



THE POLITICS OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM GOVERNANCE IN INDONESIA: POWER RELATIONS, GOVERNMENT POLICY, AND LOCAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Guntur Khayangan Sitompul

Departement of Politic, Faculty of Social and Political Sciens, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: gunturkhayangan@usu.ac.id *

Article Info

Article history:

Received : 01 July 2026

Acceptance : 30 July 2026

Published : 30 July 2026

Available online

<http://aspublisher.co.id/index.php/kolaborasi>

E-ISSN: 3064-4054

How to cite:

Sitompul, K. G. (2026). THE POLITICS OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM GOVERNANCE IN INDONESIA: POWER RELATIONS, GOVERNMENT POLICY, AND LOCAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. KOLABORASI: Journal of Multidisciplinary, 3(2),65-77



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

ABSTRACT

Sustainable tourism governance in Indonesia is shaped by complex relations among state authority, market interests, institutional arrangements, and community agency. This study examines these dynamics through a qualitative case-study approach based on documentary analysis and relevant scholarly literature. The analysis applies Foucauldian governmentality, collaborative governance, participation theory, political ecology, and tourism justice perspectives. The findings show that sustainability functions as a governmental rationality that structures policy priorities and institutional practices. Decentralisation expands local authority but also produces fragmentation and accountability gaps. Community participation remains uneven and often stops at consultation rather than co-determination. Local knowledge is selectively recognised, creating challenges for epistemic justice, while market-oriented tourism can reproduce unequal access to resources and benefits. At the same time, communities negotiate, reinterpret, and resist official tourism agendas through collective practices and local institutions. Sustainable tourism therefore requires stronger accountability, inclusive decision-making, recognition of local knowledge, and fairer benefit distribution across destinations.

Keywords: Sustainable tourism, Tourism governance, Governmentality, Community participation, Tourism justice

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism has become an important instrument of economic development, territorial promotion, cultural diplomacy, and regional transformation in Indonesia (Munthe et al., 2026; Pradnyana et al., 2025). National and local governments increasingly frame tourism as a strategic sector capable of generating employment, attracting investment, increasing regional revenue, strengthening small and medium-sized enterprises, and supporting the development of peripheral areas (Dalimunthe, Syam, et al., 2024; Ukur et al., 2025). Tourism is also presented as a mechanism for preserving cultural heritage and encouraging environmental conservation. Nevertheless, tourism expansion produces contradictory outcomes. It may generate income and infrastructure while simultaneously intensifying land competition, ecological degradation, cultural commodification, social inequality, and the displacement of local communities.

The concept of sustainable tourism has emerged as a response to these contradictions. Internationally, sustainable tourism is generally understood as tourism that takes account of present and future economic, social, and environmental impacts while addressing the needs of visitors, industry, the environment, and host communities (Suhendar, Taufika, et al., 2023). This formulation indicates that sustainability is multidimensional. It cannot be reduced to environmental protection or the growth of visitor numbers. It also requires the protection of host communities' cultural authenticity, equitable distribution of economic benefits, and the maintenance of local quality of life.

In Indonesia, sustainable tourism has been incorporated into national and subnational policy frameworks. The Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy Regulation No. 9 of 2021 provides guidelines for sustainable tourism destinations and remains an officially valid regulation (Ritonga et al., 2023; Widhiasthini et al., 2024). The policy orientation reflects an effort to establish standards for destination management, environmental sustainability, socio-cultural protection, economic development, and institutional governance. At the same time, tourism policy is implemented within a decentralised political system in which central ministries, provincial governments, district and city governments, villages, state-owned enterprises, private investors, civil society organisations, and local communities interact.

The coexistence of multiple actors does not automatically produce democratic or equitable governance. Governance involves the distribution of authority, the production of knowledge, the institutionalisation of norms, and the management of conduct (Dalimunthe, 2022; Muallidin, 2026). A destination may contain participatory forums, local tourism organisations, community-based enterprises, and public consultations while decision-making power remains concentrated among government agencies, investors, and politically connected local elites. Consequently, the existence of participation cannot be treated as evidence of empowerment without examining the institutional conditions under which participation occurs.

