

Evaluating the Outputs of the Tourism Village Program Through the 4A Tourism Development Components: Evidence from East Manggarai Regency, Indonesia

Waldenses Rojeri Babut*, Agam Marsoyo*

Master Program of Urban and Regional Planning, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jl. Grafika No.2, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia

*Correspondence: waldensesrojeribabut@mail.ugm.ac.id, agammarsoyo@gmail.com

SUBMITTED: 15 July 2026; REVISED: 3 August 2026; ACCEPTED: 6 August 2026

ABSTRACT: The tourism village program became a key strategy of the Indonesian government to stimulate local economic growth through community-based tourism; however, its implementation in lagging regions was rarely evaluated systematically. This study aimed to evaluate the outputs of the tourism village program in three villages of East Manggarai Regency, Colol, Golo Loni, and Compang Ndejing, based on the four components of tourism destination development (4A): attraction, accessibility, amenity, and ancillary. A mixed-methods approach within a formative evaluation framework was applied. Data were collected through field observations, in-depth interviews, documentation, and questionnaires involving 45 purposively selected informants. Twenty-three sub-variables were assessed against predetermined ordinal indicators (Good, Fair, and Poor) and summarized using percentage-distribution descriptive analysis. The findings showed that the overall program outputs remained suboptimal: only 15.9% of the assessments were categorized as Good, 39.1% as Fair, and 44.9% as Poor. The attraction component performed relatively well (66.7% Fair), whereas accessibility was the weakest (66.7% Poor; 0% Good), with the availability of public transportation and parking areas rated as Poor in all villages. The ancillary component revealed a marked institutional gap between villages, recording the highest proportion of Good ratings (33.3%) alongside a high proportion of Poor ratings (44.4%). These results highlighted that infrastructure improvement and institutional strengthening should be prioritized so that the existing attraction and accommodation potentials could function as operational tourism products in moderately developed rural destinations.

KEYWORDS: Tourism village; program evaluation; attraction; accessibility; amenity; ancillary

1. Introduction

Community-based tourism (CBT) has emerged as a sustainable tourism model that positions local communities as the primary actors in destination management, particularly in rural areas of developing countries [1, 2]. In Indonesia, the tourism village (desa wisata) program gained

momentum following the decentralization policy introduced through Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages, which provided communities with greater opportunities to manage local tourism potential independently. Although the number of tourism villages continued to increase, reaching 7,034 villages in 2023, only about 30% operated optimally, indicating a persistent gap between development potential and implementation [3]. Recent studies also confirmed that the performance of Indonesian tourism villages varied considerably and that many programs faced challenges related to resilience, governance, and infrastructure readiness, particularly in regions outside Java [4].

East Manggarai Regency, East Nusa Tenggara Province, formed part of the Labuan Bajo National Strategic Tourism Area (KSPN) and possessed 116 potential tourist destinations, including natural attractions such as Colol Valley and cultural assets such as ikat weaving and Manggarai traditions. Nevertheless, of the 15 designated tourism villages in the regency, only five operated optimally, while the remainder faced inadequate infrastructure, limited human resource capacity, and ineffective marketing. Three tourism villages, Colol, Golo Loni, and Compang Ndejing, illustrated the complexity of these challenges. Colol, designated as an agrotourism village in 2020, experienced a 15% decline in tourist visits within two years. Golo Loni recorded a 25% increase in tourist arrivals but remained constrained by limited accommodation and sanitation facilities. Meanwhile, Compang Ndejing, despite its cultural attractions such as the Caci dance and traditional Manggarai houses, remained underdeveloped. The 4A framework, attraction, accessibility, amenity, and ancillary, has been widely recognized as the fundamental structure of a functional tourism destination [5]. Previous studies demonstrated that destination competitiveness depended on the integrated presence of these four components, supported by sustainable management practices [6]. Within the Indonesian tourism village context, 4A-based assessments have been applied to identify the development status and priority needs of individual villages [7]. However, most previous studies focused on assessing the potential of single tourism villages, whereas systematic evaluations comparing program outputs across multiple villages in lagging regions of eastern Indonesia remained scarce, despite these regions facing the greatest infrastructure constraints for rural tourism development [8]. This represented an important research gap that the present study sought to address.

