourism development, the thesis employs a qualitative research design, and draws on empirical data collected through in-depth interviews conducted with residents and local tourism officers. The qualitative approach was chosen as the most effective way to meet the aim of the research because it illuminates the multiple perspectives of participants in their natural setting (Denzin & Lincoln 2008). This study is governed by a symbolic interactionist paradigm, which allows people to recognise human beings as having the capability to construct reality (Lincoln & Guba 1985). This means reality might be constructed differently by each individual based on their own experiences, culture and interpretation. This is consistent with the premises of symbolic interactionism which include the interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he or she encounters to develop their meanings (Blumer 1969).

The study described in this thesis involved in-depth interviews with four local tourism officers and with 48 residents of Madura Island, Indonesia (see Appendix A for details of the 48 resident participants). These respondents were sourced from eight villages in each of the four different regions on Madura Island, including areas where tourism development is already being
implemented or being planned, or where there is no tourism planning at all. This categorisation is advised by the analysis of the regional tourism master plans and interviews with tourism officers. In this study, a village with a tourist attraction is categorised as a tourism planned area, whereas a village with no tourist attraction is categorised as an unplanned tourism area. The villages where tourism development is already being implemented or being planned are as follows: Taddan Village in Sampang Region, Tanjung Village in Pamekasan Region, Kebon Agung in Sumenep Region and Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan Region. The villages which have no tourism planning at all are Prajan Village in Sampang Region, Kacok Village in Pamekasan Region, Prenduan Village in Sumenep Region and Banyuajuh in Bangkalan Region (see Figure 1.3).

The data were primarily analysed inductively and thematically (see Chapter 4 for a detailed discussion of the methods employed). The inductive approach allows the development of open coding and other higher levels of coding, such as axial and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin 1998). The open coding was carried using N-Vivo software, where the labels were derived from actual words or phrases used by the participants (Strauss & Corbin 1998). This type of coding provides the opportunity to portray the participants’ view of tourism development, as seen through their eyes.

In addition to primary empirical data, academic literature was extensively reviewed. Also, a variety of secondary sources of information were reviewed and utilised throughout the research process, including tourism planning and policy materials at national, regional, and local levels, reports and newspaper articles. Indonesian and East Java Bureau of Statistics data and Internet websites relating to Indonesia and Madura Island, generally, and tourism development on the Madura Island, specifically, were also consulted. These academic secondary sources helped to contextualise the resident interviews in order to address the research aim and objectives of the thesis.

1.6 Structure of the Thesis

This chapter began by noting that the opening of the Suramadu Bridge between East Java and Madura Island has brought into sharp focus the role tourism is beginning to play in the lives of the residents living on this small and previously isolated island. The growth of tourism and related tourism planning and development in Madura Island has begun, yet little is known about what this
means to the residents of the Island. This research will explore those meanings, the context in which they develop and the factors that shape and influence them.

To achieve this aim, the remainder of the thesis is organised to address the research objectives described earlier in this chapter. Chapter 2 examines the literature on tourism planning, particularly in the context of developing countries. This literature review is important as it provides a foundation for understanding how tourism planning has been undertaken on Madura Island. Such an understanding also provides a backdrop for examining the meanings residents of Madura assign to tourism. Chapter 3 examines the literature on resident perceptions of tourism. This literature review is significant as it provides a foundation for understanding the meanings assigned to tourism held by Madura Island residents. Chapter 4 details the study methodology and presents the theoretical framework of the thesis and a discussion of the qualitative methods used in the research design, including data collection and analysis. Chapter 5 addresses the first research objective, describing the context in which residents’ meanings of tourism develop. Chapter 6 addresses the second research objective and focuses on adopting the symbolic interactionism paradigm as a framework to investigate and analyse the meanings of tourism that develop in such an environment. Chapter 7 addresses the third research objective, examining the influences that shape these meanings. Chapter 8 summarises the major findings of the research and responds to the overall research aim of the study.
CHAPTER 2
TOURISM PLANNING: THE SUSTAINABILITY IMPERATIVE

2.1 Introduction

Tourism development has been referred to as ‘a double-edged sword’ (Zhong, Deng, Song & Ding 2011, p. 2972). Tourism creates positive impacts for host communities, by stimulating marginal economies, promoting development through employment, and generating revenue (Liu & Wall 2006). Conversely, tourism development can also create negative impacts such as increased crime and cost of living, friction between tourists and residents, changes in residents’ quality of life (Ap & Crompton 1993; Smith 2001c), marginalisation of locals in the tourism planning process (Dola & Mijan 2006), and a number of environmental impacts such as pollution and degradation of the ecosystem (Zhong et al. 2011). These negative impacts have been attributed to a lack of planning (Gunn & Var 2002; Inskeep 1991; Zhong et al. 2011) and are the impetus for increased attention towards sustainable forms of development (Hall 2008).

Sustainability requires tourism to be planned and managed in such a manner that natural and cultural resources are continuously maintained for future use (Hall 2008). Planning is considered necessary to minimise any potential negative impacts and maximise positive impacts, such as economic revenue for the destination (Hall 2008; Sharma 2004). Murphy (1985) argues that planning is focused on anticipating and regulating change in a system and is therefore able to promote development which contributes to social, economic, and environmental benefits. Gunn and Var (2002) also maintain that tourism must be planned in order to achieve better economic impacts, enhanced visitor satisfaction, community integration, and greater resource protection. It is therefore argued that the overarching task of tourism planning is to promote human welfare by creating planning which takes into account the principles of sustainable development (Hall 2008). Sustainable development thus underpins and provides a justification for the tourism planning imperative (Hall 2008).

Sustainable development has been widely discussed in tourism (Lee 2013) and is broadly supported and espoused by many countries (Mowforth & Munt 2009). It is defined as ‘...development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their
own needs’ (United Nations 1987, p. 1). However, critics argue that such a definition is ambiguous, rhetorical, and often impractical (Hopwood, Mellor & O’Brien 2005; Miltin 1992; Mowforth & Munt 2009; Wall 2002). The lack of precision in defining sustainable development has meant that it has been interpreted differently by individuals, organisations and social groups (Mowforth & Munt 2009). Concerns have been raised that the possibility exists for it to be hi-jacked for any purposes that are thought fit (Stabler 1997). The lack of clarity around sustainable development has impacted on the tourism planning process, and this is most evident in developing countries (Mowforth & Munt 2009; Telfer & Sharpley 2008).

This chapter examines tourism planning research particularly as it has manifested in developing countries. This literature review is important as it provides a foundation for understanding how tourism planning has been undertaken on Madura Island. Such an understanding also provides a backdrop for examining the meanings residents of Madura Island assign to tourism. The chapter is organised into four sections. The first section considers the tourism planning process, in terms of its various approaches. The second section examines tourism planning in developing countries, with a focus on the challenges and problematic situations faced by developing countries in formulating and implementing the plans. The third section discusses community participation in the tourism planning process in developing countries. Two important models of the participatory approach, namely the participatory and cooperative tourism planning models, are reviewed. This review is followed by a discussion of the forms of participation and critiques of participation, as well as the factors that limit participation in developing countries. Lastly, power relations in tourism planning are discussed, as power plays an important role in the explanation of why tourism planning can be difficult in practice.

2.2 Tourism Planning Processes

There is no universal agreement on a definition of planning (Dredge & Jenkins 2007). Various definitions are the result of the nature of planning as a dialectical concept (Gleeson & Low 2000). Some believe that planning implies a connection to the future (Edgell, Allen, Swanson & Smith 2007), that it refers to activities carried out to organise the future so as to achieve a certain objective (Inskeep 1991), or the process of organising a set of decisions for actions in the future that are directed at achieving goals by preferred means (Dror 1973). However, others believe that planning
is not only about deciding what is to be provided in the future, that it is also a process of human activity. For instance, Chadwick (1971, p. 24) states that:

Planning is a process, a process of human thought and action based upon that thought - in point of fact, forethought, thought for the future - nothing more or less than this is planning, which is a very general human activity.

The consideration of planning as future human activity allows the consideration of tourism planning as influenced by the demands and other influences of the tourism industry. This leads to changes in the focus of tourism planning over time. Thus, it has been argued that the focus of tourism planning does not remain constant (Gunn 2002; Hall 2008; Timothy 1998). The changes in the economic, social, technological, political and physical environment, as well as changes in thinking about how a government should act, and changes in new issues and knowledge have encouraged the changes in focus of tourism planning (Hall 2008).

Planning for tourism has traditionally been focused on the use of land (Hall 2008). Traditional planning approaches focused on physical development and regulations at the local or regional level such as site and infrastructure development, building regulations, tourist development density, and cultural and historical presentation (Hall 2008). Gunn and Var (2002, p. 26) add that in traditional planning, preparing ‘the end state of master plan’ was emphasised. This type of approach was criticised as too rigid, disregarding the changing lifestyle and therefore difficult to implement over a long-term period (Gunn & Var 2002). Given the difficulties associated with this approach, the general approach being applied in this study is that planning is a continuous process and must be flexible enough to adjust to changing circumstances, yet still achieve the basic objectives of development (Inskeep 1991).

Furthermore, the tourism planning approach emphasises the social and environmental aspects of tourism development, within a framework of more sustainable tourism (Hall 2008). As a result, more tourism planning paradigms have gradually emerged. These paradigms include: community-based planning, which is characterised by locally defined goals and development actions as an integral part of tourism planning (Murphy 1985; Prentice 1993; Simmons 1994); incremental planning, which accommodates both high levels of predictability and flexibility (Baud-Bovy 1982;
Getz 1986); and collaborative planning, where all stakeholders participate in the process (Getz & Jamal 1994; Gunn 1994; Jamal & Getz 1995; Jamal & Stronza 2009). The picture of the broad traditions of tourism planning has been outlined by Getz (1987). He describes the emergence of four broad approaches of tourism planning: boosterism; an economic or industry-oriented approach; a physical approach; and a community-oriented approach (Getz 1987). These approaches are described below.

The boosterism approach has long dominated tourism planning. It regards tourism development as inherently positive and automatically providing benefit to local communities (Hall 2008). Under this approach, little attention is given to the potential negative impacts of tourism or that cultural and natural resources are subject to exploitation for tourism development. This view leads to limited opportunities for residents of tourist destinations to participate in the decision making and planning process and, therefore, those who are against such development may be considered negative. The boosterism practice occurs within two groups of people, those who believe that economic growth is of importance and thus tourism needs to be promoted, and those who will gain financially from tourism (Getz 1987). They will continuously promote tourism until the resources to exploit it run out, the real or opportunity costs are too high, or political opposition to growth can no longer be countered. By then, the real damage has usually already been done. It is believed that a part of this approach is useful for planning, that which is focused on tourism demand, promotion and development, and it is best applied to hosting mega-events such as the Olympic Games, where such events are automatically beneficial to the host city and region (Nauright & Schimmel 2005).

Another approach to tourism planning is the economic tradition. The emphasis of this approach is the idea that tourism generates income and employment for local communities (Hall 2008). Therefore, tourism is regarded as a means used by governments to achieve certain goals of economic growth and employment benefits. Under the tenet of this view, the use of marketing and promotion to attract more visitors is important. This approach seems to be generally conducted in developing countries, since tourism in developing countries is seen as a way to create employment or to earn foreign revenue (Telfer & Sharpley 2008).

In a land use/physical/spatial approach, tourism and development is defined in geographical and environmental protection terms (Hall 2008). Under this tradition, planning is focused on ‘a spatial
or geographical component, in which the general objective is to provide for a spatial structure of activities that is better than the pattern existing without planning’ (Hall 1992, p. 4). In this approach, tourism is often viewed as having an ecological base, thus, there is a need to focus on certain spatial patterns that would reduce the negative impacts of tourism on the physical environment (Hall 2008). Environmental carrying capacity appears to be the focus of this approach (see Liu and Borthwick (2011), Mathieson and Wall (1982), Simon, Narangajavana and Marques (2004)). Carrying capacity is an important aspect to facilitate the tourism planning process in tourist destinations (Simón et al. 2004).

In the late 1970s, increasing attention was given to the negative impacts of tourism. These impacts encouraged the emergence of a community-oriented approach. The framework of community involvement in tourism development was initially proposed by Murphy (1985). Emphasising that communities are a part of the resources of tourism, Murphy (1985) argues that in order to make tourism sustainable, it is important to establish a participative approach which includes communities in the decision making process. This approach rests on the idea that without community involvement, tourism growth and development may become increasingly difficult. Murphy (1985) advocated the use of an ecological approach to tourism planning, which focused on the need for local control over the development process.

Despite the increased calls for incorporating locals into the planning and development process, the community approach has nevertheless been challenged by the fact that locals are often under represented (Liu & Wall 2006). This is because locals often have a lack of knowledge about tourism and its associated skills, and the priority is often placed on economic growth by policy makers (Liu & Wall 2006). Liu and Wall (2006) argue that in order for locals to benefit and participate, efforts must not only consider calls for more local involvement, but also move to incorporating human resource development into planning, by increasing the capabilities of locals. If this is not done, benefits will continue to accrue to outsiders, while the locals must adjust to the changes that tourism brings (Liu & Wall 2006).

Over time, the community approach to tourism planning has gradually been revised and improved. Some scholars have sharpened the idea by emphasising a strong and mutual relationship between the environment and the community in which collaboration and cooperation between these two are
essential (Jamal & Getz 1995; Sautter & Leisen 1999). Inskeep (1991) also calls for a continuous and systems oriented involvement of local communities, where tourism is viewed as an interrelated system maximising the involvement of the local community in planning and decision making. Several other authors argue that community involvement is not only socially responsible or ethically appropriate, but is also important for the success of tourism development initiatives in the long term (Ritchie 1988; Tosun 2006).

In order for the community planning approach to be able to provide a foundation for the development of a longer term approach to tourism, the formulation of sustainable approaches to tourism development is important (Hall 2008). The tenets of community-based planning should be extended to include the coordinative, iterative, integrative and strategic aspects of planning before a sustainable approach can be understood (Hall 2008). Padin (2012) maintains that the absence of incorporating environmental, economic and cultural tourism development will not ensure long-term sustainability of tourism development. One of the means to developing more sustainable forms of tourism is by incorporating sustainable tourism practices and policies (Edgell et al. 2007; Hall 2008). In this regard, governments and planners have to be convinced of the importance of incorporating the sustainable principles into their planning and operations (Hall 2008; Padin 2012). Thus, the planning process must take into account an analysis of an area’s natural environment elements, embracing its geography, climate and residents, as well as the built environment featuring history, heritage and culture (Edgell et al. 2007).

Analysing the above approaches, there has been a push towards participation or incorporating the local community in the planning process. During the era of boosterism, local community involvement in tourism planning was disregarded, however, over time, the involvement of the local community in tourism planning has gradually been encouraged. The first three traditions (boosterism, economic, and physical approach) mean that those responsible for tourism planning would draft plans that have a specific focus guided by the tradition under which they are operating (Liu & Wall 2006). However, both community-oriented and sustainable development approaches to planning are more bottom-up planning, allowing for input from local residents as opposed to top-down planning where the planners are viewed as the experts. The increasing recognition of the need for tourism development to be more sustainable will contribute to be more socially responsive and environmentally sensitive tourism industry (Hall 2008).
One of the related sustainable planning approaches is the systems approach, whereby all aspects of regional tourism, are comprehensively planned. Tourism is analysed from a holistic perspective and viewed as an interrelated system that ought to be planned as such (Inskeep 1991). Gunn (1994) maintains that all elements of regional tourism, such as transportation, accommodation, promotion, attractions, and information, need to be planned in an integrated manner to avoid difficulties between tourism sub-sectors. There has been criticism of this paradigm in the past due to the difficulty of considering all elements in the planning process at one time (Hudson 1979; Mitchell 1989).

Another planning perspective related to the systems approach is the integrated approach (Inskeep 1991). In this approach, tourism is integrated into the overall development plan and the total development patterns of the area (Inskeep 1991; Lee 1987). Tourism is regarded as ‘a very sensitive sector’ which must deal with many uncertainties and for this reason planning should take place in conjunction with the development goals of the region (Baud-Bovy 1982, p. 308). Furthermore, Timothy (1998) argues that if integrative tourism development is to be achieved, cooperation between various planning sectors should exist.

In order to achieve sustainable tourism development, planning should involve the interdependence of various factors. Hall (2008, p. 15) states that the tourism planning process comprises factors such as ‘institutional arrangements, values, powers, interests, culture, network, and significant individuals’. The extensive variety and interdependence of these factors in tourism planning is related to the complex process of tourism development. According to Telfer and Sharpley (2008), tourism development is a complex process which involves the convergence of various tourism development agents such as government, private sectors, and not-for-profit organisations. The interactions between these groups take place through the policy, planning and political layers which exist in the bureaucratic structure of destinations (Telfer & Sharpley 2008). The combination of these various stakeholders becomes more complex with the differing values, ideologies, goals, priorities, strategies and resources of each of the tourism development agents. The values and ideologies of tourism agents are interrelated with the goals, priorities, and strategies chosen, and they need to be considered within the context of power (Telfer & Sharpley 2008). Goldsworthy (1988) argues that all development theories, policies, plans and strategies are based on a set of underlying values reflected in the preferred approaches. Further elaboration of power in tourism
planning will be discussed later in the chapter (in section 2.5 on power in tourism planning), but first it is instructive to examine the tourism planning process as it plays out in developing countries.

2.3 Tourism Planning in Developing Countries

Tourism planning is important, particularly in developing countries (Pearce 2000). However, even though the important role of planning in achieving sustainable tourism has been widely recognised, in the case of developing countries, such plans are often not implemented with any determination (De Kadt 1979c).

There are several issues around planning implementation in the developing countries. These issues can be categorised into political, structural and cultural issues. In terms of political issues, a strong centralised structure is a major issue in developing countries (Tosun 2001; Tosun & Timothy 2001). This centralisation of public administration functions has caused the concentration of power in the hands of elites. As in the case of Turkey, the central government is the power base and, local bodies are therefore used by the ruling parties to implement the central government priorities, or they are forced to follow central government decisions via economic and political pressures (Tosun & Timothy 2001).

Overcentralisation also results in the government of developing countries placing too much focus on planning but having less capability and discipline to govern it (Inskeep 1991; Tosun & Timothy 2001). Pearce (2000) claims that in developing countries, the emphasis in planning is mostly focused on preparation rather than implementation. Thus, while planning needs to be regularly assessed (Lawson & Baud-Bovy 1977), this regular monitoring is often ignored and unaccomplished (Pearce 2000) as changing local situations are also not accommodated in the plans (Tosun & Timothy 2001). In other words, the plans tend to be inflexible and unable to address the fast changing socio-cultural, economic and technological conditions which the tourism industry works under (Tosun & Timothy 2001). As a result, improper implementation of plans may occur because the plans are not advanced enough to manage the real situations at hand (Tosun & Timothy 2001).
Furthermore, the centralised structure in developing countries has encouraged a tendency for those who win elections and are in power to claim entitlement in terms of making all of the decisions necessary in the name of those who elected them (Tosun 2000). This can lead to a lack of political will for those in power to implement a participatory tourism approach (Timothy 2002; Tosun 2001). Some believe that this domination of elites deliberately keeps residents in a subordinate position (De Kadt 1979b; Haywood 1988). In developing countries, the tendency to ignore residents is encouraged by the fear on the part of elites that the masses could use their numerical strength to take care of their interests through political power or coercion (Tosun 2000).

One example of power concentrated in the hands of elites is what occurred on Java Island in Indonesia. On Java Island, respect for leaders is highly valued by the communities and thus, bypassing the leaders is considered impolite (Timothy 1998). This strong power in the hands of the leaders allows the leaders to make decisions on behalf of everyone. This arrangement leaves the common people with little choice but to accept what the leader determines. To disagree would be regarded as a sign of disrespect.

With regard to centralised structure, as outlined in Chapter 1, in Indonesia, since the 1990s, decentralisation has been advocated and put into practice. However, the goals and the process have been problematic (Alm et al. 2001). The study of Alm, Aten and Bahl (2001) reveals that a number of governance issues were unresolved, such as financial management, personnel decentralisation, taxation, borrowing by local governments, as well as balancing revenue and expenditure. As a result, the pressure placed on the provincial and regional governments by the central government still exists (Alm et al. 2001).

In terms of structural issues, in the case of Turkey, Alipour (1996) discovered evidence suggesting that a planning paradigm for tourism in Turkey has been established but not necessarily adopted or applied. For example, environmental issues have not been addressed in any of the tourism development procedures. The crisis in Turkish tourism was found to be serious with a lack of recognition and understanding of the extensive set and interdependence of tourism stakeholders in the tourism sector. At the same time, the research of Tosun and Jenkins (1996) found that a lack of consideration of the internal and external factors that affect the tourism sector have caused the planning approach in tourism development to fail to meet even the basic requirements of many
Tourism development planning in developing countries is mostly supply oriented and highly market driven. Tosun and Timothy (2001) note that in developing countries physical development such as building hotels and restaurants has been emphasised in tourism planning in developing countries. Tourism planning was perceived simply as opening new hotels or improving transport infrastructure to facilitate access. As a consequence of this supply side focus, there is excess capacity in the tourism sector, an inefficient use of limited resources and an approach to development that primarily emphasises economic growth. Developing countries then focus on promoting their tourist destinations and competing with similar destinations, activities which often neglect consideration of the implication for the social, cultural and environmental domains.

The common practices of planning in developing countries, which are overwhelmingly inflexible, incomprehensive and disregard local conditions (Tosun & Timothy 2001), results in difficulties in implementing planning. Thus a wide gap between planning and practices is unavoidable (Lai, Li & Feng 2006). Tosun and Timothy (2001) suggest that tourism planning in developing countries should adhere to a suitable method of planning that considers their own conditions such as socio-economic indicators of the destination and socio-cultural traditions. As Tosun and Timothy (2001, p. 358) state, ‘There is no magical checklist for an appropriate or inappropriate approach to tourism development planning’.

In terms of cultural issues, traditions (Timothy 1999), apathy, low level of awareness in the locals, and religious sensitivities are often cited as impediments to tourism planning implementation (Aref 2011; Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012). Therefore, these issues have required tourism planners to consider local sensitivities and fine-tuning of development (Ghaderi & Henderson 2012; Tosun & Jenkins 1996). Without careful analysis of local sensitivities, a cultural backlash is possible (Tosun & Jenkins 1996).

In Malaysia, since Islam is vital to local residents’ lives, the authorities assume that the potential for conflict between Muslim residents and non-Muslim international tourists may occur (Henderson
In order to address this issue, the authorities linked the management of tourism to religious, political and economic imperatives. In this case, those who are involved in the tourism industry of Malaysia need to be aware of the conditions and have an appreciation of religious sensitivities as well as helping to educate tourists about behaviour. There was also scope for consultation with religious figures, as well as local communities, regarding the formulation of codes of conduct and presentation of sites such as the mosques and shrines as tourist attractions (Henderson 2003). Given the continuous dilemma that has been confronting Muslim nations as they attempt to deal with modern mass tourism (Henderson 2003), the cases in other countries where religion is dominant in the life of communities are worth considering. Indeed, this aspect is particularly relevant to this study of Madura Island given the very high percentage of Muslims in the resident population.

These cases are evident of how planning and sustainable development can often be difficult in developing countries. The application of boosterism and economic approaches appears to be dominant in developing countries, which leads to marginalisation of residents in the planning process (Hall 2008). Thus, despite the recognition that participation from communities in tourism planning is important, in developing countries, this participation has been difficult to implement, as discussed below.

2.4 Community Participation in Tourism

A lack of community support has also become one of the major problems of tourism planning in developing countries. This is in contrast to the sustainable tourism principle that entails a long-term perspective and broad-based participation in tourism, particularly in policy formulation, decision making and implementation at all levels (United Nations 2002). This is articulated in the report below:

One of the fundamental prerequisites for the achievement of sustainable development is broad public participation in decision making. Furthermore, in the more specific context of environment and development, the need for new forms of participation has emerged. This includes the needs of individuals, groups and organisations to participate in environmental impact assessment procedures and to have knowledge about and participate in decisions, particularly those which potentially affect the communities in which they live and work (United Nations 1992, p. 23.2).
Community participation in tourism development process has been widely recognised as essential (Cole 2008; Grybovych, Hafermann & Mazzoni 2011; Lamberti, Noci, Guo & Zhu 2011; Marien & Pizam 1997). It is believed that participation of locals in tourism planning results in better support and attitudes towards tourism and subsequently, this creates a successful industry (Grybovych et al. 2011; Timothy 2002). Yet, if the aspirations of locals are ignored or not included in tourism planning, resentments and hostilities may happen and these may have the potential to damage the industry (Haywood 1988; Murphy 1985; Zhang, Inbakaran & Jackson 2006). Roberts (2013) argues that since no one can judge the perceptions and preferences of residents except the residents themselves, their involvement in tourism planning is essential. In addition, the involvement of residents in the decision making process in developing countries is important because tourism will generate profits for the residents (Roberts 2013).

As part of the wide recognition of the importance of community participation, this topic has become a debated issue in the tourism management literature, particularly around its definition. The term ‘community participation’ has been interpreted by scholars in varying ways (Saxena 2011) and agreement on a common definition of community participation has been hard to achieve (Lamberti et al. 2011; Tosun 1999, 2005). Community participation can refer to collaboration (Bramwell & Sharman 1999; Jamal & Getz 1995; Jamal & Stronza 2009), involvement of the community in the decision making process (Aref & Ma'rof 2008), or a multi-stakeholder approach in decision making, all of which are referred to as participatory tourism planning (Timothy 1999) or cooperative tourism planning (Timothy 1998).

Key factors in community participation that relate to the input of locals are contribution, influence, sharing, or redistribution of power and control, knowledge and skills of locals in decision making (Saxena 2011). These include empowering the community by a consultative process which provides the community an opportunity to choose, make decisions and implement those decisions (Sofield 2003), as well as by enhancing self-esteem and pride in cultural traditions through an outside recognition of the values and uniqueness of the culture (Cole 2008; Scheyvens 2003b). Therefore, participation should place an emphasis on the resources, needs and decisions of the community, whereby opportunities are provided for local communities to mobilise their own resources, define their own needs, and make their own decisions in order to meet their own needs (Tosun 2005).
Timothy (1999) suggests that community participation may happen in two stages: in the decision-making process and in gaining the benefits of tourism development (see Figure 2.1). Participation in the decision making process refers to the empowerment of local residents to define their own goals for development, as well as consultation with them so their hopes and concerns with regard to tourism are addressed. Participation also encompasses the involvement of other stakeholders in the decision making and development process. The benefits of tourism refer to increased income, and opportunities for employment and education for the locals and are the most evident way of involving local community members in the benefits of tourism development (Timothy 1999).

**Figure 2.1 A Normative Model of Participatory Tourism Planning**
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Source: Adapted from Timothy (1999)

Both of these stages - involvement of locals in decision making and in the benefits of tourism - are closely related and entangled (Lamberti et al. 2011). The involvement of locals in decision making influences the generation of the benefits of tourism, and vice versa (Lamberti et al. 2011). For example, if there is no involvement of local stakeholders in decision making, disparity in the benefits of tourism might occur (Madrigal 1995). If local residents are to benefit from tourism, it is imperative that they are involved in the decision making process. However, the study of Li (2006) in China found the contrary. Li’s (2006) study results showed that even though there was low participation of locals in the decision making, local communities were happy with tourism because they received satisfactory benefits from tourism. Several elites, who were decision makers in the
process, were from local villages and may have contributed to this outcome because they may have had the interests of the local community at heart (Li 2006).

Another tourism planning approach which emphasises the collaboration of varied stakeholders is cooperative tourism planning. Sustainable tourism development, which entails consistently meeting the needs of the stakeholders involved in tourism development, as well as the need for environmental protection, requires effective planning and implementation of collaboration and partnerships among various stakeholders (Hall 2008).

According to Timothy (1998), four types of cooperation are essential for successful inclusive tourism development. These are ‘cooperation between government agencies, cooperation between levels of administration, cooperation between same-level politics, and private public sector cooperation’ (Timothy 1998, p. 54). Of particular importance is cooperation between government agencies so that misunderstanding and conflicts related to the overlap between agency responsibilities are minimised. Coordination often refers to the problem of relating units or decisions across the government agencies. In addition, government agencies mostly compete with each other for scarce operating funds. In order for tourism to be successful there needs to be cooperation between levels of administration, such that development in a region might require the coordinated efforts of two or more levels of administration. In this way, the overlap in services and planning can be addressed, improving efficiency and saving money. Hall (2000, p. 135) points out, ‘Coordination is necessary both within and between the different levels of government in order to avoid duplication of resources between the various government tourism bodies and the private sector, and to develop effective tourism strategies’. Cooperation also occurs between the same-level politics and private sectors. The wide range of services and facilities needed by tourism are mostly owned and operated by individuals or private corporations. Therefore, cooperation between the private and public sectors is important.

This cooperative tourism planning is useful in a number of ways. An integrative and cooperative approach may result in better decisions in terms of stakeholder acceptance. An integrative approach to tourism planning and management at all levels would assist in the distribution of the benefits and costs of tourism development more equitably, while focusing on improving relationships and understanding between stakeholders may also assist in agreement on planning directions and goals.
Cooperative planning is also a suitable strategy for managing turbulent planning domains at the local level (Jamal & Getz 1995). This process might also be suitable for coordinating regional level planning of tourism development (Jamal & Getz 1995).

Despite its importance, cooperative planning may be difficult to accomplish because the tourism industry has many interconnected, diverse and varied products and services (Timothy 1998). As Hall (2008, p. 118) argues, ‘The diverse structure of the industry has meant that coordination of the various elements of the planning process has been extremely difficult’. In addition, a cooperative planning process will still need to be steered in order to ensure that planning outputs occur (Hall, 2008). The interrelationships of many stakeholders involved in tourism planning have often resulted in confusion around the tourism planning process (Hall 2008).

The difficulty in implementing a collaborative approach has been highlighted in the case of Yogyakarta in Indonesia (Timothy 1998). Timothy’s (1998) research reveals that cooperation between government agencies in Yogyakarta is hard to achieve due to a lack of coordination between different planning agencies. Similar challenges occur when creating cooperation between the administrative levels and within the same-level political units, while cooperation between public and private sectors is considered totally nonexistent in Yogyakarta. Several constraints appear in the application of cooperative tourism planning within Yogyakarta. Traditional social and political hierarchy is a major factor contributing to restrictions in sectoral and political planning practices locally. Indeed, the varied local social and political conditions, coupled with a lack of awareness of cooperative planning impacts adversely on the activities of government planners.

Similarly, Ladkin and Bertramini (2002) claim that it was difficult to achieve collaboration in the tourism development process in Cusco, Peru. Tourism development in Cusco, which is still at an early stage and networks are not formed, has become the main reason for this lack of collaboration (Ladkin & Bertramini 2002). Therefore, there is a lack of confidence amongst the stakeholders and a no shared vision with regard to tourism development. These studies highlight the various ways that local communities may become involved in planning for tourism.
2.4.1 Forms of Participation in the Tourism Planning Process

Participation of local communities can be reflected in various forms. Several authors, such as Arnstein (1969), Pretty (1995) and Tosun (1999), identify and describe a typology of participation in the tourism planning process. This section discusses the forms of community participation developed by the three authors. Furthermore, power distribution which underlies the form of these typologies is also important to consider and will be further discussed later.

Arnstein (1969) developed a typology of participation called ‘A ladder of citizen participation’. The definition of citizen participation emphasises that the distribution of power underpins the form of this typology. According to Arnstein, citizen participation is ‘The redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens...to be deliberately included in the future. It is the means by which they can induce significant social reform, which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society’ (Arnstein 1969, p. 216). Guided by this definition, Arnstein forms his ladder of participation which consists of eight levels of participation. The bottom levels of the ladder are manipulation and therapy. These bottom levels are described as non-participation levels and at both these levels; those in positions of power should educate the participants. The third and fourth levels are called informing and consultation. At these levels, residents have some say but lack the power to ensure their views are considered. The fifth level is placation, whereby those in power collaborate with residents but still make the final decisions. The sixth and seventh levels are partnership and delegated power. At these levels, citizens have a greater power of speech and can influence decision making process. Negotiation with those in power is permitted at these levels. Finally, the eighth level is citizen control. This level allows the citizens to have the greatest presence in decision-making (Arnstein 1969).

While Arnstein (1969) suggests eight levels of participation, Pretty (1995) suggests there are seven forms of participation. These range from manipulative and passive participation, where people are told what has been decided or has already happened, to self-mobilisation, where people take independent initiatives and have control over resources utilisation. In detail, the types of participation proposed by Pretty (1995) are manipulative participation, passive participation, participation by consultation, participation for material incentives, functional participation, interactive participation and self-mobilisation. The range of types represents differing degrees of
involvement from those outside the community and local control, demonstrating the power relationships that exist between them (Mowforth & Munt 2009). Both Arnstein and Pretty’s models are developed in the development studies context and are not connected to the economy sector (Tosun 2006).

Tosun (1999) develops a typology of community participation specifically for tourism with three categories. These are spontaneous community participation, induced participation and coercive community participation. Coercive participation refers to top-down and passive participation which is forced and lacks in public support. Induced participation refers to formal, top-down and passive participation, in that the voices of locals are encouraged and heard, but are not supported by the power necessary to ensure their views will considered by those in positions of power such as government bodies or multinational companies. This type is the most common found in developing countries, whereby a host community simply supports decisions on tourism development made for them (Tosun 1999). It is top-down, passive and indirect. Tosun (2006) adds that induced community participation allows host communities to participate in implementation and have some share of the benefits of tourism, but excludes them from the decision making process. The last category in Tosun’s (1999) model is spontaneous participation, which is voluntary and refers to the host community having full management responsibility and authority.

Reviewing these three different typologies of community participation, Tosun (2006) identifies correspondence between these three models. Spontaneous participation in Tosun’s model is associated with degrees of citizen power in Arnstein’s typology, and to self-mobilisation and interactive participation in Pretty’s model. Induced community participation in tourism development corresponds to degrees of citizen tokenism in Arnstein’s typology, and functional participation with participation by consultation or participation for material incentives as described in Pretty’s model. Coercive participation is related to non-participation in Arnstein’s model and passive participation and manipulative participation in Pretty’s typology. These various forms of participation are potentially easy to put forward, much more difficult to achieve in practice (Mowforth & Munt 2009; Tosun 2005). The local circumstances and the unequal distribution of power between local communities and other interest groups are among factors that challenge the application of participation. This is explored further in Section 2.5.
2.4.2 Limitations of Community Participation in Tourism Planning in Developing Countries

Since participation has been developed and promoted primarily in the political and social context of developed countries (Lamberti et al. 2011), its application to developing countries is problematic (Lamberti et al. 2011; Tosun 2005). Several operational, structural and cultural aspects are identified as barriers that typically hinder community participation in developing countries (Tosun 2000). Tosun (2000) maintains that included in the operational problems are issues related to the strong centralism of public administration such as a lack of coordination between tourism stakeholders and a lack of communication. For instance, some people choose not to get involved in tourism community participation activities due to time pressures (Pongponrat & Pongquan 2007). Timothy (1999) states that local people may feel they cannot afford the time to participate, especially with their low socio-economic condition. This situation causes them to be more focused on making ends meet.

Some scholars claim that politicians in developing countries seem to be reluctant to adopt and implement participatory development approaches (Tosun & Timothy 2001). It has been argued that this lack of will on the part of the government is the result of the unequal distribution of power and resources between government and the local community - a situation that has mostly existed in the tourism development process in developing countries (Tosun & Timothy 2001). Also, since the main aim of tourism development in developing countries has most often been to increase foreign revenue (i.e. by applying the boosterism and economic approaches), the government has mostly driven tourism development towards this aim, often disregarding other community interests (Tosun & Timothy 2001). The absence of a participatory planning approach in developing countries is indeed like ‘a missing ingredient of development’ in many developing countries (Tosun & Timothy 2001, p. 355).

The lack of coordination between different government agencies can also be a hindrance to the participation of local benefits to tourism. The research of Hampton (2003) in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, shows that the central government in Jakarta is responsible for four and five star accommodation and facilities across the whole country, whereas the provincial governments are responsible for the no-star to three-star accommodation in their areas. This minimal coordination is compounded by the
lack of government interest in participatory planning (Timothy, 1991).

Other operational issues are related to the limited data available about tourism as well as its inaccessibility to the public (Tosun & Jenkins 1996). As a result, most residents have little knowledge regarding tourism development and, consequently, public involvement is low. For example, in Iran, tourism plans are inaccessible to the public, therefore, local communities have little knowledge about these plans and public participation is low (Aref & Ma'ruf 2008). Often, the information about plans in developing countries is limited to the rich and educated elites, leaving communities with low level knowledge of plans (Tosun & Jenkins 1996).

Included in the structural issues are a number of issues such as institutional problems, power and legislative structures, dysfunctional economic systems, a lack of will to adopt participatory tourism development amongst professionals, a lack of knowledge on the part of planners, domination by elites, lack of an appropriate legal system, lack of skilled human resources, and funding issues such as the high cost of community participation and few financial resources (Tosun 2000). A lack of public meetings is another significant barrier to participation. In China, even though there were many ways of attracting public participation such as attending public meetings and the submission of opinions, these procedures were only formalities, and public opinion was rarely reflected in final decision making (Wang, Yang, Chen, Yang & Li 2010). Furthermore, lack of expertise for both planners and residents is another major problem. With regard to planning, government officials and private planners both lack understanding about the nature of involvement in tourism planning (Timothy 1999). This condition is worsened by the modernisation ethos that focuses primarily on the elites and economic development (Graf 1992). In addition, the newness of the industry means there is a dearth of planners with adequate planning skills, including the skills to attract community participation in the industry (Brown 1994).

In terms of structural limitations, one of the issues is tension between the professionals who formulate the plan. This tension is usually associated with difficulties in persuading professionals to accept participatory tourism development as a viable approach in many developing countries. In this context, emergence and acceptance of participatory tourism development may depend largely on the existence of a powerful Non-Government Organisation (NGO) defending participatory development as a democratic right of host communities in tourist destinations (Tosun 2000). In many developing
countries, there is limited planning capacity, in part because they lack experts with the appropriate training (De Kadt 1979c). The research of Lai, Li, and Feng (2006) indicates that a lack of expertise dominated the local government’s ability in China, which, in turn, limited the ability to conduct planning as a whole.

The cultural limitations include the problems of low levels of knowledge and awareness in the local communities (Tosun 2000). For example, the research in Indonesia found that strong cultural and political traditions create barriers to participation. The Javanese concept of power and authority that requires respect for people in positions of power or those with high social standing has created a situation whereby common people accept their decisions without question (Timothy 1999). Reisinger and Turner (1997) maintain that when the authorities make decisions, their decisions tend to go unquestioned. In this regard, the common people, regardless of whether they agree or not, accept the decisions (Timothy 1999). Discussions with the leader are a tool used to determine what stance people should take on an issue (Jackson & Moeliono 1973). In the village in Java, for example, a great deal of respect and authority go to the head of the village. Thus, few villagers would bypass the village head when needing advice, as this behaviour would be regarded as offensive and cause the village head to lose face (Timothy 1999). Even though in some areas in developing countries, the strong role of the leaders can be important because they can influence community participation (Pongponrat & Pongquan 2007), the strong traditional culture which attributes unquestioned reverence to community leaders has also created a major challenge in developing countries.

In relation to this low level of knowledge, Mosse (2001) maintains that local people’s voice and understanding about plans, their needs and the problems they have in relation to the plans are not actually addressed through participation. Rather, local people’s understanding is strongly manipulated and formed by those in positions of power and the project organisation (Mosse 2001). In this case, negotiation takes place between project staff and villagers, who in practice, according to Moose (2001), are represented by key village leaders. Indeed, the local knowledge is essentially about ‘a collaborative product’, which effectively hides the discussions between villagers and the project staff. Thus, local knowledge becomes matched with what the project can actually provide for the people.
Local community participation in the decision making process of tourism development in developing countries has often been lacking and is often limited or marginalised, as host members are often excluded from planning and decision making (Dola & Mijan 2006). In this regard, Cole (2008, p. 58) raises the question, ‘...about how can they [the community] participate in something about which they understand so little’, as ‘...so many factors, so far from local community control, make tourism an unreliable prospects on which to base economic hopes’. This question leads to two important points which can impede locals from participating. First, Cole’s question indicates the lack of knowledge or understanding of the community in relation to tourism. In the case of the Ngada Village in Flores, Indonesia, the people have little understanding about tourism development in their area (Cole 2008). They expressed their lack of understanding of tourists and tourism; that they have little idea as to why tourists arrive and what they want. Cole (2008) notes that this lack of understanding eventually led to the inability of local residents to understand the tourism process as a whole. Second, Cole’s question elucidates the existence of dominant power, which has controlled tourism in the area and effectively excluded the locals. Thus, in this case of tourism development in Ngada Village, the issues of the loss of power, powerlessness or marginalisation of local people has been apparent (Cole 2008). In an attempt to review challenges for community participation, Cole’s question suggests an important idea - whether the unequal power that exists in developing countries has created a base that strengthens the limited opportunities for local communities to participate in tourism planning in developing countries.

The unequal power which is concentrated in the hands of a few has resulted in the benefits of tourism accruing mostly to these powerful people (Mowforth & Munt 2009). The low levels of access by the locals to financial and other tourism resources have caused an inability to negotiate and little to no sense of ownership of tourism resources. These situations are the cause of the residents being powerless in participation (Aref & Ma'rof 2008).

The perceived benefits resulting from tourism have provided the required encouragement to participate in tourism development programs (Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012). With regard to Ramsar city in Iran, the results show that there is a significant relationship between the effects of tourism for the community and degree of participation (Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012). In this case, the more people receive benefits from tourism, the more they tend to participate in tourism development (Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012).
However, Li (2006) found that community participation can be counterproductive in certain stages of tourism development, illustrating the case in which, despite poor participation in decision-making caused in part by a lack of finances, there were positive outcomes for the community. Notably, positive outcomes resulting from a decision-making process where participation is weak cannot demonstrate that participation was not effective, only the possibility that there is the need to reshape the concept and design of the participation model in developing countries (Li 2006).

The participatory planning approach has also been challenged by the complex nature of communities and the power differentials in participation which can often challenge expected beneficial outcomes. The research of Roberts (2013) makes this point. In her research of the Lowlands community on the island of Tobago, the smaller of the unitary state of Trinidad and Tobago, Roberts (2013) found that there were three factors identified as mediating the extent to which communities are able to access the benefits of community participation initiatives. These factors were clear vision of objectives, sustained interest, and institutional support. In other words, if vision of objectives is unclear, interest to participate is low and institutional support is inadequate. For example, lack of training in negotiation has hindered people from participating in decision making (Roberts 2013).

Moreover, participation is tending to become a management procedure without considering the social structures of potential participants, such as participants’ positions, the variation in advantages or disadvantages of joining participants, individual motivations, and the opportunities and problems which limit the desire of participants to participate. Cleaver (2001) suggests that further analysis about social structure may also be necessary to include the interests of poor people. The beneficial nature of individuals in participation should not overlook the social structures that underpin the desire to participate.

With regard to participation, participative decision making should be rooted in a dynamic relationship of mutual trust and respect, rather than merely depending on formal dialogues. The research of Hailey (2001) suggests that the operational and cultural limitations, as well as the history and the reality of the practice, indicate that they might legitimately be seen as a means of imposing external control. To solve these problems, personal dialogues are promoted because these conversations are important in shared effective decision-making (Hailey 2001).
In addition to these critiques, Mohan (2001) suggests that even though inequalities of power exist, the powerless cannot be looked at as such. As Rahnema (1990, p. 164) said, ‘There is a different power which is not always perceived as such, and cannot be actualised in the same manner, yet it is very real in many ways and it is constituted by the thousands of centres and informal networks of resistance which ordinary people put up’. Indeed, as discussed earlier, the principle of local participation may be easy to promote, but the practice is more difficult (Mowforth & Munt 2009), especially in developing countries due to a top-down development culture (Teye et al. 2002) and the socio-political structures (Lamberti et al. 2011). With so many limitations in developing countries, participation initiatives should be analysed with care to determine how genuine they really are (Lamberti et al. 2011).

Reflected in the review above, the challenges to planning implementation and to the application of community participation are quite similar. Several factors, such as centralisation, lack of coordination between parties, and funding issues, have challenged both the implementation of planning and participation. This indicates that these existing problems in developing countries do not only challenge planning implementation in general, but also challenge participation implementation in particular. The unequal power dynamics that dominate tourism planning in developing countries were evident in this discussion and clearly play an important role in creating such a problematic situation.

2.5 Power in Tourism Planning

Unequal power relations are prominent in tourism development as it manifests in developing countries (Hall 2008). This is particularly evident in the way community participation is enacted in developing countries.

Participation is a buzzword assumed to be always good and politically correct (Scheyvens 2003a). However, several criticisms have been raised noting that some forms of participation may actually reinforce unequal exercise of power (Cooke & Kothari 2001). Taylor (2001) claims that participation is only cosmetic and fulfils the role of a deflecting device in order to give a sense of participation without substance and it is always promoted by those with the most power. Furthermore, Taylor (2001) claims that participation is not working, or at least has not had the
impact that was expected. Those with power are often immune to criticism (Hailey 2001), and continue to hold strong control of what it means to have community participation. From this perspective, participation is used as a ‘hegemonic’ device to secure compliance to, and control held by existing power structures (Taylor 2001, p. 137).

Some authors have emphasised the importance of power relations in tourism (Coles & Church 2007; Mowforth & Munt 2009). The idea of power relations suggests that power is not ‘a possession tied to a particular individual or collective entity’ (Foucault 1978, p. 99). Rather, power is circulating everywhere and never limited to any particular hands (Foucault 1980). Yet, Foucault stresses that power should be viewed as a relationship rather than an entity that is available within ‘a network of relations’ (Cheong & Miller 2000, p. 373).

Since power exists in every human interaction (Foucault 1978), power relations exist in any relations of human beings; for instance, between a man and a woman, between the members of family, and between a teacher and a pupil (Foucault 1980). In the context of the study of tourism planning in developing countries, power exists between residents in a destination community, between local communities and governments, and between residents and tourists, between numerous tourism agents such as governmental, domestic and international private sectors, planning consultants and tourists (Mowforth & Munt 2009). These are reflected in processes such as selecting goals and priorities, strategies, preferred outcomes, deciding who controls decision making processes, and so forth (Mowforth & Munt 2009). Power exists broadly in the overall process of policy and planning processes and since each agent has their own values and ideologies, processes have become a context for high competition of interests between various agents (Telfer & Sharpley 2008).

Cheong and Miller (2000, p. 376) claim that power relations have created the ‘dominator’ on one side and the ‘dominated’ on the other, suggesting a domination of control to influence by one person over another (Lukes 1974). In this case, there is a tendency to achieve goals through influencing one’s will upon the behaviour of other persons (Weber 1954). A well-known scholar that discusses the influence is Foucault (1978, p. 92) who further elaborates on this by saying that power is ‘a general system of domination exerted by one group over another, a system whose effects, through successive derivations, pervade the entire social body’. The common perspective of power,
however, is regarded as the individual or group who is imposing their will and purpose on others, including those who are reluctant or adversarial to being imposed upon (Galbraith 1983).

The definition of power leads to the question of how power is enforced and how the will of others is influenced. Galbraith (1983, pp. 4-6) refers to the rule of three which maintains that power is enforced through three types of power: condign, compensatory and conditioned powers. Condign and compensatory powers refer to one individual obtaining submission from another individual through the ability to impose punishment and reward, respectively. Conditioned power, in contrast, is exercised by changing the other person’s ideas through persuasion, education or social commitment. In an attempt to examine the meanings of tourism held by the residents, there is the possibility that these three types of power might be exercised by some residents over others to influence the meanings of tourism.