This article approaches sustainable tourism governance through Michel Foucault's concept of power and governmentality. Foucault's perspective is valuable because it shifts attention from power as something possessed exclusively by the state to power as a relational, productive, and dispersed phenomenon. Power operates through laws, administrative procedures, expert knowledge, spatial planning, performance indicators, monitoring systems, categories, professional practices, and self-regulation. Governmentality refers to the rationalities and techniques through which conduct is directed, including the conduct of individuals, communities, organisations, and populations. In tourism, governmentality may operate through destination

branding, sustainability certification, community empowerment programmes, visitor management, environmental standards, and entrepreneurial expectations.

The use of governmentality in tourism studies has demonstrated that tourism governance is constituted through multiple forms of power, including sovereign, disciplinary, and neoliberal rationalities. Sovereign power is expressed through legal authority, licensing, zoning, regulation, and sanction. Disciplinary power operates through surveillance, standards, audits, rankings, and the normalisation of appropriate behaviour. Neoliberal governmentality encourages communities and individuals to act as self-managing entrepreneurs who bear responsibility for their own competitiveness, environmental conduct, and economic success.tandfonline+1

This study asks three questions:

- How are power relations represented in Indonesian sustainable tourism policies and governance discourses?
- How do government policies shape the institutional position and practices of local communities?
- Under what conditions does community participation become meaningful, symbolic, or contested?

The article makes three contributions. First, it contributes to the political study of tourism governance by analysing sustainability as a field of power rather than merely a technical objective. Second, it connects governmentality theory with decentralisation and community participation in the Indonesian context. Third, it develops an analytical argument that communities possess agency not only through formal participation but also through everyday negotiation, collective organisation, knowledge production, and resistance.

2. RESEARCH METHODE

This study employed a qualitative case-study approach using documentary analysis and a review of relevant academic literature (Creswell, 2021). The case examined was sustainable tourism governance in Indonesia, understood as a policy and institutional field involving interactions among national policy frameworks, decentralised implementation, destination governance, and local community participation. This approach was selected because it enables an in-depth analysis of complex governance processes, institutional relations, and power dynamics within their socio-political context. The study aimed at analytical rather than statistical generalisation by linking empirical patterns in Indonesian tourism governance with broader theoretical perspectives on governmentality, collaborative governance, participation, and political ecology.

The data consisted of publicly available secondary sources, including national laws and regulations on tourism and regional governance, ministerial guidelines, national and regional development plans, official reports and statistical publications, institutional websites, policy communication materials, reports from international organisations, and relevant scholarly publications. The Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy Regulation No. 9 of 2021 was treated as a key policy document because it provides formal guidance for sustainable tourism destination management in Indonesia. Academic sources were selected purposively based on their relevance to the research questions, conceptual contribution, credibility, and relationship to sustainable tourism governance, decentralisation, community participation, governmentality, collaborative governance, and political ecology.

Data were analysed through qualitative content analysis combined with a Foucauldian discourse approach. The analysis involved repeated reading of the

documents, identification of relevant textual segments, thematic coding, theoretical interpretation, and comparison across different types of sources. Major analytical themes included sustainability, participation, empowerment, conservation, competitiveness, investment, decentralisation, partnership, accountability, resource access, and benefit distribution. Foucauldian discourse analysis was used to examine how tourism-related problems, actors, forms of knowledge, and institutional responsibilities were constructed through policy discourse. Collaborative governance and participation theories were used to assess the extent of community involvement, while political ecology was applied to examine inequalities in resource access, benefit distribution, and recognition of local knowledge.

Research trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation by comparing regulations, policy documents, institutional reports, international frameworks, and academic studies. The analysis also considered the authorship, institutional position, purpose, intended audience, and political context of each document to avoid treating official sources as neutral representations of reality. Since the study relied exclusively on publicly available documents and published literature, it did not involve direct human participants. Ethical considerations focused on accurate source representation, avoidance of unverified claims, and recognition that local communities are heterogeneous and may differ in terms of gender, socio-economic position, ethnicity, age, occupation, land ownership, and political access.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Sustainability as a Governmental Rationality

The analysis shows that sustainability operates not only as a normative objective but also as a governmental rationality that organises the objectives, instruments, and subjects of tourism governance in Indonesia. Sustainable tourism is commonly constructed as a policy solution capable of reconciling economic development, environmental protection, cultural preservation, and community welfare (Khater et al., 2025; Kholil et al., 2024). This broad formulation enables governments, businesses, communities, and development organisations to participate within a shared policy narrative, although each actor may interpret sustainability differently. Government agencies may associate sustainability with improved planning, environmental compliance, destination quality, institutional coordination, and investment attractiveness, while businesses may emphasise market reputation, certification, resource security, and long-term profitability (Suhendar & Saragih, 2025). Local communities, in contrast, may interpret sustainability in terms of livelihood security, cultural continuity, access to land and natural resources, and control over the direction of tourism development.