Based on this gap, the present study evaluated the outputs of the tourism village program in Colol, Golo Loni, and Compang Ndejing, East Manggarai Regency, using the four components of the 4A framework. Specifically, the study examined (1) how each 4A component performed against predetermined output indicators across the three villages, and (2) which components and sub-variables represented the principal strengths and weaknesses of program implementation, thereby providing evidence to support priority setting for local governments and village-level destination managers. The novelty of this study lies in its simultaneous evaluation of three tourism villages using a standardized 4A framework, enabling direct cross-village comparison within a single regency. Unlike most previous tourism village studies, which predominantly adopted single-case approaches, this study identified inter-village differences in program performance that are rarely captured through individual village evaluations [7].

2.3. Variables and indicators.

Program outputs were measured using 23 sub-variables distributed across the four 4A components, as summarized in Table 1. Each sub-variable was assessed against predetermined three-level ordinal indicators (Good, Fair, and Poor) developed from the tourism destination literature and the Indonesian tourism village guidelines [3, 5]. Data were collected through field observations, in-depth interviews, documentation, and questionnaires between 2024 and 2025.

Table 1. Components and Sub-Variables of the Tourism Village Program Output Evaluation.

Component	Sub-variables (assessment scale: Good/Fair/Poor)	Data collection
Attraction (5)	Number of natural attractions; actively managed natural attractions; annual cultural events; cultural heritage/historical objects; art and craft groups	Field observation, interviews, documentation
Accessibility (7)	Availability of transport modes; travel distance; parking availability; parking quality; percentage of paved roads; number of directional signs; condition of directional signs	Field observation, spatial measurement, documentation
Amenity (5)	Number of lodgings (homestays); quality of lodgings; number of eating places; number of public facilities; number of souvenir shops	Field observation, interviews, secondary data
Ancillary (6)	Legal status of the managing organization; activity level of the managing organization; stakeholder coordination; innovation and development; availability of tour packages; institutional promotion	Interviews, documentation, observation

2.4. Research Instrument and Validity.

The 23 sub-variables were derived deductively from the 4A destination framework and the Indonesian tourism village guidelines and were subsequently operationalized into measurable indicators for each component: five attraction sub-variables, seven accessibility sub-variables, five amenity sub-variables, and six ancillary sub-variables. Each sub-variable was grounded in the relevant destination theory: attraction was based on Cooper et al. [5], Nuryanti [13], and Buhalis [6]; accessibility on Gunn and Var [14], Inskeep [15], and Suwanto [17]; amenity on Cooper et al. [5], Inskeep [15], and the tourism village guidelines [3]; and ancillary on the tourism village guidelines [3], Buhalis [6], and Middleton et al. [16], as summarized in Table 2. The selection of sub-variables was based on three considerations: (i) theoretical relevance to the 4A framework, (ii) measurability through field observation and documentation, and (iii) suitability for the context of tourism villages in lagging regions. Each sub-variable was assessed using graded indicators with clearly defined measurement thresholds. For example, the number of natural attractions was rated as Good for five or more attractions, Fair for three to four attractions, and Poor for two or fewer attractions. Similarly, actively managed natural attractions were rated as Good when three or more attractions were open to the public for at least eight months per year, Fair for one to two attractions, and Poor when none were operational. The questionnaire was developed as a supporting instrument to capture informants' perceptions of each sub-variable using a rating scale equivalent to these categories. Content validity was ensured by deriving the indicators from established theories and official guidelines and through expert review by the research supervisor. The consistency of the findings was further strengthened through triangulation of questionnaire responses, field observations, in-depth interviews, and documentation, ensuring that the final assessment of each sub-variable did not rely on a single source of evidence. Theoretical sources of the output sub-variables by 4A component is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Theoretical sources of the output sub-variables by 4A component.

Component	Sub-variables	Reference
Attraction	Number of natural attractions; actively managed attractions; annual cultural events; cultural heritage/historical objects; art and craft groups	[5, 6, 13, 15]
Accessibility	Availability of transport modes; travel distance; road condition; parking availability and quality; number and condition of directional signs	[14–17]
Amenity	Number and quality of lodgings (homestays); eating places; public facilities; souvenir shops	[3–6, 15]
Ancillary	Legal status and activity of the managing organization; stakeholder coordination; innovation; tour packages; institutional promotion	[3, 6, 16]

2.5. Data Analysis.

The analysis was conducted in two stages. First, each sub-variable was analyzed descriptively and qualitatively. Data obtained from field observations, interviews, and documentation were evaluated against the predetermined indicators and categorized as Good, Fair, or Poor. The findings were then interpreted based on the relevant destination-component theories [5, 6]. Second, all sub-variable ratings were compiled to obtain an overall picture of program output achievement. Because the rating data were ordinal, percentage-distribution descriptive analysis was used instead of inferential statistics [11]. Percentages were calculated based on the three study villages; therefore, a value of 33.33% represented one village, 66.67% represented two villages, and 100% represented all three villages within the same category.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Attraction.