Resources owned by a resident are a vital source of power (Nagel 1975). These have been considered a representation of power that residents could use to satisfy their needs, which could refer to land, a house, funds, skills or knowledge (Kayat 2002). In tourism and the social exchange context, those who have one of these resources will have the ability to dictate another resident’s capability to influence the tourism development process to satisfy their needs in relation to the exchange with tourism development (Kayat 2002). The various definitions of power which embrace the idea of influence are related to the possession of resources. These illuminate the unequal relationships in the exercise of power, meaning that those who have resources will wield their power over those without resources.

The study of power relations is important and has attracted much debate in tourism studies. Power relations must be taken into consideration for collaboration to succeed (Jamal & Getz 1995). Therefore, considerations of power must be included at all stages of the collaborative planning process, especially in the selection of stakeholders for inter-organisational collaboration as they are influential at every stage of the collaboration process (Jamal & Getz 1995). Reed (1997) explored the power relations among stakeholders affected by community based tourism planning activities in Squamish, Canada. Application of the typology of power relations to different policy arenas (developmental, allocational, organisational) revealed that participants use several strategies in the community-based tourism planning process to influence the process of collaboration (Reed 1997).
While most research is concerned with the power relations between hosts and guests at the tourist destinations (Cheong & Miller, 2000), appreciation of the power relations amongst the residents is almost non-existent. In some cases, their power is underestimated (Cheong & Miller, 2000). In a social exchange situation such as this, Ap (1992) suggests the inclusion of power is important because power determines the exchange partner’s ability to take advantage of the outcome of the exchange.

Unequal power relations have long been evident in the tourism planning process (Hall 2008). Focusing on local communities in ‘third world’ countries, Timothy (2002) indicates that the lack of wealth and political power for host destinations has often made them completely powerless in the planning and the decision making process. This claim is strengthened by Timothy and Ionnadies (2002) who indicated that many tourism decisions, especially those in developing regions, have been made by relegating the community’s best interest. Reid (2003, p. 134) similarly maintains that:

often, local communities are assumed to be represented by their local governments, but as evidenced previously, national governments have their own agenda, usually having to do with earning foreign exchange in order to reduce debt held by foreign banks, but not necessarily related to issues like regional development and income generation at the local level.

Burns and Holden (1995) also address this matter of powerlessness by saying that the advantages of tourism are probably more likely to go to other agents such as international companies or local elites than to local people. These local elites represent those with power in the community because they have the power to be able to make decisions over any affairs within the community (Wilkinson 1997).

Smith (2001a) suggests that the local community is subjected to powerlessness and marginalisation in the tourism development process. Using Boracay in the Philippines as an illustration, Smith (2001a) discusses that the marginalisation of locals has the potential to materialise in tourism development, particularly with poor planning and control by the government and the local elites. The descriptions of the chronological phases of tourism development in Boracay presented by Smith (2001a) have shown that the transition of an agricultural based economy to that of a world
famous tourist destination, has in fact been hurting local people, resulting in marginalisation of the locals (Smith 2001a). Further negative effects were also witnessed with the marginalisation of local people as a result of the change in tourism development control from The Philippines Tourism Authority (PTA) to the Municipality of Malay in 1991. The new legislation created more opportunities for outsiders to open their businesses in Borocay, including those who were non-Filipinos. As a result, several new foreign-owned, foreign-staffed and foreign-operated hotels were constructed and began operating in the destination. The marginalisation of local people was heightened due to the fact that they were unable to fulfil employment vacancies in these foreign facilities because they lacked the requisite skills to work in the tourism industry. A tourism-skills training program suggested by the local government to provide assistance for local people never eventuated (Smith 2001a).

Smith’s (2001a) case study demonstrates that as a result of tourism, particularly poor planning and management over the destination, local communities may experience marginalisation and loss of control over tourism development (Mowforth & Munt 2009). Power is concentrated in the select few, especially in those who have access to wealth and political strength, disempowering local residents (Telfer & Sharpley 2008). In addition, the power relationships have created a position of imbalance in the host-guest relationship, which in turn has placed the host community in a weaker position (Hashimoto 2002). The intense debates surrounding the negative impacts of tourism, have given substance to the strong belief that ‘host communities are often viewed as ‘victims’ who must accept the social and cultural changes brought about by tourism. In contrast, the guests, who impose their own values on the host communities, are positioned as the ‘villains’ (Hashimoto 2002, p. 212). These issues are the focus of Chapter 3 in which the literature on resident perceptions of tourism is reviewed.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the literature on tourism planning, particularly as it has manifested in developing countries. It has been argued that sustainability is the major imperative behind a thorough assessment of the manner in which tourism planning may be able to contribute to more sustainable forms of development.
The political nature of the planning process has been discussed as one of the challenges for the incorporation of residents’ views in the tourism planning process. The fragmented nature of tourism development also contributes to difficulties in coordination. The varied definitions of power have contributed to an understanding of how these powers are enforced and how the will of others are imposed upon. The discussion of these two issues has revealed the uneven power relations between tourism agents and residents of host communities or between the residents themselves. As a consequence of these uneven power relations, marginalisation of local communities and resentment towards tourism development may occur. Therefore, a better plan which creates opportunities for communities to provide input to tourism plans and development is necessary. The current study addresses this unevenness in power by examining the exercise of tourism planning on Madura Island, and subsequently how this leads to the development of the meanings of tourism held by its residents.

The focus and methods of tourism planning have not remained constant over time. The tourism planning approach has evolved from boosterism to a sustainable development planning approach. There seems to be a move towards participation or incorporating local community in the planning process. In boosterism, local community involvement in tourism planning is disregarded, but over time, the involvement of local community in tourism planning has gradually been encouraged. The involvement of local residents’ voices in tourism planning has been challenged by several factors such as operational, structural and cultural limitations. The obstacles categorised as operational barriers include the centralisation of the public administration of tourism development, lack of coordination between involved stakeholders, and a lack of information available to locals at the tourist destination. Structural limitations include the problem of persuading professionals to adopt participatory tourism development, lack of expertise, elite domination and lack of an appropriate legal system, lack of trained human resources, the relatively high cost of community participation and a lack of financial resources. Finally, cultural limitations include barriers such as the restricted capacity of locals, apathy and low levels of awareness in the local communities (Tosun 2000).

As this thesis investigates the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and how those meanings develop, understanding the influences that shape these meanings is important. The discussion of power revealed that domination by one person over another reinforces the asymmetrical relationship that manifests in the form of influence.
CHAPTER 3
RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM:
THE EVOLUTION OF KEY CONCEPTS AND THEORIES

3.1 Introduction

This chapter critically reviews the literature on resident perceptions of tourism as a foundation for the empirical work that follows later in the thesis. It has been noted by Teye, Sonmez and Sirakaya (2002) that research into resident perceptions of tourism is warranted and encouraged, as there are a number of gaps and limitations in the area that need to be addressed (Vargas-Sánchez, Plaza-Mejía & Porras-Bueno 2009). Such gaps include research in areas where tourism is just starting to emerge (Harril 2004; Hernández 1996) and in the context of developing countries (Cordero 2008). Another important limitation in this area is the lack of research that attempts to understand the complex development and articulation of the meanings residents attach to tourism (beyond perception and attitude). As Amuquandoh (2010, p. 34) points out, ‘...this aspect of tourism studies remains ignored and meaning is either taken for granted or pushed aside as unimportant in most perception studies in tourism’.

This chapter is organised into three sections. First, the chapter commences by discussing the evolution of thought in tourism research which goes some way to explain the evolutionary patterns of resident perception studies in tourism development. Next, the chapter explores the research that focuses on resident perceptions of tourism in both developed and developing countries. The current works are broadly classified into seven categories: attitudes toward tourism, perceptions of tourism impacts, perceptions of participation in planning, factors influencing resident perceptions of tourism, resident perceptions and Islam, resident perceptions of tourism research in developing countries and resident perceptions of tourism in Indonesia. The chapter then critically examines the social theories employed in studies of resident perceptions of tourism. The frameworks discussed include social exchange theory and social representations theory. Subsequently, the limitations of these theories lead to the justification of the use of symbolic interactionism as the most appropriate theory for this study.
3.2 The Evolution of Thought in Tourism Research: Implications for Resident Perceptions

The development and growth of tourism scholarship during the second half of the twentieth century prompted Jafari (2001) to analyse the evolutionary patterns embedded within that scholarship. These evolutionary patterns are important to consider because they explain how research on resident perceptions of tourism has developed. The evolution of thought on tourism research developed by Jafari (2001) categorises tourism studies into four overarching stages or platforms that he identified as the advocacy, cautionary, adaptancy, and knowledge-based platforms. The following section critically explores these platforms and how the studies of resident perceptions of tourism have been used.

3.2.1 The Advocacy Platform

The advocacy platform is evident in research conducted in the 1960s. This platform describes the tendency for the research that dominated scholarly literature on tourism at that time to focus on the positive and economically beneficial features of tourism and the tourism industry for communities (“Development” 1965; Thornton 1969). This positive view was encouraged by the growing affluence of the middle classes in developed countries in the 1960s when this growth was perceived by developing countries as providing positive opportunities for them to gain foreign exchange and thereby grow their economies (De Kadt 1979a). In this period of research, the benefits of tourism were stressed and its worldwide development was encouraged (Esterling 2004). However, Jafari and others have noted that tourism studies in the 1960s period were limited, mainly because of the small amount of tourism research being published in this era (Butler 2006; Smith 1977).

While the advocacy platform is primarily attributed to the positive attitudes towards tourism development in the 1960s, much research has emerged since that time that has continued to advocate the positive impacts of tourism and is thus reminiscent of the advocacy approach. Apart from the positive impacts for the economy, tourism can also contribute to the promotion and preservation of the local culture. Research conducted by Huttasin (2008) in the villages of Thailand, revealed that tourism had encouraged cultural activities in the villages. Similarly, Cooper, Fletcher, Fyall, Gilbert and Wanhill (2005) state that tourism is acknowledged as stimulating the craft skills
of the local residents and the improvement of these skills allows the residents to reinforce their culture. Although current research and that of the 1960s arrive at the same ideas about advocacy, that is, tourism provides a substantial number of positive benefits to the locals, they have different outcomes. A considerable amount of current research on tourism relates to how tourism provides positive benefits to the socio-cultural and environmental aspects of a community (Grünewald 2002; Mbaiwa 2005; Zhong et al. 2011), and is not only limited to the economy, as promoted by much of the research of the 1960s.

Even while emphasising the positive benefits of tourism in the advocacy era, very little research was concerned with the residents of tourism destinations, the impacts that tourism may have on local people, their cultures and, correspondingly, how residents view and perceive the development of tourism. Accordingly, very little such research was used to support this platform. The primary concern of attracting tourists and boosting tourism (i.e. the boosterism approach to planning) dominated the advocacy platform and overshadowed any interest in the resident perceptions of tourism. Lack of such research resulted in little application of the findings of resident perceptions of tourism studies to strengthen the advocacy platform.

3.2.2 The Cautionary Platform

The advocacy platform was challenged by the subsequent cautionary platform that is evident in research emerging since the 1970s. Research increasingly took a more cautious approach to tourism development with researchers contending that tourism did not only provide positive benefits to the community, but was also responsible for several negative impacts (Jafari 2001). In the 1970s, the negative impacts of tourism development in developing countries were starting to be recognised and were considered a new topic in tourism research (Vukonic 2012).

The debate about how tourism affects host societies is central to the cautionary platform. Contributing to this debate some 35 years ago while researching tourism in Bali, Noronha (1979) claimed that several participants had the perception that tourism in Bali did not destroy Balinese culture. One reason for such a perception is that tourism was only considered to impact on Balinese life through people directly connected with hotels, whereas the majority of the population lived in villages. This was reflected in the always-welcome attitude offered towards tourists when they
attended Balinese ceremonies because the Balinese recognised that tourism was beneficial for them.

Nettekoven (1979) argued that there are several widespread misconceptions in relation to inter-cultural encounters. According to Nettekoven (1979), tourists actually have fewer, less intensive encounters, and minimal influence of importance on the host community. The preference of tourists who are only visiting a central attraction in the destination area, rather than visiting an entire area, have limited interaction with local residents. Thus, the inter-cultural interaction is limited to those residents who reside in the immediate vicinity of a destination as well as with those who are employed in the tourism industry. In addition, tourists are only temporary visitors who do not have any positions of power or effect upon laws or other regulations to which the entire population is subjected. This positions the traditional culture in a dominant role and the tourist in that of a subordinated role. However, the work of Nettekoven (1979) is largely concerned with mass tourism, and thus, is not applicable to smaller groups such as the explorer or drifter tourists who like exploring locations where tourism is just starting to emerge (De Kadt 1979c).

More recently, the research conducted by Wilkinson and Pratiwi (1995) in Pangandaran Village, Indonesia, reflected the cautionary approach. Despite finding that tourism has opened up new employment opportunities in both the formal and informal sectors, tourism also created marginalisation of locals. The formal sector of tourism generally includes accommodation and restaurants which are mostly owned by nonlocals. Such establishments require several types of skilled occupations such as managers or receptionists which cannot be offered to the local residents due to their skill limitations. Conversely, the activities of the informal sector of tourism do not require specific skill levels or education and are therefore capable of being performed by unskilled locals. In these circumstances, the nonlocals, who have more human and cultural capital, appear to enjoy the benefits that result from tourism in greater abundance than the locals. Unfortunately, the locals are becoming marginalised in regard to their employment, property and power. The ownership of resources by a resident permits him or her to have power over those who do not have any resources and, as such, are subservient to the other residents’ power (Kayat 2002).

The focus of the research of the cautionary platform was concerned primarily with the negative impacts of tourism yet still did not capture the residents’ perceptions of tourism. Indeed, in the 1970s, Pi-Sunyer (1978) claimed that many studies on tourism only focused on the impacts of
tourism on host communities and ignored the residents’ views of these impacts. In addressing this gap, Pi-Sunyer (1978) investigated the perceptions of residents towards tourism among a Catalan Maritime Community in Spain and found that tourists were mostly perceived negatively, and viewed as an uneducated and ill-mannered group of people. The tourism industry was seen by the locals of Catalan Maritime as the cause of a loss of individuality. Pi-Sunyer’s (1978) research indicates the emergence of interest in resident perceptions of tourism in the cautionary era. However, due to limitations in the amount of research on this topic, Jafari (2001) did not consider the contribution of resident perception research to the cautionary platform. Yet, the few resident perception studies that did exist contributed by stressing the idea that residents perceive tourism as a bad thing, as the research of Pi-Sunyer (1978) showed.

This period saw the development of the index of tourist irritation (Irridex) developed by Doxey (1975). Doxey’s ‘Irridex’ model (1975) suggests four stages of resident responses to tourism development. In the initial stage of tourism, *euphoria* is evident as the community is delighted in welcoming tourism. However, with larger numbers of arrivals, the community starts to come to a state of indifference known as the *apathy* stage, as the early promises of tourism are not realised by all members. The residents' response then moves on to a stage where the community feels *annoyance* with the inconveniences created by the increased numbers of visitors, such as crowding. When continual and openly expressed irritation to visitors occurs, the community has finally come to an *antagonism* stage, the stage where the community engages in acts of covert and overt aggression towards the visitors. Despite being criticised for assuming that community reactions to tourism are homogeneous (Mason & Cheyne 2000), this model is considered the most significant and earliest work in resident responses towards tourism (Cordero 2008; Mason & Cheyne 2000).

### 3.2.3 The Adaptancy Platform

The contentious debate between the advocacy and cautionary platforms led to the appeal for new forms of tourism study which stimulated the development of adaptancy studies during the 1980s. These studies suggested there were alternative forms of tourism such as eco-tourism, rural tourism and agri-tourism which are responsive to both host communities and tourists. These maintain the sociocultural and environmental integrity of local communities and, at the same time, provide tourists with new choices and rewarding experiences (Jafari 2001).
One piece of research with its focus in Indonesia, that demonstrates the adaptancy approach, was that conducted by Gibbon and Fish (1989). Researching an international tourism pattern on the island of Bali, Gibbons and Fish (1989) identified an increase in the number of lower spending tourists visiting Bali. The recommendation of their research was that Bali must decide if its tourism strategy was to foster the growth of this group to ensure that the overall socio-economic objectives of the island were being met (Gibbons & Fish 1989). An increase in the number of lower spending tourists would mean increased use of smaller hotels and recreation facilities and greater disruption of local, social and economic activity. The use of locally owned and operated facilities would subsequently result in a reduction of capital received per tourist. Apart from this consideration, Gibbons and Fish’s (1989) research indeed indicates a change in concern, that is, there is a shift away from understandings of tourism as only bringing positive and negative impacts to the community, towards the awareness of tourism as being more responsive to the socio-economic needs of the community.

The increase in awareness directed towards the local communities is also revealed in the research of Well (1982) and Haywood (1988). The research of Well (1982) in Malaysia revealed that tourism was not only viewed as a mobiliser of development, but also as a sector of economic diversification within the developmental process. More responsible and responsive tourism planning was discussed by Haywood (1988), who proposed a tourism planning framework which encouraged a broader participatory approach. Haywood (1988) argued that despite the aims of tourism planning activity to enhance opportunity and reduce social, economic and environmental impacts, tourism planning should serve to enhance the operating effectiveness of tourism for all stakeholders such as visitors and local residents, industry operators (including employees), prospective developers, the business community and various government agencies. Haywood (1988) concluded that if all these could be accomplished, community involvement in tourism planning would be capable of achieving greater effectiveness in the future. Both the research of Well (1982) and Haywood (1988) above, reflect a strong move away from the advocacy and cautionary approaches and towards adaptancy. Relating this move to the planning approaches discussed earlier, there was a change from boosterism and an economic approach towards a more community-oriented approach within the adaptancy platform.

Aligned with a call for alternative forms of tourism to ameliorate the pressures on the community caused by tourism, was an increasing awareness among proponents of the adaptancy platform that
resident perceptions of tourism were an important consideration. In the context of an urban and
developed country, Murphy (1981, p. 189) claimed that, ‘...if we are to move toward a management
goal for urban tourism destinations, it becomes necessary to consider the attitudes of local residents
to tourism development, and to search for ways of integrating the public in those development
decisions that affect their community’. This idea reinforces the need to pay attention to resident
perceptions. This consideration led to the emergence of several resident perceptions studies (see, for
example, Belisle and Hoy (1980), Brougham (1982), Brown (1985), Heeley (1981), Liu and Var
(1986), Perdue, Long, and Allen (1987), Schluter and Var (1988)). However, the focus of resident
perception studies of this era was mostly in urban contexts in developed countries rather than in
developing countries. Little research involving resident perceptions of tourism in developing
countries was conducted.

Comparative studies across different areas were also evident in this era (Liu, Sheldon & Var 1987;
Murphy 1981). Researching resident attitudes in three different towns in the United Kingdom,
Murphy (1981) found the aesthetics and community impact of local tourism were the main concerns
in the three selected towns; and that no community had an ideal attitude towards tourism. The
emergence of research such as those mentioned above suggests that research of resident perceptions
of tourism began to emerge and become more predominant from the 1980s in response to increased
recognition of the many negative impacts mass tourism was having on fragile environments,
societies, and cultures. However, the studies were still limited, in terms of focus, quantity and
methods.

3.2.4 The Knowledge-based Platform

The alternative strategies offered by the research that grew out of the adaptancy platform were
considered insufficient to accommodate the massive volume of tourists (Jafari 2001). Thus, in
combination with the advocacy, cautionary and adaptancy platforms, there was a movement to
foster a number of developments in thinking about tourism that became known as the knowledge-
based platform. This platform flagged the inception of ‘the formation of a scientific body of
knowledge on tourism’ (Jafari 2001, p. 32). The body of research falling under the banner of the
knowledge-based platform suggested that tourism should not only consider its impacts or forms, but
should also be considered as a holistic system from which the knowledge of tourism is formulated.
In line with this idea, Macbeth (2005) adds that the first three platforms can only be considered as studies on tourism impacts and limited in terms of their understanding of tourism as knowledge.

One example of the research that emerged in this platform was the classification of resident-tourism development relationships, by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997). They classified the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of resident reactions towards tourism. The extrinsic dimension refers to factors that affect resident reactions at the community level, such that there is a common impact on the whole community. These extrinsic dimensions comprise factors such as seasonality, the number of hosts to guests and the percentage of international tourists. The intrinsic dimension refers to characteristics and circumstances of the individuals that affect change in the impacts of tourism. The intrinsic dimensions comprise involvement in tourism, socio-economic characteristics, residential proximity, and period of residence.

The comparative study of impacts within and across destinations was evident in the knowledge-based platform. Ap (1990) reviewed four tourism impact studies conducted by Belisle and Hoy (1980), Pizam (1978), Liu and Var (1986) and Milman and Pizam (1988). The aim of Ap’s (1990) review was to determine if there was any development or progress in the quest to develop operational measures and a theory of the social attributes of tourism, as well as to suggest areas for future research. In reviewing these four studies, Ap (1990) identified the following findings: heavy concentration of tourism at a destination leads to negative resident attitudes towards tourists and tourism in general (Pizam 1978); residents employed in the tourism industry were more favourable towards tourists than those not employed in the industry (Milman and Pizam 1988; Pizam 1978); resident perceptions vary with the distance the resident’s home is from the tourist zone (Belisle and Hoy 1980); and residents strongly agree that tourism provides many economic and cultural benefits (Liu and Var 1986). All four published studies contained one common element and that was the influence of socioeconomic variables upon resident perceptions of tourism. Ap (1990) concludes that these studies provide a sound description and knowledge-base of host resident perceptions of tourism impacts. This conclusion reflects the efforts of researchers in the 1990s to develop a comprehensive knowledge of tourism. Thus, not only are the concerns of researchers related to the impacts or forms of tourism, but they also represent a holistic treatment of tourism (Jafari 2001).
In terms of understanding resident perceptions of tourism, research conducted in both developed and developing countries has grown considerably. To strengthen this platform, in fact, the resident perception studies provided more comprehensive and theoretically informed investigations into tourism. Prior to the 1990s, research concerned with the resident perceptions of tourism were mostly applied only to the attitudes or perceptions required by residents to have a voice in relation to tourism. Significantly, since the 1990s, as new knowledge and nuanced research emerged, the resident perceptions of tourism research came to include more varied terms. For instance, while some research used the term resident perceptions (Ap 1990, 1992; Johnson, Snepenger & Akis 1994; Soutar & McLeod 1993), others used the term resident attitudes (Akis, Peristianis & Warner 1996; Getz 1994; Korça 1996; Mok, Slater & Cheung 1991), residents’ attitude and perception (Lankford 1994; Mansfeld & Ginosar 1994), residents’ support (Perdue, Long & Allen 1990), residents’ opinion (Snaith & Haley 1999), residents’ concepts (Lea, Kemp & Willetts 1994) and residents’ perspectives (Bachleitner & Zins 1999; Wall 1996). The use of more varied terms to point to residents’ voices showed the increased attention to this focus, as well as to an improvement in knowledge and understanding of tourism studies as a whole. In other words, the resident perception studies also contributed to the formation of knowledge in tourism.

Resident perceptions studies, with special reference to Indonesia, began to emerge in the 1990s. The growth of mass tourism in Indonesia in the late 1980s encouraged several studies to research mass tourism destinations such as Bali. The attempt to reduce the impacts of tourism, as in the adaptancy platform, led to attention on how the residents perceive these impacts. These include the research of Cukier-Snow and Wall (1996) which targeted the residents of Bali. Examining attitudes towards tourism among residents of eight villages in Bali, Wall (1996) found that tourism was generally perceived positively; there was a desire to receive more tourists, and a lack of appreciation of the negative side-effects of tourism development. He found that attitudes, however, varied among those who live closest to the resorts.

The contributions of resident perception studies within the knowledge-based platform were enhanced by more advanced techniques for understanding residents’ perceptions. For example, in order to understand the residents’ attitudes towards tourism in Spey Valley, Getz (1994) used a longitudinal study. Young, Thyne and Lawson (1999) researched comparative studies of the perceptions of tourism, while Lindberg and Johnson (1997) studied modelling residents’ attitudes.
toward tourism. Similarly, Lankford and Howards (1994) developed a tourism impact attitude scale. Thus, the research was not only concerned with residents’ voices or tourism impacts, but there were attempts to further develop the research to be more in-depth by developing more advanced techniques and more varied themes.

Scholars of resident perceptions of tourism were not only concerned with resident attitudes towards tourists, tourism development and its impacts. For example, Madrigal (1995) examined residents’ perceptions of the government’s role in tourism and Smith and Krannich (1998) researched the dependency of locals on tourism and its relation to the attitudes of residents towards tourism. By examining the connection between other aspects impacting on tourism and resident perceptions, these studies viewed resident perceptions not as a single phenomenon isolated from other factors but a combination of a number of factors. These connections indicate that resident perceptions can impact on tourism and can be affected by other factors. Such connections potentially make the research findings more valuable in that they may provide a clearer picture of the situation and therefore facilitate the development of strategies or solutions. For example, Perdue et al. (1990) claimed that the relationship between the role of the government and the residents’ perceptions indeed make the research into resident perceptions more valuable.

### 3.2.5 The Sustainable Development Platform

While the usefulness of the four platforms identified by Jafari’s (2001) work in shedding light on the development and popularity of tourism cannot be denied, his work has been critiqued by Macbeth (2005) who argues that the four platforms discussed above failed to accommodate the extensive research and writing on sustainable development and sustainable tourism. Macbeth (2005) claims that in the 21st century, there is a need to adopt an ethical position that facilitates tourism scholarship moving beyond the paradigm of objectivity in order to contribute to a more thoughtful, reflexive, and sustainable platform. Similarly, Tribe (1997) believes the platforms of Jafari are filled by the myth of objectivity and therefore disregard ethics and value. Cohen (2002, p. 268) asserts that ‘sustainable tourism is a vague concept…[it] is not a neutral one and cannot be seen in isolation’. These assertions show that tourism research is not actually value-free research and this motivates the need for an ethical and reflexive research paradigm. In addition, Jafari’s platforms rely heavily on the notion that the knowledge-based platform represents the scientification of
tourism scholarship, and thus reflects the maturing of research and scholarships (Jafari 2001). In contrast to this idea, Macbeth (2005) claims that rather than showing a maturity, tourism scholarship, with its concern for scientifics in its epistemology, is, as a consequence, more restrictive in its understanding of the world.

In response to the limitations of the four frameworks of Jafari (2001), Macbeth (2005) discusses the emergence of a fifth and sixth platform of tourism research that he labelled the sustainable development and ethics platforms. The extensive research in sustainable development has demonstrated the popularity and importance of this concept to adequately foreground it as a fifth platform. As Macbeth (2005, p. 965) asserts, ‘This wide literature and the everyday rhetoric of Western discourse is part of the justification for the assertion that it is time to argue for recognition that a fifth platform is already informing much of the current research and scholarship’.

In sustainable tourism, the role of the community in the tourism development process and the importance of understanding their perceptions are well acknowledged. As stated in The Berlin Declaration on Biological Diversity and Sustainable Tourism (The Berlin Declaration 1997):

Tourism should be developed in a way so that it benefits the local communities, strengthens the local economy, employs local workforce and wherever ecologically sustainable, uses local materials, local agricultural products and traditional skills. Mechanisms, including policies and legislation should be introduced to ensure the flow of benefits to the local communities. Tourism activities should respect the ecological characteristics and capacity of the local environment in which they take place. All efforts should be made to respect traditional lifestyles and cultures.

The tenets of the Berlin Declaration above emphasise the necessity of paying attention to the community in the process of tourism development to ensure the long term viability of tourism. Furthermore, with the emphasis on local community, several principles of sustainable tourism development (STD) have emerged (Tosun 2001, pp. 290-291):

- STD [Sustainable Tourism Development] should contribute to the satisfaction of basic and felt needs of those hitherto excluded in local tourist destinations.
• STD should reduce inequality and absolute poverty in local tourist destinations.
• STD should contribute to the emergence of necessary conditions in tourist destinations which will lead local people to gain self-esteem...STD should help host communities be free or emancipated from alienating material conditions of life and from social servitude to nature, ignorance, other people, misery, institution, and dogmatic beliefs.
• STD should accelerate not only national economic growth, but also regional and local economic growth; STD should achieve the above objectives or principles in an indefinite period of time without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need.

The statement about sustainable tourism development cited above demonstrates the importance of the community for tourism. Several scholars have emphasised the importance of the role of community within the sustainability paradigms and assert that it is important to understand and examine the community perception of, and attitude towards, tourism development (Sheldon & Abenoja 2001). This is because ‘development plans would bear little fruit unless the most affected are involved from the start’ (Gunn 1994, p. 111). Murphy (1985) adds that if residents develop a fear of tourism, they will develop resistance and hostility which can ultimately destroy tourism. The perception of local communities towards tourism for sustainability is thus a crucial indicator of the successful development of local tourism. Moreover, according to Tribe (1997), there is a tendency for tourism research to be developed around a business approach. The concept of sustainable development provides a bridge for the scholarship to deal with this reality; a counterbalance to a business approach to understanding tourism (Tribe 1997).

In this regard, Teye, Sonmez and Sirakaya (2002) claim there is a need for more platforms to accommodate the studies in the area of resident attitudes to tourism. Similarly, Chamber (2000) states that compared to the amount of scholarship devoted to tourist types and motivations, little research has been directed towards communities and resident responses to tourism. These recommendations show the need for scholars to pay more attention to resident perception studies. While the review of resident perceptions research in the first four platforms indicates the existence of resident perceptions research, Jafari’s platform did not pay much attention to capturing this topic.
As a result of this concern for the benefits of tourism to local communities, studies into resident perceptions of tourism are growing significantly. Although the research in developed countries still dominates, the number of resident perception studies in developing countries is increasing. This research includes that of Cui and Ryan (2011) in China, Eshliki and Kaboudi (2012) in Iran, Green (2005) in Thailand, and Cole (2008) in Indonesia. Within this field, the resident perceptions of sustainable tourism, such as that related to tourism planning or participation have emerged (Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). Additional methods of research such as Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) are being used to examine residents’ perceptions of environmental, cultural and economic attributes, so as to attain a better understanding of these perspectives in tourism development.

Furthermore, the research which examined the relationship between religion and resident perceptions has emerged. Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2011), in the study they conducted in Iran, observed religion (Islam) as a significant variable which influences residents’ perceptions. Their research found that Islamic beliefs and practices have positive relationships with the perceptions of sociocultural impacts of tourism. They found that residents who had strong Islamic beliefs perceived tourism and its socio-cultural impacts positively. Furthermore, despite the growth of tourism research in Indonesia, qualitative research into residents’ perceptions of tourism is still very limited. A review of this research is presented in Section 3.3 below. But first it is necessary to examine the final contemporary platform of tourism research that focuses on ethics and power in tourism planning and policy-making.

The objectivity of knowledge, a concern of the knowledge-based platform, brings attention to the need to take into consideration the values and ethical positions of tourism research (Low 1999; Tribe 1997). Macbeth (2005, p. 963) argues that the ethical and moral positions of tourism stakeholders actually play important roles in social life, because ‘… the social world cannot be understood completely until values and morality (ethics) are factored in’. Macbeth (2005) adds that tourism policy and planning developed by the government is an area where moral considerations must be addressed because tourism policy and planning decisions impact on nature and on human societies and cultures and therefore cannot be determined merely by what is technically feasible or politically desirable. The research of Madrigal (1995) regarding the role of the government and the residents’ perception showed that the policy maker should think about what they can give to their
people rather than forcing their ideas upon the residents. If the industry and its attendant research centres, nongovernmental organisations, power brokers and governments are serious about sustainable development, then a moral position must be considered and integrated with the scientific positions.

As the ethical consideration aims to provide a place for researchers to consider ethical values, researchers concerned with resident perceptions of tourism are encouraged to engage with the ethical values. As Macbeth (2005, p. 974) states, ‘Tourism, if it is to contribute seriously to any level of SD [Sustainable Development], needs to understand its ethical positions’.

### 3.2.6 The Evolution of Tourism Research on Resident Perceptions

Each of the platforms presented above demonstrates that the voices of residents in relation to their perceptions of tourism have existed in tourism research. However, they were limited in terms of number, focus and contributions. The first four platforms occasionally looked at resident perceptions but they did not place this issue centrally. As stated above, the significant contribution of resident perceptions was being overlooked. As a result, the mechanism of the voice of residents was weak in the evolutionary thoughts of tourism termed by Jafari (2001) as advocacy, cautionary and adaptancy. The increasing studies of tourism appear to be mostly situated in the fifth platform, identified by Macbeth (2005) as the sustainable development platform. The concern of the community in what approach to apply to create a more sustainable community has encouraged growth in the studies of resident perceptions. Sustainable tourism research has encouraged several issues relating to community participation, planning activity, environmental sustainability, and attitudes toward tourism development (Choi & Murray 2010), thus, sustainable development has provided an avenue for research into resident perceptions of tourism.

### 3.3 Resident Perceptions of Tourism

Recognition of the importance of resident perceptions of tourism development has led to a growth in research on this topic. Existing research suggests that in tourism studies there are several terms employed by scholars to describe residents’ voices or dispositions towards tourism. Some scholars use the term attitudes (Gursoy & Rutherford 2004; Lepp 2007; Zhang et al. 2006), while others
prefer to use perceptions (Ap 1992; Stewart & Draper 2007; Tosun 2002) or perspectives (Esterling 2004; Wall 1996). The term reactions (Fredline & Faulkner 2000) and opinions (William & Lawson 2001) are also used to refer to similar ideas. Interestingly, Lankford (1994) and Andriotis and Vaughan (2003) used the terms attitudes and perceptions interchangeably. For the purpose of this research, however, the term perception will be used because ‘…residents may attribute meaning to tourism impacts (perceptions) without necessarily having knowledge or enduring predispositions about them (attitudes), and because it cannot be assumed that all residents have knowledge and hold beliefs about tourism impact’ (Ap 1992, p. 671). Additionally, in this study, the term perception will be used together with the word meaning. These two words are connected as the meanings guide the perceptions and attitudes towards tourism (Amuquandoh 2010; Blumer 1969), in an ongoing cycle. Lea, Kemp, and Willets (1994) suggest that before residents are asked what they think and feel about tourism (perception) it is essential to know their understanding of tourism (meaning). The connection between perception and meaning is explored further in Section 3.4 below, which outlines the theoretical foundations of resident perception studies in tourism.

With regard to the growing amount of research and various terms that are used, the following is a review of resident perceptions research that demonstrates the insights and alternative ways of understanding tourism. The review classifies resident perceptions of tourism studies into seven themes, as follows: attitudes toward tourism, perceptions of tourism impacts, perceptions of participation in planning, factors influencing resident perceptions of tourism, resident perceptions and Islam, resident perceptions of tourism research in developing countries and resident perceptions of tourism in Indonesia.

### 3.3.1 Attitudes towards Tourism

Much of the research on resident perceptions of tourism has focused primarily on attitudes towards tourism. More specifically, some research focuses on residents’ attitudes toward heritage tourism (Chen & Chen 2010), sustainable tourism (Choi & Murray 2010; Choi & Sirakaya 2005), mass and alternative tourism (Gursoy, Chi & Dyer 2010), conservation (Udaya Sekhar 2003), and the impacts of tourism (Kuvan & Akan 2005), while some other research is concerned with resident attitudes to tourism development (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003; Cavus & Tanrisevdi 2003; Lepp 2007; Mason & Cheyne 2000).
Lepp (2007) conducted research in Uganda which indicates that villagers of Bigodi have consistently developed positive attitudes towards tourism. These positive attitudes resulted from the resident beliefs that tourism creates community development, improves agricultural markets, generates income, and finally, that tourism brings good fortune. Tourism in Bigodi encourages several strategies such as encouraging the use of local materials and local design, encouraging backpackers and tourists to adapt to local conditions, fostering local decision making, integrating tourism with local agriculture, and using tourism revenue for community development. These strategies have created positive attitudes towards tourism amongst the villagers. There are two areas that relate the research of Lepp (2007) to this thesis. The first is the development of the positive behaviour of local residents. The second is the economic benefits from tourism and who can enjoy these benefits, with both these areas being important issues in developing countries. While tourism in Uganda is welcomed with a positive attitude among residents, Cihar and Stanko (2006) in Chechnya, found that tourism was perceived as a negative thing with tourism intensity perceived as increasing and a disturbing factor for local communities. Kuvan and Akan’s (2005) research on the impacts of tourism in Turkey found a combination of responses. While residents on the coast of Turkey developed favourable attitudes towards tourism development, they were also concerned about the negative effects of tourism, especially the impacts on the forests in the area (Kuvan & Akan 2005).

Other researchers have focused their research on developing models to represent or account for residents’ attitudes to tourism. Using the social exchange theory, Jurowski, Uysal and William (1997) developed a model that integrated factors likely to influence reactions toward tourism. In their model, they proposed that the perceived potential for economic gain, use of the resource base, attachment to one’s community, and attitudes toward the preservation of the natural environment influenced how residents perceived the economic, social and environmental impacts. The model was based on the assumption that both the antecedents and the three categories of impacts had direct and indirect effects on support.

Moreover, the research settings for the research into resident attitudes towards tourism is varied, ranging from urban areas (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003; Teye et al. 2002; Zhang et al. 2006), to rural areas (Látková & Vogt 2012) and urban-rural regions (Zhang et al. 2006), and from just-emerged tourism areas (Lepp 2007) to mature destinations (Sheldon & Abenoja 2001). Very little research
has been conducted on resident attitudes to tourism in rural areas or village areas, particularly in developing countries. This may be either because there are fewer tourist sites in rural or remote areas, or because the focus of tourism in developing countries is largely on maximising economic benefit. Thus, research on resident perceptions in developing countries is somewhat lacking.

3.3.2 Perceptions of the Impacts of Tourism

Tourism has great potential to impact the lives of community residents (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf & Vogt 2005). This view has encouraged a number of studies to focus on the ways in which residents perceive the impacts of tourism. Some researchers studied the residents’ perceptions of the environmental impacts of tourism (Bujosa Bestard & Nadal 2007; Green 2005; Kuvan & Akan 2005), and the socio-cultural impacts (Huttasin 2008; Ratz 2002; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2011).

Tosun (2002) investigates residents’ perceptions of impacts in a Turkish town and its implications for marketing and destination management. This study was an attempt to comparatively examine three case studies of resident perceptions of tourism, namely Urgup, Nadi and Central Florida. The results of this comparative study show that compared to those in Nadi and Central Florida, residents of Urgup have developed less support for the tourism industry and less positive perceptions of tourism impacts. The study found that the lack of support towards tourism is due to unequal distribution of tourism benefits in which the government provided only a minimal level of support to local people.

Other research concerning resident perceptions of tourism impacts is the research of Han, Fang and Huang (2011), which focuses on classifying groups of residents according to local resident perceptions of tourism, and the research of Andereck, Valentine, Knopf and Vogt (2005), which investigates resident perceptions of tourism impacts in Arizona. The study results suggest residents recognise many positive and negative consequences. Those who feel tourism is important for economic development tend to benefit from it, and appreciate the greater positive impacts; however, they are no different to the others with respect to their perceptions of the negative consequences of tourism.
### 3.3.3 Perceptions of Participation in Planning

Some researchers have attempted to understand resident attitudes to tourism development and planning (e.g. Raymond and Brown (2007); Haley, Snaith and Miller (2005); and Oviedo-Garcia, Castellanos-Verdugo and Martin-Ruiz (2008)). For example, some researchers focus on the spatial attribute method which could be used to measure and integrate local and regional tourism development preferences for tourism planning purposes (Raymond & Brown 2007), while others have identified a concern with the method used to examine the level of local involvement in the tourism planning and decision making process (Haley et al. 2005). These two studies indeed contribute to an advance in the study of resident perceptions. However, the involvement of locals in tourism planning is slightly less emphasised in these studies.

The research of Oviedo-Garcia, Castellanos-Verdugo and Martin-Ruiz (2008) is another source of empirical evidence for residents and tourism planning. Starting with the basic idea that tourism development will be more successful if the government takes the residents’ attitudes into account, they found that this is not the case for the community in Santipoce, Spain. By applying social exchange theory, Oviedo-Garcia, Castellanos-Verdugo and Martin-Ruiz (2008) found that the economic, cultural and environmental effects are important factors in resident attitudes towards tourism. The perception of these effects determines the residents’ support for tourism and planning in the community. Since these effects can be viewed as either positive or negative, it was also found that residents in Santipoce perceived that the positive effects are greater than the negative effects. Relating these findings with support for tourism planning and development, the residents who obtain greater benefits from tourism showed greater support for tourism development, and the implication of this is demonstrated in stronger support for tourism planning. Interestingly, this study also found that personal benefits are identified as a factor which influences the level of support for tourism planning (Oviedo-Garcia et al. 2008).

Moreover, it has been argued that residents of a destination must be involved in each stage of the development process such as in the planning, implementing and monitoring process (Choi & Murray 2010; Pongponrat & Pongquan 2007). This is underpinned by the fact that in many communities, residents are often neither included in the decision making process nor are they even informed about it (Choi & Murray 2010). For example, Choi and Murray (2010) found that the
community they studied in New Braunfel, Texas were keen to participate in the planning process, as they were encouraged by the government to involve in the community’s tourism planning board.

While in an industrialised country like the United States, most residents tend to be knowledgeable and excited about participating in the planning and decision making process (Choi & Murray 2010), in developing countries, such participation is far from what is expected by local people. In developing countries, although local residents often support tourism development, particularly because of the potential economic benefits, their voice is in fact partly, or even completely, ignored by the government (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). The local people in Masoleh, Iran, for example, claim that most of the authorities involved in planning and managing tourism in Masoleh do not give much consideration to including the local residents in their planning and decision making processes (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). This ignorance tends to be the norm in developing countries, demonstrating how such local communities have been oppressed (Mowforth & Munt 2009). This indicates that the local community has little control over tourism development (Mowforth & Munt 2009). Arguably, in order for tourism planning to be successful, the involvement and participation of the residents in the area is essential; however, in developing countries, resident attitudes and involvement in tourism development are often neglected (Hall 2008).

As emphasised by Hall (2008), and as the above review reveals, resident perception studies that include some research into the involvement of residents in tourism planning are rarely found in the context of developing countries. If they do exist, they mostly emphasise the low involvement or marginalisation of residents in tourism planning and how residents perceive this situation. What is lacking is research which captures this low involvement in tourism planning as contributing to the meaning of tourism, and how this low involvement could be a factor which determines the development of the meaning of tourism. This is the gap which the current research attempts to address.

### 3.3.4 Factors Influencing Resident Perceptions of Tourism

Factors influencing resident perceptions of tourism are another topic of resident perceptions research. Some factors such as community attachment, community concern, utilisation of the
tourism resource base, and strong environmental attitudes have been found to affect perceptions of tourism (Gursoy & Rutherford 2004). With regard to community attachment, the findings of the research by Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) demonstrate that there was a positive relationship between community attachment and the perceptions of tourism, suggesting that residents who show a high level of attachment to their community are more likely to view tourism as beneficial. Some research supports this finding (Davis & Cosenza 1988; Jurowski et al. 1997; Nicholas, Thapa & Ko 2009; Um & Crompton 1987; Vargas-Sánchez et al. 2009), whereas other research has found that people who were born in the area tend to more keenly see the negative impacts of tourism (Haley et al. 2005). The shorter their length of residence, the more positively residents view the impacts of tourism (Haley et al. 2005). However, still other research found that community attachment did not influence residents’ perceptions of tourism (Gursoy, Jurowski & Uysal 2002; Lankford & Howard 1994). In fact, the factors underpinning the positive relations between community attachment and perceptions of tourism vary between studies. In a Spanish municipality where tourism was a new activity, positive perceptions of tourism were largely influenced by the desire to have more employment and wealth for the community (Vargas-Sánchez et al. 2009), while in Bath, an historic city in the UK, a positive attitude towards tourism was encouraged by short exposure to the significant tourist numbers (Haley et al. 2005). Such diverse research results could be a result of the different characteristics of each of the selected communities and the different degree of existing tourism development in each area of study. For example, those who live in adjacent states in the USA where tourism is important to the economy regarded that attachment to their community as strong and the stronger this feeling, the more supportive they were to tourism (Gursoy & Rutherford 2004). This is different to what happened in a Turkey where tourism is a new sector of activity, and the local residents feel that tourism destroys their community’s values (Cavus & Tanrisevdi 2003).

Economic reliance appears to be an important factor underpinning the residents’ perceptions of tourism development (Deccio & Baloglu 2002; Haley et al. 2005; Haralambopoulous & Pizam 1996). Economic dependence was a factor that triggered changes from a negative attitude to a more positive attitude towards tourism for the residents in Okavango Delta in Botswana (2011). Clearly, as confirmed by Haley, Snaith & Miller (2005), economic dependence is a significant component for predicting resident support for tourism development.
In addition to economic reliance, socio-demographic factors, such as age (Haralambous & Pizam 1996; Weaver & Lawton 2001), education (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003; Teye et al. 2002) and the possession of wealth (Haralambous & Pizam 1996) are all regarded as significant factors influencing resident dispositions towards tourism. Drawing from the results of these studies, the young, rich and educated residents are the ones who are commonly in favour of tourism development. Focusing on a community in Crete, Androtis and Vaughan (2003) claim that residents who have a higher level of education were less affected by the impacts of tourism than those with medium and lower levels of education. In fact, for the community in Crete, education is the major factor affecting the perceptions of residents towards tourism (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003).

Gender also emerges as a significant demographic factor. Mason and Cheyne (2000) indicate that women are more opposed than men towards tourism development. In respect to this gender factor, Andereck & Vogt (2000) suggest that although both sexes show support for tourism development, there are indications that they have different justifications for their support. These varied justifications will subsequently lead to differences in perceptions of tourism.

Other factors, such as the level of personal benefits received from tourism (Oviedo-Garcia, et al. 2008), the degree of contact with tourists, and proximity to the tourism zone (Weaver & Lawton 2001) also influence the perception of residents. With regard to proximity, Haley, Snaith and Miller (2005) indicate that residents who live closer to tourism areas are more favourable towards tourism development. This study is compatible with the results of the study by Huttasin (2008) who found that the residents who live within a tourism zone perceive more positive impacts than those who do not. Length of residence will also influence the support of tourism in that the longer the residents have lived in the area; the more negatively they perceive tourism impacts (Haley, Snaith & Miller 2005; Ryan & Cooper 2004). Conversely, other scholars found the opposite (Belisle & Hoy 1980; Faulkner & Tideswell 1997). Those who live closer to the tourism site were less supportive of tourism development because they were increasingly impacted by the increasing number of people on the local infrastructure.

Another factor that has been found to impact on the support of tourism is attachment to the community which refers to length of residence in the locality (Gursoy et al. 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford 2004). Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) also found other factors such as utilisation of
resource bases and the state of the local economy influences the support of tourism. In their research, the state of the local economy was found to mediate the influences of community attachment and community concern on the following five dimensions of costs and benefits: economic benefits, social benefits, social costs, cultural benefits and cultural costs. For example, the more the residents feel that the economy needs improvement, the more likely they will be to support tourism and the less likely they will be disadvantaged by any social costs. Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) maintain that these five factors must be understood by planners before attempting to develop tourism in an area.

3.3.5 Resident Perceptions and Islam

It has been argued that people’s perception and behaviour can be influenced by religion (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2011). Some scholars claim that in several Islamic countries, such as Malaysia, Indonesia, Egypt, and Iran, tourism is often viewed as a potential threat to religious values and traditions (Aziz 1995; Zamani-Farahani & Henderson 2010). Tourists are often perceived as consumers of sex, alcohol, food and natural resources, and therefore, these can contribute to negative attitudes among residents towards tourists (Aziz 1995; Gosling 2002; Teye et al. 2002). Such negative perceptions have led some countries to reject tourism as their main development priority (Aziz 1995; Zamani-Farahani & Henderson 2010). In Iran, for example, there are high levels of religious devotion and many religious conventions which worries the officials because they feel this leads to little interest in hosting foreign tourists, particularly non-Muslims (Zamani-Farahani 2010). Perceived negative influences of tourism, such as the immoral affects on the local community, has become a big concern for countries where Islam is dominant (Din 1989).