These different interpretations demonstrate that sustainability is not a politically neutral concept. A destination may be officially recognised as sustainable because it attracts investment, improves infrastructure, obtains certification, or increases visitor numbers, while local residents may simultaneously experience higher land prices, congestion, declining access to resources, or changes in cultural practices. Sustainability therefore performs an integrative function within policy discourse, but it can also obscure competing interests and unequal consequences. From a Foucauldian perspective, sustainability becomes a field through which particular problems are defined and particular forms of intervention are legitimised.

Its governmental character is particularly visible in the instruments through which sustainability is operationalised, including indicators, standards, destination plans, zoning arrangements, certification, training programmes, monitoring systems, and

performance targets. These instruments make destinations measurable and comparable while simultaneously constructing particular objects of governance, such as tourists, tourism villages, local entrepreneurs, cultural assets, and environmental resources. Measurement can strengthen accountability and make environmental and social impacts more visible. However, it can also privilege what is easily quantified, such as visitor numbers, investment values, accommodation capacity, revenue, waste generation, and certified businesses, while giving less attention to cultural dignity, unequal political voice, social trust, customary authority, and community control.

Governmentality consequently helps explain why tourism governance often operates without direct coercion. Governments, businesses, and communities may voluntarily adopt sustainability standards because these standards are presented as rational, modern, competitive, and beneficial (Fatima et al., 2023; Siregar et al., 2025). Nevertheless, what counts as successful sustainability remains shaped by institutional incentives and dominant definitions of development. When sustainability is primarily translated through investment, destination branding, infrastructure expansion, and tourism growth, economic rationality tends to dominate. By contrast, when it incorporates ecological limits, distributive justice, cultural rights, and democratic participation, sustainability has greater potential to support transformative governance. The central issue is therefore not simply whether sustainability has been incorporated into tourism policy, but how it is defined, operationalised, and translated into institutional arrangements.

State Power and Decentralised Governance

Tourism governance in Indonesia also demonstrates the continuing importance of state power despite decentralisation (Purba et al., 2025; Ristiawan et al., 2023). The state remains central through regulation, planning, infrastructure provision, investment facilitation, licensing, conservation policy, public financing, and destination branding. Although decentralisation has expanded the responsibilities of provincial, district, city, and village governments, it has not eliminated national influence. Instead, authority has been redistributed among different administrative levels and policy sectors.

This redistribution creates both opportunities and institutional tensions. Local governments may adapt tourism programmes to regional conditions, promote locally distinctive development strategies, support community-based tourism, and respond more directly to local constituencies (Turčinović et al., 2025). At the same time, decentralised authorities may compete for investment, visitor numbers, public revenue, and destination recognition. Such competition can reinforce growth-oriented tourism policies that may conflict with environmental limits and community interests. Local autonomy therefore does not automatically produce more sustainable or participatory governance.

Institutional fragmentation represents another important challenge. Tourism governance intersects with spatial planning, environmental management, investment, village administration, cultural affairs, transportation, public works, marine affairs, conservation, and land administration. Consequently, a single destination may be governed simultaneously by several institutions operating according to different mandates and administrative rationalities (Dalimunthe, Suhendar, et al., 2024; de Lurdes Calisto et al., 2023). Weak coordination among these institutions can result in overlapping authority, regulatory inconsistency, delayed implementation, and uncertainty regarding responsibility for social and environmental impacts.

From a governmentality perspective, decentralisation should therefore not be interpreted simply as the withdrawal or weakening of central government. Central authorities may continue to govern indirectly through national standards, technical guidelines, fiscal arrangements, performance assessments, funding requirements, destination branding, and development targets. Local governments are encouraged to exercise autonomy while simultaneously complying with national policy objectives. This reflects a reconfiguration rather than a straightforward dispersion of power.