Regarding the number of natural attractions, Golo Loni was rated Good, with seven natural attraction sites, whereas Colol and Compang Ndejing were rated Fair, with four attractions each. However, this quantitative advantage was not consistently accompanied by active management. For actively managed natural attractions, only Golo Loni was rated Good, with three active attractions (river tubing, trekking, and fishing-cycling activities). Compang Ndejing had only one active attraction (Ligota Beach), whereas Colol had none during the observation period; therefore, both villages were rated Poor. In Colol, this condition was attributed to an institutional issue, namely the unilateral replacement of the tourism management board by the newly elected village head, which halted tourism management activities.

These findings confirmed that attraction constituted the core component motivating tourist visits [5]. However, destination appeal only developed when attractions were supported by sustainable management [6]. The gap between attraction potential and management activities demonstrated that institutional stability within the managing organization was a key factor in sustaining tourism attractions, consistent with previous findings on inter-organizational collaboration in successful Indonesian tourism villages [12]. Regarding the cultural dimension, all villages (100%) were rated Fair for the number of annual cultural events and cultural heritage or historical sites. The three villages possessed traditional houses (Mbaru Gendang) and locally significant historical sites; however, their numbers were limited, and they had not yet been developed as managed tourist attractions. Such cultural heritage represented a distinctive tourism asset that strengthened destination identity but required interpretation and effective management to generate tourism value [13].

3.2. Accessibility.

The accessibility component was assessed using seven sub-variables and analyzed from two complementary perspectives: external accessibility (the ease of reaching the village from outside the area) and internal accessibility (the ease of moving between attractions within the village) [14, 15]. Regarding the availability of transportation, all villages (100%) were rated Poor because they could only be accessed by private vehicles or motorcycle taxis (ojek). No regular public transportation was available from Labuan Bajo or Borong, and no connecting transport services operated between attractions within the villages. This heavy dependence on private transportation indicated that the accessibility system had not yet supported broad tourist mobility [16].

In terms of external travel distance, the three villages were located 150–168 km, equivalent to approximately 4–5 hours of overland travel, from the main tourist gateways (Komodo Airport and Labuan Bajo Port). Consequently, all villages were rated Poor. From the regency capital (Borong), Compang Ndejing was the closest (approximately 10.5 km), followed by Golo Loni (approximately 29 km) and Colol (approximately 40 km). Although these villages were administratively part of the same National Strategic Tourism Area as Labuan Bajo, their location in eastern Flores left them relatively isolated from the main tourist flow. Regarding road conditions, Compang Ndejing was the most constrained, with only 25% of its attractions accessible via paved roads (Poor), whereas Colol (50%) and Golo Loni were rated Fair. Parking availability was rated Poor in all villages (100%), and most villages also performed poorly in terms of parking quality and the number and condition of directional signs. These findings highlighted the importance of road connectivity and supporting transportation infrastructure, both for reaching the villages and for facilitating movement within them [14, 17]. The results were consistent with findings from other peripheral regions, where inadequate rural road infrastructure systematically constrained tourism development despite high destination potential [8].

3.3. Amenity.

Regarding the number of lodging facilities, Colol was rated Good, with 50 registered homestay units (155 rooms, of which 69 were available for rent), while Golo Loni was also rated Good, with seven homestay units supporting its active tourism attractions. In contrast, Compang Ndejing had no homestays within the village and was therefore rated Poor because its proximity to Borong encouraged visitors to stay in the town instead. Regarding lodging quality, Colol was rated Good because 74% of its homestays were permanent buildings equipped with private bathrooms. Golo Loni was rated Fair because most of its homestays were still awaiting facility improvement assistance, whereas Compang Ndejing was rated Poor.