Several factors such as tourist behaviours which ignore religious codes have caused negative perceptions of tourism (Zamani-Farahani 2010). Grosspietsch (2005) claims that certain tourist behaviours are considered to be in contrast with religious values and traditions in that these have raised intolerance on the part of some religious groups. For example, western modes of dress for the beach where women are often scantily clad are often offensive to Muslims. Din (1989) notes that in Islam, women are required to cover their hands and face and avoid wearing scant clothing, while men are discouraged from wearing shorts that reach above the knee.
The negative perceptions of tourism relates to how Islamics view tourism. The Islamic concept of tourism emphasises the spiritual goal of submission to the ways of God (Din 1989; Graburn 1989). Muslims as hosts and guests are frequently advised to support ‘Fi-Sabililah (in the cause of God)’ (Din 1989, p. 551) and to strengthen ‘the bond of sillaturrahim (Muslim fraternity among the Ummah (Muslim community)’ (Din 1989, p. 552). As guests, Muslims are encouraged to travel to search for fun and entertainment, but it should not go beyond the rules and obligations of Islamic regulations or Shari’a (Sanad, Kassem & Scott 2010). For instance, Muslims cannot go somewhere and have sex or drink alcohol and claim that this was fun or entertainment, simply because such matters are forbidden in Islam. Thus, fun is legitimate but is managed in Islam (Sanad et al. 2010).

In addition, the emphasis of travel is to appreciate the beauty of God’s creation (Henderson 2003), the greatness of God’s creation and the realisation of the smallness of human beings (Din 1989). This represents, in the case of hijra and hajj, that hijra incorporates a duty to migrate while the hajj encompasses an ascetic abstinence and humbleness (Din 1982). Rihla (travel for the acquisition of learning or some other appropriate purpose such as commerce) and ziyara (visits to various shrines) are also considered favourable by Muslims (Kessler 1992), as the ‘spatially distinctive cultural traditions of Islamic populations’ (Bhardwaj 1998, p. 7). In relation to the way Muslims can be hosts, Islam requires Muslims to be friendly, compassionate, and welcoming to their guests (Din 1989). According to Din (1989, p. 552), ‘Muslims are bound by religious duty to extend a personal welcome to the travellers and offer good food for at least three days. In short, charity to the travellers is obligatory to the host community’. Muslims also observe a tradition of offering hospitality to strangers, which is appreciated by tourists (Din 1989).

While research has been conducted on the topic of religion and tourism (Bandyopadhyay, Morais & Chick 2008; Ron 2007; Vukonic 1996) and Islam and tourism (Din 1989; Zamani-Farahani 2010; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2011), limited research has been conducted into the connectedness between religion (Islam, in particular) and resident perceptions of tourism. Even though it is not the aim of this thesis to deeply examine the connection between Islam and resident perceptions, in the case of Madura as a devoted Muslim Island, the above discussion helps to understand how Muslims regard tourism or non-Muslim tourists. This subsequently helps to provide the foundation for the empirical evidence that is found in this study.
3.3.6 Resident Perceptions of Tourism in Developing Countries

Most of the research discussed in the themes above originated in developed countries. Despite signs of growth, only a small body of research on resident perceptions of tourism has been conducted in developing countries (Oviedo-Garcia, et al. 2008; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). These studies are located in Thailand (Huttasin); Samos, Greece (Haralambopoulou & Pizam 1996); Antalya, Turkey (Kuvan & Akan 2005); Uganda (Lepp 2007); China (Cui & Ryan 2011); and Iran (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). Since developing countries are largely neglected in the research (Cordero 2008), it is logical for Cordero (2008) to suggest that research into resident perceptions of tourism should be conducted more in the context of developing countries. Indeed, it is the lack of such studies that in part encouraged this thesis.

In addition, in relating the research in developing countries to the themes above, there is a tendency for the majority of research in developing countries to have focused on resident perceptions or the attitude towards the impacts of tourism. Very few studies have focused on perceptions of participation in tourism planning. Rarely does the research on resident perceptions of tourism examine the meanings behind these perceptions. Lea, Kemp, and Willets (1994) suggest that it is necessary to understand the meanings residents ascribe to tourism before examining their perceptions of tourism. Therefore, this thesis fills this gap.

With reference to the studies discussed above, there is a tendency to use the term attitude and perception interchangeably. Although some scholars used these two terms (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008), there was little differentiation between the two. The present research argues that by using a symbolic interactionist paradigm, the differences between these two are clear and the necessity to examine the meanings of tourism is important. While other research is concerned only with perceptions and attitude, this research differentiates itself from most research in resident perceptions by investigating the meanings attached to tourism by the residents.

3.3.7 Resident Perceptions of Tourism in Indonesia

Resident perception studies in an Indonesian context are uncommon. Most tourism studies conducted in Indonesia are concerned with international tourism (Gibbons & Fish 1989; Prideaux,
Laws & Faulkner 2003), tourism employment (Cukier-Snow & Wall 1993; Cukier & Wall 1994) and the economic impacts of tourism (Walpole & Goodwin 2000). Few studies have been found on resident perceptions of tourism development. Among those found were the studies of Wall (1996) and Cole (2008). Wall (1996) focused on resident perceptions in Bali, while Cole (2008) was concerned with tourism, culture and development in Ngada Village, Flores, Eastern Indonesia. In this case, similar to most such research in developing countries, the emphasis was on resident perceptions of tourism impacts.

Cole (2008) critically examined the perception of villagers towards tourism in Ngada Village in Flores, Indonesia. The two locations of the study, Bena and Wogo Sub Villages have very different characteristics. Bena is regarded as more economically dependent on tourism, having experienced more state intervention, more changes, and being more ‘touristy’ than Wogo. However, Cole (2008) found that there were more similarities than differences with regard to the perceptions of tourism among the villagers. The residents in both Bena and Wogo were shown to have positive attitudes towards tourists and tourism. In these areas, tourists are respected because they bring entertainment, information, pride, knowledge and status to the residents. However, even though the villagers most frequently expressed positive views of tourists and tourism, the majority of villagers complained about the dress habits of many tourists (unclean and sleeveless clothes) and considered the behaviour of some, when they ignored greetings from villagers and refused food, as arrogant and impolite. Analysing these problems, the government agreed to develop a code of conduct in an attempt to persuade tourists to dress and behave in accordance with the locals’ preferences. The study also found that the villagers have become accustomed to acting on instruction from above and tend not to use their own initiative, that they had low levels of confidence in approaching tourists for the purpose of marketing their crafts. This has implications for the current study in terms of the benefits of involving residents in the planning and creating the knowledge required to adapt to tourism development.

The study of Wall (1996) examined the attitudes towards tourism among indigenous residents of eight villages in Bali, Indonesia. It was found that tourism was mostly perceived as a positive thing because there was a desire to receive more tourists, and a lack of appreciation of the negative side-effects of tourism development. The attitudes of residents within these selected villages vary according to the distance from tourism centres. These findings have both theoretical and practical
significance. From a theoretical perspective, the existing literature suggests that attitudes towards tourism are correlated with such factors as distance from tourism areas, degree of involvement in the industry, a variety of socioeconomic factors and the stage of tourism development (Simmons 1994). From a practical perspective, the findings raise interesting questions concerning the involvement of local people in decisions about tourism development.

Research such as that of Long and Wall (1996) and Erb (2000) represent some of the few studies conducted on tourism in Indonesia. Long and Wall (1996) reported on the development of mutual co-operation between residents of Junggut Batu Village (Bali) and a boat hire company operated in the village and how the different interests between residents and the boat company were managed. How residents in Flores developed several strategies for dealing with tourists and make a space for tourists within their cultural world was the topic of Erb’s (2000) research. Both have provided useful insights and informed this study in relation to the participation of local residents in tourism planning.

Moreover, a considerable number of attempts have been made to develop models to explore the local community responses towards tourism development and these are detailed in the next section.

3.4 Social Theories and Resident Perceptions of Tourism

Some social theories have been employed to examine the topic of resident perceptions of tourism. Social exchange theory and social relations theory are among the theories most commonly used to investigate resident perceptions of tourism (Andriotis & Vaughan 2003). Symbolic interactionism is another theory which provides insight into residents’ perceptions of tourism, especially for its ability to explore the residents’ meanings of tourism. The following is a critical review of each aforementioned theory.

3.4.1 Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory is a sociological theory based on the notion that the process of social relationships involves an exchange between at least two people, each of whom provides some benefit to the other and is contingent on rewards from the other (Emerson 1981). The basic principle
underlying the concept of exchange is that an individual who supplies services to another puts him in a position of obligation. To be released from this obligation, the second must give something in return (Ap 1992). From a tourism perspective, social exchange theory proposes that an individual’s attitudes towards tourism and their subsequent level of support for its development will be influenced by their evaluation of the outcomes of tourism for themselves and their communities (Andereck et al. 2005). According to Ap (1992), residents will pursue the benefits of tourism for something they consider to be equivalent to the benefits they will relinquish. Therefore, residents who oppose tourism development react in a different way to those who support it.

Social exchange theory is reinforced by a number of studies (Ap 1992; Choi & Murray 2010; Gursoy et al. 2002; Oviedo-Garcia et al. 2008). Oviedo-Garcia et al. (2008) employ social exchange theory to analyse resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism and their level of support for tourism planning, and conclude that it provides a sound theoretical framework for studying residents’ attitudes towards tourism and planning. However, the results of other studies have indicated that the opposite is the case. The findings of Hutassin (2008), for instance, differ markedly to what is expected according to social exchange theory. Researching village residents in Thailand, Hutassin (2008) found his results were not compatible with the principle of social exchange theory.

Ward and Berno (2011) combined social exchange theory and the integrated threat theory, to test a predictive model of residents’ attitudes toward tourists. The research was conducted using survey methods on two communities, comprising 384 participants from Fiji and 279 from New Zealand. The results found that demographic factors, including employment in the tourist industry and residence in a developing country, and perceived positive impacts of tourism predicted a more favourable attitude towards tourists; however, the results also revealed that contact with tourists and low levels of perceived threats exerted incremental, positive influences on these attitudes.

The combination of social exchange theory with other theories indicates that that this theory is limited for examining resident perceptions of tourism. Ward and Berno (2011) argue that there is a range of conceptual frameworks arising from social psychology that can be applied to the study of tourist-host relations and add that social exchange theory is lacking in theoretical sophistication, especially for understanding the tourist-host relationship. They conclude that it is important to have another theory to accompany social exchange theory, claiming that the combination of the social
exchange with other theories would create the novel context of tourism (Ward & Berno 2011).

This is not the only criticism social exchange theory has received. It is criticised for its assumption that humans are ‘computer-like information processors’ (Pearce, Moscardo & Ross 1996, p. 32). The underlying idea of this assumption is that people receive information about tourism, then process or evaluate it and subsequently decide to take action either to support or oppose tourism. The problem with this assumption is that it is inadequate for explaining more complex behaviour because it considers direct experience as the only way to gain knowledge and therefore ignores outside influences (Pearce et al. 1996). Similar to Pearce et.al, the inability of social exchange theory to address the complexity of residents is also raised by Cordero (2008). This is contradicted by the view that people do not live in isolation, but within a social and historical context (Blumer 1969). Too much focus on the exchange process, rather than on the surrounding environment, may be the reason social exchange theory tends to perceive human beings as machines.

### 3.4.2 Social Representation Theory

Social representation theory attempts to understand the nature of relationships (Moscovici 1981). This theory takes into account how and what people think in their everyday experiences, as well as how these thoughts are influenced by a broader social phenomenon (Moscovici 1981). Furthermore, it is argued that social representations comprise the following: shared knowledge, meta-knowledge, which implies what people believe relevant to what other people think, enacted communication and world making assumptions or collective understandings (Elcheroth, Doise & Reicher 2011).

The study of Fredeline and Faulkner (2000) applies social representation theory to explain host community reactions to the impacts of events. The similarities between general tourism and events mean that the insights from previous research are potentially useful in forming a basis for further research. While there is a considerable body of research on community reactions to tourism, it has been limited by the overuse of the case study approach and the great variety of theories and methodologies that have been used. The study of Fredeline and Faulkner (2000) draws on social representation theory and compares the results of their study with previous cluster analyses in an effort to find some commonalities in resident perceptions of tourism and trans-communal events.
Social representation theory which focuses on examining communal practices (Moscovici 2011) or shared understanding amongst groups or a community (Pearce et al. 1996) is considered incompatible with the idea of exploring residents and their varied meanings of tourism development. There is also the need to explore power relationships between residents. From a social representation theory perspective, power relationships between residents will be understood as the conflict of power between different groups that embrace different social representations (Pearce et al. 1996).

The review of the key elements of the theoretical foundations which are commonly employed to understand the residents tourism relationship mentioned above, has demonstrated that these two frameworks are to some extent, inadequate for understanding the relationship between residents and tourism development on Madura Island. The idea that a human is considered an isolated individual who lives without mind and culture (Pearce et al. 1996), makes social representation theory unsuitable to address the aim of the current research, which pursues the diverse meanings of tourism development. It is expected that this diversity of meanings will be discovered by researching residents from diverse backgrounds throughout the island. In addition, another principle of social representation theory, which ignores outside influences like the power status of individual humans (Pearce et al. 1996), also makes it unsatisfactory for addressing the inquiry of this study in relation to how the meanings are developed and the power relations between residents. While social representation theory postulates that human behaviour is guided by considerations of exchange (Emerson 1981), this present research considers this narrow approach inadequate to explain the variety of perceptions possible in the research. In addition, with these limitations, both social exchange theory and social representation theory have also never been used to explore resident meanings of tourism and their perceptions of tourism in relation to their participation in tourism planning, especially in developing countries. Indeed, the inability of these theories to deeply explore the meanings of tourism held by residents, including the voice of residents, with regard to their participation in tourism planning, has encouraged the use of another social theory in this thesis, the symbolic interactionist theory, which is discussed below.

3.4.3 Symbolic Interactionism

This study adds to the body of research on resident perceptions studies by employing symbolic
interactionism to capture the meanings assigned to tourism by residents. This approach will provide insights that capture the meanings of tourism among residents and how those meanings develop.

Symbolic interactionism has its origins in the pragmatic school of philosophy that has Herbert Mead and Blumer as two of the prominent protagonists. The important principle of this school is the assumption that the knowledge base comes from individual experience (Lauer & Handel 1977). The concern directed towards individual experience has led to emphasis on the real world of a subject (Mead 1938). Given that the subjective experience is the main concern, the pragmatists believe that the existence of subjective experiences is something that cannot be denied in the development of knowledge (Mead 1938). The focus on the subjective experience is represented in symbolic interactionism as how people make sense of their daily life and the manner in which they interact with others (Haralambos, Holborn & Heald 2004; Vander Zanden 1990).

Symbolic interactionism regards interaction between human beings as the major focus (Blumer 1969; Lauer & Handel 1977). Interaction means mutual social action in which individuals are communicating with each other about what they do and thereby orient their acts to each other. In this sense, this idea evokes the belief that humans are constantly acting in relation to each other, communicating symbolically in almost everything they do. The interaction notion is underpinned by the idea that human beings always make relations with each other. For instance, Lauer and Handel (1977) pointed out that there are no individuals who are able to stand alone because they will always make relations with others. Individuals, according to Blumer (1969, p. 20), are engaged ‘…in a vast process of interaction in which they have to fit their developing actions to one another. This process of interaction consists in making indications to others of what to do and in interpreting the indications made by others’. As Charon (1979, p. 131) so aptly points out,

I determine a line of action, act overtly. The other (alter) acts overtly toward me, and I interpret what that act means (represents) in light of my own act. I alter my line of action slightly or to a great extent. The other must do the same in acting toward me. Thus, we must interpret the other, and we must communicate to the other, and the other, in turn, must alter his or her direction accordingly.

Furthermore, Charon (1979) maintained that the process of interaction is an endless process. This is
further explained by Blumer (1966, pp. 537-538):

Symbolic interaction involves interpretation, or ascertaining the meaning of the actions or remarks of the other person, and definition, or conveying indications to another person as how he is to act. Human association consists of a process of such interpretation and definition. Through this process the participants fit their own acts to the ongoing acts of one another and guide others in doing so.

With regard to interaction, Blumer (1969, p. 7) rightly argued, many social scientists have failed to recognise the significance of interaction by treating it as ‘a mere forum through which sociological or psychological determinants’ result in certain behaviour. In contrast, he points out that interaction ‘forms human conduct instead of being merely a means or a setting for the expression or release of human conduct’ (Blumer 1969, p. 8). The assumptions of symbolic interactionism theory which differ to the views generally held by social scientists to explain human behaviour are as follows:

The first premise is that human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them. The second premise is that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellows. The third premise is that these meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters. (Blumer 1969, p. 2)

Meaning is thus the foundation of the theory of symbolic interactionism (Aksan, Kisac, Aydin & Demirbuken 2009) and reciprocal interactions between people will arouse the meaning. Aksan, Kisac, Aydin, and Demirbuken (2009, p. 902) note that symbolic interactionism focuses upon the meanings which emerge as a result of the interaction of individuals and the question of ‘which symbols and meanings emerge from the interaction between people?’ This question relates to the claim that facts are derived from and guided by symbols (Aksan et al. 2009). These symbols encourage various definitions people ascribe to the thing as some definitions might be irrelevant or meaningless to those not making them or not a part of the systems in which the symbols are used (Lauer & Handel 1977). In addition, personality and social background variables which exist in every individual also contribute to the process of interactions and to diverse meanings that are
aroused from these interactions (Lauer & Handel 1977).

Meaning allows people to create the facts based on their own interpretation of various definitions (Aksan et al. 2009). Thus, these interpretations and definitions serve to guide action. The central importance of this process is captured by Thomas and Thomas (1928, p. 572) who claim that ‘if men define situation as real, they are real in their consequences’. This emphasises that people act according to a world they define (Charon 1979). In addition, a situation can subsequently be defined through engaging in an activity of the mind (Charon 1979). As Charon (1979, p. 136) argued, ‘We act in a world that we create through interaction with others and through interaction with our self’.

Blumer (1969) maintains that social life is formed, maintained and changed by the basic meaning attached to it by the interactions of people who respond to each other on the basis of meanings they assign to their world. Symbolic interactionism assigns meanings to experiences, the way people interact or communicate with each other as well as the way they influence those meanings. Since this study focuses on meanings associated with tourism development in a particular context, and how they have developed (by examining the roles and relationships between resident stakeholders), symbolic interactionism provides a suitable theoretical framework from which to work. Within this framework, power relations can be accounted for as a product of the way meanings are ascribed to interactions between residents.

One of the vital concepts of symbolic interactionism is the ‘worlds’ (Blumer 1969, p. 10), which refers to ‘the object world’ or ‘the world of symbols’ (Klunklin & Greenwood 2006, p. 33). Symbolic interactionism regards an object as anything that can be pointed to (Blumer 1969). However, not every object is a symbol, as an object is considered a symbol when the meaning of the object is assigned to it by the designator (Klunklin & Greenwood 2006). In other words, an object consists of its meaning to the person for whom it is an object (Vander Zanden 1990). These objects include physical objects (e.g., trees, mountains, rivers, and animals), social objects (other actors, and their actions), and finally, abstract cultural objects (gestures, words, and ideas) (Blumer 1969). In addition, viewing an object as having different meanings for different individuals encourages the individual meanings to co-exist with common interpretations among a group (Amuquandoh 2010).
In symbolic interactionism, meaning and perception are interrelated. The idea of symbolic interactionism about the ‘worlds’ underlies the relations between meaning and perception. This core concept of symbolic interactionism provides a way of seeing meaning and perception because the meanings that host populations attach to tourism serve as a pointer to their perceptions and attitudes towards tourism (Amuquandoh 2010). As Blumer (1969, p. 11) claims, ‘The meaning sets the way in which he sees the object, the way in which he is prepared to act toward it, and the way in which he is ready to talk about it’. The interrelation between meaning, perception, and action is illustrated in Figure 3.1 below. The interrelationship between these three aspects is illustrated by the interaction between individual A and B so as to emphasise that the meanings grow within the interactions (Blumer 1969). The actions of others enter as factors that form someone’s action, because human beings guide their own conduct in terms of what they take into account (Blumer 1969).

**Figure 3.1 The Interrelationship between Meaning, Perception, and Action**

There has been debate between scholars on the use of symbolic interactionism in leisure, recreation, and tourism. Reviewing a paper of Colton (1987) about the utility of symbolic interaction in understanding leisure, recreation and tourism, Brown (1988) believed that Colton (1987) failed to demonstrate clearly the relationship of leisure research in tourism with symbolic interactionism. As Brown (1988, p. 550) said, ‘…the majority of his [Colton’s] paper comprised a description of
leisure research in tourism which, it was claimed, ‘fits the symbolic interactionism paradigm. Unfortunately, such association was rarely demonstrated…’ In response, Colton (1988, p. 553) argued ‘Many authors in tourism research do not relate their findings to any theoretical frameworks at all’. However, Colton (1988) believes a number of factors such as culture, norms, roles and role playing, definitions of situations, socialisation, motivation, social systems, social change, and other sociological concepts are important in understanding leisure, recreation and tourism.

Underpinned by the premises of symbolic interactionism, several studies have utilised symbolic interactionism to address their research objectives. Foster and Jackson (1979) applied symbolic interactionism to understand the satisfaction and previous experiences of campers in Alberta Provincial Parks, Canada. Ewert (1985) used this approach to investigate the meanings that inexperienced and experienced mountain climbers ascribed to the activity. The meanings were coupled with varying past experiences in relation to the type of trip they took, their satisfaction with the trip and their subjective evaluations of the wildness of the environment and other attitudes and motives. Reviewing several studies which employed symbolic interactionism as their paradigm, it was found that symbolic interactionism is very rarely used to examine the meaning of tourism from a resident’s perspective. Therefore, this research fills this gap and gives meaningful contributions to tourism research, particularly in understanding resident perceptions.

In addition, most studies of resident perceptions in fact are conducted in a quantitative way (Cavus & Tanriselvdi 2003; Kuvan & Akan 2005; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008). Therefore, this study contributes to methodological knowledge by using qualitative research, guided by symbolic interactionism, in order to see the world through people’s perspectives. Further elaboration of the justification for using this methodology is presented in Chapter 4.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter provides a review of the literature with regard to resident perceptions of tourism. This review began by examining the emergence of an academic focus towards resident perceptions of tourism development by describing the evolution of thought on tourism. The review indicates that the four platforms constructed by Jafari to represent the evolution of such thought were inadequate to address the growth of tourism in the 21st century. Thus, there is a need to accommodate tourism
research into the fifth and sixth platforms, comprising sustainable development and ethics paradigms. In the search to find the position of this thesis, the sustainable development platform offers a new direction for providing more benefit to local communities.

Despite the limited inclusion of resident perception studies in earlier tourism scholarship, Jafari’s platforms helped to develop the evolutionary thought of resident perceptions tourism research. This evolution suggests that resident perceptions studies were very limited in the advocacy and cautionary platform and got stronger in the adaptancy platform. In the knowledge-based platform, the growth of resident perceptions became more significant and included more methods. The growth of resident perceptions studies found its way more into the sustainable development platform.

The growing body of research on resident perceptions were classified around seven key themes: attitudes toward tourism, perceptions of tourism impacts, perceptions of participation in planning, factors influencing resident perceptions of tourism, resident perceptions and Islam, resident perceptions of tourism research in developing countries and resident perceptions of tourism in Indonesia. The research in resident perceptions of tourism in developing countries, and in Indonesia, is mostly concerned with attitudes towards tourism and the impacts of tourism with little concern for residents’ perceptions of tourism planning. The research on resident perceptions in Indonesia is very rare and mainly focused on the impacts of tourism with special reference to popular Indonesian tourism destinations such as Bali.

The review of literature in this chapter has, therefore, identified various gaps to which the current study makes a significant contribution. First, this study moves beyond attitude and perception to examine the meanings assigned to tourism by residents of Madura Island, Indonesia. Second, this study employs symbolic interactionism as the theoretical framework through which meanings can be best understood. Third, the qualitative nature of this research is a contribution to the existing literature that has most often been informed by qualitative studies. The next chapter discusses the methodology used in this study and the justification of the use of symbolic interactionism as a paradigm is further explored.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

The broad objective of this chapter is to outline the methodology used to address the overarching research aim of this study which is, ‘To investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and how those meanings develop. Given this aim, the objectives of this study are to:

1. Describe the tourism planning context of Madura Island;
2. Investigate the meanings assigned to tourism by Madura Island residents;
3. Critically examine the influences that shape the meanings of tourism held by Madura Island residents.

This study draws upon a symbolic interactionism as a paradigmatic framework and employs a qualitative research design. This is discussed in detail in this chapter and includes a description of the exploratory and qualitative descriptive methods that were used to operationalise this design. This chapter also describes and justifies the research site where the study was undertaken along with participant selection and recruitment. It also describes the data collection and analysis employed. Later in the chapter, issues associated with reliability, validity and researcher bias are discussed.

4.2 Paradigmatic Framework and Research Design

A paradigmatic framework refers to a set of assumptions that guide the researcher toward how and what they will learn during their research (Creswell 2003; Lincoln & Guba 2000). The paradigm combines beliefs about ‘ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), and methodology (the nature of research design and methods)’ (Sarantakos 2005, p. 30). These three elements are conceptualised by Creswell (2003, p. 5) as ‘knowledge claims, strategies of inquiry, and methods’.
There are two main research approaches, positivist and phenomenological (Kumar 2011). The positivist approach is associated with quantitative methodologies, and with the idea that reality is objective and fixed (Sarantakos 2005). The phenomenological approach is associated with qualitative methodologies, and with the idea that reality is constructed by human imagination (Moustakas 1994), experiences and interpretation (Sarantakos 2005). The main idea of phenomenological research is that such research attempts to understand the study under investigation in context and from the perspective of those who are involved in the experience (Groenewald 2004). Table 4.1 presents the different sets of assumptions between these two approaches.

Table 4.1 Theoretical Construction of the Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Symbolic Interactionism; Phenomenology; Feminism, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontology</td>
<td>Objectivism</td>
<td>Constructionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemology</td>
<td>Empiricism</td>
<td>Interpretivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Fixed design</td>
<td>Fixed/flexible design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sarantakos (2005, p. 31)

Symbolic interactionism, a theory that is rooted in the phenomenological approach, underpins this research. The aim of this tradition is to portray and understand the process of ‘meaning making’ (Schwandt 1994, p. 123). Two overarching aspects included in this process are: first, an understanding of the process in which the meaning is developed and the nature of meanings that are represented in interactions between or among human beings; second, these meanings are understood only by interpretation (Schwandt 1994). The underlying assumptions of symbolic interactionism are detailed in the table above and discussed further below.

As presented in Table 4.1, symbolic interactionists maintain the belief that reality is constructed. Human beings are regarded to have the ability to interpret and construct their reality (Lincoln & Guba 1990). Thus, reality is regarded as a construction of experiences and interpretations (Sarantakos 2005, p. 37). As a result, reality might be constructed by each individual in various ways based on each individual’s experiences, culture and interpretation. As Patton (2002, p. 96) suggests ‘What people perceive as reality is not reality but it is made up and shaped by cultural and
linguistic construct’. The constructed world, thus, is not actually real, unless it is perceived and experienced as real by people, that is, ‘...when a person defines a situation as real, the situation is real in its consequences’ (Thomas & Thomas 1928, p. 572). Indeed, reality exists only in human experience and it appears only in the form in which human beings see the world, or as Blumer (1969) maintains, reality ‘...exists only in the empirical world which can be sought only there and can be verified only there’ (Blumer 1969, p. 22).

The above views have guided the exploration of meaning which is only made possible by capturing the participants’ points of view (Flick 2002; Schwandt 1994) or subjective meanings attributed by individuals (Creswell 2003; Sarantakos 2005). These meanings are a way for human beings to make sense of their world (Sarantakos 2005). Since, in symbolic interactionism, the meaning of a thing is important in its own right (Blumer 1969; Creswell 2003), symbolic interactionists believe that in order to achieve a proper understanding of a social process, it is important for researchers to grasp the meanings that are experienced by the participants (Chenitz & Swanson 1986). Guided by this assumption, therefore, the current study places reliance on the Madura Island residents being studied to provide their own explanations of their situation or behaviours.

In addition, meanings are created through interaction with other people (Blumer 1969) and are influenced by experiences - the historical or cultural experiences of each individual (Creswell 2003). This is because human beings respond creatively to the environment through an interpretative process in which they assign meanings to the situation and respond based on those meanings (Lauer & Handel 1977). Interpretation is not indeed a single individual process, but happens only in the thoughts of individuals (Lauer & Handel 1977). These assumptions inform the approach of interpretive researchers in allowing participants to speak for themselves as well as believing that all human behaviour will go through an interpretive process (Lauer & Handel 1977).

The reliance on participants’ views is an important characteristic of interpretive research (Veal 2006), as this research emphasises the production of meanings and is concerned with learning the views of actors or local meanings (Lauer & Handel 1977). The interpretive researcher therefore attempts to capture what is inside the minds of participants and see the world through their eyes (Veal 2006). Thus, such scholars believe that the interpretation becomes a part of the research process (Giddens 1976; Van Manen 1990) and interpreting what participants hear, see and
understand should be encouraged (Creswell 2003). Interpretation of the data includes developing a
description of an individual or setting, analysing data for themes or categories, and finally, making
an interpretation or drawing conclusions (Creswell 2003). Giddens (1976) argues that from the
outset, researchers studying human behaviours must recognise the need to interpret these
behaviours. Furthermore, in interpretive studies, the influence of the researcher on the findings is
acknowledged and not ignored (Creswell 2003). This encourages, ‘...writers to put themselves into
their texts, to engage writing as a creative act of discovery and inquiry’ (Denzin & Lincoln 1998, p.
321). In this study, the investigation of the meanings of tourism is concerned with the analysis of
those meanings as constructed by the participants and thus involved the researcher’s interpretation
in the analysis.

Guided by the assumption that reality is constructed, social life is constructed out of interaction, and
human subjectivity is important in defining a situation, the current study places emphasis on
capturing the meanings of tourism through the eyes and minds of the participants. This current
study also recognises that experiences of individuals, historical or cultural, influence the process of
interpretation which eventually allows them to assign meanings to their own situation and
encourages them to respond in terms of those meanings.

4.2.1 Qualitative Descriptive Method

To contextualise these meanings, qualitative descriptive method was employed to capture the voices
of local tourism officers in charge of tourism planning implementation and the residents who
occupied planning positions are explored. The data from these contextualising interviews is also
complimented by a review of planning process and documents such as existing planning and
development documents, media sources, internet websites and other literature relevant to the topic
area. By doing so, a comprehensive picture of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island
can be captured (Chapter 5 presents the findings regarding tourism planning implementation on
Madura Island).

In a qualitative descriptive method, researchers gather as much data as they can to enable them to
gather all of the elements of an event that describe the event as it is (Sandelowski 2000). This is
conducted by ‘…staying closer to their data and to the surface of words and events…’ (Sandelowski
Indeed, Maxwell (1992) emphasises that qualitative descriptive study is a useful approach when searching for descriptive validity, or a precise accounting of events.

The term ‘the surface of words and events’ in the statement of Sandelowski (2000) above, stresses the requirement of the qualitative descriptive method to be descriptive in nature. Yet, as ‘There is no pure looking with a naked, innocent eye’ (Pearce 1971, p. 4), it is impossible that the description does not involve any interpretation (Sandelowski 2000). Sandelowski (2010) directly claims that qualitative description does not eliminate the researcher’s responsibility to analyse or interpret at all. This is because understanding any events or experiences requires an understanding of ‘the facts’ about these events or experiences, because there are no facts outside the particular context that gives those facts meaning (Sandelowski 2000). Indeed, the description must always accurately convey events in their proper sequence, or have attributed to those events, or have interpretive validity (Pearce 1971; Sandelowski 2000). In addition, in an effort to know the events or experiences, the perceptions, preferences, sensitivities, and responsiveness of the describer are essential (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw 1995). In other words, researchers who are seeking to describe experience or events involve, in the process, selection and description and, by featuring certain aspects of the experience or event, begin to transform it (Sandelowski 2000).

The methodological paradigm of symbolic interactionism that is underpinning this qualitative research study recognises the residents’ own voices or the subjectivity of human lived experience, and aims to illuminate the multiple meanings that individuals attach to their experiences of tourism. Hence, qualitative research methods, including interviews are utilised. The majority of resident perception studies that were reviewed in Chapter 3 used quantitative methods. Qualitative research makes an important contribution, not only to understanding the meanings of tourism, but also in addressing the research aim of this thesis, more specifically. The discussion below highlights the nature of this contribution and provides a context for understanding the research design of this thesis.

4.2.2 Exploratory Research Method

The symbolic interactionist framework being used in this thesis informs a particular approach to research design. The methodological standpoint of the symbolic interactionist paradigm is that of
‘direct examination of the empirical social world’ (Blumer 1969, p. 32). This involves confronting:

...an empirical world that is available for observation and analysis, to raise abstract problems with regard to that world, to gather necessary data through careful and disciplined examination of that world, to unearth relations between categories of such data, to formulate propositions into a theoretical scheme, and to test the problem, the data, the relations, the propositions, and the theory by renewed examination of the empirical world (Blumer 1969, p. 48).

Informed by the principles of symbolic interactionist framework, this study adopts an exploratory qualitative research design. Qualitative inquiry is the appropriate research design when working from an interpretive approach because qualitative research attempts to understand the experiences of people as they are having the experience, so as to best capture what it means to them (Taylor & Bogdan 1998). Indeed, qualitative research involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach to its subject matter...’ (Denzin & Lincoln 1998, p. 3). Jaffe and Miller (1994, p. 52) point out that the aim of qualitative research is not only ‘to understand social life by taking into meaning, (and) the interpretive process of social actors’, but also ‘the cultural, social and situational context in which those processes occur’.

Exploration corresponds to a ‘depiction’ (Blumer 1969, p. 46) or ‘...the construction of comprehensive and intimate accounts of what takes place’ (Blumer 1969, p. 42). It is considered a flexible procedure which allows scholars to ‘...shift from one line of inquiry to another, adopt a new point of observation as their study progresses, and change their recognition of what the relevant data is as they acquire more information and a better understanding’ (Blumer 1969, p. 40). Qualitative researchers ‘are flexible in how they go about conducting their studies...There are guidelines to be followed, but...never is the researcher a slave to procedure and technique’ (Taylor & Bogdan 1998, p. 10). This method has become the most appropriate method of social research (Sarantakos 2005), especially for those guided by symbolic interaction (Blumer 1969).

Exploratory research is the most effective type of research design when employing the symbolic interactionist framework because it is a fundamental requirement for the researcher to
...form a close and comprehensive acquaintance with a sphere of social life that is unfamiliar... and the means of developing and sharpening his [sic] inquiry so that his problem, his directions of inquiry, data, analytical relations, and the interpretations arise out of, and remain grounded in the empirical life under study (Blumer 1969, p. 40).

The exploration embraces flexible procedures which mean the focus is originally broad with no explicit theory or predetermined hypothesis, but is sharpened progressively as the study proceeds (Blumer 1969).

As this study adopts an exploratory research design, it allows flexibility in its procedure. Blumer (1969) suggests that this flexibility has two main aims, firstly, the flexibility allows the researcher to obtain a close acquaintance with the subject of study that is unfamiliar and, second, the flexibility of the procedure will be a means to develop and improve the inquiry of the researcher, so that the research questions, strategy inquiry, and data analysis ‘remain grounded in the empirical life under study’ (Blumer 1969, p. 40). In addition, since the exploration procedure is flexible, it is not restricted to any particular methods (Blumer 1969). Any methods, as long as their aims are to get a clearer picture of what is occurring in the area of study, are considered valuable (Blumer 1969; Sarantakos 2005). Therefore, the researcher may employ ‘direct observation, interviewing people, listening to their conversations, securing accounts of their life-history, using letters and diaries, consulting public records, arranging group discussion, and making counts of an item if this appears worthwhile’ (Blumer 1969, p. 41). There is a broad array of resources available in contemporary times that a qualitative researcher can use, such as audio, e-mails, videotapes and a variety of other forms (Creswell 2003). In addition, the use of a personal research journal is encouraged in the qualitative research as it is important to record personal experiences of the entire research process (Miles & Huberman 1994). Howe (1990) claims the using of this journal is also vital to minimise researcher bias.

Within the symbolic interactionism paradigm, interviewing is one method employed to obtain a direct observation of the empirical world (Blumer 1969; Klunklin & Greenwood 2006). The assumption underpins the conduct of interviews is that ‘the view of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit’ (Patton 1990, p. 278). Interviewing is described as ‘a verbal
questioning’ (Sarantakos 2005, p. 268) or ‘a conversation with a purpose’ (Kahn & Cannell 1957, p. 149), which qualitative research is mostly dependent upon (Marshall & Rossman 2006). Qualitative research mostly employs in-depth interviews (Veal 2006) using open-ended questions (Sarantakos 2005). The aim of this type of interview is to allow the interviewer to enter the perspective of others (Patton 1990). Additionally, the in-depth interviews appear to be the best method for research in which ‘the information likely to be obtained from each subject is expected to vary considerably, and in complex ways’ (Veal 2006, p. 198). For this study, the in-depth interviews will elicit rich meanings of tourism held by residents on Madura Island and how those meanings develop.

The structure for interviews in social research may vary, from structured, to unstructured and semi-structured interviews. The structured interview employs a strict and fixed format for its questions, response categories, instructions, order and wording (Pizam 1994; Sarantakos 2005). On the other hand, the unstructured interview involves a number of open-ended questions, where the wording and word order is capable of being changed (Sarantakos 2005). The semi-structured interview, which is considered a qualitative structured interview (Howe 1988) contains elements of both the structured and unstructured interviews. The degree to whether interviews are structured or not depends on the research aims, resources, the methodology that is employed and the type of information sought (Sarantakos 2005). Considering that the participants are expert and valuable, the semi-structured and unstructured types of interview will capture the reality ‘…as it is, in its own terms’ (Sarantakos 2005, p. 270) and will give the opportunity to participants to express their views (Sarantakos 2005). Alternatively, quantitative research employs strategies of inquiry such as standardised interviews, close-ended questions and designs its data collections on a predetermined instrument (Creswell 2003).

In order to capture the participants’ subjective meaning of tourism development and an understanding of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island, the main method of data collection for this study is the in-depth interviews. Since this study investigates the meanings of tourism development experienced by different individuals under varied conditions, thus, the in-depth interviews are considered the most appropriate method of interviewing.
4.2.3 The Use of Qualitative Methodology in Tourism

Qualitative research is significantly important to social research, including social relations studies (Flick 2002) and more applied subjects, such as education, regional planning, nursing, social work, community development and management (Marshall & Rossman 2006). Tourism research has been dominated for a long time by positivistic business and economics approaches which in turn leads to the dominance of quantitative research methodology (Jennings 2007; Riley & Love 2000; Tribe & Airey 2007; Wearing 1998). However, Veal (1994) notes that the wide range of research approaches evident in published research has made the dominance of quantitative research methodology no longer relevant. Reservations about the capacity of quantitative research to address questions of understanding and meaning have been raised by several researchers (Riley 1996; Walle 1987), encouraging them to explore paradigms beyond positivism (Dann 1996).

Furthermore, the latest trends in tourism research have indicated that there has been a methodological change in tourism studies from the dominant quantitative approach to the qualitative approach (Dann & Phillips 2001; Riley & Love 2000). The areas of tourism research which have become more concerned with cultural, social and other non-industry topics have encouraged this change (Tribe & Airey 2007). In addition, the fact that tourism studies are ‘multi-disciplinary, cross-disciplinary, and inter-disciplinary’ means that tourism research embraces a number of other disciplines (Veal 2006, p. 20) which has also motivated the need for more interpretive and qualitative research.

Rossman & Rallis (2003, p. 8) suggest that the qualitative approach has five characteristics. These characteristics are as follows: ‘natural setting, researcher as key instrument, multiple source of data, inductive data analysis, participants’ meanings, emergent design, theoretical lens, interpretive, and holistic account’ (Cresswell 2009, pp. 175-176). A qualitative researcher perceives social phenomena as holistic which involves taking into account who they are in the research, by considering the researcher’s personal biography and how it influences the study (Rossman & Rallis 2003).

Drawing on the characteristics of qualitative research and with a focus on Madura Island, this research aims to critically investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island.
and, hence, studies these diverse perspectives in their natural setting. These views are significantly important because the individuals’ view will vary according to their personal experiences as well as the setting in which they live (Faulkner & Tideswell 1997). This study also aims to provide a greater understanding of the subjective experiences that the Madura Island residents have towards tourism and therefore determine the meaning of tourism through their eyes.

Given the interpretive approach taken, this study primarily relied upon data collected through in-depth interviews with residents and tourism officers to address the research objectives. Planning policies, statistical reports, newspaper articles and other data that were downloaded from Internet websites about Madura Island were reviewed and discussed in Chapter 1 and 2. These documents also contextualised and supplemented the empirical research conducted in this thesis.

Few studies that have examined residents’ perceptions of tourism, have considered how qualitative approaches might be employed to understand them (see Eshliki & Kaboudi (2012); Horn and Simmons (2002); and Mbaïwa (2011)). Most studies of residents’ perceptions have been deductive in nature, with an emphasis on how individuals respond to lists of predetermined statements and how individual perspectives are related to various independent variables (Fredline & Faulkner 2000). Further, by employing a qualitative methodology, more diverse perspectives of tourism meanings will be captured than would be possible using a quantitative framework (Petrzelka, Krannich, Brehm & Trentelman 2005).

While the research questions will determine which method is appropriate (Jennings 2007; Westerman 2006), qualitative research is considered more appropriate for capturing the potentially diverse meanings of tourism, as well as how those meanings develop. The qualitative research conducted in this study ultimately aims to create a holistic picture of the meanings of tourism held by the residents of Madura Island. This aim led to the decision to employ qualitative data collection in this study, which is discussed below.

4.3 Data Collection Process

Data collection for this study was conducted from November 2009 to January 2010. Before the research was actually conducted, all official approvals for the research were sought, including
clearance from the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committe. All details of the procedures for recruitment, informed consent, as well as confidentiality were subject to clearance. The translated version of the English-Indonesian information statement, consent form and the list of questions in the interview guide were also subject to clearance. Participants gave written permission to be audio recorded. A full verbal rundown on the details of the research project and how to contact the University of Newcastle were also given. The interviewer also met all occupational health and safety requirements of the University of Newcastle and the participant organisations.

4.3.1 Research Sites

The research site for this study is Madura Island. The reason for selecting Madura Island as a research site is because following the opening of the Suramadu Bridge, there has been significant growth of tourism and development on the Island which may affect what this means to the residents of the Island. Therefore, it is important to explore the meanings of tourism held by the residents on Madura Island. Also, while the research of tourism in emerging destination such as Madura Island is limited. Most studies in Indonesia primarily focus upon established destinations such as Bali and Yogyakarta, therefore this research on Madura Island is warranted.

As described in Chapter 1, Madura Island consists of four regions, namely Bangkalan, Pamekasan, Sampang, and Sumenep. This study selected all four regions as locations for data collection. This decision was based on the intention to capture potential multiple perspectives from different individuals under varied conditions and settings. It has been noted that the location where a resident lives certainly influences their perspectives and experiences of tourism development (Faulkner & Tideswell 1997). The context of the participants is important in symbolic interactionism; the same individual might be expected to respond differently to tourism depending on a particular context. Since this research seeks to capture the meanings of tourism, residents within selected villages from all regions in Madura Island were invited to participate.

Many qualitative researchers use theoretical or purposive sampling frameworks to select groups, settings and individuals where and for whom the processes being studied have most relevance (Denzin & Lincoln 2000). Purposive sampling was employed in order to select two villages from each of the four regions. This was done based on the following criteria: one village with
planned/implemented tourism development and the other without tourism planning/development. Eight villages within four regions were selected as shown in Table 4.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Villages with Tourism Planned or Implemented</th>
<th>Villages without Tourism Planned or Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangkalan</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat</td>
<td>Banyuajuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampang</td>
<td>Taddan</td>
<td>Prajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamekasan</td>
<td>Tanjung</td>
<td>Kacok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumenep</td>
<td>Kebon Agung</td>
<td>Prenduan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The justification of this purposively chosen criterion is that the distance of residence from the tourism zone is a significant variable for resident perceptions (Belisle & Hoy 1980; Haley et al. 2005), as is the degree of tourism development of the zone and the density of the tourists (Vargas-Sánchez, Porras-Bueno & Plaza-Mejía 2011). The underlying assumption is that the different setting where the interactions occur may influence the development of the meanings of tourism among residents. This provides a strong justification for the selection of the sites for this study.

### 4.3.2 Study Participants

To address the research aim and objectives, data collection was focused on two groups of participants: local tourism officers and residents of eight villages in the four regions of Madura Island. The details of the participants who were recruited for this study were as follows:

- Four local tourism officers
- Forty-eight residents (including those who involved in tourism planning such as the staff of BPD and Pokdarwis)

In total, the researcher conducted 52 interviews. The aim was to interview until a reasonable level of saturation was reached. Since there were no fixed rules for the sample size in this qualitative approach, the interviews for this study stopped at the point of ‘redundancy’ (Lincoln & Guba 1985, p. 202). The similar responses from the interviewees indicate the point of redundancy had been reached. In addition, it was considered difficult to extend the data collecting process due to time constraints.
limitations that the researcher as a PhD student must consider. The selection process of the participants is discussed below.

Selection of the Local Tourism Officers

Purposive sampling was conducted to select the local tourism officers. They were purposively selected based on their role as a tourism board officer who has knowledge and is in charge of tourism planning on Madura Island. Given that the description of the tourism planning context of Madura Island is what is essentially sought from the officers; they do not necessarily have to be residents of Madura Island. In this study, one officer from the tourism board of each of the regions was chosen. They were sourced from the Disporabudpar (Youth, Sport, Culture and Tourism Board) of Bangkalan, Disbudparpora (Culture, Tourism, Youth and Sport Board) of Sampang and Sumenep. Due to the absence of a tourism board in Pamekasan, the government representative interviewed in this study was sourced from the staff of the Pamekasan Local Government and was in charge of managing tourism.

The selection of local tourism officers commenced by making initial contact with the Heads of the Culture Tourism Youth and Sport Department from each of the regions. The Head of the Culture Tourism Youth and Sport Department in Sampang was the first person to be approached, followed by those in Sumenep, and Bangkalan, respectively. The Regional Development and Planning Organisation (Economy Section) was then contacted to discern which body was responsible for tourism development in Pamekasan. The responsibility is that of the Pamekasan Local Government. The heads of board were then asked to recommend which of their key personnel were responsible for tourism planning and development in the region and had the relevant knowledge pertaining to it. These personnels were subsequently contacted with an invitation to participate and asked to provide information about organisational policies and the tourism planning process from their respective region (refer to the range of topic areas for the interviews as explained later in this chapter).

The information provided from the key personnel in relation to specific villages yielded diverse viewpoints held by the residents about tourism development. This information was used to purposively sample the villages where tourism development was being planned or was already implemented and those where there were no plans or development. This categorisation was
informed by the analysis of the regional tourism master plans and the interviews with the tourism officers. The analysis of these plans and interviews indicates that there are three layers of areas in regional tourism planning: the areas where tourism development is planned; already being implemented; and where there is no tourism planning at all. As the regional tourism planning is focused on the development of a tourist attraction, and the surrounding areas and local residents (The Provincial Regional Rule No. 16/1998 on RIPP of East Java Province), in this study, a village with a tourist attraction is categorised as a tourism planned area, whereas a village with no tourist attraction is categorised as an unplanned tourism area. Eight villages within four regions were selected and will be discussed in the Research Site section.