Such arrangements also position local governments as entrepreneurial actors expected to mobilise resources, promote competitive destinations, attract investors, and increase local revenue. Their dual role as representatives of local interests and agents of broader development agendas creates an important institutional dilemma. Local authorities may seek to protect community interests while simultaneously pursuing tourism expansion for fiscal, political, and developmental purposes. Their commitment to participation and environmental protection may therefore vary according to bureaucratic priorities, electoral incentives, investment opportunities, and local political dynamics.

Effective decentralised tourism governance consequently requires more than the formal transfer of responsibilities. It depends on clear institutional coordination, adequate administrative capacity, transparent decision-making, accessible information, and effective accountability mechanisms. These mechanisms are particularly important because fragmented governance may create accountability gaps in which ministries, provincial agencies, local governments, village administrations, and private partners exercise partial authority while no single actor assumes full responsibility for negative social or environmental consequences.

Community Participation, Institutional Inclusion, and Co-determination

Community participation is strongly represented within sustainable tourism discourse, but its institutional implementation remains uneven (Anil Dawan & Mega Larasati, 2023). Participation may occur through public consultations, village tourism programmes, community-based tourism organisations, cooperatives, cultural groups, destination management institutions, environmental initiatives, and partnerships between communities, government agencies, and businesses. Such mechanisms can provide communities with access to training, public funding, infrastructure, tourism markets, and institutional recognition. They can also strengthen collective identity and encourage local stewardship of environmental and cultural resources.

However, participation frequently operates as a mechanism for implementing predetermined development programmes rather than as a means through which communities exercise meaningful influence over policy decisions (Zikargae et al., 2022). Communities may be encouraged to manage homestays, cultural performances, culinary enterprises, guiding services, transport, environmental conservation, and tourism products while having considerably less authority over land allocation, spatial planning, investment agreements, tourism pricing, development scale, or the distribution of economic benefits. In some cases, consultation occurs only after major development priorities have already been determined.

This condition can be interpreted through Arnstein's participation framework, in which information and consultation represent substantially lower levels of participation than partnership, delegated power, or citizen control (Suhendar et al., 2023). The existence of participatory institutions therefore does not necessarily indicate a redistribution of authority. Participation may create an appearance of inclusion while communities remain structurally excluded from strategic decisions. From a Foucauldian perspective, participation can simultaneously function as an empowering process and as a technology of governance through which communities

are encouraged to accept responsibility for implementing policies over which they have limited influence.

The representation of communities also deserves critical attention. Communities are not homogeneous social units. Village leaders, customary authorities, local business owners, educated residents, landowners, and politically connected groups may have greater access to decision-making processes than women, young people, poorer households, migrants, informal workers, tenants, or minority groups. The institutional use of the term “local community” can therefore conceal differences in interests, resources, and political influence. It can also shift responsibility for sustainability towards communities while structural issues such as unequal land markets, investment regimes, infrastructure disparities, and growth-oriented development priorities remain insufficiently questioned.

For this reason, sustainable tourism participation needs to move beyond consultation towards co-determination. Co-determination implies that communities possess meaningful institutional authority over decisions affecting their livelihoods, resources, cultural identity, and long-term future. This requires, first, access to relevant information before decisions are made, including information regarding investment agreements, land use, environmental impacts, tourism capacity, public finance, and benefit-sharing mechanisms. Second, participatory institutions must be internally inclusive by providing opportunities for women, youth, disadvantaged households, informal workers, cultural minorities, and groups negatively affected by tourism development.

Third, communities need substantive decision-making rights rather than purely advisory roles. Depending on the institutional context, these may involve co-management arrangements, control over cultural representation, participation in designing sustainability indicators, or stronger authority concerning environmentally and culturally sensitive development. Fourth, participation requires material and organisational capacity. Meetings and consultations alone cannot redistribute power when communities lack legal assistance, organisational funding, market information, digital access, or technical resources. Meaningful participation therefore depends on both institutional recognition and the resources necessary to exercise authority effectively.

Knowledge, Expertise, and Epistemic Justice

Sustainable tourism governance also involves a struggle over which forms of knowledge are recognised as legitimate. Policy and institutional documents generally privilege technical planning, legal classifications, environmental assessments, statistical indicators, managerial standards, and professional expertise (Griffin, 2025; Saragih et al., 2025). These forms of knowledge are important for tourism planning, but they do not represent the full range of knowledge required for sustainable destination governance.