The availability of community-owned homestays in Colol and Golo Loni reflected the principles of community-based tourism, in which local residents acted as the primary beneficiaries through the management of tourism assets [18, 19]. However, the experience of Colol demonstrated that high-quality physical accommodation alone did not guarantee tourism success without adequate institutional management capacity. Conversely, the absence of homestays in Compang Ndejing indicated that accommodation availability was also influenced by its connectivity with nearby service centers [14]. At the same time, this situation represented a missed opportunity for community empowerment, as the economic benefits associated with

visitor accommodation accrued to businesses in Borong rather than to local residents. Among the remaining amenity sub-variables, the number of eating places was rated Fair in all villages (100%), whereas the availability of public facilities and souvenir shops was predominantly rated Poor (66.67% for each).

3.4. *Ancillary.*

Institutional capacity constituted an essential component of the tourism system because it coordinated destination development, marketing, and management activities [5]. Regarding the legal status of the managing organization, Golo Loni was rated Good because its Tourism Awareness Group (Pokdarwis) possessed a formal legal deed. Compang Ndejing was also rated Good because tourism management was undertaken by a Village-Owned Enterprise (BUMDes) established through an official village government decree. In contrast, Colol was rated Fair because, although its Pokdarwis had been formally established by decree, an internal conflict following the change in village leadership resulted in dual management boards, preventing the institution from functioning effectively.

This institutional gap was also reflected in the remaining ancillary sub-variables. The activity level of the managing organization and stakeholder coordination were evenly distributed across the three categories (33.33% each), whereas innovation and development, the availability of tour packages, and institutional promotion were predominantly rated Poor (66.67%). These findings indicated that formal legal status was not necessarily accompanied by active institutional performance. Institutions that were both legally established and operational represented an important supporting factor for successful tourism village management [3]. Recent studies also suggested that leveraging local values, digital promotion, and continuous innovation were essential for sustaining institutional performance [20, 21].

From a tourism governance perspective, these findings underscored that successful destination management depended not merely on the formal existence of institutions but also on the quality of collaborative governance linking village governments, Pokdarwis or BUMDes, business actors, and local communities through trust, shared norms, and social networks [22]. The case of Colol demonstrated that weak succession planning and inadequate conflict-resolution mechanisms eroded the social capital underpinning collaborative governance. In contrast, Golo Loni illustrated that institutional capacity building contributed directly to the sustainability of attraction management [23]. Therefore, the ancillary component should be regarded as the destination management function that coordinated the other three 4A components rather than merely serving as an administrative complement.

3.5. *Overall output achievement.*

To provide an overall comparison of tourism village performance, the principal strengths and weaknesses of each village across the four 4A components are summarized in Table 3. This summary highlights the distinct comparative advantages and major constraints that characterized each tourism village. Table 3 demonstrates that each village possessed different comparative advantages as well as different development constraints. Colol exhibited strong accommodation capacity through its large number of permanent homestays but experienced significant institutional problems that affected attraction management. Golo Loni showed the most balanced tourism development, combining active attractions with a well-functioning management institution, although transportation infrastructure remained inadequate. In

contrast, Compang Ndejing benefited from a legally established management organization and rich cultural resources, yet lacked tourism accommodation and sufficient accessibility. These differences suggest that tourism village development should be tailored to the specific conditions and priorities of each village rather than applying a uniform development strategy.

Table 3. Summary of the Main Strengths and Weaknesses of Each Village By 4A Component.

Village	Main strengths	Main weaknesses
Colol	Largest and highest-quality homestay stock (50 units, 74% permanent); Colol Valley agrotourism potential	No actively managed attractions; dual Pokdarwis management; poor accessibility and parking
Golo Loni	Legally established and active tourism institution; largest number of actively managed attractions (river tubing, trekking, and flying fox); supporting homestays	Some homestays were not yet ready for operation; limited transportation options and inadequate parking
Compang Ndejing	Legally established management institution (BUMDes); proximity to Borong; strong cultural potential (Caci dance and traditional houses)	No homestays within the village; limited road access to attractions (25% paved roads); few actively managed attractions

To further evaluate the implementation of the tourism village program, the performance of all 23 output sub-variables was recapitulated across the three study villages. Table 4 presents the percentage distribution of Good, Fair, and Poor ratings for each sub-variable, thereby identifying the relative strengths and weaknesses of individual program outputs. Table 4 indicates considerable variation among the individual sub-variables. Several variables, such as the number of annual cultural events and the availability of eating places, consistently achieved Fair ratings across all villages, indicating relatively stable conditions but also considerable room for improvement.