Selection of the Residents

In this study, residents are defined as ‘those who have been living within the geographical study area for at least six months…’ (Statistics Indonesia 2009). The residents in this study include: sellers (souvenir bridge sellers, a food stall holder, fruit beach sellers), a hotel manager, business entrepreneurs, village officers, farmers, students, a housewife, an unemployed person, travel agency employees, fish factory and jamu (traditional medicine) company employees, a graveyard officer, a builder, teachers and the head of a pesantren. In addition, there are several gurus amongst the residents (See Appendix A for a detailed summary of all the study participants). As discussed in Chapter 1, for the Madura Island people, guru refers to kyai, leader, religious teacher and respected person. The functions that a kyai performs in a community may be multi-faceted (Rozaki 2004). For example, in addition to being a kyai, he may also be a farmer, a businessman and so forth. Hence, this study has found that teachers, the head of a pesantren and a village officer also fulfill the role of a kyai in their communities.

To ensure a broad cross section of perspectives were included, a geographically focussed purposive sampling framework was used to identify the villages that became the research sites for this study (see above). Snowball sampling was then employed in each of these purposively sampled villages to select resident respondents for this research. This procedure allows the researcher to access informants through contact information that are given by other informants (Noy 2008).
The first step in the process of recruiting the residents was to approach the respective community leaders from the selected villages for permission to conduct the research in their villages. The scope of the permission was dualistic because it was also asking for information about which residents lived in the village and who had particular positions in the community that might be of interest to the study. While the researcher was at the research location, the residents were present and agreed to participate. These residents would then help by pointing to other residents who have particular positions which would be interesting for this study to capture. Information in relation to the project, research participant information statements and consent forms were disseminated at the time of meeting with the residents.

Once consent had been received, the participants were invited to participate in an individual in-depth interview. The interviews of the residents focused on the socio demographic characteristics of participants, their involvement in tourism, their employment dependency on tourism, their knowledge of tourism, their personal history in the community, their overall attitude towards tourism, the factors influencing their perceptions of tourism in current and future tourism development, the range of challenges facing tourism on Madura Island, the roles taken by residents and the relationship between residents.

The first villages visited for interviews were Taddan, and then Prajan, both situated in the Sampang Region. Interviewing the participants from both villages required approximately nine days. Banyuajuh Village in the Bangkalan Region was the next location visited and three days were required to interview six participants. The third region visited for interviews was Pamekasan Region where Kacak Village was followed by a visit to Tanjung Village. The fourth region visited was Sumenep Region where residents from Prenduan Village participated in interviews followed by those in Kebon Agung Village. The last village intended to be visited for interviews was Sukolilo Barat Village in the Bangkalan Region but due to a miscount of the Prajan participants, a decision was made to return to Prajan for a few days in mid-January 2010. There was no priority given to the schedule of interviews; this was instead determined by variables such as access, official permission and interview appointments with participants. The original intention was to finish at one location then proceed to the next location. A research personal journal was kept continually throughout the entire interview process to record personal experiences of the study process and includes my thoughts and feelings.
It was also anticipated that when the collection of data was recognised as being formally finished there would be a requirement to conduct follow up interviews because of unforeseen special circumstances which might require clarification of certain issues. Because the researcher had to travel back to Australia after the formal data collection period, follow up supplementary interviews were conducted by phone and email where necessary.

**Table 4.3** The Number of Participants Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Tourism Officers Interviewed</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Number of Residents Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangkalan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banyuajuh</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Taddan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prajan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamukasan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tanjung</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kacak</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumenep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kebon Agung</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prenduan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total Residents</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.3 Data Collection Methods**

Consistent with the methodological paradigm of symbolic interactionism and qualitative descriptive method that underpin my research, I utilised in depth interviews. These were supplemented and informed by a critical review of planning process and documents that I have discussed in Chapter 1 and 2.

In the interview schedule for the study, some questions were structured (such as questions about the personal demographics of the respondents) and others were open-ended. The questions were purposely designed to be broad and general in order to encourage participants to speak openly and express their views freely. According to Creswell (2003, p. 8), ‘The more open-ended the questioning, the better, as the researcher will listen carefully to what people say or do in their life setting’. The interview schedules used in this study are presented in the Appendices B and C of the thesis (in-depth interview checklist for residents and for local tourism officers, respectively).
key themes of the interviews are presented in Table 4.4 below:

**Table 4.4 The Key Themes of the Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Local Tourism Officers</th>
<th>For Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Current and future tourism development</td>
<td>• Socio demographic characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The challenges facing tourism on Madura Island</td>
<td>• Involvement in tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The roles taken by the officers</td>
<td>• Geographical proximity between the tourist zone and bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How the officers perform their roles</td>
<td>• Economic/Employment dependency on tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personal history in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The perceptions of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The roles taken by residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Factors influence the meanings of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to the planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All individual interviews were conducted in the Indonesian language and were recorded (with the permission of the participants) and conducted at a time and location most convenient to the participants. Some interviews were held at the participants’ place of residence, whereas others preferred to be interviewed in their workplace.

The interviews were transcribed in Indonesian and translated into English by the researcher, a native speaker of Bahasa Indonesia. Some difficulties were encountered when translating and explaining local terms such as *batik*, *pokdarwis*, and so on, where there is no exact equivalent in English. The glossary is used in an attempt to overcome this problem, by not only translating the term, but also explaining the nature of the local custom. Clear, detailed explanations were provided to address such issues. Another challenge for the author was making participant remarks readable and understandable, while keeping the language as natural as possible. The assistance of an editor familiar with Indonesian culture was required and much discussion ensued in order to achieve fluent and accurate translation.

As the design of such a qualitative study is emergent (Creswell 2003), the interviews are therefore not tightly prefigured in terms of content, number and length. At the beginning, it was anticipated that each interview would have a duration of approximately 60 minutes, however, several
participants were still happy to discuss the issue at length and consequently, some interviews took longer than anticipated. The interviews ranged anywhere from forty-five minutes to four hours.

4.4 Validity and Reliability

Producing consistent results is essential for both qualitative and quantitative research. Reliability refers to the ability to produce the same findings every time the procedure is repeated. A qualitative study uses measures of reliability by increasing the variability of perspectives in research or to set up a list of possible errors or distortions (Sarantakos 2005). Reliability is arguably quite difficult in qualitative research, with some authors preferring the term ‘credibility’, ‘applicability’, ‘audibility’ or conformability (Lincoln & Guba 1985). Reliability for this research was enhanced by adhering to a script and developing similar questions in every interview. Also, the use of the personal research journal helps with the reliability of this study. The responses could then be cross-checked between participants and across organisations (in the case of the officers).

4.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the process used to transform data into findings (Patton 2002). The process of data analysis involves delving deeper in order to understanding the data, represent the data, and interpret the deeper meaning of the data (Creswell 2003). Data analysis in qualitative research is ongoing, flexible and adjusted to emergent findings that stay grounded in the empirical data (Blumer 1969; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Taylor & Bogdan 1998). In addition, data analysis requires a persistent reflection about the data, posing analytical questions, and keeping memos throughout the study (Rossman & Rallis 2003).

Consistent with the symbolic interactionist paradigm, this study employs an inspection when analysing data, particularly the data of the voices of residents. According to Blumer (1969, p. 43), inspection refers to ‘an intensive focused examination’ of analytical elements, which are...general or category items... employed as the key items in the analysis’. Furthermore, this close intensive focus is also employed to examine the relations between these elements (Blumer 1969). The inspection is the procedure ‘…in which the researcher conceptualises (theorises) the data, then checks those conceptualisations against the data’ (Klunklin & Greenwood 2006, p. 35).
Similar procedure is also applied to analyse the voices of local tourism officers, specifically in the form of qualitative content analysis; the analysis strategy of a qualitative descriptive study. It is a form of analysis that emphasises summary of the information content of the data (Morgan 1993). This approach systematically applies codes, which are derived from the data (Sandelowski 2000). Qualitative content analysis is similarly reflexive and interactive as the researcher continuously modifies their treatment of the data to accommodate new data and new insights from that data (Sandelowski 2000). In this regard, it appears there is interpretation involved in the qualitative content analysis in an effort to understand the implicit content of the data (Sandelowski 2000).

The flexibility of the analysis process leads to the variety in timing of the analysis (Sarantakos 2005). For some research, data analysis may occur after data collection, while others conduct analysis throughout the data collection period. As data analysis is sometimes difficult to differentiate from data collection, it is also possible to conduct it during and after the fieldwork (Sarantakos 2005). For this study, the basic analysis was carried out during data collection, while the main analysis commenced when the data collection was formally finished, particularly when the tapes were listened to and the interviews were transcribed. The ongoing data analysis is useful in terms of preparing the following interviews so as to capture or explore points made in preceding interviews.

The first step of analysis for this study for both the local tourism officers and the residents is organising and preparing the data for analysis. This involved transcribing 52 interviews and organising the data into different sources of information. Those that were sourced from the same village were grouped together into one folder followed by the commencement of a detailed analysis employing a coding process. Since the interview was conducted in the Indonesian language, the initial step of the analysis process included translating transcripts into English. In this research, the generic procedures of qualitative research above were combined with the steps of the inspection procedure.

The analysis of data in this study was mainly inductive as it involved ‘discovering patterns, themes, and categories in one’s data’ (Patton 2002, p. 453). The inductive approach then allows the development of open coding and other higher levels of coding, such as axial and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin 1998). Aiming for immersion in the data (Strauss & Corbin 1998), open coding
was started by ‘opening the data, breaking it down and looking for empirical indicators of concepts’ (Sarantakos 2005, p. 349). This includes labelling the data and reorganising the labels for conceptualising the data, as well as looking for the conceptual patterns within them (Sarantakos 2005). Open coding was proceeded by the use of N-Vivo software, where the labels were derived from actual words or phrases used by the participants (Strauss & Corbin 1998). This type of coding in this study provided the opportunity to portray what the participants’ view of tourism development was about, as seen through their eyes. Using the N-Vivo computer software package was advantageous to this research as ‘it is able to quickly locate useful quotations and multiple perspectives on a category or theme’ (Creswell 2003, p. 193).

Several themes in relation to the tourism planning implementation captured from the voices of local tourism officers emerged from the systematic analysis of data. They were the planning priorities such as attracting visitors, managing tourist attractions and promoting benefits to residents; challenges in the form of political and bureaucratic issues such as overlapping authorities, funding issues and top down planning; and resident resistance to tourism, where responses included reducing political and bureaucratic issues and minimising resistance by establishing the pokdarwis, encouraging resident initiatives in tourism, and cooperation with religious and key leaders for decision making. Meanwhile, four major themes emerged from the systematic analysis of data about the meanings of tourism held by the residents. The first theme, which relates to meanings of tourism, is that for some participants, tourism means business opportunities. The second theme, threat to culture and religious values, is about the fear of some participants that tourism will threaten their culture and religious values. The third theme is low involvement of local residents in tourism planning, which relates to the feeling that the voices of some residents are not being heard. The fourth theme is insecure income and the fifth theme is an opportunity to share culture and religious values. These are reported in the following chapters. The rich data and varied stories of participants give insight into the meanings of tourism through the eyes of the Madura residents. As the qualitative methodology employed values the researchers’ influence on the research, the possibility of researcher bias should be recognised, and is discussed below.
4.6 Researcher Bias

In qualitative research, the reflexivity of researchers is highly valued (Sarantakos 2005). This means that the self-reflection or self-awareness of the researcher towards the findings is respected (Sarantakos 2005). This includes the interpretation that the researcher makes of what they see, hear and understand, which cannot be separated from the researcher’s background, history and context (Cresswell 2009). This relates to the characteristic of qualitative research which recognises the importance of the researcher’s interpretation of the findings (Blumer 1969) and regards the researcher as a key means to understanding the research (Polkinghorne 2006). In other words, underpinning the interpretive practice is always ‘the biographically situated researcher’ (Denzin & Lincoln 2003, p. 30). Polkinghorne (2006) adds that this reflexivity of the researcher is one of the strengths of a qualitative study in that its results are contingent on the diligence and judgement of a researcher, not adherence to a method. In addition, when the influence of the researcher is exposed, ‘alternative ways to look at the data are often introduced’ (Fontana & Frey 2003). Despite its merit, the researcher’s interpretation may present the challenge of bias for the research. As Poggenpoel and Myburgh (2003) claim that the reflexivity of the researcher can be the greatest jeopardy for trustworthiness in qualitative research. They thus recommend that to manage these biases, triangulation of the research and peer evaluation should be undertaken (Poggenpoel & Myburgh 2003).

The area of origin of the researcher potentially contributed to some biases during the research process. In terms of the researcher’s background, I am originally from Java Island, Indonesia (the main Island in Indonesia). The Indonesian economy, infrastructure and human development mostly enjoyed by the Javanese (Kusharjanto & Kim 2011) has contributed to a bias in this research in many aspects, such as knowledge, wealth, and level of education. I entered the research field with some feelings of superiority over the Madurese residents, whose small and isolated island has, in the past, endured problems such as poverty and high levels of unemployment (see Chapter 1). For these reasons, Madura Island has long been regarded by residents of the Indonesian mainland as left behind compared to other islands, especially Java. This situation has created the effect of underestimating the study participants. As a result, initially, during the interviews, I had difficulty in establishing a solid rapport with the participants and encouraging them to speak freely. I realised that if I did not address this bias, my unintentioned arrogance would impact on the way I gathered
information and interpreted the data.

Another Indonesian cultural bias that existed is the enduring stereotype that the people of Madura have volatile tempers, and are poor and uneducated. These biases created, for me, an atmosphere of nervousness and discomfort, particularly during the interviews. Poggenpoel and Myburgh (2003) acknowledge that the researcher's discomforts may threaten the truth value of data obtained and in turn, the information obtained from the data analyses. The combination of being unfair to myself as part of my cultural socialisation and being a nervous Javanese, resulted in feelings of elevated discomfort that initially caused some difficulties in obtaining the data during the face-to-face interviews with participants.

Another bias emerged as a result of the fact that Madura residents are highly devout Muslim people. This characteristic encourages the assumption that the majority of residents interviewed will see tourism as a threat to their religious values. This assumption is based on the fact that Madura was once an isolated island with few visitors. The opening of the bridge, which was rapidly followed by tourism, is a new development for the island and its residents. Thus, tourism might be seen as a threat to their religious life. Also, the contribution of residents to tourism planning on Madura Island is low. This assumption is based on the previous research and the premise that, in developing countries, the participatory planning approach has been somewhat lacking.

In order to control for the above biases and to ensure that these biases did not influence the data obtained or the research findings, several procedures were implemented. First, particular attention was given to techniques of triangulation. In order to reduce the biases, data from a variety of resources were compared. These biases were also challenged regularly throughout this study. Such an approach resulted in re-shaping the way I perceive Madura residents. For example, during data collection, I found that the Madura residents were friendly and did not always have volatile tempers as per my bias. Also, once I gathered data from the participants, I found that their responses were really valuable to my research, despite their low levels of formal education. Thus, it became apparent to me that their meanings of tourism were important to examine. This process fascinated me to the point that I was compelled to dig deeper for more information from the participants in order to strengthen my research.
Second, as explained earlier, the personal research journal was also kept during the study. The journal entries were made every few days throughout the data collection period. This activity helped me to reflect on my observations and interviews from a personal point of view, by asking myself what my personal opinions were on particular issues, incidents or comments that I had recorded in my research transcripts. In qualitative research, keeping a journal during the conduct of the research is important because this activity may provide information about the descriptive and reflective notes, the two dimensions of primary resources in research (Cresswell 2009, p. 181-182). Descriptive refers to descriptions of the physical setting, or description of participants, whereas reflection refers to the researcher’s personal thoughts such as ‘speculation, feelings, problems, ideas, hunches, impression and prejudices’ (Bogdan & Biklen 1992, p. 121). In addition, consultation and discussion of findings with supervisors and other colleagues were undertaken on a regular basis. By doing so, consistent feedback was received throughout the process and this has helped to keep my biases in check. Ultimately, these activities have helped me to sharpen the analysis of these findings.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has provided justification for the application of the qualitative method as the most appropriate and effective research design, given the adoption of the symbolic interactionist paradigm. A qualitative descriptive study, based on the theoretical underpinnings elaborates in detail the knowledge claims and strategies of the inquiries, and best addresses the research aim of this thesis. The data was shaped and given understanding through an extensive interrogation of the flexible methods, the exploratory research design and the inspection analysis design employed in this study, supported by the use of N-vivo software. This afforded an in-depth understanding of the subjective nature of the residents’ perceptions of tourism. The remainder of the thesis is dedicated to the analysis and discussion of the findings in order to address the research aim of the thesis. The summary of research design employed in this study is presented in Table 4.5 below.
**Table 4.5 Summary of Research Design**

**Research Aim:**
To investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and how those meanings develop.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Methodological Approach</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. To describe tourism planning context of Madura Island | Qualitative Descriptive Analysis | • Tourism Officers  
• Residents occupied planning positions | Chapter 5 |
| 2. To investigate the meanings assigned to tourism by Madura Island residents | Symbolic Interactionism | • Residents | Chapter 6 |
| 3. To critically examine the influences that shape the meanings of tourism held by Madura Island residents | Symbolic Interactionism | • Tourism Officers  
• Residents occupied planning positions  
• Residents | Chapter 7 |
CHAPTER 5
TOURISM PLANNING IMPLEMENTATION ON MADURA ISLAND:
A DESCRIPTION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses research objective 1: To describe the tourism planning context of Madura Island. It is primarily achieved through the voices of the tourism board officers in Madura because these are the people responsible for implementing tourism planning. As mentioned in the methodology chapter, analysis of the interviews employs a qualitative descriptive method. The analysis in this chapter is therefore primarily descriptive in nature. A comprehensive summary of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island is generated by focusing on the tourism officers’ perspectives as they perform their duties. Examination of tourism planning implementation is an important consideration because it sets the context for the residents’ meanings of tourism.

The basis for discussion in this chapter is primarily drawn from data collected in interviews with the tourism board officers from the four regions on the Island, Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan and Sumenep. The interview data collected from the officers is combined with data collected from interviews with the residents of Madura Island, who occupied other planning positions such as the staff from the BPD (the consultative group) of Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan Region and pokdarwis (tourism awareness group) in Pamekasan Region. The data from these particular residents contributes to an understanding of how the tourism board officers interpret their roles, which ultimately assists in providing a complete picture of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island as a whole. The data from the interviews is complemented by data drawn from secondary sources such as existing planning and development documents, media sources, internet websites and other literature relevant to the topic area.

This chapter is organised into three sections. The first section describes tourism planning implementation priorities, which includes attracting visitors (implementing promotional strategies and promoting local culture), managing tourist attractions (improving facilities, amenities and services) and promoting the benefits of tourism to residents. The second section explores several challenges of tourism planning implementation such as political and bureaucratic issues.
(overlapping responsibilities amongst authorities, funding issues and top down planning) and the residents’ resistance to tourism planning. The third section describes efforts to address the challenges. These include reducing political and bureaucratic issues (such as managing tourism development myopically and prioritising projects) and minimising resident resistance to tourism (establishing the pokdarwis (tourism awareness group), encouraging resident initiatives in tourism, cooperating with religious leaders and creating a small group of key leaders for decision making).

5.2. Tourism Planning Implementation Priorities

The interviews revealed that there are three key themes attached to tourism planning implementation priorities. These include attracting visitors, managing tourist attractions and promoting the benefits of tourism to residents. These themes are further explored below.

5.2.1 Attracting Visitors

The interviews revealed that concentrating on visitors is important and the main agenda for implementing tourism planning. As described in Chapter 1, one of the targets of tourism in East Java Province is increasing the number of tourists and their level of satisfaction during visits. Interpretation of this provincial plan by the four tourism officers interviewed was focussed mostly on attracting more visitors to their region.

This focus is reflected in the remarks below:

*What we are doing is inviting visitors to visit Sumenep. We do such a big promotion to attract them to come.* (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board)

*We are happy if more and more visitors arrive in Sampang. That is what we want.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

*The visits to Bangkalan have increased dramatically in recent times. We are so happy.* (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)
I think an increase in visitors is what we want, for sure. That’s why we have to develop better service so the visitors can enjoy visiting here. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

The remarks above suggest the concern of tourism officers in attracting visitors. Words that are often used, such as ‘happy’, ‘that’s what we want’ and ‘for sure’, show the delight as well as the perceived goals that they should pursue in their role as an officer. In other words, as an officer, one important role is to attract visitors to Madura Island. Therefore, as the remarks indicate, the officers interviewed applied a substantial amount of effort to attracting visitors and making them happy during their visit. As well as complying with the tourism plans, this effort was extended because tourism in developing countries is seen as a simple, effective and cheap way of gaining revenue (Tosun 2001). Thus, it is understandable when the officer from Pamekasan says that developing better service is important because this will make the tourists happy with their visit. As he further said that if the tourists are happy they will come back, therefore generating more revenue. Creating a good experience for tourists seems to have become the concern of this officer. Indeed, the idea that the longer the duration of a visit, the better, seems to be implied in the remarks of the officers because such visits would be perceived to generate greater revenue for the regions.

In addition, despite encouraging visits for economic purposes, the perception of ‘visitors as king’ is bolstered by the traditional philosophy held by most Indonesians, including Madura residents. This philosophy is known as tamu adalah raja or guests are king. The officers see visitors as an extension of this idea.

Visitors are king for us. So, we have to cater to them nicely. (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

The importance of being kind and friendly to visitors is paramount to the officers, evidenced by the repeated mention of this during interviews with tourism officers. The idea that ‘visitors are the king’ underpins this cultural aspect of the plan and indicates that the tourism boards place visitors as a high priority. Therefore, they maintain that it is the duty of the locals to offer the guests hospitable service. It is the belief of the officers that the friendliness of the local residents would attract the visitors to visit and stay in Madura because they have been made to feel comfortable and welcome.
Moreover, the role of attracting visitors was accompanied by subsequent actions such as implementing promotional strategies and introducing the visitors to local culture.

**Implementing Promotional Strategies**

Although the officers interviewed stated directly that they wanted more visitors to visit their area, the tourism officers from the Bangkalan and Sumenep Regions seemed more confident than those from the Sampang and Pamekasan Regions of increasing the number of international tourists to their regions in the future. This confidence is encouraged by the fact that both Bangkalan and Sumenep have special characteristics that are different to other locations in Madura. For example, historically, Sumenep was once the only kingdom on Madura Island. These characteristics are perceived by the tourism board officers as enhancing the ability of the regions to attract overseas tourists. Most of the international tourist visits are arranged by travel agents prior to their arrival which shows that the Bangkalan and Sumenep tourism boards have liaised and cooperated with travel agents in Madura and Java. This includes distributing brochures to the travel agents as part of tourism board promotions and providing guides in Madura when required.

In contrast, the local officers interviewed from the Pamekasan and Sampang Regions explained that they were not overly concerned with the low numbers of international tourists. They believe that focusing on improvements to the infrastructure is of greater importance than expanding the promotion of Madura to attract overseas visitors.

_"Our focus at the moment is not on overseas tourists and I think it is better to firstly improve our infrastructure before concentrating on promoting international visits. If not, the international visitors will be disappointed and have a bad impression of us and the area."_(Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The comment of Rudi above shows his concern that the existing infrastructure in the Pamekasan and Sampang Regions is not adequate to promote to overseas visitors as they would leave with a bad impression, devaluing the island’s image.
The focus for Sampang Tourism Board on physical improvements first, rather than on international promotions, is in line with the Regional Master Plan (RIPPDA). The RIPPDA document for all regions is limited to a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis of the tourism assets of these regions, in the form of attractions. The key points requiring the attention of the tourist board officers include identifying the attractions, their current status and the direction the plans should take in relation to physical improvements. There is a lack of clarity and absence of instructions with regard to promotional strategies in the RIPPDA document which indicates the low priority afforded marketing. It is little wonder, therefore, that the Sampang and Pamekasan tourism board officers prioritised the implementation of physical improvements to the attractions more than promotions for overseas visitors because there are no such instructions within the plans. The desire to conform and follow the plan has bound the officers to do what is expected of them and leaves little scope for flexibility or initiative.

The Bangkalan and Sumenep officers interviewed were more confident of attracting international tourists, even though their RIPPDA has the same instructions as the RIPPDA of the Sampang and Pamekasan Regions. In this case, the instructions of the RIPPDA plan are intensified by the tourism boards in Bangkalan and Sumenep but weakened by the tourism boards in Sampang and Pamekasan. Thus, the different interpretation of the plans results in different actions being taken. The availability of funding in Bangkalan and Sumenep facilitates proactive responses to the RIPPDA plan.

**Promoting Local Culture**

Promoting local culture is an activity that is regularly conducted by tourism boards in all regions in their efforts to attract visitors. The performances of some traditional ceremonies, such as *Rokat Tase’, Rokat Sabeh and Petik Laut*, have become routine promotional features for tourists. *Rokat Tase’,* for example, is one traditional ceremony often encountered in coastal areas where the majority of residents are fishermen. This ceremony involves praying for the safety of the fishermen and abundant supplies of fish (Wasiah 2012). The Bull Race, which is an expression of thanks to God, has also become a significant tourist event in Madura. In 2009, ‘*Semalam di Madura*’ or ‘One night in Madura’ was conducted to promote traditional Madurese culture. This event comprised a package of cultural performances held in several coastal areas of East Java, finishing at Pamekasan.
Parallel to the regional plans, the introduction of local performances has become one of the agendas for tourism. Informed by the RIPPDA plan - which prioritises the attraction of more visitors - these performances have recently been made an agenda for the tourist routine by the tourism board. Thus, according to the tourism officers, there is dual advantage in this plan, such as the involvement of local residents in local ceremonies, as well as the entertainment of visitors.

*We always conduct regular events to promote our local traditional performance. We have one month to visit Sampang that combines all events at once.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

*We always join any events conducted by East Java Tourism Board to introduce our traditional culture. I think that is important, so Bangkalan will become more popular.* (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

*Local traditional culture should always be performed. These performances are important to attract visitors.* (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board)

With the emergence of tourism on the island, the government has focused on the introduction of local traditional ceremonies for the tourists. While in the literature on the impact of tourism, the performances may involve commercialisation, the local governments tend to overlook this aspect and focus instead on the promotion of their culture which will contribute to increased arrivals.

In addition, the officer also notes that preservation of Islamic culture should receive a high level of attention. This is primarily because Madura Island is recognised as a devoutly Islamic island and therefore the officers maintained that they had to preserve Islamic values.

*We always try to develop our local events, mostly the ones which contain Islamic values. All the development we have been doing should fit with Islamic values.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

This can be interpreted as a strategy on the part of the officers to develop tourism based on the preferences of the residents, so the residents are more accepting of the tourism development.
Therefore, tourism development must be compliant with Islamic values. By operating in this manner, the residents are more likely to support tourism while, on the other hand, the main aim of the board officers, inviting visitors, will also be achieved. This discussion will be further elaborated in Chapter 7.

5.2.2 Managing Tourist Attractions

Managing tourist attractions is perceived as another significant role of the tourism officers. This includes improving facilities, amenities and services.

*Improving Facilities, Amenities and Services*

The motivation to please visitors is the impetus for improving facilities for the benefit of visitors. The interviews showed that improving infrastructure such as roads, buildings, and making tourist attractions more appealing via the addition of other physical facilities such as more canopies, fences and so forth, are viewed as part of the role of tourism officers. As alluded to the remark presented earlier, it is necessary for the Sampang officer to work on developing a sturdy infrastructure and adequate facilities prior to attracting tourists. Having an image that deprecates the region is something that worried the officer. One of the facilities proposed is a tourist information centre in Pamekasan.

*We will build several tourist information centres to assist visitors. However, it is hard because we do not have enough human power.* (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

In response to increased numbers of visitors to Pamekasan, the Pamekasan Tourism Board intends to develop several tourist information centres, with the aim of providing information to visitors about tourist attractions in Pamekasan. Despite this goal, the establishment of information centres has not occurred as yet due to technical and staffing problems. A frequent problem for local government is the lack of resources and expertise required to implement the planning and development (Dredge & Jenkins 2007).
In addition to providing information to visitors, the proposed tourist information centres aim to protect visitors from unofficial tour guides. According to Karman from Pamekasan Region Government, these centres will also serve to protect visitors from ‘bad guides’ who, according to him, often ‘mislead’ tourists by guiding them to ‘improper’ craft industries. For example, ‘bad guides’ (the language used by the officer), often took tourists to certain craftsmen in order to get money as a commission from them. This tourism board officer also said that the actions of ‘bad guides’ went beyond mere vested interests, and caused visitors to develop a bad impression because they were sometimes taken to art centres that were not of good quality or were too expensive.

The goal of protecting visitors from ‘bad guides’ may be related to the issue of the control and quality assurance of tourist guides. Dahles (2002) suggests that under the New Order, government intervention in tourism was expanded to include the regulation of all aspects of tour guiding such as licensing, certification, training and the professional ethics of guides. This extension of government intervention was aimed at maintaining professionalism so as to reflect the order and security of the central control (Dahles 2002). In Madura's case, because tourism has only started to emerge on this island, it is apparent that the local government intends to have more control of the tour guides in relation to their professionalism and conformity. Under a new tourism regulation, tour guides are the responsibility of the local government. However, the emphasis on the national standardised competency in tour guides has evidently demonstrated the need for uniformity. The term ‘bad guide’ arose due to uncontrolled tour guiding, whereby anyone could participate in guiding. This situation, according to the Pamekasan tourism officer, had the potential to provide a negative service to tourists and was difficult for the tourism board to control, leaving a bad impression on the tourists. These negative aspects are the stimulus for the local government’s intention to implement greater control over tour guides.

Moreover, in order to achieve the plans to create better tourist attractions, the board coordinates with other institutions. For example, the Sampang officer maintained that the board had actively developed good cooperation with other tourism stakeholders such as other government departments or private companies. For example, the tourism board of Sampang was responsible for developing the attractions, while the Forest Board of Sampang and the House and Area Board of Sampang were responsible for the plants and roads, respectively. Maintaining good cooperation with other boards to manage tourism in the area is implemented and closely monitored by the tourism board. In
addition, other facilities such as shaded areas, stages at the beach, more permanent stalls are also the responsibility of the tourism officers. These activities are implemented with one sole purpose which is to encourage more visitors, as revealed directly in the remark below:

*We build new fences, canopies and so forth, so the visitors are happy, enjoy their visits. And if they are happy, they can inform their friends to come here as well.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

Besides indicating the actions of the officer to improve tourist facilities, the remark also shows how the officer confidently uses the ‘word of mouth’ strategy as part of the board’s promotional tool to attract more visitors to Sampang. The belief that making the visits highly enjoyable for tourists will automatically bring more visitors to the region encourages the use of this strategy.

### 5.2.3 Promoting Benefits of Tourism to Residents

Promoting the economic benefits of tourism to residents, particularly in terms of income and job generation was an important focus for the tourism officers interviewed. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the plans, either national, provincial or regional plans, suggest that one of the aims of tourism planning in Indonesia is to improve the welfare of the local people. Thus, all the officers interviewed interpreted the plans and viewed tourism as a source of income and job generation for the residents.

*Tourist attraction will give benefits to the locals. They can sell food on Sundays or can be a souvenir seller, for example. Really, there are a lot of chances for them to gain benefits from tourism.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

*People in here are very excited with tourism, because it gives them income, through being a souvenir seller or making the souvenirs.* (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board)

*Local residents can be a seller around tourist attraction. Tourism definitely benefits them, improving their income.* (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)
The interpretation that tourism is a way to improve the residents’ welfare by alleviating poverty and increasing local regional income is reflected in the actions of the officers interviewed. These officers apply a significant amount of effort to create opportunities for the local residents to start their own business and to work in various tourism-industry-related jobs. This study found that being a seller; whether a souvenir, fruit or drink seller in the location of the attractions, seems to be a popular source of employment for those residing near the attraction. In line with the remarks above, this indicates that these informal sector jobs were the type of employment offered to residents so they could benefit from tourism.

Providing an opportunity for the residents to earn income from tourism is evident in the Sampang Region where the government, via the private company who rent the beach, did not charge the residents to sell at the beach. A similar opportunity was provided by the Bangkalan Government when residents were permitted to sell at the sides of the bridge for free. Unfortunately, these incentives were not accompanied by any restrictive regulation to control the number or to manage the sellers. As a result, once the number of sellers was superfluous to requirements, problems arose, such as informal competition, which will be further discussed in Chapter 6. Yet, the management of the Asta Tinggi attraction in Sumenep anticipated this problem by giving priority to those residents who were descendants of the king’s servants.

Tourism promotions are spread widely via several formal and informal community information sessions. Informal community sessions are those conducted by religious leaders in pesantren (Islamic boarding school). This will be further discussed in the resident support section later in this chapter. Other ways to promote the benefits of tourism to local residents include instruction on how to create souvenirs such as the information sessions held in Tanjung Village, Pamekasan; competitions; sessions on how to provide better service to visitors such as those conducted by Bangkalan Tourism Board for sellers at the Suramadu Bridge. The officers provide regular training sessions to help support the residents in how to provide better service to visitors, such as those conducted by Bangkalan Tourism Board for sellers at the Suramadu Bridge. The Bangkalan tourism officer recalled that the sellers were initially impolite and unfriendly to visitors, but with continuous training, the sellers at the bridge gradually became friendlier and more welcoming to visitors.
Nowadays, the sellers are welcoming and can deliver better service to visitors. If the visitors are happy, they will spend more money, and this benefits the seller, of course.
(Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

Moreover, the Bangkalan Tourism Board also helped the sellers to determine the price of souvenirs. The price of the same souvenir initially differed from one stall to another. This issue was referred to as ‘the price war’, and was a cause of informal competition among the sellers, as well as a cause of confusion for the visitors. As a part of the training, the Bangkalan Tourism Board gradually educated the sellers on the importance of providing a correct and uniform price to visitors.

The decision to provide opportunities for the residents to gain economic benefits is underpinned by the view that one of the main benefits of tourism is to stimulate the economy, as evidenced in the following comments by an officer:

They [the residents] will help to maintain the attraction because it is their source of income. If many visitors come, they will benefit, if the attraction is broken then not many people come; they will lose (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

The interview revealed two important things. First, how the board officer understood that the success of tourism development depends on the support of its residents. By involving the residents in tourism planning, the officer believed that the residents would support tourism. This is mostly undertaken in the framework of tourism providing economic opportunities. Second, tourism will generate income for the residents. The words, ‘...their source of income’ indicates a strong perception that tourism is a way for the residents to improve their household income. The mindset of the government is that if the residents were given the opportunity to benefit from tourism, they would support tourism. This economically oriented mindset is stated clearly in the national and regional plans where tourism is described as improving the residents’ welfare and empowering residents through an increase in quality of life, independence and welfare. With this mandate, it is understandable that the tourism officers encourage the involvement of the residents by opening up opportunities for the residents to benefit by gaining personal income.
5.3 Tourism Planning Implementation Challenges

The interviews revealed that two political issues relating to power emerged as barriers for the implementation of tourism planning on Madura Island. These are the overlapping roles of authorities and a lack of funding.

5.3.1 Overlapping of Authorities

One of challenges indicated as a barrier to tourism planning implementation is the overlapping roles of authorities. As tourism has occupied a number of different divisions in the government administrative structure, there are various authorities responsible for managing tourism which has made coordination in the planning process extremely problematic (Hall 2008). The overlapping roles of authorities has impacted on tourism planning on Madura Island and become an issue for the tourism officers interviewed. This is most evident in relation to the BPWS but also in relation to the pokdarwis.

The role of BPWS, the formal body created by the central government responsible for managing tourism in the Suramadu (Surabaya and Madura) areas overlaps the authority of the local governments of the four regions on Madura Island. The BPWS has been marginally responsible for creating conflict with local governments in Madura and, in particular, the Bangkalan local government. The conflict arose due to the perception of BPWS as oppositional to the local autonomy policy. Not only is there an issue of overlapping authority, but confusion over the form and substance of this authority. The Bangkalan local government has full authority over tourism in Bangkalan and the overlap in authority has occurred in relation to the Suramadu Bridge area. This area has also been managed by the BPWS, which in turn indicated heavy involvement by the central government in the Bangkalan area. This situation exacerbated the overlap in authority. The BPWS maintains that their primary role is to assist in the development of the economy of Madura Island (Badan Pelaksana - Badan Pengembangan Wilayah Suramadu 2012) and to act as a mediator between the local government and the central government (“PR BPWS” 2011). However, according to the local government and activists in Madura, these roles are in opposition to the local autonomy policy for managing tourism in Bangkalan (Subairi 2009). On Antara News, Irwan Setiawan (a member of Local Representative Council (DPRD) of East Java), claimed that BPWS has not
performed positively in regard to the development of the areas around the Suramadu Bridge (Arfani 2011). In addition, another activist added that the BPWS is not an actual agency of the central government because it was formed by Presidential Decree rather than being a legislated body. He saw this aspect as the form and substance of the conflict. Clearly, there are coordination problems amongst government stakeholders which lead to difficulties in achieving common goals.

The pokdarwis in Tanjung village in Sampang Region is another case to demonstrate the issue of coordination. The pokdarwis is a community group developed by the regional government with the aim of increasing the involvement of local residents in tourism. The roles that this tourism awareness groups perform includes maintaining and promoting tourism in the local area. Within the structure of the pokdarwis, a number of issues have emerged associated with planning and the method in which the planning is implemented. The pokdarwis currently has little power compared to previous times where it maintained the attractions at the village. The loss of power eventuated because of a change of leadership in the village. When the research was conducted at Tanjung village in Sampang Region at the end of 2009, it coincided with a change in village leadership. This change of leadership has significantly affected tourism management in the village. Before discussing this change in leadership and its implications for the management of attractions in the village, the recent history and activities of the pokdarwis of Tanjung Village are described.

In Tanjung Village, there are two important tourist attractions: the grave on the eastern side of the village and the Jumiang Beach on the southern side. Both these locations are very popular among the Madurese people and have been for a long time. According to the grave officer, these two attractions are important for this village because they have strong historical significance in the development of the village. As a special group primarily established for tourism development in the local area, the pokdarwis at Tanjung Village had substantial responsibilities for the maintenance of these two attractions, and between 2007 and 2010, the pokdarwis worked hard in actively promoting these attractions. The secretary of the pokdarwis group said that the agenda of the group’s programs was not fundamentally based on physical improvement but more focused on promoting Tanjung Village attractions to visitors. Examples are a number of competitions that were regularly held at the beach, such as competitions in boat decoration, boat manufacture and walking. The walking competition commenced on the western side of the village and finished at the eastern side of the village. On the eastern side, pengajian (an activity to read the Koran) was performed to
welcome the winner of this competition. Again, this competition demonstrates how the pokdarwis and the former local village government worked to delineate between the eastern side as the place for religion and the western side as the place for recreation. Traditional walks (kirab) were another activity to promote the village. These were conducted every year and attended by the bupati (the head of region) of Pamekasan. As well as these events, the pokdarwis, along with the support of 50 young people from Tanjung Village, actively provided information to residents about tourism and how tourism was important in improving their welfare.

In 2008, a year before the pokdarwis finished its term, there was a change in village leadership (village head/kepala desa). Shortly after this change, the new village head removed the power of pokdarwis to manage attractions and, along with his staff, took responsibility for village attractions. The outcome was that the pokdarwis were left in what could be termed a power vacuum. Under this new leadership, several changes occurred in managing tourism attractions. Beach management for both the staff and the scheme was overhauled and new rules were implemented. For example, all the income raised from entry to the beach became ‘village income’ and this revenue was turned over to the village treasurer (kas desa), rather than to the pokdarwis. Even the staff who were in charge of maintaining the beach on a daily basis were replaced by new staff, under instructions from the new village regime.

The pokdarwis staff were not asked to be involved in destination management after the change in leadership, which left them feeling discouraged. This led to a lack of confidence and their ability to manage destinations was questioned. This is evident in the following comments:

"Maybe he [head of the village] thinks that what we [pokdarwis] did was far from what was expected or maybe our management was not good enough. (Kudori, 34, the Former Secretary of Pokdarwis of Tanjung Village, Pamekasan)

Confusion among the pokdarwis staff was followed by dissatisfaction with the new regime’s performance, which they monitored with suspicion.

"We haven’t seen any improvements from what they [new regime] have done so far. After they took over our position, we haven’t seen any real improvements. (Kudori, 34, the
The poor management and coordination between the pokdarwis and the new leadership resulted in the termination of promotional and other activities, such as the competitions at the village. Even though the pokdarwis staff had planned other events, such as welcoming the Islamic New Year, at the time of interview, they were uncertain whether these events would proceed. Owing to the uncertainty of the situation, it was decided to stop all promotional and other development actions for a time.

The pokdarwis maintain that they are the ones who are legally in charge of the management of the destinations. They defiantly continue their activities and have taken their plight to higher levels of government. For example, in response to there being no guardian at the beach, the head of pokdarwis has sent a request to the region government to ask for security officers (locally Satpol PP) to replace the local guardian. The pokdarwis also sent five members to join the National Pokdarwis Jamboree held by the Pamekasan Region. According to the pokdarwis staff, this demonstrates that the pokdarwis still exist, even though, at the village level, they are not acknowledged.

At the time of this research, the pokdarwis staff had adopted a ‘wait and see’ approach, but they expected that the Pamekasan Board would eventually provide a meaningful response to the problems arising from the abrupt change in management. However, because the pokdarwis are not responsible to any specific authority, the situation lacks control, resulting in a state of confusion. The case of the pokdarwis has demonstrated that coordination between tourism stakeholders is important. The lack of coordination in implementing the plan, as in this case, may cause conflicts and confusion. Indeed, coordination is important in reducing conflicts and inconsistency between tourism stakeholders’ actions that may lead to ineffective implementation of plans and resource wastage (Bridgman & Davis 2004).

In addition to the lack of coordination in tourism, the case of the pokdarwis above also suggests unequal power relationships among those involved in maintaining tourism in Tanjung Village. The new head of the village used his power to replace the pokdarwis and subsequently left the pokdarwis and former staff powerless. Moreover, the fact that the pokdarwis was created by the
local government shows the extent of the power of the head of the village. However, as suggested by Kudori above, the vague structure of the tourist body in Pamekasan (the only region with no tourism board) has resulted in confusion at the local level because there are no clear guidelines as to who the *pokdarwis* is answerable to. This situation enabled the new head of the village to replace the position of the *pokdarwis*.

### 5.3.2 Funding Issues

The interviews revealed that secure funding and investments are important. All of the officers interviewed from the four regions in this study explained that perhaps the biggest obstacle to tourism development in all of the regions is the lack of funding and investment. This is evident in the following statements:

*The main thing needed to develop destinations is the funding. If we had a lot of funding, then Bangkalan could turn into a world class attraction. We also have to acknowledge that tourism in Bangkalan has been left behind compared to other regencies because there has been no investment.* (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

*We have a lot of programs but the biggest problem is limited funding. Every year, we plan to develop many things, but due to the limitation of funds we may have to remove some of these things.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The remark from the officer of Bangkalan reveals that lack of investment appears to be another big problem and the absence of investors has been more of a problem in Bangkalan than other regencies. Difficultly in accessing transport may be one of the causes of the lack of investment for Bangkalan and for Madura in general. With the prospect of better access to Madura and Bangkalan from the opening of the bridge, the Bangkalan officer was optimistic about attracting investors in the future. The above quote shows that the officer believed that with more capital support, Bangkalan has the potential to become a world class attraction.

The issue of investment was not restricted only to Bangkalan and Sampang, the officers from Pamekasan and Sumenep also mentioned that this has become the main concern for these two
regions, as revealed in the remarks below:

Firstly, the local residents disagreed with what we were doing, and secondly, there was only a very small amount of funding. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

The problems are firstly, no investors have shown any interest, and secondly, the residents’ resistance is still an issue in our region. (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board)

The fact that Sumenep has major concerns with regard to limited funding and investment is perhaps partly caused by its location at the eastern point of Madura. ‘It is not a stopover place’, said Fathur (Sumenep Tourism Board). Thus, tourists who visit Sumenep are those who really have intentions to do so for some time. Sumenep has continued to have few visitors on an annual basis and this may be the reason behind the reluctance of investors.

The lack of capital was mentioned by all the government officials interviewed, and was identified as one of the most serious barriers faced by the regions, causing significant delays to several tourism development programs. Therefore, although the long-term plans look ideal, there are limitations in translating these plans into action and making the tourism development programs operational due to the lack of funding.

### 5.3.3 Top-down Planning

All the officers interviewed for this study claimed that compliance and consistency with the instructions of the bupati and upper level authorities such as the governor, provincial authorities or national authorities, are central in the tourism planning process.

We have to follow the direction given by East Java Government, as well as here where the decision should always be in bupati’s hand, but as I said, it should conform with the East Java Government. (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

Everything depends on the bupati. Whatever we are doing is dependent on him. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)
The remarks above indicate the top down approach that exists in tourism planning on Madura Island. It is imperative that the decisions made by tourism boards at the regional level are consistent with the policy made by the upper level, in this case, the provincial level. For example, the regional plans should comply with the plans of East Java and the East Java plans must be consistent with the Indonesian national plans. Therefore, it is logical that the officer from Bangkalan should maintain that they must comply with the instructions from the East Java Government. In addition, both of the above remarks confirm that the most important element is that the bupati is the final decision maker at the regional level. The fact that the bupati holds the highest authority of the region and is the person with the power to manage tourism at the regional level, may be the reason motivating the top down approach in the region.

The necessity of complying with the instructions of the bupati emerged strongly in the case of scheduling the dates for traditional events in the Bangkalan Region, as raised by the tourism officer from Bangkalan. A deficiency in the RIPPDA/Regional Tourism Plan, as a strategic plan, is that there are no definite completion dates for the plans. The RIPPDA documents are comprised of a general development strategy for the future development of each of the attractions in the region and an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for each of these attractions over a certain period of time (5-15 years). According to the legislation, the RIPPDA document is developed by the regional government and serves as a strategic plan to be used as a guide for future tourism development in the region. It is also important to note that the RIPPARNAS (National Tourism Plans) and the RIPP (Provincial Tourism Plan) have become a foundation for the development of the RIPPDA for each of the regencies. In other words, as stated in Chapter 1, the use of RIPPARNAS and RIPP from the higher levels of government serves as a foundation for the plans of the regional government and means that the regional plans have to be aligned with the plans of higher level governments. Thus, in the case of Madura, even though each of the regencies has the authority to develop its own tourism plans, they must be consistent with the broad framework of the tourism master plan for East Java Province (the RIPP of East Java).

According to Hall (2008), a strategic plan is considered to be the document which is the outcome of the process of strategic planning. Hall (2008) also adds that the vital outputs from a strategic planning process are: a mission statement, a vision, a series of goals, a series of objectives and a set
of targets which are usually accompanied by a statement with respect to the resources that will be required to fulfil them. In light of these ideas, the RIPPDA focuses on a broad future development strategy for attractions, but what is lacking is more measurable goals and targets. Therefore, difficulties and confusion in setting the dates occur because the operational plans are not fully developed. The strategic plans should be a guide for the operating and action plans. Thus, the operational plan should be fully developed to translate this strategic plan into practice. Inskeep (1991) argues that the planning should be prepared in sequence from the general to the specific as the general levels will provide the framework and guidance for preparing the specific plans. In addition, cohesive plans have to lay out in detail how they can be implemented in order for successful implementation to occur. In view of these arguments, it seems that there is a problem in the process of preparing the detailed operational plans for Madura which, in turn, results in confusion, especially with regard to the uncertainty in the timing of the implementation of the plans. The officers interviewed argued that operational plans should accompany the broader strategic plans.

It is apparent that difficulties and confusion frequently occurred at the production stage of the more operational plans, as was evidenced by the difficulty in setting the dates for traditional events in the Bangkalan Region. The uncertainty brought about by the sudden change of policy by the head of the region (bupati) was mentioned as the main cause of the board’s inability to supply completion dates for predetermined plans.

The exact dates are heavily dependent on the bupati for this region. For instance, sometimes, we have already set the dates and completed extensive promotions of the event, but suddenly he [bupati] wanted to change the date. We had to follow his instructions and swiftly change the date to another date, irrespective of how big the promotions were that we had already completed. It was only the Bull Race event in which he [bupati] could not change the date. (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

The indecisiveness of the actual timing of the plan appears to be attributed to the influence of the power of the local elite, the bupati. It can be interpreted from the remarks of Hari, the Bangkalan Tourism Board Officer above, that the tourism board officers seem to be rendered powerless by the fact that ‘the exact date is heavily influenced by the bupati’. The situation is such that, irrespective
of the numerous promotional efforts already put into motion by the tourism board, the bupati can change the date to one he prefers. The strength of the power held by some of the local elites, like the bupati, has seen the tourism board reduced to subordination to the bupati. However, the fact that the bupati cannot change the date of other events such as the Bull Race performances, because the dates are determined by the Governor (the head of the province), indicates the direct involvement of the provincial government in regional development. Thus, this involvement indicates that planning implementation is conducted in a top down fashion, that is, the decisions are hierarchically made by those who are in the upper levels of the government structure and passed down to those in the lower levels of government, such as from the provincial to region levels. This finding confirms the statement of Dredge and Jenkins (2007) that local governments in developing countries often do not have sufficient political power to undertake the tourism planning required by the local policy document. In addition, the data revealed that the formidable power of the bupati is undeniable and regarded by some of the residents as highly significant in determining the development of tourism in the region (this will be elaborated in Chapter 6).

Compliance with the instructions issued from the upper levels is underpinned by the lack of political power of local government to undertake tourism planning. In developed countries, local governments play an important role in tourism planning (Dredge & Jenkins 2007), such as to consult with the private sector and other relevant stakeholders to manage infrastructure, to engage communities in planning for tourism, to improve partnerships with key stakeholders, and to facilitate tourism marketing (New Zealand Government 2003).

In developing countries, the opportunities to take part in such important roles are not in the hands of local governments as they are considered lacking in sufficient political power, resources and expertise (Dredge & Jenkins 2007). As outlined in Chapter 1 of this thesis, the lack of political power is also apparent in the fact that the central government of Indonesia intervenes in some provincial and regional planning and policy documentation on behalf of the regions - by undertaking activities that focus on some of the aspects of tourism funding, developing human resources, empowering communities, and national tourism promotion. Thus, even though decentralisation has brought broader authority to local government to manage tourism in their area (see Chapter 1 for discussion of responsibilities of local government in Indonesia), in practice, the
top down planning approach is generally the case. The effect of this is that, potentially, non-participation of local people in their own affairs may occur (Tosun 2000).

5.3.4 Resident Resistance to Tourism

Resident resistance to tourism planning is viewed by the tourism officers as one of the major obstacles for tourism development on Madura Island. The Pamekasan and Sumenep tourist officers explicitly mentioned ‘…the local residents often disagreed with what we were doing…’ (Karman, Head of Section of Culture and Relations of Pamekasan Region Government) and ‘…the residents’ resistance has still been an issue in our region’ (Fathur, Secretary of Sumenep Tourism Board Officer). The Sumenep officer went so far as to say that the residents’ resistance has been a major problem for the Sumenep Region.

An example of a minor instance of resistance occurred during Madura’s promotional event, ‘Semalam di Madura’ or ‘One Night in Madura’ at the end of 2009. According to the Pamekasan tourism officer, the performances in Pamekasan were criticised by the media because they finished at 10pm rather than lasting the whole night, as suggested by the title. In response to this criticism, according to a Pamekasan tourist officer, the event should comply with the local regulation that any performances in Pamekasan should finish no later than 11pm. He also said that this event had been carefully prepared so that it would not get any complaints from the local community and its leaders:

We were extremely careful to avoid any complaints from local religious leaders. Last year, they complained to us about fireworks and firecrackers. They said it was a waste of money and they used religious scriptures to prove that it was a waste of money.

(Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

In contrast to the experience of the officers from the Pamekasan and Sumenep Regencies, according to the Bangkalan and Sampang tourism officers, the local residents of these two areas show more encouragement and are more open to tourism development. However, in remote villages of these two areas, resistance to tourism development by the residents still exists. The resistance and non-resistance of residents are evidenced in the following statements:
There is no resistance now and in fact, local communities are more open to tourists and they are showing more care towards tourists. In remote areas, however, it is still hard to get their support of tourism development. (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

Local community resistance happened only in the past but it is now at an acceptable level with very minor resistance still in existence. Local communities are much more eager to support tourism in their area with people now being very supportive. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The attitude of residents toward tourism is significant for the success of tourism development in a community (Kuvan & Akan 2005). It is of vital importance that planners recognise the impact of positive and negative attitudes of residents towards tourism (Belisle & Hoy 1980; Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2008) because this is of quintessential importance for planning and policy considerations (Ap 1992). According to the planning officers above, the residents in Bangkalan and Sampang are, in general, believed to be more supportive of tourism than they were before. The location of these two regencies, close to the bridge, may provide opportunities for the residents to access the bridge to travel to Java. As a result, they are more open towards tourism than the other two regencies. The more open or favourable the attitudes of residents towards tourism are, the better for tourism planning implementation. The statement of the Bangkalan Tourism Board officer that ‘because now the residents are more supportive towards tourism, tourism will become more developed here’ (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board) provides evidence of how the success of tourism is dependent upon the support of residents. The interpretation of this statement is that tourism will achieve success with the support of the residents, not simply that because residents are supportive, tourism will be developed.

In terms of the low level of involvement of the local residents in Pamekasan Region, the tourist officer of Pamekasan claimed that the Pamekasan Government does not always openly explain the plans to the residents.

Sometimes we play ‘hide and seek’ with residents. But you know that religion and culture are two completely different things. Religion is religion. Culture is culture. Some residents mix them up. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)
This remark represents a divergence of views between residents and the tourism officer or the government. Religion and culture is viewed by the officer as two different things, while these religious and cultural aspects are perceived by the residents as one inseparable thing. These different ways of seeing two elements ultimately results in conflict between the residents and the government, which manifests in the government deciding to take action without the approval of the residents.

In this event, resistance can eventuate in the form of a blockage in the interactions between the residents and the government. This blocked interaction is demonstrated by the fact that the government often plays ‘hide and seek’ with the residents. This can be interpreted as the government taking some action without the approval of the residents and will do so irrespective of whether the residents like it or not; they just have to ‘accept’ the decision of the government. This means that the residents have little or no control over tourism development. According to Mowforth and Munt (2009), in developing countries, the local residents indeed have little control over the ways in which the industry is developed and their views are rarely heard.

Moreover, the data revealed that problematic situations are compounded by the fact that local residents are influenced by their religious leaders who are angered by tourism, thus, tourism often lacks the support of the residents.

If we get permission to develop tourism then that is okay. The modern kyai have no problem with tourism which is in stark contrast with the traditional kyai who are deeply opposed to tourism. So it follows that if the kyai said no, then the residents will also say no to tourism. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

Normally, the central government's programs will be informed through the council and then the council will inform the residents. It is different here, in that, if the residents get an invitation from the government to attend a meeting about the programs, they will first consult their kyai as they are their religious leaders. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

The Pamekasan officer stated that the religious environment presents a strong challenge to be
overcome by the development of tourism in Pamekasan. He mentioned that some areas in Pamekasan are opposed to tourism such as Kacok Village in the Palenga’an Sub-district. He explained that the strong religious environment in this area, along with other areas in the south of Pamekasan, has challenged the development of tourism. The challenge comes from the fact that when the tourism board wants to develop an area, there is often opposition from the local residents. An example of this is the local residents asking for a swimming pool that separates the men and women. According to the officer from Pamekasan, this idea was surprisingly perpetuated by the voice of some young residents who have higher levels of education.

*Most young people with high levels of education also ask for swimming pools which separate males and females. This is weird, isn’t it?* (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

This officer interprets resistance as a product of the educational level of residents and makes an assumption about the level of education and conservative behaviours, thinking that young educated people will be more supportive and older conservative people will be less supportive of tourism. It is clear that this decision about planning is viewed from quite a discriminatory view around making an assessment of people from their levels of education. For example, judgement is made about the residents’ capacity to make an informed decision. The above remark confirms how religiously conservative Pamekasan is; even the young people want gender separate swimming.

In light of these situations, there is a prerequisite for the government to have discussions with the kyai before there is dissemination of information regarding any development programs. Officers in all four regencies mentioned that the kyai are always involved in the development process. ‘We always work in coordination with the kyai because they play a vital role in creating a more conducive environment for tourism development itself’, said the Sampang tourist officer.

The importance of approaching both the local community and its leader are revealed in the following quotes:

*We always introduce and discuss every program of development with kyai. Then we always explain that religion is religion and culture is culture. Religious values should*
not be viewed superficially. We distribute this information to pesantren (Islamic boarding school) and other local residents. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

Yes, whenever we have meeting it is a must that the head of the village and kyai are invited. So that when we have a meeting we are discussing all of the people’s suggestions. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

This case suggests the existence of kyai as the local elite within the Madurese community which empowers them to influence the tourism planning process. This scenario, which allows the kyai to be the representative of the people’s voices, is accepted by the community. However, this situation has become a significant barrier for the participation of the community. The involvement of the local leader is supported by Scott and Jafari (2010), who explain that in a strongly religious country, such as Indonesia, the voices of religious leaders are always taken into account. In Madura, the involvement of kyai is closely related with the strong philosophy that the Madura people have: Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato (meaning father, mother, guru and government) (see Chapter 1). For the purposes of this priority order, kyai, as religious leaders, are regarded by Madura residents as teachers (see Chapter 6 and 7 for discussion of the broad roles of the kyai and how Madura Island residents respect and highly value their guidance). Despite the planning process, this philosophy also influences every single aspect of life on Madura.

Interestingly, the majority of the staff indicated that the efforts and ideas of the kyai in relation to attracting tourists were sometimes in conflict with the local residents’ ideas and preferences. For example:

*It even happened in this area...A member of the local legislative board in the tourism section saw chances for this area to be developed as a tourist destination believing that the local residents would gain advantages from tourism. Unfortunately, the local religious leaders disagreed with tourism development and signed up against it, stating that it was against religion. Then people just followed them.* (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)
When we were going to develop a hotel, the leaders and local residents disagreed. I think if we talk about negative impacts, the negative things do not only happen because of the hotel. The local residents always follow what their religious leader says. (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board Officer)

When the hotel was built in 1991, there was a protest from local residents. There was a misunderstanding at the time; the local residents thought that those who stayed in the hotel were not always legal couples. The hotel, however, said that it always asked for ID cards and this request was clearly displayed for guests to see, so they knew that they would need proof of their marital status. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

Citing examples such as these indicates that tourism development on Madura Island has often been challenged by residents. Failure in communicating the residents’ preferences in relation to the plans of the local tourism board to build hotels has caused ineffective interaction between the residents and the tourism board. As a result, a protest occurred which was a response to ‘a confusion' about the intentions of the other party.

The remarks demonstrate the differing views of local residents and tourism board officers to tourism. The view of tourism board officers is mainly concerned with arrivals and tourists’ needs, rather than the residents’ needs. One of the aims of effective tourism development is to pay attention to the residents needs and not only to the needs of the tourists (Cooke 1982). In the process of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island, this aim appears to be absent. However, Cooke’s (1982) study, which was conducted in British Columbia, a province in Canada, also found that residents’ aspirations were difficult to achieve. The political nature of the planning process (Hall 2008) and a low degree of resident participation in planning seems to be the case in developing countries (Mowforth & Munt 2009).

The strong belief that certain types of tourism are viewed negatively by the residents has made the implementation of tourism programs across the island problematic. However, there is high local support for the development of any religious form of tourism such as excursions to the graves or sacred Muslim places (see Chapter 1 and 6).
5.4 Responses to Challenges

The interviews revealed that there were several efforts to address the challenges discussed above. These include reducing political and bureaucratic issues and minimising resident resistance to tourism. According to the participants, efforts in addressing political and bureaucratic issues took the form of managing tourism development myopically and prioritising development projects. Meanwhile, in order to minimise resident resistance, the officers took several courses of action such as establishing *pokdarwis*, encouraging resident initiatives in tourism, cooperating with religious leaders and creating a small group of key leaders for decision making.

5.4.1 Reducing Political and Bureaucratic Issues

*Managing Tourism Development Myopically*

With regard to the challenges of tourism planning, especially the overlapping roles in managing tourism on Madura Island, the outcomes have been interpreted and attached to the actions of the officers. In the case of Bangkalan, the officer stated that his role is only that of educating and training the sellers, thus, he refused to manage other things that he interprets as beyond his role, such as managing the location of the sellers.

*The messiness of location of stalls or walking sellers is not our business at all. It is totally the responsibility of BPWS. We are just concerned with improving the sales of the sellers and the service provided to tourists. We provide training so that visitors are happy to visit that place* (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board Officer)

The above remark shows that the overlap in authority leads to a lack of coordination in managing tourism development. One organisation can easily state that something is not their business and refer the responsibility to another organisation. This is in contrast with the coordination principle where there is mutual cooperation in order to create a good atmosphere conducive to tourist visits.

Concern only with one’s own area of authority and having a tendency to ignore the authority of other agencies also occurred in the case of managing the beach. The Sampang Tourism Officer
claims that the beach is organised by a private company, so that it is their business to manage the
beach.

_Camplong Beach is managed by a private company. So, that’s their business to look
after the beach. Not us. We receive the rental money and management of the beach is
done by that private company._ (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The view of looking after one’s own business and disregarding that of others is clearly reflected in
the remark above. The expression ‘not us’ emphasises this inward looking view. While it is true that
Camplong Beach is managed by a private company, thus, the management is done by this company,
the tourism board should also pay attention to the beach in order to ensure that the beach is
managed properly and in keeping with the aims of tourism in Sampang as a whole. This reluctance
to consider the management of the beach is compounded by also ignoring what is occurring at the
beach. For example, in regard to the messiness of sellers, the officer of Sampang claimed that
‘That’s the business of the company’. This view is blatantly contradictory with the spirit and efforts
to create and plan Sampang as a desirable destination on Madura Island. In other words, while on
the one hand, the Sampang tourism board is heavily committed in its efforts to develop tourism, on
the other hand, the efforts are not accompanied by harmonious cooperation with other agencies.
The officer seems unaware that the tendency to disregard the business of other institutions may
hinder the development of tourism in the Sampang Region.

In addition, the poor coordination seems to be exacerbated by the fact that the officer focused only
on his own job, as suggested in the remark below:

_Part of my role is focused on training the sellers in several tourist attractions. Other
stuff such as promotion is looked after by other staff. It does not really matter for me
because it is not my responsibility._ (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

While planning implementation should be focused on several aspects such as promotion and
maintaining tourist attractions (Hall 2008), those in charge of implementing planning on Madura
Island should also pay attention to these other aspects. In other words, although some aspects are
the responsibility of others, it is important for the officer to have an understanding of how other
sectors are performing as this provides a holistic view of tourism planning implementation. The partial view held by the officer, as suggested in the remark above, leads to partial actions being taken. In this regard, there is a low level of awareness by the officer that the coordination with other sections is important. The concern with one’s own business which is understood as a way of addressing the coordination challenges may, in fact, perpetuate the existence of this challenge.

**Prioritising Projects**

In an effort to deal with funding issues, the government prioritises development projects. In this prioritisation, power interests led to a divergence of ideas. The case in Sumenep illustrates such a situation.

This case involved the lack of funding raised by the officer from the Sumenep Tourism Board as affecting their promotional activities. The lack of promotional funding was caused by a conflict between the Tourism Board, the *bupati* and the DPRD (local representative board) in determining the priority of various tourist promotions. Those people who were the authority responsible for managing and monitoring funding and development at the region level appear to have been indecisive. This indecision in ranking the prioritisation of which program to implement has seen several tourism programs removed because they are not considered a priority.

*Our promotions totally depend on the support of our DPRD [local representative board]. They may or may not delete our programs. Sometimes we ask for more funds for promotion so that we can promote our region to people outside Madura, but the DPRD disagrees.* (Fathur, Sumenep Tourism Board)

Besides suggesting a funding problem, the fact that there are different ideas and priorities indicates there is a covert disregard for the aspirations of the tourism board by the *bupati* and the DPRD when proposals are cancelled or delayed. In the Sumenep case, as presented in the remark above, the programs of the tourism board designed to promote their region widely were abolished by the *bupati* and the DPRD. This occurs because the priorities of the tourism board differ from those of the *bupati* and the DPRD. Consequently, this extends the time that it takes for a project proposed by the tourism board to be approved and implemented. As a result, the promotional campaigns
suggested by the board often have to be cancelled or delayed and the board merely complies with the decision. The data revealed the problems of limited funding and the prioritisation of projects, which subsequently led to compliance on the part of the tourism board. Perfect communication between those who manage the implementation seems hard to achieve (Hogwood & Gunn 1984). The communication between the board, the bupati and the DPRD does not seem to be effective because it leaves the board powerless.

The divergence of views between the tourism board, the bupati and the DPRD culminated in projects that were unable to be implemented because the project did not serve the residents’ preferences and needs. Even though the tourism board officers said that all the plans are based on requests from the residents, it was found that some of the plans were not tenable. According to a former secretary of the pokdarwis, some of the new facilities at the beach are futile, such as the facility for taking wudhu (the activity of cleaning parts of the body before praying), and are of no use because of the presence of obstacles in accessing the water. This exemplifies how the needs of the residents are not prioritised. It is undeniable that not considering the residents’ perspective in the planning process is in complete contrast to the concept of a community planning approach In such an approach, all tourism planning is initiated from the bottom up and is thus more likely to guarantee the achievement of the goals and priorities of the residents (Hall 2008).

In the bigger picture, this case suggests there is clearly a blocked interaction between the tourism board, the DPRD, the bupati and the residents. Misunderstanding and conflict seems to occur between the various stakeholders, such as between the local government or local tourism board and residents; the local tourism board and the bupati; the bupati and the DPRD; and between the DPRD and the tourism board. As a result, there is miscommunication between the needs of the residents and what the bupati and DPRD intend to do. Thus, communication and interaction are blocked, resulting in difficulties which impede the formation of a joint action.

5.4.2 Minimising Resident Resistance to Tourism

According to the literature presented in Chapter 2, wide community support is absolutely essential for sustainable tourism development (Gursoy & Rutherford 2004; Murphy 1985; Murphy & Murphy 2004). Hall (2008) emphasises that without the support of residents, the growth of tourism
may become increasingly problematic. As informed by the national and regional tourism plans reviewed in Chapter 1, the involvement of residents in planning is recognised and should be encouraged. The East Java Tourism Plan also states explicitly that the local residents’ participation is one of the targets of tourism development. The interviews revealed that a number of efforts were made to encourage residents to support tourism planning. These included establishing the *pokdarwis*, encouraging resident initiatives in tourism planning, cooperating with religious leaders, and creating a small group of key leaders responsible for decision making.

*Establishing the Pokdarwis*

Even though the interviews revealed that there was no clear statement regarding the need to encourage resident involvement in tourism planning from tourism board officers, several efforts were made by the tourism officers to create such involvement, for example, by forming the *pokdarwis*, a tourism awareness group established in every destination by the village leader. As the secretary of the *pokdarwis* in Tanjung Village in Pamekasan mentioned, he and his *pokdarwis* have offered regular meetings with local residents discussing several tourism matters, including promoting the benefits of tourism to residents.

> *We encourage participation of local residents through pokdarwis, which are available in each of attractions. They will help us to disseminate information and to influence local residents in that area. Therefore, we always conduct regular pembinaan [training] for the head and members of pokdarwis* (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

One interpretation of the remark from the Bangkalan officer, above, is that because the *pokdarwis* is an organisation ‘from and for’ local residents’, he perceives the *pokdarwis* as an important means of facilitating the involvement of local residents in tourism. This is not only the perception of the Bangkalan officer. Officers from the other three regencies held a similar view. However, the Bangkalan officer’s remark, above, also revealed a perception that the participation they talked about is unidirectional. This is evident in words such as, ‘They will help us to disseminate...and to influence...’ In this case, the *pokdarwis* is primarily viewed as a tool for the government from which to disseminate information and influence the local residents. Referring to Pretty’s typology of participation, the word ‘influence’ used by the officer does not appear to be congruent with the idea
of self-mobilisation of participation which provides opportunities for residents to independently take initiative to secure the resources they need. Instead, it indicates an emphasis on the pokdarwis ‘only’ as a means of sharing the information with residents and as a way of ‘forcing’ the residents to accept decisions made by the government. Thus, the idea that the pokdarwis is an organisation ‘from and for’ local residents is limited in its application to implementation of what is said or decided by the government. In fact, the local residents do not have any power to exert any control over tourism development in their own area. Pretty (1995) refers to this as passive participation. The word pembinaan which means training also emphasises this passive participation or one way communication because pembinaan means a meeting to train rather than being actively involved in the discussion. The connection between pokdarwis and Pretty’s typology has also been well studied by a number of scholars (Adams 1997; Cole 2008; Erb 1998). Cole (2008) states that the aim of the pokdarwis is not to empower residents, but to gain their support for tourism. Therefore, the intention of the pokdarwis is to provide unidirectional dissemination of education from the government to the residents (Cole 2008).

The emphasis on passive participation underlying the form of the pokdarwis is obvious in the explanation of the roles of the pokdarwis below.

Pokdarwis can give information to the residents and maintain the attraction, for example, if there was any pickpocket, he would be warned by local residents in pokdarwis. So, there will not be any crimes in here. (Hari, Bangkalan Tourism Board)

As discussed earlier, the involvement of local residents in the pokdarwis, as interpreted by the Bangkalan officer, seems to be limited to technical operational objectives such as maintaining the attraction. The idea that the pokdarwis is the focal point of the tourism board may be behind this limited perception. In other words, the local residents’ ability to be involved in tourism is perceived as limited. There seems to be a commonly held view among the officers that local residents are not capable of contributing to local tourism planning beyond maintaining attractions. The ability of local residents to take initiatives and to take more control of tourism development in their area is disregarded. Local residents are viewed as an object of tourism development who need to be informed, rather than a subject who should be regarded as a part of the tourism planning process.
**Encouraging Residents’ Initiatives**

There was evidence that in some areas, residents bought into the planning goals being promoted by the tourism officers. Understandably, this pleased a number of the officers. For example, the Monkey Forest is one of the main attractions in the Sampang Region. The Sampang tourism board received a suggestion from the locals to have a fence and some canopies built around the attraction. The officer was pleased with the fact that the residents are proactive in raising ideas and informing the tourism board.

*This is really a good thing. The residents fully took the initiative to let us know their ideas or concern. We want this to be continued in the future.* (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The pleasure felt by this officer indicates the initiative is perceived as something positive that will assist the officers in managing tourism. There was appreciation on the part of the officer for what the residents had contributed so, rather than being despondent or in conflict with the residents’ action, the officer was supportive and delighted. He also expressed a desire to encourage similar actions from the residents in the future. In other words, the officer feels that it is his role to encourage these initiatives so the residents become more involved in tourism. The words that ‘we want this to be continued…’ clearly emphasises a welcoming situation where there is the intention for continued cooperation with the residents. It seems that the officer realises how important it is to cooperate with the residents and how important it is to involve the residents in tourism development.

Another example of locally defined goals was the case of the Macan Cave in Sampang Region. *Macan* Cave (Tiger Cave) is considered the newest attraction in the region, and was founded on advice provided by the local residents. At that time, the advice was received directly by the board, rather than through a consultation process. The Sampang Region tourism board officer perceived this as evidence of increased support from the residents towards tourism, as the following comments show:
Residents helped us by informing us that their area may be able to be developed as a new tourist destination. This happened in Sukodono area [the name of a sub district in Sampang] where local residents informed us about the Macan Cave. This cave was known about for long time but because we did not have enough personnel to do a survey and, at that time, local residents were not really interested in developing tourism, the cave was never managed properly. So, it is really good that local residents are now more involved in tourism. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

Now people are more supportive. They have voiced their opinion through reporting to us directly, sending letters to the newspaper, reporting to bupati [the head of the region] so, when they look at their destinations and if they know they are not good and not well maintained, they are instantly critical of us. They’re not quite the same as they used to be. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The support given by the residents in taking the initiative to inform the Sampang Tourism Board of a new attraction in the village was very much appreciated and valued by the tourism board. In this case, there appears to be convivial relations between the local residents and the government. The continuous support given to the tourism board is evidenced by the actions of the residents in that they are more critical and proactive in raising their concerns to the tourism board. According to the tourism officer, this is also an indication of an increase in a sense of belonging among the residents.

More critical participation on the part of the residents can also be interpreted as an indication they are unhappy with the existing public consultation process, because it did not really include them in the decision making process. This dissatisfaction has forced the residents to intentionally find other ways in which they can have their voice heard at a much higher level. While this chapter has focussed on contextualising the resident meanings of tourism, further discussion from the perspective of the residents’ voice will be presented in Chapter 6. However, it is important to indicate that participation has been somewhat lacking, resulting in residents becoming more active in finding alternate ways to voice their ideas concerning development. Another thing that can be learnt from the above interview is that the leaders’ voice receives a slightly higher level of credibility than the residents’ voice. This is evidenced by the process where the residents independently created a short cut and approached the tourism board directly.
Moreover, some residents are also taking the initiative in promoting the benefits of tourism. This initiative takes place in the informal village sessions, such as through informal gatherings or religious information discussions. According to one of the residents interviewed in Prenduan Village in Sumenep, the pesantren offered a once a month meeting with nearby local residents to discuss many development issues, including tourism issues. The kyai and his pesantren become mediators who gather the local villagers’ aspirations and inform the village leader. This suggests that the kyai have wide roles in the Madura community in that they can facilitate discussions between residents and the government. The roles of the kyai and the need for the government to cooperate with them will be described in the section below.

**Cooperation with Religious Leaders**

In light of the resistance of residents towards tourism and in order to facilitate the board in promoting tourism, there is a prerequisite for the government to have discussions with the kyai before there is any dissemination of information regarding development programs. Officers in all four regencies mentioned that the kyai are always involved in the development process. ‘We always work in coordination with the kyai because their involvement plays a vital role in creating a more conducive environment for tourism development itself’, said the Sampang tourist officer.

The importance of approaching both the local community and its leader is revealed in the following quotes:

> We always introduce and discuss every program of development with kyai. Then we always explain that religion is religion and culture is culture. Religious values should not be viewed superficially. We distribute this information to pesantren [Islamic boarding school] and other local residents. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

> Yes, whenever we have meeting it is a must that the head of the village and kyai are invited. So that when we have a meeting we are discussing all of the people’s suggestions. (Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)
Oh yeah, we always involve local village leaders and kyai to promote our programs including educating people about the benefits of tourism to improve their income.
(Rudi, Sampang Tourism Board)

The above remarks suggest that the kyai have wide roles in the Madura Island community and that this encourages the government to develop good relations or cooperate with them. The role of the kyai as mediator also allows the government to use the leaders to promote their programs, including disseminating information about the benefits of tourism.

This case suggests the existence of the kyai as the local elite within the Madura Island community, which gives him the power to influence the tourism planning process. This scenario, that allows the kyai to be a representative of the people’s voices, is accepted by the community but has become a significant barrier for their participation. The involvement of the local leader is supported by Scott and Jafari (2010), who explain that in a strongly religious country, such as Indonesia, the voices of religious leaders are always taken into account.

Meanwhile, while cooperation is necessary, the interviews also revealed that, according to the officers, the cooperation with religious leaders is conducted with one purpose, that is, to benefit the government. This is evidenced in the following remarks:

Cooperation with kyai is important and a thing that we always do. It should help us to disseminate our programs. If kyai agree with us, good! So, they can voice what we are after to their community. If not, we will negotiate with them first before they continue it to the community. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)

This interviewee adds,

Sometimes we found there were kyai who are very conservative, old fashioned. For these kinds of leaders, sometimes they directly say no to our program. This can be dangerous. (Karman, Pamekasan Region Government)
The remarks indicate that because the officers hope to gain advantages from the cooperation, via dissemination of information to the community, the government has to ensure that the mission works according to what they want. In other words, the cooperation should be focused on the expected result, that is, that the kyai agrees and spreads the message to their community. Different situations might occur where officers have found that the kyai has not supported their programs. Once this happens, the officers see this as dangerous and therefore conduct a meeting to discuss, negotiate and clarify the reasons behind the disagreement. In addition, even though it is not clarified directly in the remarks, the remark can be interpreted as the officers trying to avoid conflict with the kyai. It is understood that the kyai is respected within the community and this is the reason underpinning the negotiations.

The words ‘This can be dangerous’ indicate the desperation or disappointment of the officers when they cannot implement their program in the community. The trust of the residents in their leaders requires that the officer works hand in hand with the leaders. Therefore, once the leader does not align with the idea of the officer, this is perceived by the officer as something dangerous, something that challenges them. The word ‘dangerous’ can also be interpreted as the officer understanding the importance of the support of the community in tourism development, because the programs will only be successful with the support of the community. Therefore, the officers will do anything to gain support from the community. For the Madurese community, one way of doing this is to work hand in hand with religious leaders.

**Key Leaders for Decision Making**

The lack of recognition of the involvement of the residents in tourism planning is apparent by the way the leaders often arrive at decisions affecting the community with contributions from only a small group of people. While the village meeting should ideally invite all residents, it invariably invites only prominent residents such as the head of village, the head of BPD (the consultative group), the kyai, and other residents, usually men. Men are mostly invited because in Indonesia, and Madura Island is no exception, men (usually fathers) are considered the head of the family (with the exception being when there are no men within in the family). Therefore, most invitations go to the heads of families (locally Kepala keluarga/KK).
We always invite the key leaders and the heads of families. They are representatives of all residents. (Sudiro, 46, Village Leader, Prajan Village, Sampang)

The statement that ‘They are representative of all residents’ can be interpreted, according to the leader, that inviting the key leaders and the heads of families is adequate because they already represent the residents of the village. They are thus considered the spokespersons for others. The fact that only the heads of families are generally the ones who are invited to the village discussion raises the issue of marginalisation of other family members’ voices, namely, women. This was mentioned by several female respondents who were unaware of how to voice their opinion forced to be passive bystanders with their husbands’ voice being the only one heard (this will be explored further in the Chapter 6). The gender bias issue and non-representation of women’s voices in the decision making process has consequently provided different outcomes for decisions. Even though the PKK (Empowerment Family Welfare), whose members are women, exist in every village, the confusion raised by several females in this research as to where to voice their opinions, shows that there is a lack of understanding of the way they should situate themselves in the planning of tourism. In this case, the fact that the PKK sometimes were not involved in the village meetings indicates that under-representation of women’s voices exists on Madura Island.

Furthermore, the village discussion is formally attended by both the informal and formal leaders of the community, for example, the village head, the head of the dusun (rural hamlet), the head and members of the village discussion, BPD and other informal local leaders (such as the kyai and the youth leader). However, according to the findings of this study, different situations often occur. When deciding a certain matter, the village planner of Sukolilo Barat Village of Bangkalan Region explained that he normally just creates a small group, mostly consisting of himself as the planner, the head of the village and the head of the village discussion board (BPD). The planner explained that the reason for doing this is that having a lot of people means there are a lot of opinions and invariably this results in numerous conflicts and competition between the attendees of the meeting. In his experience, this conflict is exacerbated by the fact that each person has a personal vested interest, which more often than not turns the meeting into chaos. This is reflected in the quote below:
So, rather than have too many arguments and fights, it is better for me to decide with a small group. There is only me, the head of village and the head of BPD. We know and understand what is best for the residents. The residents will accept our decisions without any argument as long as they can see a benefit from them. (Rizki, 39, Member of BPD of Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)

The conflicts in meetings and the frequently swift consultation among a smaller group are of great concern. Without considering all opinions, the government (in this case, the local government) acts as if they know what is best for the people, an assumption that may be misguided. This commonly happens in Indonesia as the decision making and control remains firmly in the hands of the government representative (Erb 2000). The research of Timothy (1999) in Yogyakarta demonstrates that officials were found to be reluctant to involve the residents because they were regarded as being uneducated and thus incapable of participating in the planning process.

The above finding in Bangkalan is important as it demonstrates that the voice of the leaders sometimes silences the voice of the community residents, who are rendered powerless. The fact that only the leaders are invited to offer contributions to the discussion demonstrates that the residents’ voices are often marginalised in the planning process, which unfortunately has always been the case. People participate by being told what has been decided or has already happened, as suggested by the remark of Rizki above, indicating passive participation. Furthermore, the fact that the opinions of women are not taken into account shows the inequality inherent in the process. While the village discussion is ideally a formal way for village residents to express their ideas, this discussion does not provide room for all residents to voice their opinion and important sectors of the community are silenced. Indeed, the perception that the power of decision making is in the hands of the key leaders demonstrates the strong concentration of power in the hands of a few people, rather than all local residents.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has sought to investigate the implementation of tourism planning on Madura Island through the examination of the perspectives of tourism board officers as they performed their roles. The discussion has revealed the issues and challenges faced by tourism board officers, as well as the
efforts they make to address these challenges, which provides a comprehensive picture of the machinations of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island. The findings of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island as presented in this chapter are summarised in Table 5.1, below.

**Table 5.1 Summary of Tourism Planning Implementation on Madura Island**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Priorities</th>
<th>The Challenges</th>
<th>The Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ❖ Attracting visitors  
  • Implementing promotional strategies  
  • Promoting local culture  
| ❖ Overlapping authorities  
| ❖ Funding issues  
| ❖ Top-down planning  
| ❖ Resident resistance to tourism  
  • Complaints from local religious leaders  
  • Conservative residents due to strong religious environment  
| ❖ Reducing political and bureaucratic issues:  
  • Managing tourism development myopically  
  • Prioritising projects  
| ❖ Managing tourist attractions  
  • Improving facilities, amenities and service  
| ❖ Minimising resident resistance to tourism:  
  • Establishing the pokdarwis  
  • Encouraging residents’ initiatives  
  • Cooperation with religious leaders  
  • Key leaders for decision making  
| ❖ Promoting benefits of tourism to residents  
  • Promoting income & job generation  

The findings reveal that there are several themes that are attached to the tourism planning, such as attracting visitors, managing tourist attractions, and promoting the benefits of tourism to residents. In conducting these roles, the interviews revealed several challenges that hindered tourism planning implementation. These include political and bureaucratic issues such as overlapping of authorities, funding issues and top down planning. Furthermore, resident resistance is also interpreted by the officers as a challenge for planning implementation. There was a lack of understanding among those interviewed that they were too focussed only on their own responsibilities which had the potential to lead to a lack of coordination with other institutions. In addition, the divergence of views and political interest on the part of the actors in tourism planning resulted in the prioritisation of projects which marginalised and ignored the needs of the residents.
Moreover, the concentration of power in small elites has resulted in decision making being restricted to small groups of people, with the residents disempowered through passive participation and only being informed of what was discussed after the fact. The discussion reveals that the religious leaders (the kyai) have important roles in the community as they become a mediator between the government and the residents. The kyai can also be a spokesperson for the residents. The confusion of the local governments on Madura, in terms of how to translate the strategic plan into more operational plans, and the doubts about actual completion dates for implementing the plans, should be seen as part of the bigger picture. That is, they are the outcome of top down policy and a strong traditional view that power is concentrated in the leader. Such a situation still exists on the island and has become a barrier for the implementation of a true community approach. The government, which assumes that it knows what is best for its people, in fact, sometimes has to face the reality that the local people are in opposition to their policies. The consultation process of local planning shows that the residents actually want to be more involved in the process and want to be heard more. However, the fact that Madura people have strong religious beliefs and place a very high value on the respect given to their parents and the guru (kyai), rather than the government, has made the planning process more challenging. Consequently, in this situation, the aims of tourism planning are considerably harder to achieve.

The government also sees that encouraging resident participation in tourism planning is important. They facilitate this participation through forming and training the pokdarwis. However, the interpretations of the tourism officers show that the pokdarwis is used by the government only to facilitate one way communication, discouraging two way communications. Again, this disempowers the residents, making them passive participants because they are only informed of what has been decided, rather than actively participating in the process.

The government perceives tourism as positive because it improves household income and job generation, particularly through informal employment. This positive view encourages them to continuously disseminate information that tourism is important. Because the government sees that tourism benefits the residents, it prioritises attracting visitors, regarding them as kings and therefore treating them nicely. This is done with one aim, to please them so they are happy with their visit. The happier the visitors are the more money they will spend at the destination, providing advantages for the residents. It is also possible tourists will return if they have happy memories of
their visit to Madura. Resident resistance to tourism planning is another concern for the officers. In this regard, the officers see that minimising resident resistance is highly important. Therefore, the residents should be continuously reminded that tourism provides positive benefits.

By understanding the roles of tourism officers and how they interpret these roles, the issues, challenges and conflicts in the implementation planning process emerge. These combine to position tourism in a particular way in the eyes of residents. As is the nature of social interaction, the conduct of others will enter as an input in the creation of their own attitude (Blumer 1969), therefore, the actions of tourism board officers in communicating the participatory plans to the residents will be an input for the formation of the residents’ conduct. This chapter has provided a context for exploring residents’ perceptions towards tourism, specifically, the meanings that residents ascribe to tourism. The issues related to this development will be explored in Chapter 6.
6.1 Introduction

The previous chapter described the manifestation of tourism planning implementation on Madura Island, providing a context for this chapter. This chapter addresses research objective 2: To investigate the meanings assigned to tourism by Madura Island residents. As discussed in Chapter 2 and 3, the roles and voices of residents in the tourism development process are significant in sustainable tourism (Tosun 2001), therefore understanding their meanings of tourism is important. These meanings were captured in the empirical data drawn from in-depth interviews with 48 residents, from diverse villages in Madura Island that were purposively sampled in order to capture a spectrum of perspectives (see Appendix A for details of the residents interviewed). The key themes that emerged from the data analysis constitute the findings of this component of this thesis.

This chapter is organised into four sections, which are comprised of an exploration of the meanings of tourism in each of the four regions of Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan and Sumenep. At the beginning of each of these sections, a brief synopsis of the current state of tourism development is given to provide a background for the analysis of the meanings of tourism voiced by individual residents.
6.2 The Meanings of Tourism in Bangkalan Region

The opening of the Suramadu Bridge in Bangkalan Region in 2009 has brought significant changes to this region because it is now an important gateway to the island. The significance impact of this new mega-infrastructure is the emergence of tourism on the island, in general, and Bangkalan Region, in particular. Accordingly, several tourism plans are being implemented in Bangkalan Region, especially for the bridge area, such as the development of a rest area at the side of the bridge, which will include various tourist facilities such as a food court, cafes, souvenir stalls, a parking area, playgrounds, a mosque, the Madura Tourist Information Centre and an Islamic centre (Faz & Yop 2011).

The two villages of Bangkalan Region selected for this study, Sukolilo Barat Village and Banyuajuh Village, have experienced significant changes since the bridge opened. Planning documents from the Bangkalan Tourism Authority identify Sukolilo Barat Village as one of the areas in Bangkalan Region earmarked for tourism development. Conversely, Banyuajuh Village, located near the Kamal Harbour area, is a non-tourism planning area. Since the opening of the bridge, there has been a substantial decrease in economic activities for several business sectors in the harbour area such as small stores, supermarkets and restaurants (Joewono 2011). This has occurred because Kamal Harbour is no longer the only means of access to Madura Island. According to the Banyuajuh Village officer, there have been various effects due to the decrease in activities in Banyuajuh Village. These include less congestion on the main road that connects Banyuajuh Village to Kamal Harbour and a reduced number of street sellers in the Kamal Harbour area. These effects are primarily due to the relocation by many of the sellers to the vicinity of the bridge in Sukolilo Barat Village. Overall, as a result of these changes in Banyuajuh and Sukolilo Barat Villages, there is also corresponding and significant changes to the lives of the residents, including the meanings of tourism held by the residents.

The meanings attached to tourism by the 12 residents interviewed in Bangkalan Region are captured by the themes: positive and negative business opportunities; threat to religious and cultural values; and low involvement of local residents in tourism planning. These themes will be further explored below.
6.2.1 Business Opportunities: Gain and Loss

One of the themes to emerge in the interviews with residents in the Bangkalan Region is business opportunities. The opening of the Suramadu Bridge and the long term development plans for the villages of the Bangkalan Region have attracted people who hope to take advantage of these plans. Each of the tourism officers described the tourist activity near the bridge as busy, with food and souvenir stalls appearing on both sides of the entrance and exit gates of the bridge. There were also sellers without stalls who conducted mobile selling, by walking around and offering their merchandise to visitors.

Mustari and Nur are two female residents from the Sukolilo Barat Village who sell souvenirs from fixed street stalls near the Suramadu Bridge. The recollections of Mustari and Nur reveal that both these women were delighted by the increase in visitor arrivals to Sukolilo Barat. The joy of deriving benefits and opportunities from tourism is reflected in the recollections of these two residents with regard to their selling experiences:

\[
\text{I remember the times before I started selling souvenirs at the bridge when I was out of work, and I opened a little store in front of my house to make some money. I didn't make much money because the profits were very small and then my aunt asked me to consider selling at the bridge. She said we could make more money, which was too tempting for me to resist. At first I started selling ice then I moved on to selling pieces of traditional cloth and plenty of people followed me and did the same thing. I am happier now because I am not as poor as what I was. (Mustari, 29, Seller, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)}
\]

\[
\text{I am happy to have tourism development in here [SukoliloBarat Village] because it gave me and my mum the opportunity to open our business and make money. It is a really big relief to have a job, even though I only do it temporarily. (Nur, 21, Seller, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)}
\]

The recollections of Mustari and Nur exemplify how some of the residents in Sukolilo Barat Village have benefited economically since the bridge opened. Mustari was tempted into becoming a seller
and has eventually changed her life from that of being a housewife with a little grocery business gaining minimal returns to a souvenir seller with the potential to obtain greater earnings. Then there was Nur, who now has a steady job and who might otherwise be jobless if not for tourism. These two women clearly recognise that tourism can provide them with an opportunity to increase their income. Also embedded in their comments is evidence that such a change meant a change in the way they lived. For these women, tourism meant relief from the grip of poverty; even if it was only fleeting, as was the case for Nur. Such financial relief enabled them to experience a different life and they liked it. It is therefore not surprising that they view tourism positively.

Mustari’s story is an indication of her upward mobility, experienced as a result of her participation in informal employment, commencing with the opening of her grocery business, then progressing to a higher status job as an icy juice and souvenir seller. For Mustari, these changes in employment achieved an important aim, that is, increased income. In addition, by undergoing some changes in employment, she has actually secured a slightly higher status in the community. The improvement in status can be signified by two aspects of tourism, the first being increased income. The improvement in her household economy has allowed Mustari to better support her family, as she happily said, ‘...I am not as poor as what I was’. This is what has secured her a better status in the community, the fact that she and her family are no longer poor. Secondly, the statement by Mustari, ‘...plenty of people followed me...’ indicates that being a souvenir seller has allowed her to be a leader in her community; to be the one who had the initiative to improve her standard of living and escape poverty.

The existence of status, as a signifier of the business opportunity associated with tourism, is also revealed in the remark below.

*People here do not have any ideas to develop their business, to widen their business.*

*No one has an idea like me. While I do have a dream to open more permanent souvenir store, they don’t.* (Mustari, 29, Seller, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)

The statement ‘...no one has an idea like me’ represents several other significant points. It represents her pride in being a leader in her community. It also suggests she has an ambitious attitude, wanting to improve her business in the future by having a much better souvenir shop. Not
only is her desire for improvement interpreted by her as a more permanent building, the souvenir shop that she dreams of can be interpreted as a symbol of her wish to have a more stable business in the future, representing a safer and more secure location and source of income. Furthermore, the statement also demonstrates the strong entrepreneurial spirit of Mustari, which, by comparing herself to others, positions her as different; the only person or entrepreneur in the area who may see business opportunities. Although she did not mention to whom she was referring when she said ‘people’, it can be assumed that she meant the sellers or other residents in her community. This claim is a source of pride, such that she makes a clear delineation between herself and others, and interprets herself as a smarter entrepreneur due to her ability to see opportunities. Thus, it can be interpreted that Mustari is confident in carrying out her business and, overall, is confident about change in the future.

An outcome of this confidence is that Mustari may potentially have a better status in the community. According to Mustari, while others were satisfied with being a street seller, her dream of moving beyond what those in the local community would normally aim for, distinguishes her from others. Mustari highlights her own knowledge and abilities as the mechanism by which she will be able to take advantage of opportunities to improve her situation and, subsequently, access a better life in the future. In short, tourism for Mustari means a better life in the future.

Mustari’s dream of building a souvenir store also suggests she has a desire to move away from informal employment because it makes her feel insecure. The interview with her indicated that despite the benefits of greater income, being a souvenir seller with a temporary stall on the street has raised some feelings of concern and doubt about her business such as the theft of her goods and the uncertainty of profit. The fear of having her merchandise stolen was seemingly exacerbated by the absence of a secure storage area in which to keep her merchandise safe overnight. This situation forced her to transport her merchandise home every night and return it to the stall on a daily basis. This was not only a major source of irritation and inconvenience for her because of the packing and unpacking every day and night, but also a financial burden due to the expensive transportation costs associated with the movement of her goods.

The uncertainty of profits was another influential factor in Mustari’s dream of establishing a permanent store. This uncertainty was a direct result of the structure and location of the stall. The
observation revealed that Mustari had a simple stall (with only plastic as the roof and light wood as
buffers) and did her selling in the street (in an open space). She explained that if the weather was
inclement, she could not continue to sell as there would not be many visitors, if any, and her goods
would be damaged. However, with a permanent stall, although the weather would deter some
visitors, she may still be able to attract some visitors and also protect her merchandise. In Mustari’s
case, while tourism means economic benefits for her, the obstacles of selling souvenirs from an ill-
equipped stall are then interpreted by her as important factors, prompting her to take action. That is,
saving money in order to develop a store suitable for her to move away from informal employment.

While Mustari’s mostly positive interpretation of tourism was encouraged by an increased status,
income and influenced by her relatives, Nur’s interpretation of tourism, however, was somewhat
influenced by her mother. Nur commenced running and sustaining her mother’s stall at her request,
because her mother could no longer do so due to illness. The significant thing that caused Nur to
positively embrace tourism was not based totally on increased income, but was also developed via
obedience to her parents. The philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato (father, mother, guru and
government) amongst the Madura Island residents require that obedience be shown to parents by
children (see Chapter 1), and abiding by this philosophy is perhaps a reason why Nur felt it was her
duty to obey her parents. However, her words ‘…It is a really big relief to have a job even though I
do it only temporarily’ can be interpreted as reluctance on her part to being a seller. She is
compelled to do the job requested by her mother, however, by the Madurese philosophy of obeying
parents.

From the interview, Nur suggested that the word ‘...temporary’ for her means that her working as a
seller might merely be a stepping stone towards a better job in the future. This interpretation is
encouraged by the fact that Nur had graduated from senior high school, a level of education which
according to the interview with a village officer, is considered high among the villagers. Having a
high level of education made Nur confident that she could have a better job in the future, and not
only be a souvenir bridge seller like her mother. Another interpretation is that Nur perceived
working as a seller as not providing her with a secure income in the future because she thought the
job was only temporary (until perhaps her mother recovered from her illness). This means that
despite the business opportunities, for Nur, tourism may also be viewed conversely as income that is
insecure in the future. The fact that Nur and her friends had similar high levels of education may be
salient, because the interactions between them could have been a vital factor in her defining tourism and the work of a souvenir street seller as not offering a promising career or the guarantee of future income.