Table 4. Recapitulation of the Achievement Percentages of the 23 Output Sub-Variables (4A) Across the Three Study Villages.

4A Component	Sub-variable	Good (%)	Fair (%)	Poor (%)
Attraction	Number of natural attractions	33.33	66.67	0.00
	Actively managed natural attractions	33.33	0.00	66.67
	Number of annual cultural events	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Cultural heritage/historical objects	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Art and craft groups	0.00	66.67	33.33
Accessibility	Availability of transport modes	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Travel distance from the regency capital	0.00	66.67	33.33
	Parking availability	0.00	0.00	100.00
	Parking quality	0.00	33.33	66.67
	Percentage of paved roads	0.00	66.67	33.33
	Number of directional signs	0.00	33.33	66.67
	Condition of directional signs	0.00	33.33	66.67
Amenity	Number of lodgings (homestays)	66.67	0.00	33.33
	Quality of lodgings (homestays)	33.33	33.33	33.33
	Number of eating places	0.00	100.00	0.00
	Number of public facilities	0.00	33.33	66.67
	Number of souvenir shops	0.00	33.33	66.67
Ancillary	Legal status of the managing organization	66.67	33.33	0.00
	Activity level of the managing organization	33.33	33.33	33.33
	Stakeholder coordination	33.33	33.33	33.33
	Innovation and development	33.33	0.00	66.67
	Availability of tour packages	0.00	33.33	66.67
	Institutional tourism promotion	33.33	0.00	66.67

Conversely, transport-mode availability and parking availability were rated Poor in every village, demonstrating that accessibility represented the most widespread structural limitation. Although the legal status of managing organizations and the number of homestays achieved relatively high Good ratings, the associated operational indicators, including organizational activity, innovation, tour package development, and institutional promotion, remained weak. These findings indicate that the existence of physical facilities or formal institutions alone was insufficient without effective management and continuous operational support.

To facilitate comparison among the four destination components, the results in Table 4 were aggregated into average category percentages, as presented in Table 5. This summary provides an overall assessment of the relative performance of each 4A component. Table 5 shows that the attraction component achieved the strongest overall performance, with most of its sub-variables (66.7%) rated Fair and only 20.0% rated Poor. This finding suggests that the tourism villages already possessed attractive natural and cultural resources but had not yet fully optimized their management. In contrast, accessibility represented the weakest component, with two-thirds of its sub-variables rated Poor and none achieving a Good rating, highlighting transportation infrastructure as the principal barrier to tourism development. The amenity component demonstrated moderate performance, reflecting the uneven distribution of accommodation and supporting facilities among the villages. Meanwhile, the ancillary component exhibited the greatest variation, recording both the highest proportion of Good ratings (33.3%) and a high proportion of Poor ratings (44.4%), indicating substantial differences in institutional capacity between villages.

Table 5. Average Percentage Distribution of Categories by 4A Component.

Component	Good (%)	Fair (%)	Poor (%)
Attraction	13.3	66.7	20.0
Accessibility	0.0	33.3	66.7
Amenity	20.0	40.0	40.0
Ancillary	33.3	22.2	44.4

As shown in Table 5, the attraction component demonstrated the strongest overall performance, with most of its sub-variables (66.7%) rated Fair and only 20.0% rated Poor. In contrast, accessibility represented the weakest component, with 66.7% of its sub-variables rated Poor and none achieving a Good rating. The amenity component showed moderate performance, with an equal distribution of Fair and Poor ratings (40.0% each). Meanwhile, the ancillary component exhibited the greatest variation, recording the highest proportion of Good ratings (33.3%) while simultaneously having a high proportion of Poor ratings (44.4%), indicating substantial institutional disparities among the three villages. Overall, across the 23 sub-variables evaluated in the three villages, 15.9% of the assessments were rated Good, 39.1% Fair, and 44.9% Poor. These findings indicated that the overall implementation of the tourism village program remained suboptimal, with 84.1% of the assessed aspects still requiring improvement. In terms of dominant performance categories, 11 sub-variables were dominated by Poor ratings, seven by Fair ratings, and only five by Good ratings.