However, the high volume of residents who are enthusiastic about becoming sellers created competition to secure a location at the sides of the Suramadu Bridge. From interviews with the residents, it was found that there is an unregulated or informal agreement in place as to the location of stalls between the local residents who are interested in becoming sellers. Villages which are located in the vicinity of the bridge (such as Sukolilo Village Barat, Morkepek Village, and Pangpong Village) have set up their arrangements so that selling is conducted on a ‘first come, first served’ basis. Accordingly, those who were the first occupiers of a space or stall claimed to be ‘the owner’ of that location. Subsequent prospective sellers who intend to sell on that location are permitted to occupy that location but only after they pay rental fees to ‘the owner’. This informal competition often results in disputes between sellers:

*We used to compete for ownership of the kiosk’s location. I competed until I finally got this place. The first person occupying the location may lease it to anyone. It results in big disputes sometimes. Can you see the place over there? It is the most favoured place for selling and people have a real uphill battle to get that place.* (Mustari, 29, Seller, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)

The informal and intense competition among sellers at the bridge area is consistent with the findings of Connell and Rugendyke (2008) that competition in tourism employment is common, particularly in a situation where alternative income-earning opportunities are limited. Despite this limited access, the study of de Jonge (2000) found that competition also arises from the dominance of certain cultural groups, such as that of the migrants from Raas Island (Indonesia) who occupy the stalls at Kuta Beach in Bali. In the case of the Bangkalan Region, the dominance of cultural groups is not apparent, but the dominance of villagers from certain areas occupying certain selling locations at the bridge is evident, as with the case of competition among the sellers at the bridge mentioned above.
The case of informal competition may be a response to the dissemination of positive information about the plans and the usefulness of tourism in the alleviation of poverty, conducted by tourism board officers. These actions eventually create a positive interpretation of tourism among some of the local residents. However, once those positive impressions were formed and guided the actions of residents (in the form of becoming a seller), the government did not appear to provide a mechanism for the control or support of these actions, leaving the residents alone to deal with the situation the government had created; local residents competing with each other for a stall.

In contrast to the majority of residents who live in the vicinity of the bridge in the Sukolilo Barat Village, and who are excited by the opening of the bridge and the emergent tourism in the bridge area, the majority of residents who live in Banyuajuh Village in Bangkalan Region indicated that tourism represents a loss of business opportunities. The evidence of this change was commented on with desperation by some of the residents interviewed, who spoke of the low-levels of activity in their areas after the opening of the bridge, particularly those who are entrepreneurs near the Kamal Harbour area (the Banyuajuh road). The words of two residents who work in a travel agent in Banyuajuh Village are presented below.

This business is impacted by the Suramadu Bridge. People used to pass Kamal, now they pass Suramadu. More people are going to Surabaya. Consequently, here has become quiet. Luckily, it does not really impact my ticket sales. (Diah, 44, staff of travel agent, Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan)

Tourism in here, according to me, will have a more unclear future prospect. The business works so slowly. Because it [Bangkalan] is close to Surabaya [Java Island], that’s why the demand [Bangkalan’s customers] was quite high, but, finally, Bangkalan people will tend to choose a travel agent in Surabaya. They think it is better. (Lukman, 46, staff of travel agent, Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan)

For both Diah and Lukman, tourism means an opportunity for reaping profits from entrepreneurial endeavours. When their opportunities for gaining profits were reduced (due to the opening of the bridge), they became worried and disappointed. Because, according to them, their travel agent has become famous amongst Pamekasan and Sampang customers, Diah argues that the closing of the
Kamal Harbour would not highly impact her ticket sales. However, the statement that now a lot of people go to Surabaya implies regret that she and her business have lost opportunities to attract customers who once passed by on the Kamal main road. Moreover, her statement of ‘here has become so quiet’ might refer to the area in general and/or the travel agency itself. Even though she does not clarify what she means by ‘here’, the statement supports what she said earlier, that due to more people going to Surabaya, not so many people pass on the Kamal road anymore, therefore, the travel agency has lost many profits.

This regret is also strongly indicated in Lukman’s words. Working at the same travel agency as Diah, Lukman explicitly describes the business condition of the agency at the moment. Currently, his business growth is quite low. Although he did not provide exact data supporting this statement, his statement that, ‘the tourism business such as travel agent and hotel work so slow’, can be interpreted as referring also to the low growth of his own travel agency. This is also supported by the fact that many customers have changed to travel agents in Surabaya on Java Island. The loss of profits is exactly what Lukman discussed and complained about. Moreover, he believes that customers should not necessarily compare his travel agency with travel agencies in Surabaya as he believes that his travel agency is able to deliver good service. The questioning of the industry’s capacity has, therefore, also become an issue.

Furthermore, the fact that many people now go to Surabaya and choose to trade with a travel agency on Java Island rather than on Madura Island has been the source of some disappointment for Lukman. The idea of the Madurese people that travel booked in Surabaya is better, relates to their perception that whatever comes from Java is always better. This also relates to an esteem issue whereby people are proud of Java, while Madura is considered to be backward in comparison. Entrepreneurs like Lukman consider that stereotyping will become a barrier preventing the growth of the tourism industry in Madura. The statement that ‘tourism in here...will have...unclear prospects’ seems to suggest Lukman’s concern for the future. His statement is also interesting, because he explicitly predicts a dark future for the Kamal Harbour area, already evident in the slow growth of the tourism business.

The downturn in business can be explained by the opening of the Suramadu Bridge which resulted in Kamal Harbour losing its exclusivity as the point of access to Madura Island. Consequently, this
situation resulted in a drastic reduction in economic activity in the area of Kamal Harbour, including Banyuajuh Village. The reliance on the bridge as the access point to Madura Island is dualistic in that, in one way, it has stimulated a rise of income through the provision of informal employment, while at the same time impacting negatively on tourism in areas such as Kamal Harbour. This disparity of impact confirms Telfer and Sharpley’s (2008) claim that tourism in developing nations often faces a dilemma. On the one hand, tourism may be widely perceived by the government as a means of achieving development because it provides income and employment generation for the local residents; and on the other hand, tourism represents a loss of business opportunities. The opening of the bridge which elevated the emergence of tourism on Madura Island has demonstrated the existence of this dilemma.

The degree to which the residents assigned meaning to tourism about business opportunities appears to be affected partly by the geographical location in which the participants live; whether they live close to or far from Suramadu Bridge. For some of those who live close to the bridge, tourism means a gain in opportunities and/or profits, while for some others who live further from the bridge; tourism means loss of opportunities and/or profits.

6.2.2 Threat to Cultural and Religious Values

Another theme that emerged and moves beyond the economics of tourism is the issue of religious and cultural values. The data reveals that there is a strong fear that the emergent tourism on Madura Island may negatively impact the local traditional culture and religion, a view shared by the teachers of pesantren (Islamic boarding school). Thus, this view sits in contrast to the perspectives of entrepreneurs who perceive tourism as economically beneficial. For the teachers of the pesantrens interviewed in both Sukolilo Barat and Banyujuh Villages in Bangkalan, tourism means a threat to the religious and traditional cultural values of Madura. This fear raises many concerns such as the changing of hadrah (a traditional music) into a modern drum band which was claimed by one of the teachers as the commercialisation and destruction of the local traditional culture.

*Hadrah is now replaced by modern band. You know, this can be a signal of cultural destruction. People will forget our cultural values.* (Marhuda, 33, Teacher, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)
Even though Marhuda did not mention the process of change from traditional music to modern, and it is also not within the scope of this thesis to discuss this topic, his remark can be interpreted as change in the behaviours of the young generations who, bombarded by the influences of television and other electronic media, are imitating modern bands and no longer able to sing traditional music. This situation indeed worried Marhuda as he thought that this change may lead to the gradual disappearance of the traditional culture, as well as deterioration in the respect the younger generations had towards it.

Another practice in the commercialisation of local culture, which worries the teachers from the pesantren, is the tour packages organised by several travel agencies. These packages are often a combination of a visit to the graves with a visit to the beach.

_Tourism is an opportunity for visiting the graves and thus it should not be commercialised otherwise our religious values will gradually disappear._ (Ahmadi, 36, Head of pesantren, Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan)

In this case, it appears there are different perceptions of tourism between the entrepreneurs (discussed in the previous section) and the pesantren teachers. Tourism in the form of visiting graves is perceived by travel agents as a way to earn profits, while the teachers perceive it as a way of showing respect to the ancestors (Muslim leaders). Thus, the combined package tours of graves and beach visits organised by travel agencies were considered by the teachers as a destructive activity opposed to religious values.

Moreover, with regard to the different perceptions of the commercialisation of tours, the idea of _silahtuhrrahim_ (Muslim fraternity) is heavily entrenched in Madurese culture and underpins these perceptions. This notion has the figurative meaning of the efforts made in establishing connections with other people and also takes on the literal meaning of physically ‘visiting the graves’ as an effort to make connections with the dead. Therefore, from the teachers’ perspective, the commercialisation of religious tours is an interference with the opportunities of having a connection with others and is a sign of disrespect to ancestors.
There is currently an increase in interest in Islamic travel (Henderson 2003; Yeoman 2008), and the comment of the teacher Ahmadi, appears to be consistent with how some scholars claim Islam views tourism. Din (1989, p. 552) indicates that for a Muslim, ‘the spiritual goal is to reinforce one’s submission to the ways of God, the social goal which follows is to encourage and strengthen the bond of silaturrahim (Muslim fraternity) among the Ummah (Muslim community)’. The concept of creating a relationship with others is the one that encourages Muslims to enjoy a particular type of tourism such as ziyara (visiting shrines), which demonstrates the ‘spatially distinctive cultural traditions of Islamic populations’ (Bhardwaj 1998, p. 71). These arguments have become important reasons which underlie the responses of the teacher Ahmadi. For him, tourism means creating relationships with others. Situating this in the bigger picture, the unique way Muslims view tourism as a threat to their religious values explains the emergence of envy and suspicion towards tourism. This is especially pertinent in relation to the moral and legal status of tourism, as well as in relation to its economic and environmental impacts (Sanad et al. 2010).

The concern of the teacher regarding the commercialisation of religious tours and the commodification of Madurese culture is confirmed by the study of tourism in Toraja (Indonesia) by Crystal (1977). In his study, he found that the increasing tourism in Toraja caused the Torajan ritual to become commercialised and commodified. The doubt surrounding Toraja’s ritual which has emerged is thus, ‘Can all other aspects of the complex customs associated with funerals remain untouched?’ (Crystal 1977, p. 123). This question is indeed reflected upon by teachers in relation to their concern for the future of Madurese religious and cultural values.

Not only is it the commercialisation of tourism but also the plans of the proposed development to cater for the needs of the tourist that is perceived by the teachers interviewed as a threat to their culture. When the bridge opened, it was feared that this may stimulate the development of cafes and swimming pools which reflect values different to the values of the traditional Madurese culture. As the teacher said:

*Our culture will gradually disappear, being destroyed by the likes of hotels, cafes and swimming pools which are all very bad for our culture.* (Ahmadi, 36, Head of pesantren (Islamic boarding school), Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan)
Ahmadi’s concerns are that the arrival of visitors poses a threat to the culture and the proposed development of cafes and swimming pools are a threat to his religious values. The study of Joseph and Kavoori (2001) in Puskhar, India and Van Broeck (2001) in Pamukkale, Turkey, found that tourism is perceived as a threat to tradition and religion, even though a large segment of the population is dependent on its economic benefits. Furthermore, Ahmadi’s comment and the role of Ahmadi in the community as the Head of pesantren may relate to Henderson’s claims that Muslim social leaders and citizens are concerned that tourism will lead to drug and alcohol consumption, spread unacceptable behaviour and immodest dress, not to mention open displays of affection between males and females which is believed to lead to sexual prostitution and gambling, forbidden under Islamic law (Henderson 2003). Moreover, some participants also raised concerns about participation and having a voice and this is explored further in the next section.

6.2.3 Low Involvement of Local Residents in Tourism Planning

The interviews reveal another theme around the issue of participation in tourism planning. The remarks below suggest that, in accordance with the aim of turning the Suramadu Bridge area into a tourist destination, the government officers were perceived by some participants to be actively disseminating information to the local residents.

*Sometimes my manager and other entrepreneurs in this area are invited to the meetings by the government. I believe that perhaps one of their agenda is to discuss tourism in this area.* (Syukron, 44, Chef, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)

*After the opening of the bridge, Bangkalan is undoubtedly sought by the government as a tourist destination. Therefore, the government actively promotes the positive benefits of tourism. Yet, the government should also be able to recognise that there are a lot of people with negative perceptions of tourism. So, the government should understand their perceptions, too.* (Marhuda, 33, Teacher, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan)

In the first remark, even though Syukron was in doubt about what the meetings were for, because his manager was the only one invited, his remark indicates actions on the part of the government to promote tourism. These meetings demonstrate that there were efforts from government to involve
local entrepreneurs in the tourism development in Bangkalan. The actions to disseminate
information by the government are strengthened by the second remark. Despite suggesting the
promotion of tourism conducted by the government, Marhuda also provided a recommendation that
in order for the actions to be more successful, the government should also consider various
interpretations of tourism. Underpinning this idea is the claim that the residents’ support of tourism
development is crucial to its success.

Both of the male informants above, from Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan, indicated that the
government had actively promoted tourism. However, while the interpretation of Syukron’s remark
is that he is happy with the benefits that accrue from the promotion of tourism by the government
and that entrepreneurs are at least involved, Marhuda sees these actions as still inadequate. The
word ‘should’ from Marhuda indicates that the efforts by the government to understand the
residents’ perceptions are still rather inadequate. These different interpretations or opinions about
the government actions lead to a variety of responses. While Syukron has positive views, Marhuda
sees room for improvement.

Tourism Board Officers actively introduce new plans as well as disseminate information about the
positive impacts of tourism to local residents. The actions of the government (in this case,
Bangkalan Tourism Board Officers), as discussed in Chapter 5, are to actively prepare the sellers
from the Suramadu Bridge area to offer better service to visitors, by providing regular training and
preparing sellers and other local residents to be more friendly to visitors. Indeed, the actions of the
officers could be seen as another factor which has influenced the development of the meaning of
tourism among the residents of Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan. As the residents are bombarded
by positive information about tourism, as presented in the above excerpts, or as tourism is presented
to them by officers as something positive and economically beneficial, they may interpret and
construct meanings of tourism as something that could also be positive for them. The case of some
residents who took action by changing their livelihood to become sellers is one example of how
their positive interpretation of tourism has been subsequently reflected in their actions.

Moreover, according to the pesantren teachers and village officers from both selected villages,
problems such as informal competition between the sellers and the degradation of traditional local
culture, occur in the community because of a lack of willingness by the government to include
residents in tourism planning. One of the teachers interviewed claimed, ‘… local residents should be educated to understand what tourism development is about…’ implying that there has been a lack of will from the government to involve local residents in tourism, particularly in planning. This idea is parallel to the statements of the village officers interviewed in this study which claimed that, ‘There is still not any dissemination of information about the plans at the village level’ (Rizki, 39, Village Officer/Member of BPD, Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan) and ‘I am just a small, insignificant person’ (Sumali, 41, Village officer, Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan), indicating the powerlessness and lack of involvement of residents in tourism planning.

This lack of involvement in tourism planning limits what local residents know, but what they do know, according to Marhuda, is that tourism is the reason for the relocation of their houses or changes to the local culture. Marhuda had also experienced the trauma of having his grandparents’ graves relocated because of the Suramadu Bridge development and, according to him, ‘the action was an unreligious thing and in opposition to the local residents’ culture and tradition to go to the graves’. This has heightened his resentment towards tourism. Therefore, he has suggested that the maintenance of local culture and religious values in tourism is a must in order to win the support of the local residents.

The residents interviewed who are local entrepreneurs in Banyuajuh Village, all discussed that the strong influence of the kyai as a religious leader in Banyuajuh Village has challenged tourism. This situation creates difficulties for some of the local entrepreneurs in this village despite the fact that few economic activities now occur in the village (since the opening of the bridge):

The progress of tourism here is quite slow due to the change in situation and the strong influences of the kyai and religion which is our biggest problem. They [kyai] are worried that the arrivals will bring negative influences, but actually they [the arrivals] will not always be like that. We just follow the rules of the government policy and we have no one else to speak to about this situation. (Lukman, 46, Staff of Travel Agent, Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan)

The remark of Lukman above shows how local entrepreneurs are challenged by the influence of the kyai in Banyuajuh Village in Bangkalan. On the one hand, they want to gain profits and on the other
hand, their efforts are challenged by the resistance of some local residents who see tourism as a threat rather than an opportunity. Unfortunately, according to Lukman, the government seems to do nothing and there is no forum for local business people such as him to voice their dissatisfaction. He is asking for help on this issue and demanding a greater level of discussion in relation to the emerging tourism process.

The influence of kyai upon the residents in this study has illustrated the point discussed in the literature, and in Chapter 5 of this thesis, that there are small groups of powerful elites in the local community that tend to rule the community (Mowforth & Munt 2009; Seckelmann 2002; Tosun 2002). The distribution of power within the local community is important in gaining an understanding of the community dynamics and the potential impacts of tourism development (Mowforth & Munt 2009). In this case, recognising the existence of the kyai and other powerful elites within the Madura community is essential to understanding the issues and challenges of tourism development on the island. In addition, the disparity of power is important in terms of the influence on the meanings of tourism development adopted by local residents.

This exploration of the complex meanings of tourism for the participants in the Bangkalan Region, after the development of new infrastructure in the form of the bridge, has uncovered a dilemma. As a consequence of this new tourism development, there has been a rise in informal employment opportunities, especially for local women, on the one hand and the loss of opportunities and a fear of negative impacts on local traditions and religious values on the other hand. Frequently, there is competition for jobs both between locals themselves, as well as between locals and non-locals. Informal employment may also be dominated by outsiders due to a perceived lack of skills on the part of local residents, which can mean they are only able to gain tentative employment. In this situation, the role of the government in improving the skills and knowledge of tourism is essential if local residents are to participate better in tourism development. Moreover, given that in Madura in general and in Bangkalan specifically, the majority of the population is Islamic, it must be accepted and understood that Islamic values will thus impact on the way of life of residents. Therefore, they are bound to Islamic rule, and obedience to kyai as the religious leader, which causes some residents to perceive tourism as a threat to their religion and traditions.
6.3 The Meanings of Tourism in the Sampang Region

Natural attractions, such as beaches, caves and waterfalls, as well as traditional ceremonies and graves, have been regarded as the major pull factors to the Sampang Region. However, visits to this region by both international and domestic tourists have always been low. According to the Sampang Tourism Plan (RIPPDA Sampang) (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah Kabupaten Sampang 2005), the low number of visits to this region can be explained by several problems such as poor physical facilities, poor access to tourist attractions and lack of promotional campaigns.

The two villages in Sampang Region selected for this study are Taddan and Prajan Villages. Taddan Village is located on Camplong Beach. As this beach is one of the most popular tourist attractions in Sampang Region, Taddan Village is the area earmarked for tourism development. Prajan Village is located closed to Taddan Village, however, as there are no tourist attractions in the village, Prajan Village is regarded as a non-tourism planning area. It is a village with many pesantren, and therefore famous as a Desa Santri (Santri Village).

Similar to the Bangkalan Region discussed above, the themes that emerged from the interviews with the 12 residents in the Sampang Region were around the issue of business opportunities, threats to cultural and religious values and low involvement of local residents in tourism planning. These themes will be further explored below.

6.3.1 Business Opportunities

It is not only the majority of residents interviewed in the villages of the Bangkalan Region who see tourism as bringing business opportunities. Pleased by the growth of tourism in the Camplong Beach area of Sampang, the overwhelming majority of Sampang residents interviewed are delighted with the prospect of tourism. This is evident in frequently used expressions such as ‘happy’, ‘good’, ‘delight’, and ‘pleased’. Some others used indirect expressions such as ‘so blessed’ and ‘Thanks God’, which also imply they are grateful for the emergence of tourism in their area.

The data reveals that the positive interpretations of tourism came mostly from entrepreneurs and were primarily driven by their belief that they would gain profits from tourism. Some sellers saw
tourism as an opportunity to have their merchandise sell quickly, whereas others such as hotel managers, restaurant or billiard center owners, perceived tourism as an opportunity to have more customers visit their establishments. These findings indicate that tourism is primarily seen by the majority of participants as a way of income generation. Underlying this income generation view is various meanings that each interviewee had towards tourism. For some, more income simply means poverty alleviation, whereas for others, it may mean increased recognition or status in the community.

Tourism has encouraged some of the residents interviewed to change their livelihood and become involved in tourism as sellers or entrepreneurs. Hamid, for example, opened a Javanese restaurant at the gate to Camplong Beach in 2009. At first, he did not think of opening a restaurant but was influenced by the increase in visitors, particularly from Java. This increased his motivation to run a business. The growing Javanese market has become his main reason for opening a Javanese restaurant. Furthermore, according to him, his decision to open the business has changed his life. Prior to opening his business he worked as a teacher but now considers his primary occupation to be entrepreneur and teaching his secondary job.

*I am actually a teacher by profession but now I just think of being a teacher as a safety net occupation. There is more growth of tourism here in Camplong Beach.* (Hamid, 22, Restaurant Entrepreneur, Taddan Village, Sampang)

Hamid’s decision to change his livelihood was influenced by his status as an *honorer* teacher (temporary teacher). His salary was relatively small compared to that of permanent teachers, prompting him to find an occupation with a higher income and greater job security. His statement that ‘...*now I depend on my business*…’ indicates he is confident that tourism will be able to provide him with a more reliable source of income. Besides, this observation reveals that Hamid’s restaurant is quite large and successful and represents the considerable capital that Hamid invested to run the business. Thus, in the case of Hamid, the issue of changing his livelihood is not as much about poverty alleviation as it is about an increased and safer income.

Job provision in the sense of having a much clearer job status is also an important factor in the development of Hamid’s perception of tourism. In addition to a relatively low salary, most
temporary teachers do not have full rights and responsibilities for teaching. By changing his livelihood to restaurant entrepreneur, Hamid has a much clearer status in his career. This may bring him a more secure status in the community in general and in his family in particular, proving that he can handle the responsibility of running the business. This, however, is not the case for all residents in Sampang.

Some residents indicated that their interest in tourism is purely profit oriented, as shown in the rather callous response of a hotel manager to drowning incidents at the swimming pool.

As far as I’m concerned, if you have a swimming pool it is normal that sooner or later someone will drown and the same goes for if you are around a fire you will get burnt. It is still hard for the Sampang people to accept the existence of a swimming pool.

(Rahmad, 41, Hotel Manager, Taddan Village, Sampang)

The statement of Rahmad that it is normal for someone to die in a pool is evidence of his extreme view of profits as the one and only thing that concerns him in tourism. The statement ‘…It is still hard for the Sampang people to accept the existence of a swimming pool’ indicates that in his opinion, there is a difference in the views of tourism between the manager (the entrepreneur) and the rest of the Sampang residents. A swimming pool is regarded by Muslims (Sampang residents are mostly Muslim) as something which is not acceptable to their religious values (because it may allow men and women to swim together). According to the hotel manager, the swimming pool represents ‘a necessary facility of the hotel’. The different perceptions of the swimming pool and tourism have influenced the different reactions of the residents and the manager. While the manager prioritises the interests of the tourists or customers, the local residents insist that the hotel close its swimming pool. As a result, conflict between the hotel manager and the local residents was unavoidable. These different perceptions have remained and for some of the locals interviewed, hotel facilities such as a swimming pool and karaoke are regarded as a threat to their religious values.

The way the hotel manager views tourism is also influenced by his role. He is bound by the requirements of his role. For example, he has to be able to attract a lot of customers, making more profits for the hotel and making his hotel the best in the region. With these responsibilities, it is
therefore unsurprising that he puts profits first; the profits that promote his reputation (as a successful manager) and the hotel name. Indeed, his role as a hotel manager motivates him to support tourism and believe that it can provide what he and his hotel are trying to achieve. This role has undoubtedly influenced his positive and profit oriented view of tourism.

Moreover, in the plan to build a souvenir market at Camplong Beach, the central government (in cooperation with the Surabaya Inn Company, the company which manages the beach) will provide sellers with a permanent stall for which they have to pay rental fees. According to the hotel manager, goods for sale have to be of high quality or leading products (*produk unggulan*). Many of the sellers were concerned by these two conditions. Describing herself as a seller with a low volume of sales, Rumi thinks that these new stalls will eliminate her chance of having any access to sell at the beach. Her initial impetus for selling at Camplong Beach was because there was no fee to pay:

*I know there will be stores with their development still in progress. I don’t know how much the rental fees are going to be but I believe they will be expensive. If not many tourists buy my fruit, then how do I pay the rental fees?* (Rumi, 50, Seller, Taddan Village, Sampang)

As well as being troubled about the fees, Rumi is also worried about the goods that she sells. Since she only sells fruit, she is not sure whether her fruit will be allocated a new stall in the souvenir market. The worry and confusion are apparent in her response ‘*I don’t know*’, when she was asked about her future business and stall development. Indeed, the plans of the government for the new market are somewhat confusing and have created uncertainty amongst the sellers, indicating the lack of consultation and communication with residents.

The above data indicates a major dilemma for those involved in tourism. With tourism perceived as a way of increasing income and business opportunities, any changes will be viewed as a threat. As in the case of Rumi above, the plan obviously represents a threat to her business opportunities. There are transparent discrepancies in the goals of the government and those of local residents. These discrepancies are dualistic in that the management thinks the stalls will solve the beach sellers’ management problems but, on the other hand, the local sellers think the stalls will not be the best solution for them. From a symbolic interactionist perspective, this miscommunication will
create confusion or even a block in the interaction (Blumer 1969). In this case, a block in interaction between residents and the government could create the possibility of conflict, that is on the one hand, tourism is perceived as a positive means for development, while on the other hand, tourism may impact negatively on the local residents.

Tourism is interpreted by Rumi as bringing a sense of powerlessness. The blurriness of her future prospects of selling undoubtedly represents this powerlessness. This confusion relates to Rumi’s situation of wanting to have the opportunity to sell at the beach as she had before, but the actions of the beach management and the government who selected and relocated the sellers took her opportunity to sell or to gain benefits from tourism away from her. The confusion and questioning of the government actions represents how she feels towards those in power after struggling for herself, creating her business opportunities, which unfortunately just ended with ignorance and loss on her side.

Clearly, while tourism is promoted by the government officers and the industry as something positive, it also creates ambiguity in the form of competition and the criteria for selling in a new location. The plan of the government to relocate the sellers in a specific location has actually created confusion among them. The fees, unsold items and the capacity to occupy a stall are some of the concerns created amongst the sellers. In the context of developing the meanings of tourism, the actions of others (in this case, the government), has been interpreted by sellers as being something that is confusing. At the beginning of tourism development, the government encouraged and fully supported the residents’ involvement in tourism, and then without notification, the government actively discouraged the process and, as some sellers have said, ‘only those who have money can pay for the stall’. Thus, in this case, there is an inconsistency in the government’s actions which has created confusion for the local residents.

For these residents, tourism means having an income, which conflicts with the government or industry perceptions of tourism, as providing the most effective location for selling to the tourists. Apart from the government’s aim of regulating or controlling tourism enterprises, the plan to relocate sellers to a special location, which is accompanied by certain criteria, has disheartened some residents. The government has prioritised the interests of the tourists at the expense of the residents. The irony is that the government has tried to define tourism as positive and promote it in
this way to the residents, but at the same time has ignored and excluded the interests of the residents. Residents interviewed, who have developed their interpretation of tourism as a source of income generation, have concluded that the government is ignoring them.

The residents living in the Camplong Beach area at Taddan Village in the Sampang Region have developed their interpretation of tourism from the other residents, government officers and their interactions with the hotel staff. An interview with a hotel manager revealed that the interactions between residents and hotel staff have developed around the issue that tourism brings positive impacts to the area in the form of income generation. In particular, the issue of tourism is viewed as a way of promoting income and providing comfort for the visitors to the beach and the hotel guests.

In contrast to the meanings assigned to tourism by residents of the Bangkalan Region, where the business opportunities theme was dominated by entrepreneurships and profits to alleviate poverty and family security, in the Sampang Region, it was found that there was concern from business entrepreneurs that tourism largely means attracting more visitors and making efforts to please them.

6.3.2 Threat to Cultural and Religious Values

Another theme that emerged was around religion and culture. The negative interpretations of tourism arose in the interviews primarily from those who have roles as teachers in the pesantren. Kahar, for example, claimed outright that tourism always symbolises undesirable things. As he said:

"Tourism is filled with negative things such as karaoke, hotels, night clubs, drunks, isn’t it?" (Kahar, 40, Teacher, Taddan Village, Sampang)

Not only did the Taddan Village residents interviewed develop fears about the impacts of tourism, the fears also spread to those who live far from the beach (such as those interviewed from Prajan Village). Their responses are as follows:

"I don’t like the karaoke at the hotel. It is quite a nuisance. It is also a bad influence on the younger generation and does not fit in with our cultural and religious values." (Sudiro, 46, Village Officer, Prajan Village, Sampang)
I have no trouble with the hotel but I know that sometimes men and women who are not married take a room together at the hotel. There are no procedures in place to check on this activity. (Muhni, 45, Housewife, Prajan Village, Sampang)

The beach is a centre for prostitution and I know that they keep it well hidden. (Edo, 23, Billiard Entrepreneur, Prajan Village, Sampang)

Although, geographically, Prajan Village is far from the beach, the remarks above indicate that some interviewees who lived in this village have also developed fears about the potential impacts of tourism. This may be encouraged by the fact that some residents in this village are experiencing the impacts of tourism on a first hand basis, such as the nuisance caused by karaoke at the hotel or prostitution at the beach. Hamidi’s statement, however, of his feelings of the fear of tourism related to night clubs and naked people at the beach gets its substance from the fear itself and not as a fact, given that the observation of naked people at the beach has never been substantiated. In Hamidi’s case, it is clear that his worries about the future potential impacts of tourism are so strong that it stimulates his fear of tourism, which in turn leads to his negative interpretation of tourism. As well as being fearful, the remark of Hamidi indicates that there seems to be a negative stereotype about tourism and tourists in which they are associated with bad or immoral things. This stereotype influences the way he sees tourism, and justifies his action in opposing tourism. Even though the remark does not clearly show his opposition, the statement, ‘…it doesn’t fit in with what I believe’ can be interpreted as his resistance towards tourism. In addition, this statement suggests that there is a clash of value sets between what he believes and tourism. But, again, this clash is caused by the strong negative stereotype about tourism, which subsequently creates fear about tourism itself.

The statement of Muhni above that ‘…There are no procedures in place …’ indicates that she is questioning the intention and capability of the government and hotel management to be able to control and regulate the hotel sector, based on her values. Muhni observed that there is little control when a man and woman check in together at the hotel. As someone who has strong religious values, she sees no requirement to produce proof of marriage as deterioration in values brought about by tourism. Other residents interviewed also mentioned the same issue. This means that locals find it is hard to reconcile tourism with their values as there are certain things that tourism does not do that their values require. Selecting the guests is one of these criteria mentioned by some participants.
Hamidi and Muhni are husband and wife. They have grown up and lived with strong religious values. Hamidi has been working in Malaysia and Saudi Arabia before recently returning to his village. This experience of living in Islamic countries has made him hold strongly to his religious values. He views everything that is different to what he values as a threat to his religious values. Therefore, the fear of tourism, similar to that of Hamid presented above, is driven by the strong affirmation of religious values. The interaction between husband and wife in developing the same meaning of tourism strengthens these negative views of tourism.

The fact that some residents may feel disturbed with the activities associated with the beach and the hotel suggests several aspects of tourism they find disturbing. These concerns are not fully addressed by the government and those who fulfil the roles of managing the tourism sectors. In order to cater for the visitors or guests, the residents’ preferences, needs and cultural values are largely ignored. This indicates that economically oriented matters have priority above everything else.

The discussion of the Camplong Beach development above also demonstrates that both the sellers and the hotel management have similar perceptions of tourism. They both see tourism as a way to improve their income, in this case, for the region in general and the hotel company. The high concentration of focus on profits and the importance for the government and hotel management for visitors to come to Madura contribute to their ignoring everything else including the livelihoods of local sellers, who are also highly dependent on tourism. As a place with strong religious and cultural traditions, this lack of regard causes some concern for the residents of Madura Island and has the potential to lead to problems for tourism in the future.

One villager was dismayed by some of the actions taken by the government which he believes have weakened his culture. In this case, he mentioned the Kacong-Jebbing (tourism ambassador for promoting the regions of Madura) competitions. According to him, the tourist ambassador candidates should have a high level of knowledge of the culture in Madura, but this does not happen. The following remarks indicate his disappointment with the omission of cultural knowledge as one of the criteria in the competition.
What is happening now is the gradual disappearance of the Madurese culture with the Kacong-Jebbing competition being a classic example of this. The competitors and the judges do not have even a small amount of understanding about the Madurese culture as well as failing to speak the Madurese language. (Arif, 30, Teacher, Prajan Village, Sampang)

In relation to concerns about the lack of attention to the cultural knowledge of these candidates, Arif explained the situation as an outcome of the lack of attention paid by the government to the rejuvenation of Madurese culture through the tourism agenda, and no clear dissemination of Madurese culture to the local residents. Due to these two factors, there was concern that the younger generation may not be able to speak the traditional language and may lack cultural knowledge as evidenced at the Kacong-Jebbing competition.

Moreover, according to Kahar, the negative actions occurring at the beach (karaoke, drinking, unmarried people staying together) as described above, are all happening because the government does not have a clear vision of tourism development in Sampang. One example of these vague government visions, discussed by Kahar, is the plan to build a souvenir market at the beach. As he said:

*The plan to build a souvenir market just does not make any sense. I cannot understand why they would build a souvenir market here because there only a few traditional workers here. Take batik as an example, there are probably only two villages that have batik workers. The government needs to understand that they have to make the traditional centre stronger in the first place and then find the market.* (Kahar, 40, Teacher, Taddan Village, Sampang)

In regard to this situation, Kahar claims that profits transcend everything else. He claimed that ‘the government only thinks about profits and not the impacts to the local community’. This condition undoubtedly shows the different perceptions of tourism on the part of the government and the locals, in that what is good for the government is not always good in the residents’ eyes. The government plans tend to create confusion and dishearten the sellers, and also create another conflict with the teachers of pesantren in the village. The role of teacher, part of which is to protect
the local community, appears to contradict the actions of the government. Kahar challenges the
government idea to plan a souvenir market because, according to him, there are not many people
making souvenirs in the village. In other words, he emphasised that the government should pay
attention to what skills the locals have and need, and start to develop the potential that the locals
have, rather than developing other resources that the villagers do not have an interest in. Again, the
unclear vision and unclear idea of what the residents actually have or want underpin these ideas.
Another contributing factor that might compound this confusion, as suggested by Kahar, is the
reluctance of the government to include local residents in planning. This theme will be explored in
the next section.

6.3.3 Low Involvement of Local Residents in Tourism Planning

Despite business opportunities and the threat to religious and cultural values, low involvement of
local residents in tourism planning is another important theme. Kahar mentioned clearly that there is
reluctance from the government to include residents. In regard to this reluctance, he knows that:

_It is actually unnecessary for the government to consider the residents’ voice in
planning. The government does not care for people’s aspirations and participation and
I have gotten used to it and that’s the way it is._ (Kahar, 40, Teacher, Taddan Village,
Sampang)

This remark by Kahar, suggests that the marginalisation of the residents’ voices in tourism
development originates from the government. In addition, the statement, ‘_I have gotten used to it and
that’s the way it is_’ has its origin in a time when Kahar used to hold the position of legislative
member. In this role, he understood how the government often made decisions without considering
the local residents. The statement of ‘_that’s the way it is_’ strengthens the fact that ignoring the
residents’ voices are considered a routine activity of the government. However, he is also aware that
he currently has no power. Kahar has indicated he capitulated to the situation because he felt that
whether he was happy or dissatisfied with the tourism in his village would not influence the
government at all. He believes that the government will only ignore his voice and those of other
local residents.
Compounding the continuing loss of the Madurese culture is the fact that, according to Arif, the government itself lacks an understanding of the local culture. He maintains that this has happened as a consequence of the lack of opportunities for residents to voice their opinions on matters relating to their culture. Therefore, according to Arif, the government is not clear on what the actual culture of Madura is as well as the cultural problems that arise within the community as a consequence of the emergence of tourism. In this case, Arif provides some explanation as to why it is that some residents disagree with the development of tourism. The first reason is that the voices of residents are not heard and thus the government does not know what their aspirations are. The second reason is that local residents are not actively involved in the process of tourism development. Local residents have to be included in the development process and allotted responsibility in the maintenance and stewardship of their area. In doing so, the local residents will have a greater sense of belonging and commitment, because they will no longer be a silent majority and will be a part of retaining their culture.

*Local residents have to be included in the process of tourism because if they are not they will not support tourism. Give them responsibility and listen to their voices. If the government ignores the voices of the residents how can they possibly understand what they want?* (Arif, 30, Teacher, Prajan Village, Sampang)

While there are techniques that the government can implement to allow the residents to voice their opinion, Arif commented that the dialogue between residents and the government lacked substance and was mainly invoked to satisfy the compliance required of formal procedures with no real intent of taking account of resident perspectives. Therefore, the powerless residents are, as Arif indicated, nothing but mere passengers in tourism development. Again, in Arif’s view, there are two key concepts and these are the level of involvement of local residents in tourism development and the understanding of their aspirations by the government.

Some participants were concerned with their lack of involvement in tourism planning and this was evident in the frequently used expression that the aspiration of locals is ‘just a routine agenda’, ‘aspirations are just being collected with no further actions’, ‘finished meeting, that’s it’. These expressions indicate the tiredness or perhaps desperation of the local community towards what they consider as an approach or ploy often used by the government. In this regard, the government seems
to apply passive participation, in which the residents are only told the outcomes. This finally raised concern and critical consideration amongst some of the locals, who questioned their opportunities to have a voice in tourism planning. Little opportunity to have their voice heard and be involved has strengthened motivation for greater mobilisation in participation. Indeed, a strong sense emerged in this study that the residents want to be heard and involved in tourism planning.

The meanings assigned to tourism by the residents interviewed in the Sampang Region, similar to the case of those in the Bangkalan Region, were that some individuals perceive tourism as economically beneficial for them, especially those who supply goods and services to tourists, such as the hotel manager. For others, however, tourism may be seen as a threat to their opportunities for economic benefits. This is revealed in the situation where the government plans to relocate the sellers at Camplong Beach which caused confusion and concern among the sellers. In this case, it is apparent that the government has given little attention to the needs of local residents and as a result such plans threaten some residents. One resident saw this as the result of a lack of understanding by the government of the residents’ needs, a product of the continuous exclusion of residents in the planning process. While the plan should be beneficial for residents, blocked interaction will result in plans which are potentially negative for the residents and which may impact negatively on the success of tourism development in the long term.
6.4 The Meanings of Tourism in the Pamekasan Region

Pamekasan Region is located between Sampang Region to the South and Sumenep Region to the East. It is famous for its motto, ‘Gerbang Salam’ (*Gerakan Pembangunan Masyarakat Islam*/The Development Movement of Islamic Society), a motto that encapsulates the religious attitude and high morality of the residents. This motto is reflected in the region’s vision which is ‘the development of Pamekasan to be religious, peaceful, advanced, independent, and fair towards the preference of God Almighty’ (Kabupaten Pamekasan 2012). The motto as well as the vision of the region has shown that Pamekasan Region strongly embraces the values of Islam.

The two villages of Pamekasan Region selected for this study are Tanjung and Kacok Villages. Tanjung Village is located on Jumiang Beach. The grave of *Adhirasa* (a Muslim/Madurese leader) is also located in this village. With two attractions in this village, the beach on the south and the grave on the east, Tanjung Village is earmarked for tourism development. Conversely, there is no tourist attraction in Kacok Village and it is therefore considered a non-tourism planning area. Based on the interviews with the tourism officer of Sampang Region, Kacok Village is regarded as one of the areas in Pamekasan that is opposed to tourism development.

In the interviews with the 12 residents in the Pamekasan Region, only two themes emerged: business opportunities and the threat to culture and religion. These themes will be discussed below.

6.4.1 Business Opportunities

The findings in the Pamekasan Region had some commonalities with the two previously reported regions. It was found that income and employment generation are the signifiers of the meanings that some residents attach to tourism. For two fishermen and a student who are directly involved in tourism at the beach, tourism means poverty alleviation. The two fishermen from Tanjung Village, Mahdi and Ali, leased their boats out to tourists. The arrival of these visitors gave them an opportunity to raise additional income for their family. The statement of Ali, ‘I am happier with the more visitors here’ indicates the delight of the fishermen. As their income from fishing is decreasing, they are pleased to be able to earn extra money from tourism.
Moreover, for Kudori, as a former secretary of the pokdarwis (Tourism Awareness Group) of Tanjung Village, he recognised that tourism is a means of earning income and generating employment, and attempts to convince the residents of the benefits to be gained from tourism. In this role, he and his former organisation were in charge of externally promoting the attractions available in the village. He was also responsible for various other aspects of tourism training. These included providing information or educating local residents on the importance of tourism, how they should behave toward visitors, or how to create a good environment for visitors, or how the local people benefit economically from tourism (see Chapter 5 for the range of activities conducted by pokdarwis).

The dissemination of information regarding the positive impacts of tourism on the residents, according to Kudori, was sometimes challenged by the residents. Some people disagree and are worried about tourism development in their village. Kudori, however, believes that this is due to the strong sense of belonging to their village that the people embrace. Interactions with these kinds of residents involve giving continual support and explanations by the pokdarwis. This is necessary in order to reassure residents and increase their awareness of the positive benefits of tourism.

*Of course you are going to find some that disagree with tourism but this is understandable because of the high sense of belonging to their village. In the beginning people always have a negative reaction to tourism. It is my duty to convince the local residents that they can benefit from tourism and prove to them that tourism can economically improve their way of life.* (Kudori, 34, the Former Secretary of Pokdarwis of Tanjung Village/Teacher, Pamekasan)

In response to the continuous dissemination of the economic benefits associated with tourism conducted by Kudori and pokdarwis, some of the residents developed a positive attitude towards tourism, while others did not. Ros was identified as one of the two residents of Tanjung Village who is not interested in participating in tourism. Recognising that tourism in Tanjung Village is emerging, but still at the point of infancy with very few visitors arriving at the village, Ros was not interested in actively participating. As she said:
Tourism here is still at its early stage with not many visitor arrivals here. So, why should I depend on this [tourism]? I am better off by continuing to work in a fish factory, I think [it is] a more secure form of income. (Ros, 37, Employee, Tanjung Village, Pamekasan)

The role of Ros as wife and the main breadwinner in the family (due to her husband’s illness) has encouraged her to keep her secure factory job rather than pursue opportunities in tourism. Thus, it is worth noting that in Tanjung Village, Pamekasan, some residents are actively promoting tourism in their area because they perceive that tourism will bring benefits to them, while others prefer not to be involved.

6.4.2 Threat to Cultural and Religious Values

Concern about the threat to culture and religion caused by tourism also emerged as a reoccurring theme for some participants in this region. Similar to what was found in Bangkalan, visiting graves was also mentioned by a resident interviewed in Pamekasan. The clear separation in the planning of tourism in Tanjung Village, Pamekasan, influences resident perceptions of tourism. The east side of the village has been allocated graves as their cultural attraction, whereas the south side of the village has the beach culture. As a consequence, it was found that some residents from the south side see tourism for its economic benefits, while one resident living on the east side viewed tourism as a religious opportunity. With his role as a grave officer, Joko indicated that tourism was regarded as visiting the graves, which, according to him, was a way to connect with other people, including those who have passed away.

In my opinion, tourism should be visiting the grave. They are still alive, you know.

(Joko, 70, a Grave Officer, Tanjung Village, Pamekasan)

The statement of Joko above is indeed similar to the idea of Ahmadi from Bangkalan, that Islam prefers a particular type of travel which has retained a significant religious and social function such as building a connection with people (friends and relatives) and visiting various graves (ziyara) (Henderson 2003). According to Bhardwaj (1998, p. 71), these visits characterise ‘the spatially distinctive cultural traditions of Islamic populations’. In the case of Joko, the strong view that the
dead are considered to still be alive and the entrenched idea of silahtuhrahim have motivated his personal perception of tourism, that of visiting a grave as a way of maintaining the culture. For Ahmadi, the teacher from Bangkalan, the development of the meaning of tourism is encouraged by the commercialisation of the travel agency to facilitate these visits. From the perspective of Joko, his view of tourism is driven by his role as a grave officer, which has a more religio-cultural emphasis/significance, entailing respect of the dead.

Similar to the findings of the first two regions discussed, the data reveals that some of the residents interviewed in Pamekasan also held the idea that tourism is a threat to their religious values. The difference between what was found in Pamekasan and other regions, however, is that while the idea that tourism is a threat to religious values in other regions is held by some residents in both planned and unplanned tourism areas, in the Pamekasan Region, this meaning is held only by participants who live in unplanned tourism areas. In addition, while in the other regions only a small number of people interviewed developed this meaning, in Kacok Village, it was found that all of the residents interviewed had developed a negative meaning of tourism.

This similar way of seeing tourism is fortified by the strong religious values existing in Kacok Village. As explained by Sohadi, one of the residents of Kacok Village and a village officer, the religious values in this village are very strong because there are many Islamic boarding schools (pesantren) of varying sizes operating in the village. Moreover, the strong traditional and religious influences in Kacok Village are well known, because the village has been identified by the local government as one of the unsupported tourism areas in Pamekasan (as revealed by the interview with Pamekasan Local Government Officer, outlined in Chapter 5). The religious situation in Kacok Village plays a significant role in creating an environment which eventually shapes the way people think about tourism. The stories of Nurul and Kamali, two teachers in Kacok Village, show how their religious environment shapes what tourism mean to them, and are discussed below.

Nurul and Kamali are residents of Kacok Village who for years have dedicated their lives to being teachers in one of the traditional pesantren. Prior to becoming teachers, they were both students at the same pesantren. For them, it is considered an honour to have the opportunity to be a teacher, as not all students have the same opportunities. The interview with them suggested that both of them were happy to be in the pesantren and would like to dedicate their life to this school. This is also
evident in the story of Kamali, who has continued to stay and work in pesantren even though she has finished university. According to them, one further benefit of staying at their pesantren is that they have had an opportunity to attain a higher education.

For both Nurul and Kamali, the long time they have lived in pesantren has formed a strong appreciation of the values which are shared in pesantren. This makes them perceive that whatever is opposed to what they believe as a threat to their values.

Tourism is different to what I believe. Hang out between boys and girls at the beach, as common in tourism activities, is again different to what I believe. I will not be influenced by this. (Kamali, 23, Teacher, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

Tourism, which is unacceptable to me and this pesantren environment, can reduce our motivation to study and this may lead to moral degradation. (Nurul 24, Teacher, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

The statements of Kamali, ‘…different to what I believe’, and Nurul, ‘…which is unacceptable’ indicate that tourism is understood as something which is contradictory to what they believe - that is, what they have so far been taught in pesantren. This incongruence between tourism and their value system leads Nurul and Kamali to view tourism as something which will endanger their religious life. This interpretation is subsequently reflected in their fear of the tourism development in their area.

Moreover, their position is not only attributed to the pesantren and its values, the prolonged period of living in pesantren also motivates a great deal of respect and loyalty to the owner of pesantren (referred to as kyai and nyai). The kindness of the owners, who provided an opportunity to learn and live and attain higher degrees, as well as jobs as teachers, is considered a big help by the students. Therefore, they are very appreciative of being provided with these positions and afford a great deal of respect to the kyai as the owner of the pesantren (kyai). This respect is then followed by them recognising that the owners are the acknowledged leaders in their lives.
The loyalty to the owner is also encouraged by the strong hold of the Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato philosophy amongst the residents. As described in Chapter One, the high respect paid to kyai is highly valued by the majority of the Madurese people. The philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato, in which parents and teachers are placed above everyone else, has encouraged the high respect given to the kyai as leader in the community. Also, the idea that there is an endless relationship between teacher and student, in that the student must maintain this respect for their teachers after the completion of school and should consider them as a leader, has also bolstered strong cultural values. The strong influence and respect afforded to the kyai have encouraged some residents in the village to simply obey what they say, as revealed in the responses provided by some residents:

*All the people here, including myself follow what our kyai says.* (Subahrudin, 30, Unemployed, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

*If I had the permission from my kyai, I’d really love to go to the beach. I honestly don’t know why they don’t allow us to go to the beach. All I know is that the kyai said that is not suitable with my religious values and I am afraid to ask why.* (Rahmawan, 20, Student, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

Rahmawan is strongly influenced by the idea that the beach is not a good place for santri (students of pesantren). This belief applies not only to him, other residents of other villages such as Prajan Village in Sampang, are also constantly reminded that the beach is not an appropriate place for them to visit. With regard to the intense dissemination of this idea by the kyai, according to Rahmawan, he would just agree with it, without questioning it further. Therefore, for him, the influence of his leader strongly influences the development of the meaning of tourism.

Given that Rahmawan’s status is still that of an active student, it makes more sense for him to obey the teachers and be bound by the rules that they have created in the pesantren. An example of the strength of the influence of the kyai is given greater clarity in the lives of two other residents, who are not involved directly with life in the pesantren. For these two, even though they live near the beach, the influence of the kyai and the religious values are also strong. Both Rowuna and Subahrudin consider that tourism will (to some extent) challenge their religious values. Rowuna
simply cannot understand why people like to visit the beach dressed scantily in inappropriate attire or get drunk, while Subahrudin states that he does not support tourism because he ‘just can’t’:

*People say that most of the visitors at the beach wear improper dress and get drunk. I have no idea why they do that. My leader said that it does not agree with my religious values.* (Rowuna, 40, Local Entrepreneur (Warung), Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

*I just can’t support tourism because I grew up in this neighbourhood and it is a pesantren environment.* (Subahrudin, 30, Unemployed, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

The improperly dressed referred to by Rowuna is related to dressing in contrast to the dress code for a Muslim, which is, as maintained by Din (1989), that women have to cover their hands and face and not wear scant clothing, and men are encouraged to wear long pants. In addition, drunken activity as mentioned by the participants above is deemed to be contrary to Islamic values because Islam prohibits the consumption of alcoholic substances (Bon & Hussain 2010). In Kacok Village, it seems there is a distinct clash between the religious and cultural values of residents and the development of tourism in Pamekasan Region. Burns and Cooper (1997) claim that there is an intrusion upon cultural and religious values by the development of tourism and the Muslims must be able to cope with that.

Furthermore, the remarks above suggest there is an issue of powerlessness. The statements of Rowuna ‘…My leader said…’ and Subahrudin of ‘…I just can’t…’ may suggest fervent obedience where these residents follow their leaders blindly. This obedience appears to be a product of a lack of power to critically challenge the leader. Powerlessness is the foundation of oppression (Mowforth & Munt 2009). This is a reflection of the philosophy of *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato*, to which the residents interviewed are obliged to conform.

In addition, the remarks of participants in Kacok Village presented above have raised two important points: the first being that there is a strong fear of certain types of tourism. Obviously, it refers to the fear of the impact of tourism in the form found at the beaches. The fear does not refer to other types of tourism, as Sohadi claimed:
If it is visiting the graves type of tourism, I would be happy to support it. (Sohadi, 49, Village Officer, Kacok Village, Pamekasan)

The support of a particular type of tourism is guided by the strong grip of these religious values, and as a result, any type of tourism which is different to these values is interpreted as unsuitable and instrumental in invoking concerns and negative attitudes.

The strong attachment to religious systems and values among Pamekasan residents has influenced the way of life of people living in this region. In this region, it was found that tourism is viewed suspiciously by some residents. While the literature suggests that the source of this suspicion is based on arguments both about its moral and legal status, as well as its economic and environmental impact (Sanad et al. 2010), in Pamekasan, it was found that the suspicion is mostly based on strong religious values. This was evident in the many respondents who said that tourism does not fall in line with my values. The hold of religion, as well as the strong hold of the philosophy Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato, has encouraged the obedience to the kyai. The trust in kyai is also reflected in the trust in the kyai to deliver the voice of the residents.

The above discussion reveals that similar to the two previous regions discussed, business opportunities are the meanings of tourism for the majority of the residents who live in Tanjung Village. However, while the variety of meanings of the residents in other selected villages consistently reflect the heterogeneity, for Kacok Village residents, their meanings only focus on one theme, which is the threat of tourism to religious values.
6.5 The Meanings of Tourism in the Sumenep Region

Sumenep Region is located on the eastern side of Madura Island. In the past, it was the only kingdom on Madura Island. The kingdom’s palace and the Asta Tinggi Graves, which are the graves of the kings of Sumenep, are the heritage of the kingdom and have become the most promoted attractions in Sumenep, both domestically and internationally.

The two villages selected for study are Kebun Agung and Prenduan Village. Kebun Agung Village is the village where the Asta Tinggi Graves are located, while Prenduan Village is a village where there is no planned tourism. In fact, Prenduan Village is a village with several pesantren in it. The cultural pride of being a resident of Sumenep appears to be the most significant factor influencing the meaning of tourism among the residents interviewed.

Unlike other regions, tourism for the 12 residents interviewed in Sumenep Region focused only around the issue of tourism being an opportunity to share cultural and religious values.

Even though different individuals may hold a different meaning toward an object (Blumer 1969), the data reveals that all of the residents interviewed in Sumenep viewed tourism as an opportunity to share their cultural and religious values. The interactions between the teachers from the pesantren with other teachers or with other Sumenep residents, interactions between sellers, sub district officers with other sub district officers or other residents, for example, have eventually evoked a similar meaning of tourism.

Such a contrast in meaning is evident in the case of Nanang, one of the teachers interviewed from a pesantren. Nanang indicates how tourism means an opportunity to promote culture and religious values:

*Madura Island is known to be a Muslim island and as a Muslim we have to be able to enjoy the beauty and spread the words of God’s scripture widely so that we can persuade and the use of tourism is a very good way of doing this.* (Nanang, 22, Writer/Teacher, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)
Nanang attributes a positive meaning to tourism as a way of informing others about God’s scripture. In his role as a writer and teacher, Nanang, from my interpretation, understands that he has an obligation to inform others of God’s scripture. This duty-bound feeling is more apparent in his words ‘…Madura Island is known to be a Muslim island…’ which identifies him as both Madurese and a Muslim.

In addition to tourism as a way of sharing religious scriptures, Nanang also sees tourism as a way of enjoying God’s creation. This view is congruent with Islamic values, that is, that Muslims should fully appreciate the beauty of God’s creation (Henderson 2003). Tourism is subsequently perceived by Nanang as a vehicle to educate and spread religious scriptures, which is also a way for him to appreciate the beauty of God’s creation.

The interactions between those who are in the pesantren have encouraged what is referred to by some participants as ‘the pesantren environment’. This ‘pesantren environment’, which can be assumed to be the world that exists for the teachers and students who live there, is comprised of the actions of those who are devout and have high regard for Islamic religious values. This situation will encourage the meaning of tourism among its participants to be seen in a religious frame. As highlighted by a number of teachers in pesantren, tourism as such, can be a vehicle to spread religious values, a way to respect and enjoy God’s creation and so forth. Thus, for those who are living in the pesantren, where every day they have interactions with people with similar beliefs, their way of viewing tourism has subsequently been influenced.

Despite tourism being seen as an opportunity to share religious values, those who were teachers also interpret tourism as an opportunity to promote Madurese culture. They explained that some of the dances, crafts and other traditional practices need more development and tourism can assist with this. Izul, for example, believes that tourism can encourage the further development of Lok-alok within traditional cultures. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 1, Bull race has been identified by the authorities as the major tourist event in Madura Island. According to Izul, Lok-alok, a kind of traditional musical performance, that was once performed before the Bull race attraction and in recent years has gradually disappeared, is a case in point. With tourism, he firmly believes that this traditional musical performance will be rejuvenated.
I think bull race attractions nowadays are only about the race, which has lost its cultural undertone. Lok-alok, which used to be part of the Bull race attraction, has already gone. Tourism will help to restore our culture, including traditional music and dances. (Izul, 26, Teacher, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)

The above comment highlights the perception of tourism as revitalising traditional cultural practices. The belief of Izul that Lok-alok will be rejuvenated demonstrates his expectation that cultural practices can be rejuvenated through tourism. This finding confirms the potential for tourism to encourage the revitalisation or resurgence of interest in traditional cultural practices (Oppermann & Chon 1997; Telfer & Sharpley 2008).

The data collected from Prenduan Village, Sumenep, indicates a number of significant points: the first point suggests that, according to the participants, there is an opportunity for freedom of speech in the pesantren where they stayed. The opportunity to speak freely among the residents indicates that the choices made in life by individuals are not scrutinised and controlled by someone else such as their leader. For example, even though the residents still conform to the philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato, evident in the statement that the kyai is highly valued and respected, they are not obligated to follow orders of the kyai as a leader. Given that most of the residents in this village are part-time teachers in the pesantren, implies they have a good level of knowledge within the community and have an understanding of what is best for them. This means that they are not totally dependent on someone else’s thinking. The following statements draw attention to the critical stance held by the residents about the leader’s orders.

If the suggestions of the kyai are good in my mind I will follow what he said, but if it is not good, I will disobey him. He should have sound logic for anything that he says. (Varah, 19, Teacher, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)

As long as what they order is good and fits in with my religious beliefs I will obey their orders, otherwise I will disobey their orders. It is also my belief that the government and the Kyai should work in harmony to give the community a sense of harmony. (Izul, 26, Teacher, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)
The second point is that even though all the interviewed residents feel they have the opportunity to speak freely; there are some who are still content to ask their leader as their spokesperson for advice. In these cases, the value, trust and dependence given to the *kyai* still remains high, because they believe that the *kyai* will be their mediator in voicing their thoughts to the government.

*I am just small person so the kyai will be my voice.* (Said, 38, Sub District Officer, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)

*If residents want to say something they should tell the kyai first and then the Kyai will tell the government what the resident has said. In cases like this, the Kyai is the mediator between the residents and government.* (Izul, 26, Teacher, Prenduan Village, Sumenep)

The obligation, as well as the high respect afforded the *kyai* among the residents, has indeed provided the *kyai* with a high degree of power over the community. The broad role of the *kyai* in the community, the philosophy of *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato* and the endless relationship of *kyai* and student has indeed created a high level of respect and trust of the *kyai* in people lives, including in decision making. The fact that some residents seem to perceive themselves as powerless as well as deferring to the *kyai* as a mediator has demonstrated the powerlessness of local residents in tourism planning.

The data revealed a great sense of pride in the hearts of the residents from Prenduan Village and Kebon Agung Village in relation to its region. The residents explained that this pride is the guidance that makes them embrace and hold onto their historical values very tightly. Tourism is positioned as possessing religious and cultural opportunities. Unlike the participants who are highly oriented towards economic benefits, the desire to obtain opportunites for profit for the majority of residents in Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep, is also associated with the respect that they show to their ancestors. In this case, the perceptions of tourism are stimulated by the high level of pride associated with being involved in tourism at the Asta Tinggi Graves. The source of this pride has its genesis in the fact that Sumenep is the one and only former kingdom of Madura Island and Asta Tinggi Graves are the graves where the Kings of Sumenep Kingdom are buried. The unique findings from this village are that the perceptions of residents are not only concerned with the
economic benefits of tourism but also focus on opportunities to respect and rejuvenate their historical cultural values. As one of these residents said:

_I am happy with the development of tourism in Asta Tinggi Graves. Tourism not only gives me opportunities to gain income, but it also allows me to show my respect to my ancestors._ (Farid, 59, Seller, Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep)

_I enjoy my work in Asta Tinggi and I am proud of it because it has been handed down from generation to generation and it is privileged because not everyone can work here._ (Sugeng, 59, Farmer/Staff of Asta Tinggi Graves, Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep)

Another reason that elevates the pride of the residents interviewed who work at the graves is the exclusivity of the workers of Asta Tinggi Graves. This exclusivity stems from the fact that they are direct descendants of the workers of the kings. The workers have various roles as cleaners, parking officers, musholla officers and administration staff. Given that there is no salary paid for being a worker (except of having pecaton land in lieu of salary), implies high levels of loyalty, another reason for their pride. This situation, to varying degrees, gives those who are working at the graves a sense of cultural pride and high status in the community. Furthermore, this pride also spills over to those who are not related to descendants but are just involved in activities around the graves. In the remarks presented above, Farid, who is a seller at the area of Asta Tinggi Graves, emphasises this pride. The ability of tourism to bring pride has been widely discussed by several scholars (e.g. Adams 1997; Cole 2008; Scheyvens 2003b). Researching tourism in Wogo, Indonesia, Cole (2008) found that the residents feel proud if their culture is recognised by tourists, as they believe that tourism will strengthen their cultural values.

The strong meaning attributed to tourism by the residents in the Sumenep Region who participated in this study, as a way to promote religion and culture, is different to the way the government sees tourism development. While tourism for teachers and other participants in this study is an opportunity to share cultural and religious values, for the government, tourism is primarily seen as an economic opportunity, as presented in the Sumenep Tourism master plan (discussed in Chapter 5). This different interpretation has subsequently encouraged different actions amongst these stakeholders. As a result, there is the potential for conflicting opinions between the government and
the workers of Asta Tinggi, such as what happened at Asta Tinggi, as described below.

The conflicting views that arose at Asta Tinggi Graves was triggered by government plans to pave the graves area in order for the Asta Tinggi Graves to be more clean and tidy. This plan created a dispute between the workers and the government as it was argued by the workers that the paved yard would reduce the work of the workers. It would also reduce the uniqueness of the graves. In this case, the different interpretation of tourism by the government, which places tourists as its priority, is opposed to the workers, who prioritise traditional and cultural uniqueness, and this led to a dispute. The different interpretations made an agreed action improbable for these stakeholders. In other words, the government did not understand the plans or the indications of what the workers were trying to do and the residents did not understand what the government was planning to do. As a result, there was confusion or misunderstanding between government and residents, resulting in ineffective communication and impeded interactions.

All in all, the analysis of findings from the interviews in Sumenep comes to the conclusion that, regardless of the villages they live in, the residents of Sumenep have a prolific sense of pride in their history and cultural heritage. This pride for many of the residents is accompanied by privilege and high status within the community. It has also become a major driving force for them to see tourism as an opportunity to share their cultural and religious values. Subsequently this meaning has become a motivator for the actions of the residents.
6.6 Discussion of the Meanings Residents Assigned to Tourism

As discussed above, resident meanings were categorised into five key themes. These are ‘tourism as business opportunities gained and lost’, ‘a source of disempowerment’, ‘a threat to culture’ and ‘an opportunity to share religious and cultural values’. Even though residents live in the same area, the meanings they assign to tourism have been shown to be heterogeneous. This heterogeneity is presented in Table 6.1.

A diversity of meanings is present even for residents who have the same occupations or roles within a community. The meanings of tourism for street sellers, for instance, consistently show this diversity. For some street sellers, tourism is perceived as upward mobility, family security, or obedience to parents, while for others, tourism means a blurring of future business prospects that would lead to uncertainties in deriving income. Further development of diversity in meanings was also revealed in another group of the residents interviewed, namely entrepreneurs, farmers, teachers, fishermen and students from across the island. For example, for some pesantren teachers, tourism means an opportunity to enjoy God’s creation, while for others; tourism means a threat to religious values.

In this current study, with the exception of location and occupation, the variety of meanings appears consistent within the residents irrespective of their age or gender. For instance, for some men, tourism means gradual disappearance of Madurese culture, but for others, tourism means spreading cultural values. Meanwhile, for some women, tourism means entrepreneurship or profits, while for others tourism means a threat to their business. At the same time, for one young high school student who participated in this study, tourism means an opportunity to earn some profit, but for another, the ability to be involved in tourism is primarily dependent on his leaders or kyai (this is suggesting that the meaning of tourism for him is obedience to the leader). In addition, while there is some evidence to suggest resistance to tourism development can manifest in the form of women’s work (see Cukier, Norris & Wall (1996) and Petrzelka, Krannich, Brehm & Trentelman (2005)), this study find that resistance is not always considered as women’s work. As discussed above, some male participants are also indicated to develop their concern about tourism.
Table 6.1 Meanings Assigned to Tourism by Residents in the Four Regions of Madura Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meanings of Tourism</th>
<th>Meanings of Tourism</th>
<th>Meanings of Tourism</th>
<th>Meanings of Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangkalan</strong></td>
<td>- Future positive optimism</td>
<td>- Insecure income</td>
<td>- Commercialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Upward mobility</td>
<td>- Unstable business’s profits</td>
<td>- Changing traditional music to a modern drum band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Family security</td>
<td>- Loss of customers</td>
<td>- Interference with <em>silaturrahim</em> (Muslim fraternity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informal competition</td>
<td>- Low growth of business</td>
<td>- More development of tourists facilities (cafes, swimming pools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obedience to parent</td>
<td>- Entrepreneurships/profits</td>
<td>- Commercialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Entrepreneurships/profits</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Changing traditional music to a modern drum band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampang</strong></td>
<td>- Income/Profit generation</td>
<td>- A threat for business opportunities</td>
<td>- Disadvantageous plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More stable livelihood</td>
<td>- Blurred future business prospects</td>
<td>- Low capability of government to control tourism sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More visitors</td>
<td>- Gradual disappearance of Madurese culture</td>
<td>- Lack of opportunities for residents to have their voice heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pleased visitors/customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Providing hotel facilities to visitors</td>
<td>- Insecure income</td>
<td>- Negative things (karaoke, hotels, drunks, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Career promotion for hotel manager</td>
<td>- Disadvantageous way of living</td>
<td>- Interference with making connection with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pamekasan</strong></td>
<td>- Income &amp; employment generation</td>
<td>- Insecure income</td>
<td>- Interference with making connection with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Earning extra money</td>
<td>- Disadvantageous way of living</td>
<td>- Following the leaders’ advice (powerlessness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Poverty alleviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The arrival of tourists with improper dress/behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Constant promotion of the benefits of tourism by <em>Pokdarwis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stronger religious values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sumenep</strong></td>
<td>- Spreading religious values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enjoying God’s creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting Madurese culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obeying the leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Key Themes of Tourism Meanings

- Business Opportunities
- Business Opportunities
- Threat to culture & religion
- A source of disempowerment
- An opportunity to share culture & religious values
Given that this research finds so much variety in the meanings of tourism, it does not align with previous studies which have found that demographic factors such as age (Haralambopoulos & Pizam 1996; Weaver & Lawton 2001) and gender (Mason & Cheyne 2000) influence the residents’ disposition towards tourism. The contention of Fredline and Faulkner (2000) as well as Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), that older residents are more negative towards tourism is not supported. However, it should be borne in mind that these previous studies mostly examined the actions of an individual through traditional works (through senses or values), while this study focuses on the resident meanings ascribed by symbols. The communication about tourism through symbols encourages a variety of definitions ascribed to tourism by the participants. As a result of this communication process, some definitions might be irrelevant or meaningless to those not making them or who are not a part of the system in which the symbols are employed (Lauer & Handel 1977). Different approaches utilised in the traditional works and those guided by symbolic interactionism has resulted in different results and analysis.

The above mixed findings also certainly contrast with the notion of homogeneous resident perceptions proposed by Doxey (1975). They confirm the studies of Ryan and Montgomery (1994), Huttasin (2008), Horn and Simmons (2002) which demonstrate that homogeneity of resident responses is less common than the Doxey’s ‘Irridex’ model (1975) suggests.

In contrast, the results of this research confirm the findings of some earlier studies. Factors such as education (Andriotis 2003; Korça 1998; Teye et al. 2002) and possession of wealth (Haralambopoulos & Pizam 1996), which were found to be important factors in the previous studies of the perceptions of tourism also appear to be significant factors for developing the meaning of tourism for residents on Madura Island. However, the different thoughts and paradigms which were used as a guide for the previous studies encouraged different results and analysis. While in other studies, education and prosperity are considered to be the impetus that triggers resident perceptions, in this research, these two factors are understood as power factors owned by the residents which can influence the definition of tourism through their interactions with others. In addition, this control over the resources such as education or prosperity, is important to consider in the development of meanings because it can contribute to unequal relationships between individuals, which subsequently allows the development of meanings to be dictated by those who have power. This point will be discussed further in Chapter 7 and 8.

Moreover, the findings reveal that for some of those who live close to the bridge, tourism means a gain in opportunities and/or profits, while for others who live far from the bridge tourism
means loss of opportunities and/or profits. This prompts one to agree with Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) who claim that the distance of residence from the central tourism zone is an important factor in the attitude toward tourism. In particular, this current study supports Haley, Snaith and Miller’s (2005) idea that those living closer to a central tourism zone are more supportive of tourism than those living further away. Similarly, it was found that some of the residents interviewed, especially those living near the bridge, developed positive meanings of tourism. As this current study examines the dynamism of meanings, the distance of residence from tourism area appears to influence the ways in which the residents develop meanings of tourism. Therefore, it has also been found in this current study, that the participants who live in the bridge area or in the tourism zone also have a negative meaning of tourism.

In addition, some of the residents interviewed who are dependent on tourism do not always have positive meanings of tourism. For example, even though Rumi depends on tourism as a souvenir seller at the Camplong Beach in Sampang, she is to some extent worried that tourism may be a threat to her religious values because she said that it is embarrassing to see visitors in many different types of clothes at the beach. These findings challenge Andereck and McGhee (2004) who found that community dependence on tourism is a predictor of the attitude towards tourism, in that those who are dependent on tourism are likely to develop positive attitudes towards tourism.

The extensive diversity in the meanings of tourism found in this research can be explained in depth by the concept called ‘the worlds’, which refers to a composition of objects in which the meanings of these objects are different for every individual (Blumer 1969) (see Chapter 3). It has been determined that every human being lives in a different world that is completely different from one individual to the next, because the diverse meanings of objects arises from the way they are defined to an individual by others with whom they interact (Blumer 1969). Therefore, the meanings of tourism for the interviewed residents may vary from one person to another, even though they may live in the same village or have the same occupation within a community because of the different ways people construct the meanings of objects. Due to the variety of constructions for the meanings of tourism, the construction of meanings needs to be examined.

In addition to ‘the worlds’, these diversity of meanings can be explained as the second premise of symbolic interaction, that is, ‘the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one’s fellow’ (Blumer 1969, p. 2). This fundamental premise
suggests that the process of interactions between people has a pivotal role in developing the meaning of a thing (Blumer 1969). On the basis of this premise, the interaction that the resident has with others, who participants potentially interact with, is of considerable importance in explaining the growth of the meanings of tourism development for the individual person.

In addition, as explained in Chapter 2, personality and social background variables are also relevant factors contributing to individual differences (Lauer & Handel 1977). The interaction of one individual with another, who has a totally different personality and background, may also contribute to the diversity of meanings of tourism assigned by the participants.

Moreover, many negative meanings of tourism may reflect fear and worry on the part of some participants. This suggests that to some extent tourism plans in Madura Island may not be consistent with sustainability. The concern expressed by participants about the future of tourism in Kamal Harbour area, as well as cultural and religious values destruction, are examples of how tourism on the island lacks in the promotion of social and economic advantage for its residents. In addition, the complaints of residents about beach erosion and other environmental damage may represent a lack of satisfaction on the part of residents in relation to the impacts of tourism on the environment.

6.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the meanings of tourism on Madura Island have been explored. The meanings ascribed to tourism development by the residents interviewed from the four regions on Madura Island are complex. They vary from region to region, village to village and person to person. The data reveals that the wide range of meanings of tourism development amongst the interviewed residents are centred around tourism as business opportunities and loss, threats to culture and religious values, a source of disempowerment, and an opportunity to share culture and religious values.

In general, the findings confirm that business opportunities and threat to cultural and religious values are the overarching themes of the meanings of tourism for residents in three different regions, namely Bangkalan, Sampang and Pamekasan. However, in the Sumenep Region, all the residents interviewed maintained that tourism is predominantly viewed as an opportunity to share culture and religious values (see Table 6.1).
Although the majority of residents interviewed in Bangkalan, Sampang and Pamekasan reveal quite similar themes regarding the meanings of tourism, the factors that signify and encourage the development of these meanings are different from one region to another. In Bangkalan and Sampang, it was found that an increased status and income are important signifiers of the meanings of tourism as business opportunities, whereas in Pamekasan increased personal income as well as the locals’ welfare (entailed in the role of the secretary of pokdarwis) were the signifiers of business opportunities. Moreover, the influence of others is the most important factor for the development of the meaning of tourism around business opportunities for the majority of the informants from Bangkalan and Pamekasan.

The welcoming approach to tourism has encouraged an increase in the informal sector and a decrease in the formal sector in all regions, especially in Bangkalan, Sampang and Pamekasan. Some participants in these three regions changed their livelihood so as to be able to be involved in tourism. In contrast, some other participants who live in the Kamal Harbour area, as a result of the loss of exclusivity of Kamal Harbour as the gateway to the Madura Islands, have lost business opportunities.

The emergence of tourism, however, was of concern to some people in the Bangkalan, Sampang and Pamekasan Regions, especially those who occupy the position of teacher and leader and who are not involved in tourism. They questioned the ability of locals to participate in tourism development and the integrity of the government in managing tourism. These concerns may challenge the principals of sustainable tourism if the issue of local resident participation is not addressed.

There is a similar complexity of meanings surrounding economic benefits and cultural benefits found in areas of unplanned tourism. The discrepancy of issues between the goals of government and the local residents are also evident in Sampang Region. This is especially so in the Pamekasan Region, because tourism is taking place in the village, the continuous dissemination of the benefits of tourism occurred because the pokdarwis felt compelled to promote the benefits of tourism to the residents. However, one resident responded to these disseminations as being irrelevant for her because she perceives tourism as lacking security, as a way of making a living. Tourism in her region was at the early stages of emergence. Conversely, for those who live a considerable distance from the attraction and have no involvement at all in tourism, tourism is viewed by these residents as negative with their meaning of tourism solely focused upon religious concerns. Furthermore, in Sumenep, enhancement of community pride
drives the views of tourism as a way of promoting cultural and religious values. These views arose in both planned and non-planned tourism areas.

Under the perspective of the symbolic interactionist paradigm, social interaction is significant in forming individual conduct, in which it includes the presentation of gestures and a response to the meaning of those gestures (Blumer 1969, p. 9). Interpreting the findings using this perspective, it can be said that the complexity of meanings that the residents have towards tourism on Madura Island is a response to the activity of others. Thus, in the way the government communicates the plans to the residents, as the presentation of orders, commands and activities to be carried out by the government, these gestures form important input that are taken into account in the formation of the residents’ attitudes. The complexity of meanings is indeed a response to how the government acts upon and communicates tourism planning approaches.

For some, the strong obedience to the leader has made the residents’ voices powerless by the fact that the leaders represent their voice in the planning process. The marginalisation of the voice of the residents has led to minimal contribution of the residents’ voice in the tourism development process. Therefore, in the following chapters, the further discussion of the complexity of the meanings held by the Madura residents in relation to how the meanings develop and contribute to the planning process are explored and analysed.
CHAPTER 7
THE INFLUENCES THAT SHAPE THE MEANINGS OF TOURISM

7.1 Introduction

The aim of this study is to investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents of Madura Island and how those meanings develop. Given this aim, the objectives of this study are to:

1. Describe the tourism planning context of Madura Island;
2. Investigate the meanings assigned to tourism by Madura Island residents;
3. Critically examine the influences that shape the meanings of tourism held by Madura Island residents.

While the previous results chapters (Chapters 5 and 6) address the first two research questions respectively, this chapter aims to address the third research question. This is achieved by reviewing and analysing the themes reported in Chapters 5 and 6. This analysis is also accompanied by a critical discussion drawing on relevant literature that supports and is supported by the findings of this investigation.

Thus, this chapter is organised into six sections. The first section analyses the influence of guru (kyai). The second section focuses on the influence of mother. The third section analyses the influence of government. The fourth section analyses the influence of those interested in the tourism industry such as hotel managers and travel agency entrepreneurs. The fifth section focuses on the nexus between the influences and the philosophy. The sixth section focuses on synthesising the influences that shape the meanings of tourism.

7.2 The Influence of Guru (Kyai)

As revealed in Chapters 5 and 6, gurus, who in Madurese culture are referred to as kyai, appear to be the most influential. The kyai has a very important role in the Madurese community. According to Risti (2011), in Indonesia, the role of the kyai and their pesantren, is not only associated with Islamic teaching, but also the power they represent for their students as well as the surrounding community. The current research has revealed that there is a high level of reverence given to the kyai and the pesantren on the island of Madura. The kyai’s activities in
society also have a broader scope in Madura compared to other areas of Indonesia. This study confirms that the roles of the kyai in Madura could also include activities such as providing moral support to individuals, marital advice, as well as first aid and medical support for their students and the community. An interviewee from Prenduan Village in Sumenep added that the kyai are in a state of preparedness twenty four hours a day to help the community and their integrity is of a very high level. It is these aspects that underlie the respect given to them by the villagers. It is clearly evident that the roles of the kyai in Madura are considerably broad. The study of Muthmainnah (1998) and Rozaki (2004) also confirm the importance of the role of the kyai in the Madurese community.

Also, as observed by Timothy (1999) and discussed in Chapter 2, the traditions of Javanese culture in Indonesia require that obedience and reverence are given to people in positions of power and directly influence the way people interact. An example of this influence on personal interactions is that it is considered offensive for villagers to bypass the village head as the first source of advice, as this action may cause the village head to lose face. Apparently, there is a parallel within the Madurese community, because the kyai are the ones who should be approached first for advice, due to the respect they command within the community.

The wide range of their responsibilities and the dependency of the Madurese people on the kyai give them power over the residents and this power has contributed to the meanings of tourism. Some interviewees in Pamekasan claim that they simply never go to the beach because their kyai prohibits it. Others said they did not want to become involved in tourism because their kyai does not allow them to do so. In this case, kyai contribute to the development of the meanings of tourism among the residents interviewed who perceive it as a threat to their religious and cultural values. The frequent statements of the participants who lived in pesantren referred to their fear of the ‘negative impacts of tourism’ or that tourism is ‘not good for santri’ signifying concern with regard to tourism and its negative impacts. They demonstrated these meanings in their beliefs and actions such as the inappropriateness of visiting the beach for those with Islamic values, values that have been continuously disseminated to them by kyai. The strong relations between teachers and students influence the definition of tourism among the students, particularly given the fact that decision making is in the hands of the kyai as the head of the pesantren.

While this relationship is obvious for students from the pesantren, those who live outside pesantren also show that they have a strong respect for the kyai, thus allowing the kyai to
influence their meanings of tourism. The strong hold of the Buppa’Babbu’Guru Rato philosophy which attributes high levels of respect to kyai and the belief that there is no end to the teacher-student relationship held by most residents, means that students always regard kyai as their teacher long after they have finished their studies. This has the effect of reinforcing the development of the meaning of tourism among the participants, even for those who live outside the pesantren. When engaging in very strong religious environments, such as that of Kacok Village in Pamekasan, where most people value religion above anything else, it is evident that the residents organise their actions on the basis of intensifying the religious perspective. The values that ‘I am a santri’ (‘I am a student of pesantren’) thus ‘tourism should be matched with religious values’, as defined by the people in Kacok Village, has even influenced the residents interviewed to intensify the meaning of tourism as a threat to religion.

Recognising that Madura residents endow the kyai with extremely high respect, the government always collaborates with the kyai in disseminating their programs. In this case, kyai may encourage the meanings of tourism as having other than a religious side. The case of Mustari, a seller at Suramadu Bridge, whose pengajian (an activity for reading the Koran) group was always organising travel to Muslim sacred places as well as other attractions, indicates there was continuous encouragement from kyai for the residents to become involved in tourism so they would benefit economically.

7.3 The Influence of Mother

As laid out in the Madurese values philosophy, one of the important influences in Madurese culture is the influence of parents. In this study, that primarily manifests as mothers having influence over their daughters to behave in particular ways. The example of this is the case of Nur, in Chapter 6, who appears somewhat reluctant to be a seller, but must obey her mother’s instruction. However, this influence does not represent the complete picture. The influences of others, or interactions with others, allow this woman to have a range of different meanings, more diverse than business opportunities alone.

In this case, while the literature relating to power is primarily concerned with the ownership of resources such as knowledge, skill, and wealth, the power resources held by mothers are much more varied and complex. As the source of power can be varied (Telfer & Sharpley 2008), the mother or an older relative of the child may have power vested in them by the culture of the society which obliges the young to offer respect towards older people. Accordingly, those who
have this power then exercise it to fulfil their individual preferences and needs. In this case, they use their resources to persuade and to influence the development of the meanings of tourism development for their children. The source of the power of the parent originates in traditions that prescribe respect for parents and the older generation. Specifically, the philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato, where the Madura Island residents place obedience to their parents first, signifies the level of respect given to parents, especially to mothers. However, the strong respect afforded the kyai binds the Madurese people that were interviewed, including mothers, to respect the kyai above everything else.

This finding on Madura Island confirms the notion of power enforcement in the category of conditioned power, that is, power exercised by changing the other person’s ideas through persuasion, education or social commitment (Galbraith 1983). In line with this enforcement, the duty to obey mother makes the power of the mother over their children mandatory. In addition, condign power, which refers to power that is exercised through compulsion or physical punishment (Galbraith 1983), also seems to apply in this case. However, the ability to impose the power is not obtained through physical punishment, but more ‘social punishment’. The social sanctions are such that people outside the family will regard the children as anak durhaka (bad child). This is evident in the comment made by one participant, ‘if I do not follow mother’s instruction, what will people say?’ This indicates that there is a social sanction that is applied in the case where children ignore the instruction of their parents. In addition to the philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato, the obedience afforded the mother is also fortified by the Indonesian traditional belief of surga di bawah telapak kaki ibu (heaven in the feet of mother). This belief refers to the requirements that respect should be given to parents, in particular to the mother. This belief reinforces the cultural belief held in the Madurese community, encouraging children to be obedient to their parents, especially instructions given by the mother.

7.4 The Influence of Government

It is not only the actions of parents, friends, family members or the kyai that influence the participants’ interpretations of tourism. In this study, the residents’ meanings of tourism are also developed by the active persuasion of government officers, particularly the local tourism officers. The influence that the government officers contribute to the meanings of tourism held by the residents interviewed is evident in how the implementation of tourism planning takes place. The current study reveals that tourism planning implementation have influenced the meanings of tourism held by the residents interviewed.
In accordance with the aim of creating the Suramadu Bridge area as a tourist destination, the government officers actively introduce new plans as well as disseminate information about the positive impacts of tourism to residents. The actions of these officers could be seen as a factor which has influenced the development of the meanings of tourism among residents in Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan. The residents are bombarded by positive information about tourism; it is defined by the officers as something positive and economically beneficial, so the residents interpret and construct the meanings of tourism as a positive thing for them. Again, their positive interpretation of tourism is subsequently reflected in their actions, that is, the decision to become a seller.

However, while tourism is disseminated to residents by government officers and the industry as something positive and beneficial, it also creates ambiguity among the residents interviewed. The plan of the government to locate the residents in a specific location as sellers, so as to enable them to provide a good service to visitors, has actually created confusion among the residents interviewed. The fees, unsold items and the capability to occupy the new stall are some of the things that are of concern for displaced sellers. In the context of the development of the meanings of tourism, the actions of others (in this case, the government officers) have been interpreted by sellers interviewed as something that is confusing. At the beginning of the development, the government encouraged and ‘fully’ supported the involvement of the residents in tourism, but suddenly, the government seems to be discouraging the process. As some sellers have said, ‘Only those who have money can pay for the stall.’ Thus, in this case, there is inconsistency in the government’s action, which is somewhat nebulous for the residents.

In this case, the meanings of tourism held by the participants clash with the government or industry meanings of tourism, which is to provide a good location for the tourist markets and thus maximise the economic benefits gained. The government prioritises the interests of the tourists at the expense of the interests of the residents. The irony is that the government tries to define tourism and disseminate it to the residents, but at the same time ignores the interests of the residents. The residents interviewed, who are influenced from a number of sources such as government officers and other residents, have developed their meanings of tourism as a source of income generation as well as a source of disempowerment.

The interviews also revealed a strongly entrenched fear of change within the Madura residents who were interviewed. These fears of change include the worry of having their culture, religion, language and traditional way of life destroyed by tourism. Other negative impacts of tourism
such as an increase in prostitution, crimes, organised gambling and the marked effect on Madura residents are also commonly mentioned by the residents interviewed. These negative feelings from the potential growth of tourism on Madura Island may be the source of the fear and worry of the Madura residents.

7.5 The Influence of the Tourism Industry

Apart from the interactions mentioned above, the tourism industry itself also influences the meanings of tourism among the residents interviewed. The industry comprises those who have access to tourism resources such as hotel managers and travel agency entrepreneurs. These parties appear to be driven by economic opportunities; the ambition of gaining economic profit from tourism. This set of meanings have influenced the hotel manager to view drowning cases in his swimming pool as inevitable, the karaoke facilities as an acceptable and necessary facility for his hotel and the reduction in profits for those who had travel agencies in the Kamal Harbour area as part of business.

As discussed in Chapter 6, some travel agency entrepreneurs complained about the reduction in opportunities to gain profits, and became worried and disappointed. This indicates that economic opportunities, in terms of gaining profits or improving business, are the most important objectives for entrepreneurs. According to Kayat (2002) in terms of source of power, these entrepreneurs have access to resources that allow them to hold market, information, or wealth power. The possession of power allows entrepreneurs to become ‘agents’ who can dictate terms to other residents who do not have any power. The economic orientation emphasised by the entrepreneurs directs the residents to follow them, with the sole aim of gaining their support and making greater profits. The loss of profits is what the travel agency entrepreneurs complained about. The regret, confusion and concern about what is happening and how this will impact directly on the future of business among entrepreneurs is sourced in the notion of the market. For example, Hamid, a restaurant entrepreneur on Camplong Beach gives up his job as honorer teacher (temporary teacher) to open a restaurant because of his low salary and the unstable status of his employment. The hotel manager has the role of attracting customers, in order to make more profit for the hotel and make his hotel the best in the region, hence securing his career. With these responsibilities, it is therefore unsurprising that he puts profits first; the profits that promote his reputation (as a successful manager) and the hotel name.
The focal interest of the hotel is in having a welcoming environment for its guests and visitors from the beach due to its proximity to the beach. With this in mind, the hotel manager, with his power (acquired through wealth and information), will try to influence local residents in order to achieve his preferred outcome. Thus, he and other hotel staff have developed some charitable activities in the surrounding community to engage the local residents and encourage them to adopt these positive meanings of tourism. Chapter 6 revealed that these charitable activities include helping poor families and their children by providing adequate funds for their education and life’s necessities. Since the hotel is surrounded by pesantren, the hotel staff also conduct regular pengajian and celebrate Islamic religious days together with local residents. All of these actions, which can be considered an exercise in power, ultimately result in a strong dependency on the part of local residents on the hotel and on tourism development in general. As suggested by the literature, those who have resources will have the ability to dictate to others (Kayat 2002), in this case the residents, in order to satisfy their needs. In this situation, the hotel manager has the ability to manipulate the residents in order to achieve the aims of his hotel business.

However, it was found that the interpretations of residents towards the actions of the manager are inconsistent. Some residents interviewed interpret and react positively to the hotel manager and staff actions, but others do not. Rumi, Hamid and Furdin are among the Taddan Village residents who have developed positive meanings and actions towards the hotel and tourism development in general. The hotel offers a selling location to a seller free of charge, and Rumi and Furdin interpret this opportunity as a good chance for them to gain more income. The positive interpretation of Hamid towards tourism is also reflected in his decision to run a restaurant which serves both local residents and visitors. In contrast, other residents who live just as close to the hotel interpret the hotel’s charitable activities as something that is negative, threatening religious and cultural values. The variety of meanings thus again challenges the homogeneity principle discussed in Chapter 6.

Another factor which influences the meanings of tourism is the individual interactions between residents. For example, the case of the mechanism for choosing a location for a stall that occurred between sellers at the Suramadu Bridge. This competition can be explained as a power battle between residents. Those residents who own a stall are the ones who have power. Therefore, the stall owner is able to ‘influence’ other residents to rent the stall to them. The fact that conflict sometimes arises between residents results due to a misconception. Legally, no one has any power over others because the land is owned by the government. The fact that the
government has not reacted to what happens is based on their interpretation of events as ‘something usual’, which in turn creates more conflict between residents, as was explored in Chapter 6.

7.6 Comparing ‘Influences’ and the Philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato in Madura Island

As discussed in Chapter 2, asymmetrical relations may occur in relationships where one person wields more power than another person (Ford, Wang & Vestal 2012), for example, those who have resources are considered more powerful than those who do not (Nagel 1975). Asymmetrical relations empower those who have resources to dictate terms to other residents in order to influence the tourism process (Kayat 2002).

In the context of Madura residents, the results revealed that asymmetrical relations between people are repeatedly established. The uneven relations in the Madura community are evident in the interactions between parents and children, teachers and students, government officials and residents, those with more capital and those with less capital, those who are more educated and those who are less educated and so on. Ultimately, these uneven interactions are the vital sources for the growth of the meanings of tourism for each of the Madura residents.

As revealed in Chapter 1, the philosophy of Buppa’Babbu’Guru Rato is an important principle of life for the Madurese people. It is therefore reasonable to expect this philosophy to shape the asymmetry of both tourism planning implementation and the meanings of tourism held by the residents interviewed. However, the findings of this study suggests otherwise. Figure 7.1 presents the difference between what is reflected in the philosophy of Buppa’Babbu’Guru Rato and the findings of this study.
Figure 7.2 above demonstrates that there are a number of points of dissimilarity. The first such dissimilarity derives from the order of respect that persists from the philosophy. As Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato philosophy encompasses the order of power or respect, the current study found that there was a different order embedded in the findings of this study. The role of the kyai appears to be strong and plays a major role in developing the meanings. However, the order of the remaining elements of the Madurese Philosophy was less clear. In some cases, it was found that the residents interviewed obeyed their mother, while in other cases they listened to and followed the instructions of the government or friends more than their mother. The case of Nur, a resident from Sukolilo Barat Village in Bangkalan, showed a slight shift in respect, whereby her mother is no longer the highest authority figure in her life. Nur’s shift is only slight for she obeys her mother and becomes involved in tourism. However, her interaction with others leads to her making another choice in life. Her friends have greater power to influence the form of the meanings and actions in her life. This suggests that the filial bonds that connect children to their mother are not as tight as they once were. Respect is not automatically followed by the obedience to what mothers say. Several examples similar to the case of Nur support this notion. The variety of responses presented earlier in this chapter, as well as in Chapters 5 and 6, indicate a lack of clarity with regard to the order of respect in the Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato philosophy.
The second dissimilarity is that the father appears to have no role in developing the meanings of tourism among the participants. As explained above, parent-child relationships are mostly manifest in the relationship of mother-daughter and there was no evidence of a mother-son relationship, or the influences of the father in defining the meanings of tourism for his children. This is contradicted by the philosophy that places father as the most respected party in the family, as well as in the community. The mother, in fact, is considered as having a bigger role in influencing the meanings of tourism than the father. This is consistent with the notion that the mother in reality has been the most influential decision maker in the family (Rifai 2007). The traditional system of marriage that, after marriage requires, men to stay in the woman’s house, as well as the Madurese house structure that gives more rooms to women rather than men, shows how women are, in practice, more highly valued than men (Rifai 2007). In addition, the philosophy held by most Indonesians that places ‘heaven in the feet of mother’ or judges disobedience with the term ‘bad child’ discussed earlier, reinforces respect for the mother.

The lack of mother-son relationships and the lack of contribution by fathers in defining the meanings of tourism among the residents interviewed may simply reflect the limited sample used in this study. However, it may also reflect the fact that women dominate informal employment in tourism in developing countries. This is consistent with the previous studies that claim that tourism, especially in developing countries, gives opportunities to women to find alternative paid employment outside their traditional activities (Mathieson & Wall 2006; Wilkinson & Pratiwi 1995). This occurs because women engage in the lower payed, part-time and seasonal jobs (Mathieson & Wall 2006). Additionally, women are more involved in souvenirs or other handicraft making than men, because it can be incorporated into domestic activities (Connell & Rugendyke 2008). Bali, as a well established tourist destination provides many examples of women working in the informal sector because they could still do their childminding as well as conduct their religious practices while working (Cukier, Norris & Wall 1996). Even though tourism brings considerable changes in gender relations, the culture expects women to maintain their primary duties as wives and mothers (Connell & Rugendyke 2008).

As well, the ethic of care in gender theory is also relevant in explaining what happened on Madura Island. This theory suggests that the process of patriarchal hegemonic socialisation encourages women to adopt and internalise their roles as care givers (Gilligan 1982). Some women on Madura Island engaged in these roles by helping and suggesting to others to earn money to support their family through the informal employment in tourism. The acceptance of these roles reinforces the hegemony that subordinates women’s needs to the needs of others.
According to the strong *Buppa’Babbu’Guru Rato* principle in Madurese culture, the residents should hold their parents as the first people they comply with in society, then the *kyai*. In fact, *kyai* are accorded the highest position of respect, which allows them to be influential in the development of the meanings of tourism. The pivotal role and respect afforded the *kyai* in Madura Island is bolstered by the finding that most residents interviewed, regardless of the village they live in or the level of formal education they have attained, maintain that *kyai* are the people to be obeyed. Aminah is a case in point. She prefers to discuss any problems with her guru rather than her parents which show the high level of respect and trust accorded the guru. The respect given to *kyai* by residents allows the *kyai* to be powerful parties within the community. This high level of respect accorded *kyai* leads to the government always implementing their plans hand in hand with *kyai* (see Chapter 5). This, as discussed above, leads to the residents in this study feeling happy about being represented by *kyai* in tourism planning discussions. As a result, the *kyai* hinder resident participation in tourism planning. This situation will be elaborated further in Chapter 8.

Finally, despite the ordering of parties suggested by the *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato* philosophy, the findings of this study suggests another party outside the traditional philosophy of Madura Island has some influences. The tourism industry itself is comprised of those who have access to tourism resources as well as having skill or knowledge, capital, and information such as hotel managers and travel agency entrepreneurs. The ownership of such resources represents the ownership of power that individuals can use to satisfy their needs (Kayat 2002). This means that by having these resources, business entrepreneurs have more power than local residents. This leads to unequal relationships in that entrepreneurs have power to dictate to residents in terms of defining the meanings of tourism. As a consequence, local residents have been marginalised and disempowered because they have limited opportunities to gain employment in tourism (Hampton 2003; Liu & Wall 2006). These opportunities mostly go to the industry parties, as they are more capable of reorienting themselves towards tourism through qualifications and experience (Walpole & Goodwin 2000). As stated earlier, this difference, together with other discrepancies between the values and the study findings will be further synthesised in the following section.
7.7 Synthesising the Influences that Shape the Meanings of Tourism

The emergence of tourism on Madura Island has transformed and challenged the order of Madurese philosophy. This is consistent with a great deal of tourism impact studies discussed in Chapter 3 where tourism was seen to have considerable social impacts on destination societies (Haley et al. 2005; Telfer & Sharpley 2008). However, while other studies found that tourism can introduce new values that mix with the local residents’ values such as in the form of demonstration effect and acculturation (Fisher 2004; Telfer & Sharpley 2008), this current study found that the traditional values held by the local residents are interpreted and transformed into different things that are no longer consistent with traditional values. Tourism is able to lead the Madurese residents who were interviewed to create their own hierarchy of parties based on who they interact with and how they create order and meaning from their interactions with those parties. This situation may suggest a shift of obedience, a shift away from what is suggested by the traditional philosophy.

The emergence of a new order among the influences suggests increased power among local elites within the community. The massive tourism developments that are planned for Madura Island have encouraged the emergence of elites who have control over tourism development. Mowforth and Munt (2009) claim that the local community is not resistant to the divisions which may exist within the community. Thus, the influences of parties represent the distribution of power that exists on the island. These four parties represent the four major powers within the Madurese community. Parents represent the power of family; kyai represent the power of religion; the government represents the power of the formal authority; and entrepreneurs represent the power of the market/industry. As each elite has their own wishes and their own meanings of tourism, the elites reflect different wishes (Mowforth & Munt 2009). These wishes subsequently enter as inputs for the residents to their meanings; creating subjective meanings for each individual. In other words, this subjectivity of meanings is encouraged by the power exercised by the parties that exist in the community.