Three major findings emerged from the recapitulation. First, two accessibility sub-variables, availability of transportation modes and parking availability, were rated Poor in all villages (100%), representing common structural constraints and the highest priority for improvement. Second, three sub-variables, annual cultural events, cultural heritage or historical objects, and eating places, were consistently rated Fair across all villages, indicating relatively

stable conditions with considerable potential for further development. Third, the highest proportions of Good ratings were recorded for the number of homestays and the legal status of the managing organization (66.67% each). Nevertheless, the presence of accommodation facilities and formal institutional legality did not necessarily translate into effective management, as reflected by the relatively low performance of organizational activity, innovation, and institutional promotion.

From a planning perspective, these findings suggested several important policy implications. First, improving basic accessibility including public or semi-public transportation, paved access roads to attraction sites, parking facilities, and directional signage, should become the highest priority because accessibility represented the principal constraint shared by all three villages. Second, institutional strengthening should extend beyond legal establishment to include continuous capacity building, effective succession planning, and conflict-resolution mechanisms, as illustrated by the contrasting experiences of Golo Loni and Colol. Third, existing homestays and cultural assets should be integrated into comprehensive tourism packages supported by digital marketing strategies so that the strengths already identified could compensate for, and gradually improve, the weaker components.

Based on these findings, several practical recommendations can be proposed. For local governments, priority should be given to (1) improving road infrastructure leading to major tourist attractions and providing standardized parking facilities and directional signage in all three villages; (2) piloting scheduled tourist transportation or weekend shuttle services connecting Borong and Labuan Bajo with the tourism villages; and (3) providing legal and governance support to prevent dual management structures during transitions in village leadership. For village-level managers (Pokdarwis and BUMDes), priority actions include (1) developing integrated thematic tourism packages that combine natural attractions, cultural assets, and existing homestays; (2) strengthening digital promotion through social media platforms and online booking systems to expand market reach; and (3) establishing formal succession and conflict-resolution mechanisms to ensure continuity of tourism management regardless of changes in local leadership.

4. Conclusions

This study found that the outputs of the tourism village program in Colol, Golo Loni, and Compang Ndejing remained suboptimal when evaluated using the 4A components, with 44.9% of the assessments rated Poor and only 15.9% rated Good. Attraction represented the strongest asset of the three villages, whereas accessibility was the most critical weakness, particularly the availability of transport modes and parking areas, which were rated Poor in all villages. The amenity component showed moderate performance, supported by resident-owned homestays, while the ancillary component revealed marked institutional disparities. Golo Loni, with a legal and active tourism institution, successfully managed its attractions, whereas Colol experienced a management standstill due to institutional conflict despite its considerable tourism potential. These findings suggested that institutional stability and basic accessibility jointly determined whether tourism resources could be transformed into operational tourism products in moderately developed rural destinations. This study had several limitations. First, it covered only three tourism villages; therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to other regions. Second, the evaluation employed three-level ordinal indicators (Good, Fair, and Poor) analyzed descriptively, without statistically examining causal relationships among the 4A components.

Third, the cross-sectional design did not capture changes in program performance over time. Future studies should expand the number of tourism villages, apply longitudinal approaches, evaluate program outcomes and community impacts, and employ inferential analyses to identify the determinants of successful tourism village development.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the Master Program in Urban and Regional Planning, Universitas Gadjah Mada, for providing academic support throughout this research. The authors also express their sincere appreciation to the Government of East Manggarai Regency, the Regency Office of Tourism and Culture, and the village governments and communities of Colol, Golo Loni, and Compang Ndejing for their valuable assistance and cooperation during data collection. This research did not receive any specific funding from public, commercial, or not-for-profit organizations.

Author Contribution

Waldenses Rojeri Babut was responsible for conceptualizing the research, collecting and analyzing data, and writing the manuscript. Agam Marsoyo contributed to the development of the methodology, participated in data analysis, and provided supervision throughout the study.