The emergence of powerful conservative leaders in the form of kyai, the culturally powerful mothers, the powerful centralised government, and the rise of tourism industries, has created a scenario whereby these powerful parties have taken control over the way tourism meanings are shaped among residents on Madura Island. In essence, they have taken control over the residents. This situation is central in demonstrating two aspects of developing countries: the first being the shift in the way tourism planning in developing countries is formulated and
implemented, and the second is the limited participation of local residents as a consequence of this control.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the centralised administrative structure in most developing countries is an important issue impacting on the tourism planning process and the achievement of sustainable tourism (Tosun & Timothy 2001). It leads to the centralisation of the planning activities in the hands of certain elites (Tosun & Timothy 2001). Some research has revealed that the control of the planning process in developing countries is mostly in the hands of the government (Cole 2006; Tosun & Timothy 2001). However, as suggested by the current study, the religious leaders have become the most influential party in the community in relation to tourism planning. The domination of power in this study has been shifting from each successive government to religious leaders. The opportunity for the kyai to represent the voices of the residents in tourism planning discussions and their role of collaborating with the government leaders certainly suggests the domination of the kyai and shift of power in this study.

While the roles of leaders have been widely discussed in the tourism planning literature, the role of religious leaders in tourism planning is something that has received little attention. Henderson (2003) and Timothy (1998) are among those who recognise the important role of the religious leaders in tourism planning and acknowledge the need to consult with them (Henderson 2003). Some argue that the inclusion of the local religious leaders in tourism planning is important in order to align tourism with the needs and goodwill of the community (Chabra 2010).

The currently powerful status of religious leaders also suggests that there has been an increase in power. Their power extends further than their limited religious scope to a broader scope encompassing the tourism planning process. As discussed earlier, the role of the kyai and their pesantren (Islamic dorms) on Madura Island, which is not only associated with Islamic teaching, but also broadly associated with the surrounding community, has allowed them to achieve a high level of reverence in the eyes of the local community (Risti 2011). The strong cultural tradition is the catalyst that has usurped the power of the residents and binds the residents to a respect for the religious leaders. This strong power in the hands of the leaders reinforces the obedience of the local residents. This is consistent with the study of Timothy (1998), which found that trust and respect toward the leaders resulted in obedience from the residents.
This power allows the leaders to make decisions on behalf of everyone (Timothy 1998). This was evident on Madura Island where the wide range of responsibilities held by the kyai and the dependency of the Madura people upon them gives the kyai power over the residents. This leads to the issue of participation because the power and representation by the religious leaders limits the participation of the residents in tourism planning. Indeed, the power of leaders leaves the local residents with little choice but to accept what the leaders decide (Timothy 1998). The powerful kyai dynamic limits residents’ participation in tourism planning, which contradicts the principles of sustainable tourism development as stated in Chapter 2 and 3. Thus, it is difficult to achieve sustainable tourism development without the involvement of residents in tourism planning.

The limited participation of residents or disregard for the residents’ voices may cause mismatches between resident preferences and the implementation of tourism planning. Opposition to the beach is one example of many mismatched cases. The beach visits which are considered as incongruent with Islamic values in fact have become one of the main agendas of tourism planning in promoting Madura Island to tourists. This is consistent with Mowforth and Munt’s (2009) claim that the planning of destinations often represents different interests and has different priorities from those of local communities. This is totally in contrast to the spirit of involving local residents in tourism presented in the tourism master plans (national, provincial or regional tourism master plans).

This lack of control on the part of the residents in relation to tourism development is made worse by the emergence of tourism industries. The industries’ influence is reflected in the situation where the greater the growth of tourism in an area, the less control there is by communities over tourism development (Telfer & Sharpley 2008). In other words, as the destination evolves and external companies enter the destination, control is passed from the local community to external agents (Telfer & Sharpley 2008). This is what happened to Madura Island. The opening of the bridge which was followed by various tourism plans have attracted entrepreneurs tempted by the opportunity to gain profits from participating in tourism. As they have power in capital and in the market, they are able to dictate and control tourism on Madura Island. This creates dependency on the part of residents who have less power than the entrepreneurs.

This condition is worsened by the low level of skill and capital of Madurese local residents who find it difficult to participate in tourism. As Mathieson and Wall (2006) note, local residents
have limited skills and ability and can therefore only get access to unpaid or unskilled jobs in tourism. Furthermore, the local residents cannot become entrepreneurs with this limited ability and lack of capital (Tosun 1998). Wilkinson and Pratiwi (1995) in Pangandaran Village, Indonesia, also maintain that despite the fact that tourism has opened up new employment opportunities in both the formal and informal sectors, tourism has also resulted in marginalisation of the locals. The ownership of these resources by a resident permits him or her to have power over those who do not have any resources and, as such, are subservient to the other residents’ power (Kayat 2002). As a result, on Madura Island, the locals are becoming marginalised in regard to their employment, property and power, leaving the industry parties to grow and continue to dictate and influence the local residents.

Indeed, the emergence of the increased power among local elites, such as religious leaders and the tourism industry in the community, may suggest a shift in as well as a challenge to resident participations in the tourism planning process in developing countries. This challenge will be further elaborated in Chapter 8.

7.8 Conclusion

The above discussion reveals that a wide variety of actors play roles in the development of the meanings of tourism held by the residents in this study. These actors are guru (kyai), mother, the government and the tourism industry. These four parties may represent the four major powers within the Madurese community. Mother may represent the power of family, guru (kyai) may represent the power of religion, the government may represent the power of the formal institution, and the entrepreneurs may represent the power of the market. In this study, as kyai are the most important party, the religious power appears to be the most powerful influence in the development of the meanings of tourism.

The philosophy of Buppa’Babbu’Guru Rato is an important principle of life for the Madurese people. It is therefore reasonable to expect the development of the meanings should follow this order. However, this study found that in the development of the meanings there has been a shift of order. Parents, in this case mother, play a role in developing the meanings, but they are not the dominant party. Kyai, in fact, appear to be the most influential party. In other words, the power of the family has been usurped by the religious power.
The high level of influence of kyai is encouraged by the religious/cultural respect accorded them by the residents, regardless of their educational level or status. This situation has influenced the government to adjust its planning implementation by always coordinating and consulting with the kyai. For example, in order to successfully disseminate their program or implement their plan, they must proceed hand in hand with the kyai.

The emergence of tourism on the island has encouraged the establishment of the power of the market. As other parties appear in the form of hotel managers and travel entrepreneurs, they demonstrate the power which is sourced in the ownership of or access to tourism or market resources. As is the case in most developing countries, the community is ruled directly and indirectly by small and powerful elites (Timothy 1999). On Madura Island, the emergence of tourism has motivated the emergence of other powerful actors who have contributed to change in the hierarchy of respect within the community. Indeed, there is now another actor, the tourism industry, in addition to those listed in the philosophy of Buppa Babbu Guru Rato, influencing the meanings of tourism for the residents.

Moreover, with the top-down nature of governance that pervades Indonesia and Madura Island, the interactions between residents and those in the hierarchy of respect take place through a top-down planning approach. This means the residents have limited opportunity to participate. In the context of the development of the meanings of tourism, this top-down planning approach has restricted and directed the resident interpretation to be more closely aligned with the values of the government. However, the preference values of the government result from their consultations with kyai as the religious power on the island. Again, the supreme role of the kyai contributes to the development of the meanings of tourism as well as the limited participation of the residents in tourism planning. This situation will be further elaborated in Chapter 8.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION:
FROM DIVERSE MEANINGS TO SHARED PASSIVE PARTICIPATION IN TOURISM PLANNING

8.1 Summary

The opening of the Suramadu Bridge between the Indonesian islands of Madura and Java in June 2009 has encouraged the implementation of many tourism development plans by the government. Given that Madura Island was once an isolated island with a low number of visitors, the escalation in the number of tourists visiting is something new and potentially a challenge given the stereotype of Madurese people, largely attributed by Indonesians from elsewhere. Madurese people are largely believed to be rough, rude, extroverted, temperamental, impolite, and crude, resulting in the perception of them as frightening or ‘to be avoided’ (Jonge 1995). This situation added to my interest in the emergence of tourism on Madura Island and led to a desire to examine what tourism means for individuals living on the island. The complexity of the social, political and cultural landscapes of the residents enhanced my interest in understanding their meanings of tourism. Consequently, I narrowed my topic to look more closely at the multifaceted development and articulation of the meanings which are attached to tourism by residents.

A central issue addressed by this thesis is that the residents of Madura Island and their voices have been systematically ignored by the Indonesian Government. Indeed, a top-down approach to the governance of Indonesia is reflected in the findings of this thesis, despite the fact that the people of Madura have strong views about what should happen with regard to tourism development.

In earlier chapters, I critically reviewed the literature on tourism planning and resident perception studies, particularly as they have been applied in developing countries. As an outcome of this review, I recognised that much of the work on resident perceptions overlooks the complex processes that shape the meanings that residents assign to tourism, which are derived from social interactions that ultimately reinforce power inequities among residents.
In this thesis, symbolic interactionism was employed as a paradigmatic framework to address the research objectives and to focus on how the complex meanings assigned to tourism interact with the social, political and cultural landscapes to reinforce patterns of disengagement among residents in the tourism planning processes in developing countries. To achieve this, I employed a qualitative research design to conduct a study of residents of Madura Island. I sought to collect rich qualitative data to address the objectives of the thesis by conducting in-depth interviews with residents and local tourism officers on Madura Island. I also reviewed tourism planning and policy materials at national, regional and local levels to contextualise the data drawn from the interviews.

Thematic analysis of the data revealed that the meanings residents assigned to tourism could be broadly categorised as ‘business opportunities gained and lost’, ‘a source of disempowerment’, ‘a threat to culture’ and ‘an opportunity to share religious and cultural values’. However, a more critical analysis revealed that these meanings of tourism were underpinned by the hegemony of a central political and cultural philosophy: *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato* (father, mother, guru and government), which influenced the life of Madura Island residents.

The overarching aim of this thesis was to investigate the meanings of tourism held by residents on Madura Island and critically examine how these meanings develop. While the previous chapters (5, 6 and 7) addressed the three specific research objectives related to this aim, this final chapter focuses upon the overall aim of the study. This chapter explores the underlying finding that, despite the diversity of meanings assigned to tourism, the influences of guru (*kyai*), mother, government and the tourism industry reinforced resident non-participation or, at best, passive participation in the tourism planning process on Madura Island.

### 8.2 Passive Participation in Tourism Planning

Participation is subject to various interpretations (Cole 2006) which vary from ‘being manipulated’ to ‘taking initiative independently’ (see Arnstein (1969), Pretty (1995), and Tosun (1999)). The meanings of tourism constructed in the minds of participants were coupled with a level of passivity and sometimes non-participation in the tourism planning on Madura Island. The influences of guru (*kyai*), mother, government and the tourism industry laid out in the previous chapters lead to a critical questioning of the issues around participation on Madura Island, especially with the emergence of the research theme of tourism as a source of disempowerment. Figure 8.1 presents how these meanings affect participation in tourism.
As Timothy (1999) suggests, participation may happen at two levels: public participation in decision making and resident involvement in the benefits of tourism. The first aims to empower local residents to determine their own goals and desires for development, as well as to encourage the involvement of other stakeholders, while the second aims to reduce the potential benefits asymmetry that is frequently experienced by residents in the context of a top-down approach (Lamberti et al. 2011; Timothy 1999). Thus, the effect of the meanings on participation in tourism planning on Madura Island is elaborated around these two levels, and is discussed below.

**Public Participation in Decision Making**

The empirical evidence presented in this thesis demonstrates that the meanings of tourism resulted in the desperate actions of some residents to find their own way of becoming involved in the tourism decision making process. This is signified in several examples such as the
entrepreneurs who urgently needed the government to listen to their aspirations, the teachers of *pesantren* who wanted to voice their concerns about the negative impacts of tourism in harming their cultural and religious values, and the local residents who complained about the lack of control of the government in the operation of the hotel and the relocation of stalls that occurred at some attractions (e.g. Camplong Beach). Desperate actions were taken by those participants who felt they did not have any access to the decision making process or that the government did not want to listen to their opinions. These findings fit within Tosun’s (1999) typology of induced participation, and also with Arnstein (1969) degrees of citizen tokenism typology. Furthermore, these findings reflect functional participation for material incentives, and participation by consultation as described in Pretty’s model. The residents appear to have a voice, but they do not know how to make their voices heard. This type of participation is the most common form to be found in developing countries where a host community only supports decisions regarding tourism development matters that are ‘made for them rather than by them’ (Tosun 2006, p. 495).

The above examples also show that the participants appear to view the government as the main initiator in participation. This view is also common in developing countries where governments tend to have a central role in initiating participatory action and institutionalising it (commonly referred to as induced participation) (Tosun 1999). Unfortunately, these desperate actions show that the government’s strategies to initiate participatory action are viewed by the residents as limited.

In addition, these findings represent coercive participation (Tosun 1999), in that the participation is manipulated and consultations with the local residents are primarily held to reduce socio-political risks for tourists and tourism development, not to encourage participation of local people. Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that the findings reveal that some residents desperately complained about tourism development in their areas because tourism seemed to be skewed towards fostering tourism development on Madura Island, rather than involving the residents in the tourism development process. Indeed, coercive and induced participation are hard to distinguish (Tosun 1999), as is evident in the findings of this study.

The overall results of this research identified restrictions that limit the capabilities of residents in voicing their views or participating in decision making. One of the limitations is the fact that the religious leaders of the Madurese people (the *kyai*) are the foremost representative spokespersons for the local residents in most discussions, including tourism development. This finding was substantiated by the Madura residents interviewed. The prominence of *kyai* spokespersons leads to the representation of the local residents’ voice. This is very much related
to the status and the broad role that the *kyai* occupy in Madurese society

In fact, some residents questioned the role of the *kyai* in representing their voice. Reservation and feelings of doubt towards the *kyai* reveal something important regarding the contribution of the residents’ voice in tourism planning or the active participation of the residents. Residents who question the capabilities of the *kyai* apparently disagree with having their voices represented. What this means is that there was a strong desire amongst some residents interviewed to more actively participate in the tourism planning discussions. Even those who were pleased to have their voices represented may actually be exhibiting the intention of at least being involved in the discussion.

Ironically, even though some residents were found to have great intention to participate, the inequity in power between the *kyai* (as the gurus and religious leaders in the community) and the residents, as described above, seems to limit the residents’ participation in tourism discussions. This inequity is increased further by the fact that, due to local circumstances, only selected villagers, such as the heads of families, are invited to the discussions. The voices of other family members are may be marginalised. This situation may disadvantage residents in that they are not able to voice their views.

These limitations to participation found in the Madurese community fit with Tosun’s (2000) notions of structural and cultural limitations, where residents are restricted from participating in tourism planning discussions. He also confirms that these limitations are familiar and significant barriers for most residents in developing countries. So, what limits the Madurese residents from participating in the tourism planning process is aligned more broadly with the tourism planning process in developing nations.

Referring to the typology of Pretty (1995), the results of this research have revealed that passive participation seems to be the most frequent type of participation practice for the residents of this study given that their involvement was limited to being informed about what had been decided or what has already occurred (Pretty 1995). For example, the process of consultation in Sukolilo Barat Village, as discussed in Chapter 5, illustrated that village decisions was made by a small number of local elites and the residents’ voices were ignored at the village level meeting, thus clearly demonstrating the existence of passive participation.
This study also found that the purpose of the pokdarwis is mostly for ‘training’ rather than for listening to the voices of the residents or empowering them, and is another indication of the existence of passive participation in Pretty’s (1995) typology and coercive participation in Tosun’s (1999) typology. In this kind of participation, the leaders have the role of educating or ‘curing’ local residents by emphasising how their actions may harm the development of tourism (Tosun 2006, p. 495). Thus, the leaders, such as the pokdarwis staff or the local tourism board officers, provide information, persuading and convincing the local residents that tourism has great economic benefits for them and will not impact on their religious and cultural values. This is evident in the statement of the former secretary of pokdarwis who claimed that there were some people who disagreed with tourism, but once they were convinced they would be happy with tourism in the area. This indicates efforts conducted by the government were intended to discourage potential threats to future tourism development. This is in line with Tosun’s (2006) idea that, in most developing countries, even though tourism development is construed as considering the host community’s priorities, in reality, it is more heavily concerned with the promotion and development of tourism, and meeting the needs and desires of decision makers, tourism operators and tourists.

Furthermore, the results suggest that the government and the community leaders, to some extent, encourage residents to participate through pokdarwis or the informal meetings led by kyai, as was the case in Sumenep. According to Tosun's (1999) typology, this represents ‘induced participation’. As the interviewee who had an important role in facilitating a planning discussion in West Sukolilo stated, ‘Discussion is only wishy-washy’ and some residents in Prajan Village in Sampang and Prenduan Village in Sumenep, said that dialogues are usually needed only to ensure compliance with government procedures, rather than aiming at truly capturing the residents’ voice. Such planning discussions show all the traits of passivity. The ‘wissy-washy’ discussion indicates that the power of residents is relatively low, because while they have a voice in the tourism development process, they have no power to guarantee that their views will be taken into consideration by the powerful groups such as government bodies. This situation of powerlessness led to some residents feeling that any discussions were only a routine activity, performing the role of ‘lip service’ such that they had no expectation of any further follow up. This situation, according to Tosun’s (1999) typology is ‘induced participation’, where the participation of residents in decision making has been limited to informing and consulting or being induced to participate in body only.
A further indication of passivity is found in the instance of the local tourism officer in Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan, who was not fully aware of the tourism plans that the government was planning to implement in his area. This indicates that the power and control over development actually lies in the hands of people or groups outside the community, who disregard the residents, leaving them powerless. The decisions were made for the residents rather than by them. In addition to this, another resident suggested that residents basically just agree to tourism as long as it benefits them, confirming the existence of passive participation within the Madura community.

As a result of the disregard for residents’ views and their passive participation, the outcome of discussions were sometimes far from what the residents expected. The cases of competition between residents for stall locations, the uncertain future for sellers in tourist destinations, the relocation of sellers to new places, the demand for differentiating the location of swimming for women and men (either at the beach or at the swimming pool), and protests at the development are some examples of what occurred in the Madurese community. Moreover, the statement by the tourism board officers, that they are sometimes frustrated that their ideas and plans are in contradiction to the residents’ ideas and preferences, is another significant piece of evidence of the consequences of neglecting resident voices.

The interviews revealed that the lack of expertise and understanding of the plans on the part of the residents is another important issue that functioned as a barrier to participation in the tourism planning process for Madura residents. With the tendency to regard Madura residents as having low levels of formal education and, some of the residents in positions of power, such as teachers, said that the low level of formal education that the residents commonly have is their main barrier to understanding the planning and its process. Consequently, resident voices tend to be disregarded.

Studies on host-guest relationships primarily draw from international tourism in developing countries (Burns & Holden 1995; Telfer & Sharpley 2008), however, their arguments are useful in helping to explain why such issues emerged in the Madurese local community. According to these studies, tourism creates various negative implications for the community. For instance, Burns and Holden (1995) claim that one of the negative implications of tourism is that the majority of the benefits of tourism go to certain local elites rather than residents. In the context of Madura Island, visitors are predominantly domestic tourists, thus negative implications of tourism are feared, in particular, the fear that the benefits of tourism will accrue to local elites or
groups of people outside the Madurese community. In addition, this concern has potential implications for communities; that is, that local residents are controlled by local elites (Burns & Holden 1995).

Some scholars argue that the local community is not resistant to the divisions which may come from within its own numbers and which may expose either the influence of a dominant local elite or the need to balance the demands and wishes of different sectors of the community (Mowforth & Munt 2009). In the Madurese community, there is a great deal of local elitism formed from within the community. The *kyai* representing the residents’ voices across the island is one example of the form and control of local elites in the Madurese community. This occurs because the capacity to influence the meanings of tourism does not change the overarching influences of the philosophy that shapes Madurese culture. The traditional structures of power embedded in Madurese philosophy remain in place and this has encouraged the high respect paid to *kyai* by the majority of the Madurese people.

Recognising that Madura residents endow the *kyai* with an extremely high respect, the government always collaborates with the *kyai* in disseminating their programs. In response to the actions of the residents, the government chooses to employ the power maintained by the *kyai* to achieve its aims. The co-operative action between the government and the *kyai* is reflected in the involvement of the *kyai* in the process of tourism planning. At the implementation level, the instances of including the *kyai* to avoid resident resentment towards tourism development are common on Madura Island. For example, the beach improvements in Pamekasan, the hotel development in Sampang and Sumenep, and the tourism plans disseminated in all regions and at all levels demonstrate these relations.

Not only do local elites appear in the form of *kyai*, the local elites also appear in the form of the village leader and others who are in positions of power. The case of the *pokdarwis* in Tanjung Village illustrates this point, showing how the community is, to a great extent, controlled by a regime of new village leaders. In selected areas, such as Sukolilo Barat and Taddan Village, where tourism has had very significant growth and where many new local elites are those who run new tourism businesses, there has been an increase in people with substantial capital and tourism skills. The government also maps out their plans for each area in Madura and implements control among the communities through laws and regulations.
While power may come from a variety of sources and is exercised in different fashions in the tourism development process, the power of local residents is achieved through local participation (Mowforth & Munt 2009). However, as discussed earlier, participation has not worked well with regard to the contribution of local residents’ voices to discussions of tourism planning or in terms of the opportunities to gain benefits from tourism, ultimately leaving the Madurese residents interviewed in a position of powerless.

This absence of power is also reflected in the frequent statement, ‘I am just a small insignificant person’ which was echoed by many of the residents interviewed. An interpretation of this phrase is the lack of access to the tourism development process, as well as the lack of expertise of the residents. Chapter 6 also reveals that those who are in power (such as educated people) also repeatedly articulated a similar phrase. This may suggest that for some, lack of expertise may not be an issue in participating in decision making. The lack of accessibility and opportunities to be involved in tourism planning seems to be the biggest barrier for the residents of Madura Island in being actively involved in decision making in tourism.

The proof of the existence of this significant constraint to participation is strengthened by another widely mentioned statement, namely, ‘depends on bupati’ (the head of kabupaten/region). This statement can be interpreted to mean that the control of tourism development is acknowledged to be in the hands of one person, the bupati, or more broadly, the local government. With this in mind, the hotel manager in Sampang suggested that all tourism development processes in the Sampang Region was in the hands of the bupati. If the bupati is concerned with tourism, it is more than likely that tourism will be a priority on his agenda. If it is not his priority, then tourism may be put aside. In addition to this, the interviews with residents who were engaged in the tourism industry in Banyuajuh Village (around Kamal Harbour area) and who had expressed some complaints to the bupati also expressed the view that the bupati should be the one who is responsible for tourism development at the local level. This statement was uttered by residents from both categories of the research (villages with planned tourism and non-planned tourism), such as hotel managers, travel agency staff, teachers and civil servants, revealing the common recognition that the highest level of structural government hierarchy in the region is in the hands of the bupati. The bupati is acknowledged as the person in the highest position of formal power in the community.

The views contained in the statements ‘depends on bupati’ and ‘I am a small, insignificant person’ also imply the high dependency of local residents on the government, in this case, the
bupati (as the one who has power). It also demonstrates a pessimistic attitude on the part of the residents in relation to the current situation. As the access and capabilities to participate in tourism are limited, the residents interpret the situation and create some actions in response to this situation by passing control of the process of tourism development solely to the bupati and, in so doing, have little choice but to accept decisions and regulations made by the government. The case of the pokdarwis (tourism awareness group) at Jumiang Beach, the lack of activity in the Kamal Harbour area, the plans of regions, and the acceptance of stalls being relocated to other places, each illustrate this point. As the resident who is active in managing Jumiang Beach said, ‘…whatever the decision of the bupati or government, we have to follow it’.

Furthermore, the tourism development process on Madura Island conceptualises the symbolic interaction process. As is maintained by Erb (2000), the governments of developing countries always think that they know what is best for their people, and it seems that this is the case for the government of Madura Island. At this point, the government is using a top-down approach to deliver decisions, regulations and laws (these are considered the sources of power of the government (Telfer & Sharpley 2008), while the residents, with no power, are in the position of having to accept whatever decisions are made by the government. The government’s actions and other influences provide limited access for the residents to participate in tourism development such that they accept the decisions and regulations of the government without question.

Even though the residents seem to be powerless in the tourism development process of the island and surrender the process to governmental control, a teacher from Prenduan Village and one resident from Prajan Village raised an important point when stating that they were actually aware that the responsibility of tourism development should be in their hands. However, the situations discussed above have created barriers for them such that they are unable to participate. Indeed, in the face of the tourism development process on Madura Island, it seems there are two large and powerful groups within the community, the religious leaders (kyai) and the government. The above discussion demonstrates how these two powers have direct and indirect rule over the local residents.

**Involvement in the Benefits of Tourism**

The above discussion of passive participation and unheard voices brings another significant matter of tourism planning into the analysis; that is, does the emergence of tourism development on Madura Island benefit local people? This issue was repeatedly raised by some interviewees,
particularly those who live in non-tourism planned areas. These residents critically interpreted the meaning of tourism in a way that was defined by others. Using self-inquiry as to whether tourism benefits local people or not provides the information that, in fact, only a few of the elites in the Madurese community actually derive benefits from tourism. The conflict involved in this power imbalance for the residents, and the fact that they have not received any benefits of tourism (due to the absence of a tourist destination or their having no involvement in tourism), encouraged them to interpret and to respond in particular ways. In response to the situation confronting them, one of the reactions was for residents to question the benefits of tourism.

The most salient aspect of this issue to emerge was the elevated level of fear among the interviewees that tourism will not benefit them. The informal competition that exists between the street sellers in the Suramadu Bridge area and at Camplong Beach is evidence of this fear. Even though several scholars have noted that informal competition is a common factor for destinations in developing countries (Connell & Rugendyke 2008), it also suggests a lack of participation in tourism. In this case, the opportunities for the locals to maintain secure work in tourism have been impeded. For Madura Island, the practice of tourism authorities to focus only on their role of training the sellers in hospitality and ignoring other issues that arise in the conduct of the business of tourism (as in the case of informal competition between the street sellers at the Suramadu Bridge) has impeded the opportunity for local residents to benefit from tourism. Empowerment of the residents places an emphasis on access to wide opportunities for them in order that they gain personally from tourism (Cole 2006; Scheyvens 1999) and this situation appears to be far from being realised on Madura Island.

The marginalisation can also be detected in the sceptical feelings of the residents interviewed that they will only become spectators in the tourism development process, as articulated by several interviewees in Prenduan Village. Long before the Suramadu Bridge was built, this issue was indicated as the most significant for Madura residents, with Muthmainah (1998) finding that a large number of the kyai in Madura had concerns over whether the bridge would deliver affluence to the locals. This study has found that when the bridge was finally opened and tourism began to emerge, similar issues still exist, with residents voicing their concerns and questioning the benefits of tourism.

The interviews with residents revealed that their lack of expertise is a significant barrier for them in gaining benefits of tourism. Given the fact that the majority of Madurese residents have low levels of formal education and a lack skills in tourism, some residents who are active in
people empowerment organisations, such as those from Sukolilo Barat and Prajan Village, believe that the residents are not suited to employment in management positions in tourism business but could be informal employees, such as parking officers or pengamen (musicians on the street). This finding confirms the research of Wilkinson and Pratiwi (1995) who also found that the development of tourism in Pangandaran, a traditional Javanese fishing village, has only provided the local residents with access to informal positions, while the formal positions and the greater economic benefits are gained by non-locals, who are considered to have more substantial capital and tourism skills.

In relation to the skills of residents, different views existed between two interviewees, namely Kudori and Marhuda, with regard to the expected skills of the residents. The actions of Kudori, the former secretary of the pokdarwis in Pamekasan, to convince residents of the economic benefits of tourism is different to that of Marhuda, a teacher from Bangkalan. As discussed in Chapter 6, Marhuda placed his emphasis on the culture as a way of convincing residents about the benefits of tourism and that tourism is not negative but is about maintaining culture. Even though both Marhuda and Kudori are involved in empowering the residents through skills and education, they have different orientations. Marhuda seems to educate the residents to have formal positions in tourism, while Kudori empowers the residents by enabling them to participate in tourism, especially in informal positions such as parking officers or sellers. The roles in the community, the experiences, the interests in tourism and the level of involvement in tourism are some of the factors that underpin the differing views between these two residents. These different orientations are also encouraged by the broad tourism plans, coupled with the industrialisation plan in Bangkalan (for Marhuda), which is different to the plans of Jumiang Beach in Pamekasan (for Kudori) whose plans are smaller in scope. The demand for skilled positions is definitely greater in Bangkalan than in Sampang. In such a situation, it is perhaps understandable that Marhuda has strongly pessimistic views with regard to the residents fitting into the industry. These different orientations lead to the development of different meanings of tourism.

Recognising that local residents fear they will not benefit from tourism, Liu and Wall (2006) propose that if locals expect to gain advantage from tourism, there should be more involvement and input by them into tourism planning. Arguably, this can be achieved by making sustained efforts to increase the capabilities of local residents in order for them to be able to participate. However, this proposal does not seem to fit the case of Madura Island. Interviews with the tourism board officers across the island have revealed that the main aim of service training for
local residents, which, as discussed in Chapter 7 are conducted by the tourism board, is primarily to create a better service attitude and a more welcoming atmosphere for visitors. There appears to be no consideration of increasing the capabilities of residents or opportunities to participate in tourism planning. Thus, the suggestion to empower residents through local participation is far from being achieved on Madura Island.

In addition, the inadequate expertise of local government officers (in this case tourism board officers), who are perceived by local residents as managing tourism development processes on the island, has emerged from the study. The failure and difficulty in translating the central government policies at the local level is an instance of the incapacity of local government. This failure may occur due to the status of the local government in Indonesia, which acts primarily as the facilitator of programs created by the central government (Widianingsih & Morrell 2007). In this top down approach, the initiatives and creativity of the local government are not necessarily supported; therefore, local governments sometimes have difficulty in adjusting and translating central government decisions into local preferences and needs.

Moreover, as discussed in Chapter 5, a lack of investment emerged as an obstacle in tourism planning implementation on Madura Island. This barrier is, in fact, also an obstacle to resident participation. In discussing the contributions of residents in the tourism planning context, it is understood that, in the search to solve these problems, the government has been active in attracting the attention of investors to the island. A possible negative effect of this action is that there could be external control which would intervene in the process of tourism development on Madura Island. The invitation to external investors is regarded by Mowforth and Munt (2009) as a transfer of control from the hands of local community to external bodies. However, the idea of having the control of tourism development move from the hands of the local community to external counterparts is something that seems far from being taken into account by the local government. The obvious reason for this is that the main priority for development on Madura Island is attracting external counterparts to provide funding and this is clearly outlined in the RIPPDA or Tourism Plan documents for each region. The dependency of governments in developing countries on external agents creates external pressures that may limit the opportunity to improve participation for the local community (Tosun 2005).
8.3 Theoretical and Practical Contributions

Local community participation is a widely accepted criterion of sustainable tourism (United Nations 2002). Thus, despite some opposition (see, for example, Li (2006), Ladkin and Bertramini (2002)), a consensus of opinion now exists that recommends community participation as important in tourism development (Grybovych et al. 2011; Lamberti et al. 2011). The involvement of residents in tourism planning is, therefore, essential, as they are the only ones who comprehend the reasons behind their perceptions and preferences (Roberts 2013). Therefore, residents should be involved in tourism decision making processes and have opportunities to enjoy the full extent of the benefits of tourism (Timothy 1999). In this regard, while the tourism planning literature suggests that community participation should happen, in the context of tourism planning on Madura Island, I found that resident participation is difficult to achieve. Figure 8.2, below, presents community participation model drawn from the literature which is an idealised model against the reality of what this study found to be taking place on Madura Island.

This thesis concludes that the meanings of tourism held by residents are diverse. The diverse meanings assigned to tourism by the residents in this study were shaped by the influences of guru (kyai), mother, government and the tourism industry. These political and cultural influences, in fact, also impede the participation of residents in tourism planning. Figure 8.2 shows that guru (kyai), mother, government, and tourism industry, are reflected in the way of the residents, intercept in the planning process, obstruct their voices, and result in the failure of the decision makers to understand what tourism means for the residents. In this way, the meanings of tourism are not communicated in the tourism planning process, because the voices of residents are often ignored and not included in the decision making process. Therefore, what tourism means for the residents, which is reflected in how the residents interpret and define tourism, is muted and does not get communicated to the decision makers.
Figure 8.2 Community Participation in Tourism Planning: the Idealised Model and the Madura Context Model

The Idealised Model:

![Idealised Model Diagram]

Source: Adapted from Dredge and Jenkins (2007), Timothy (1999) & Tosun (2005)

The Madura Context Model:
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Source: Designed for this research
While the findings indicate that there was some participation in the process, this involvement was not on the part of the residents. As guru, the *kyai* are highly respected in the Madurese community, so the people who participated are mainly these religious leaders. The philosophy of *Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato* which emphasises obedience to, or respect for, the guru (*kyai*) who then deals with the government, allows the *kyai* to be even more powerful and gain greater obeisance from residents. This has two implications: first, the voices of the powerful *kyai* are considered by the government as representative of the voices of the residents; and second, the powerful *kyai* is used as a tool by the government to disseminate their programs to the residents. In this regard, the role of *kyai* is as a kind of mediator between the residents and the government. As a result, the *kyai* are the ones who are mostly asked to participate in tourism decision making. Thus, again, while the tourism planning literature suggests the importance of consulting locals to determine their perspectives on tourism (Timothy 1999), in this study, the voices of residents were really at the bottom of the communication channel (see Figure 8.2). Their voices and contribution to tourism planning are represented by the powerful and respected *kyai*.

The existence of this strong cultural tradition, which ultimately precludes people from participating in tourism planning, is not unique to Madura Island. The research of Timothy (1999) in Yogyakarta also raised a similar issue. The strong cultural traditions in Yogyakarta (Javanese culture), that give authority and reverence to people in positions of power or high social standing, have prevented followers from questioning the decisions taken by their leaders. Rather, discussion with leaders is a means of determining where followers should stand on an issue. The pervasiveness of this cultural view leads to the belief that local people should not be involved in tourism planning (Timothy 1999).

The minimal participation of residents in tourism planning resulted in some mismatches in tourism planning. Many such cases were presented and discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, such as the useless beach facilities or the relocation of sellers at Camplong Beach or at Suramadu Bridge. These instances demonstrate how the implemented plans often invite reactions as well as desperation among the residents. This occurred because the plans did not reflect the residents’ needs and preferences.

This condition is worsened by the top-down approach and highly centralised planning applied in most developing countries (Tosun & Timothy 2001). In the context of Indonesia and Madura Island, tourism is decentralised to local government, but should be consistent with the national
plan. This requirement indicates that tourism development at the regional level also reflects, to some extent, the concerns of the national and provincial government. This allows the local government to have little space for flexibility. The complaints raised by the tourism officers interviewed in this study with regard to the changed date of the Bull race attraction illustrate the inflexible nature of the processes. Moreover, the top-down approach means that all decisions and implementation plans are taken without careful attention to regional or local conditions. In most developing countries, there is a lack of political will to implement a participatory tourism development approach because of the effects in relation to the distribution of power and resources (Tosun & Timothy 2001). The government is not only disinterested in development but also rigorously suppresses the efforts of the progressive element to bring about meaningful changes. As a result, the realisation of community participation in tourism on Madura Island is far from development ideals, particularly with regard to participatory development strategy. Community participation is the lost component in developing countries (Tosun & Timothy 2001), and indeed tourism planning in Madura Island is not exceptional in this regard.

The planning literature maintains that while for developing countries the main purpose of tourism development is to increase foreign revenue, many other dimensions of tourism are largely ignored (Tosun & Timothy 2001). For that reason, tourism continues to be driven by the upper levels of government rather than community interests (Tosun & Timothy 2001). In the context of Madura Island, tourism is directed towards regional economic development with a focus on increasing revenue and, thus, considerations of the community’s interests are ignored. This thesis has found that this results in feelings of uselessness and desperation on the part of the residents.

Either the local government does not know what tourism means for the residents or, if they have some understanding of it, they have no power to act (due to the top-down approach), so the residents and their voices remain at the bottom of the communication channel (see Figure 8.2). Their voices are stopped without any chance of being heard by the decision makers. The influences of guru (kyai), mother, government and the tourism industry are a significant roadblock in achieving more power for some of the other residents. While this study supports the literature which claims that community participation in tourism planning is a major problem in many developing countries (Tosun 2000; Tosun & Timothy 2001), the current study adds to the growing body of literature on tourism planning in developing countries by asserting that resident participation in tourism planning in developing countries is destined to fail, especially while the cultural system remains strong.
The idea that tourism has the potential to be a tool for improving regional economies in developing countries (Telfer & Sharpely 2008) is adopted by the Indonesian government, as well as the East Java provincial government and the regional governments of Madura Island. However, this view is not fully supported by the residents and tourism officers interviewed. The plans of East Java and the regional governments to develop Madura Island as a tourist destination, and the idea that tourism will generate alternative income for the individual regions appears to be challenged by the strong engagement of the residents in the cultural philosophy of Buppa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato. As a result, the plan of the East Java government to create Madura Island as a tourist destination in Indonesia is a challenging prospect.

This study also contributes to the body of research on resident perceptions of tourism in Indonesia. Given that such studies in the Indonesian context are limited, research in the diverse location of Madura Island was warranted. While the focus of tourism studies in Indonesia is mostly concerned with mature and developed tourist destinations such as Bali (Crofts 1999; Cukier-Snow & Wall 1993; Cukier & Wall 1994; Gibbons & Fish 1989; Long & Wall 1999; Nuryanti, Peggy, Chang & Ho 2001; Rodenburg 1980), Yogyakarta (Hampton 2003), Pangandaran (Wilkinson & Pratiwi 1995), North Sulawesi (Crawford, Kasmidi, Korompis & Pollnac 2006; Ross & Wall 1999) and Flores (Cole 2008; Maribeth 2000), areas where tourism development is only starting to emerge, such as that on Madura Island, is largely unexamined.

The practical contributions of this study include that this research offers positive input for the Indonesian government, especially the East Java government and the regional governments of Madura Island. For these government bodies, this research provides critical insights into how tourism is understood by local residents, and the complex processes that shape the meanings that residents assign to tourism. From the context of a broader scope, this research also provides understanding for developing countries of resident perceptions of tourism development and what tourism means to them which, until this point, has remained largely unexamined. The research sheds light not only on tourism development on Madura Island, but also on tourism development for developing countries more broadly.

The findings suggest several courses of action for encouraging resident participation in tourism planning. Most importantly, residents need to be convinced that their voices are taken into account and heard. The government needs to understand the preferences, needs and wishes of the residents, as well as develop a better appreciation of Madurese culture. The residents need to be assured that they have access to and can enjoy the benefits of tourism. In so doing, the
Indonesian government, especially the East Java government and the regional governments of Madura Island must listen to the residents’ voices, understand their needs and wants, and provide access to relevant information. Once the government understands the preferences of the residents, the residents know what to expect from the government and what the government expects them to do, joint actions by both parties can be achieved.

Furthermore, some of the residents interviewed made the pertinent point that the responsibility of tourism development is in their hands too, not only in the hands of the government. From this basis, it is suggested that the residents be more proactive in their participation. Therefore, they need to develop adequate knowledge of tourism, particularly their needs, preferences and skills in tourism which will subsequently facilitate greater access for them to participate or to actively reject tourism.

However, the efforts needed to encourage resident participation will be difficult to achieve without any cultural shift, including the willingness of the government to improve on their current top-down planning approach so as to incorporate more bottom up approaches. The hegemony of the Bappa’ Babbu’ Guru Rato philosophy combined with the influences of guru (kyai), mother, government and tourism industry found in this study reinforced the residents’ passivity with regard to tourism planning. As suggested by Tosun (2000), removing the cultural barriers to participation requires a long educational process. In line with this, an educational process could be implemented for the residents that enable them to critically consider the role of the philosophy and the influences that are shaped by this hegemony. This should also be enhanced by the commitment of the government to improve the contribution of residents to tourism planning or to improve the political will to implement a participatory tourism development approach. Constant efforts and a strong will to improve participation both on the part of the government and the residents should be undertaken, because a ‘participatory capacity cannot be built like a road or dam; it must be developed’ (Tosun 2000, p. 630).

Moreover, in light of the absence of research into the meanings of tourism by the use of symbolic interactionism, these findings are worthy of consideration. The use of symbolic interactionism has revealed the diverse meanings of tourism held by residents, including tourism as a source of disempowerment and has also been effective in uncovering the hegemonic influences that shape these meanings. Ultimately, this affects participation in tourism planning. Another contribution of this research is that symbolic interactionism, supported by a descriptive qualitative analysis, has been useful in providing a thorough analysis that has elaborated the
context for the meanings of tourism. Like social exchange theory which is often combined with other social theories, the combination of symbolic interactionism and descriptive qualitative analysis has provided a solid piece of research. The meanings and how the meanings develop as the two central issues of the inquiry have been thoroughly addressed with this approach.

The use of symbolic interactionism in this study has made a significant contribution to tourism studies by revealing the various meanings of tourism held by residents, including tourism as a source of disempowerment. As discussed in Chapter 3, previous resident perception studies have mostly been concerned with investigating the residents’ voices around tourism. This has been achieved through the use of a variety of terms, often used interchangeably. For example, as explained in Chapter 3, Lankford (1994) and Andriotis and Vaughan (2003) used the terms *attitudes* and *perceptions* in the same context and implied similar meanings for both words. In contrast, this study looked at the meaning which underlies the perception. Thus, it has been argued that there is clearly a differentiation between the terms *meanings*, *attitudes* and *perceptions*. Therefore, these terms cannot be used interchangeably, because the meanings guide the perception and the attitude (Blumer 1969). In addition, the use of symbolic interactionism has revealed the various meanings of tourism held by residents.

### 8.4 Limitations of this Study

The results of this investigation were limited by a number of constraining factors. First, this study has not considered some of the individual characteristics of participants that may have influenced the results of this research, for example, community attachment or the length of habitation by a participant in an area. The differences in community attachment between the participants may have confounded the results, as it may be assumed that the longer a resident stays in the area, the deeper their interactions with other parties in the surrounding area will be. Thus, it may be inferred that there are additional influences in the growth of the meanings as well as the more varied meanings assigned to tourism.

Second, the conclusion drawn from this and previous chapters must be considered in the context of the study on which they are based. Thirdly, the major limitation of the methodology is primarily related to the difficulty in approaching participants to check the accuracy of data due to a lack of contact with the person or their remote location. This factor potentially limits the validity of the findings. Fourth, in terms of the findings, the limited size of the sample used in this study contributed to the lack of mother-son relationships and the lack of contribution by
fathers in defining the meanings of tourism among the participants. Fifth, as the conversations with participants were conducted in the Indonesian language, the ‘story’ that has been reported in this thesis has been translated into English and mediated by the researcher allowing for researcher interpretation or bias. Sixth, this study was conducted by non-resident or non-Madurese person. Therefore, a rapport of close association between the researcher and the participant was difficult to develop within the time frame of the fieldwork. Due to the time limitations of a PhD study, the fieldwork in this study had to be accomplished with these restraints.

8.5 Future Research

Given the limitations of this study, as outlined above, a number of recommendations for further research can be made. This study examined the meanings of tourism held by the residents on one Indonesian island, Madura Island, which could be categorised as a ‘just emerging’ destination. Further research needs to be conducted in this area in the future. Also, future research could focus on examining similar issues for different residents on other islands in Indonesia and in other developing countries. This would contribute to a greater understanding of the meanings of tourism held by residents.

Also, since research concerned with tourism on Madura Island is limited, particularly because tourism is a recent phenomenon there, it would be worth considering other issues emerging on the island as tourism continues to develop. For example, the present study did not extend to an analysis of the impacts of tourism on the residents of Madura Island. It would be useful to research the impacts of tourism on the island, in particular, for the villages where tourist attractions are located. Such an examination in the future would shed light on the economic and socio-cultural impacts of having tourism in their area. In addition, future studies could also evaluate the resident attitudes toward tourism in these villages. It could measure the level of support of the local residents towards tourism. This would bring significance in terms of examining tourism as a way to improve the economy of Madura Island, or the development of a form of tourism appropriate for the residents of Madura Island which is able to promote positive attitudes and inspire pro-tourism behaviour.

As the time to conduct this study was limited, future studies could seek to advance methodologies by employing a qualitative, ethnographic research approach, with the researcher acting as a participant observer for longer periods of time in the field. This would allow a more
substantial rapport to develop between the researcher and the participants contributing to an increased opportunity for participants to speak freely and at length with the researcher. Also, this would allow for thicker description and a more accurate portrayal of the residents’ experiences of tourism.

As discussed, this research will serve as ‘a wake-up call’ for the Indonesian Government to listen to the voices of the residents of Madura Island. It is beyond this scope of this study to research community participation in any depth such as the level of participation, the obstacles to community participation and how to encourage the community participation. Therefore, future research is considered necessary to develop a better knowledge of community participation in tourism planning on Madura Island. The results of these studies will also provide better recommendations for developing or implementing a participatory tourism development approach in developing countries.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A. Profile of Participants

Participants from Villages Where Tourism Development is Being Planned or is Already Being Implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Elementary School (Not Graduated)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rahmad</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Hotel Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kahar</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hamid</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Still studying at university</td>
<td>Restaurant Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Furdin</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adi</td>
<td>Taddan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Sales Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mahdi</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Elementary School (Not Graduated)</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ali</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kadori</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Former Secretary of Pokdarwis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ros</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rahmidi</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Still studying at University</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Joko</td>
<td>Tanjung Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A Grave Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mayasari</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Kindergarten Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mahda</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Farid</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Suryo</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eki</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sugeng</td>
<td>Kebon Agung Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Farmer/Asta Tinggi Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Syukron</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Chef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rizki</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Village Officer/ Member of BPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants from Villages Where Tourism Development is Being Planned or is Already Being Implemented (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mustari</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Aminah</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Still studying at Senior High School</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marhuda</td>
<td>Sukolilo Barat Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants from Villages Where Tourism Development is Not Being Planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sudiro</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Village Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Edo</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Billiard Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hamidi</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Muhni</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Matsari</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Elementary School (Not Graduated)</td>
<td>Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Arif</td>
<td>Prajan Village, Sampang</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rahmawan</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Still Studying in Senior High School</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sohadi</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Village Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kamali</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Administrative Staff/Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nurul</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Administrative Staff/Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rowuna</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Local Entrepreneur (Warung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Subahrudin</td>
<td>Kacok Village, Pamekasan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Elementary School (Not Graduated)</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sumali</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Village Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ahmadi</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Elementary School (Not Graduated)</td>
<td>Teacher/Head of pesantren</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants from Villages Where Tourism Development is Not Being Planned (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yono</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>Food Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Diah</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Staff of Travel Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lukman</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Staff of Travel Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Anto</td>
<td>Banyuajuh Village, Bangkalan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Staff of Travel Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hadi</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Izul</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Guzri</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nanang</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Writer/Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Varah</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Said</td>
<td>Prenduan Village, Sumenep</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>Sub District Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. In-depth Interviews Checklist (For Residents)

1. Socio demographic characteristics: (Gender, Age, Education, Income)
2. Involvement in tourism
3. Geographical proximity from tourist zone and bridge
4. Economic/Employment dependency on tourism
5. Knowledge of tourism
6. Personal history in community
   - How tourism changed over the time they lived in Madura
7. The effect of tourism (Identification of positive and negative effects of tourism)
8. The overall perceptions of tourism

The roles taken by residents in the development of tourism on Madura Island

9. Could you describe your roles in the community related to the development of tourism?

The power relations between Madura Residents

10. Who influences your perceptions of tourism and meanings of tourism?
11. What factors influence the meanings of tourism?
12. Inclusiveness (Do you think your voice is already included in the tourism planning process?)
13. Do you have any access to the regional planning process
14. Who has power over whom in the community
Appendix C. In-depth Interviews Checklist (For Local Tourism Officers)

1. Roles taken in tourism planning
2. Policies and planning regarding current and future tourism development in Madura Island.
3. A range of challenges facing tourism planning implementation in Madura
4. Actions to address identified challenges
5. How resident perceptions are included in the tourism regional planning process
6. Tourism planning process in Madura Island