Competing Interest

The authors declares that there are no known financial, personal, or professional competing interests that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] Hariyadi, B.R.; Rokhman, A.; Rosyadi, S.; Yamin, M.; Runtiko, A.G. (2024). The role of community-based tourism in sustainable tourism village in Indonesia. *Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 18(7), e05466. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n7-038>.
- [2] Priatmoko, S.; Kabil, M.; Purwoko, Y.; Dávid, L.D. (2021). Rethinking sustainable community-based tourism: A villager's point of view and case study in Pampang Village, Indonesia. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3245. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063245>.
- [3] Kementerian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif. (2021). Buku Panduan Desa Wisata. Deputi Bidang Pengembangan Destinasi dan Infrastruktur: Jakarta, Indonesia.
- [4] Ariyani, N.; Fauzi, A. (2024). Measuring the resilience of rural tourism in Indonesia using the Adjusted Mazziotta–Pareto index. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(4), 3467. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i4.3467>.
- [5] Cooper, C.; Fletcher, J.; Gilbert, D.; Shepherd, R.; Wanhill, S. (1993). *Tourism: Principles and Practice*. Pitman Publishing: London, United Kingdom.
- [6] Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 97–116. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(99\)00095-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00095-3).
- [7] Amir, A.; Sukarno, T.D.; Rahmawati, F. (2020). Identifikasi potensi dan status pengembangan desa wisata di Kabupaten Lombok Tengah, Nusa Tenggara Barat. *Journal of Regional and Rural Development Planning*, 4(2), 84–98. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jp2wd.2020.4.2.84-98>.
- [8] Haulle, E.; Nchimbi, C.S.; Ndimbo, G.K. (2024). Engendering rural tourism as a viable strategy for poverty alleviation and rural development in the Southern Tourist Circuit of Tanzania. *SAGE Open*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241285496>.

- [9] Stufflebeam, D.L.; Shinkfield, A.J. (2007). *Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, USA.
- [10] Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 4th ed.; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, USA.
- [11] Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta: Bandung, Indonesia.
- [12] Manaf, A.; Purbasari, N.; Damayanti, M.; Aprilia, N.; Astuti, W. (2018). Community-based rural tourism in inter-organizational collaboration: How does it work sustainably? Lessons learned from Nglanggeran Tourism Village, Gunungkidul Regency, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Sustainability*, 10(7), 2142. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10062142>.
- [13] Nuryanti, W. (1993). Concept, perspective and challenges of cultural tourism in Indonesia. In *Tourism in Indonesia: Cultural and Historical Analysis*; Gadjah Mada University Press: Yogyakarta, Indonesia; pp. 139–153.
- [14] Gunn, C.A.; Var, T. (2002). *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases*, 4th ed.; Routledge: New York, USA.
- [15] Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. Van Nostrand Reinhold: New York, USA.
- [16] Middleton, V.T.C.; Fyall, A.; Morgan, M.; Ranchhod, A. (2009). *Marketing in Travel and Tourism*, 4th ed.; Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford, United Kingdom.
- [17] Suwanto, G. (2004). *Dasar-Dasar Pariwisata*. Andi: Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [18] Nurfadilah, N.; Syah, A.; Suci, S.; Ginanjar, M.; Hamida, H. (2024). Community homestay management assistance. *Advances in Community Services Research*, 2(2), 111–121. <https://doi.org/10.60079/acsrv2i2.298>.
- [19] Suyatna, H.; Indroyono, P.; Yuda, T.K.; Firdaus, R.S.M. (2024). How community-based tourism improves community welfare? A practical case study of ‘Governing the Commons’ in rural Nglanggeran, Indonesia. *International Journal of Community and Social Development*, 6(1), 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25166026241228717>.
- [20] Kusumastuti, H.; Pranita, D.; Viendyasari, M.; Rasul, M.S.; Sarjana, S. (2024). Leveraging local value in a post-smart tourism village to encourage sustainable tourism. *Sustainability*, 16(2), 873. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020873>.
- [21] Raynaldi, R.; Malihah, E.; Andari, R. (2024). Analysis of community-based tourism (CBT) sustainability in Karedok Tourism Village, Jatigede District, Sumedang Regency. *Media Wisata*, 22(1), 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.36276/mws.v22i1.582>.
- [22] Prayitno, G.; Auliah, A.; Efendi, A.; Hayat, A.; Dinanti, D.; Aziz, N.A. (2024). Social capital in tourism village development: A systematic literature review. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2312320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2312320>.
- [23] Rocca, L.H.D.; Zielinski, S. (2022). Community-based tourism, social capital, and governance of post-conflict rural tourism destinations: The case of Montes de María, Colombia. *Sustainability*, 14(13), 7736. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137736>.



© 2026 by the authors. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).