Local communities may possess detailed knowledge concerning seasonal ecological change, customary resource access, sacred areas, historical land use, social boundaries, local carrying capacities, and culturally appropriate forms of visitor behaviour (Kurniawati et al., 2025; Suhendar et al., 2024). Such knowledge may not be expressed through formal technical terminology or quantified indicators, yet it can be essential to maintaining ecological sustainability, cultural continuity, and community legitimacy.

The recognition of this knowledge, however, is often selective. Local knowledge may be welcomed when it supports cultural branding, strengthens destination attractiveness, or contributes to conservation programmes. The same knowledge may receive less institutional recognition when it challenges investment projects, zoning

decisions, infrastructure development, official heritage classifications, or dominant representations of tourism potential (Li et al., 2024). This reflects what Foucauldian analysis describes as a regime of truth, in which particular forms of knowledge acquire authority because they are associated with institutions possessing legal, scientific, or administrative legitimacy.

As a result, community knowledge may be translated into categories that are compatible with administrative systems while losing part of its original social, cultural, or political meaning. Community participation must therefore be assessed not only by whether residents are physically present in meetings, but also by whether their concepts, experiences, and knowledge influence final decisions (Lynch et al., 2022). Presence without epistemic authority represents only limited participation.

This issue can be understood through the concept of epistemic justice. Sustainable tourism governance should recognise local communities not merely as beneficiaries, cultural resources, or implementation partners but as legitimate producers of knowledge. Their knowledge should contribute to defining tourism problems, developing plans, establishing environmental limits, monitoring changes, and evaluating policy outcomes. Incorporating local knowledge into formal planning should nevertheless avoid epistemic erasure. Sacred landscapes, for example, should not be reduced solely to categories of tourist attractions, and customary ecological practices should not be recognised only when they can be transformed into marketable tourism products.

Recognition must also remain sensitive to internal community power relations. Knowledge classified as “local” is not automatically representative or inclusive. Customary institutions may successfully protect collective resources but may also reproduce inequalities affecting women, migrants, lower-status groups, or dissenting residents. Epistemic justice should therefore combine recognition of local knowledge with inclusive deliberation, transparency, and protection of basic rights.

Market Power, Entrepreneurial Communities, and Tourism Justice

Sustainable tourism governance is increasingly connected to market-oriented objectives such as entrepreneurship, investment, innovation, digital promotion, creative industries, and destination competitiveness (Ohorella et al., 2024). These objectives can create employment opportunities, stimulate local enterprises, and strengthen regional economies. At the same time, they transform communities into entrepreneurial subjects expected to convert local culture, environmental resources, skills, and everyday practices into marketable tourism experiences.

Within this governance model, communities are encouraged to identify business opportunities, improve service quality, maintain environmental cleanliness, develop tourism products, adopt digital technologies, respond to consumer preferences, and compete for market visibility (Purnomo & Purwandari, 2025). Governance operates partly through training, incentives, competitions, certification, rankings, awards, and expectations of continuous self-improvement rather than through direct state intervention. In Foucauldian terms, communities are encouraged to govern themselves according to entrepreneurial and market-oriented norms.

However, market-based participation does not produce equal outcomes because communities and individuals enter tourism markets with unequal resources. Access to land, financial capital, education, transportation, digital infrastructure, government networks, and investors varies substantially. Residents with stronger assets and institutional connections may capture greater tourism benefits, while others remain dependent on low-paid employment, informal services, seasonal work, or economically marginal activities.

The discourse of empowerment can consequently shift responsibility for structural problems onto communities themselves. When local tourism enterprises struggle, failure may be attributed to inadequate entrepreneurship, limited innovation, or insufficient competitiveness rather than unequal access to markets, restrictive licensing, inadequate infrastructure, concentration of ownership, or exclusion from strategic decision-making. Empowerment may therefore operate both as an opportunity for local agency and as a governmental technique that encourages communities to adapt themselves to existing market structures.

These inequalities demonstrate why sustainable tourism cannot be separated from questions of distributive justice. Tourism can generate employment, local business opportunities, infrastructure improvement, cultural revitalisation, and public revenue. However, it may simultaneously increase land prices, contribute to displacement, intensify congestion, increase environmental pressure, commodify culture, and produce insecure employment. Whether tourism is socially sustainable therefore depends not only on aggregate economic growth but also on who owns assets, controls tourism revenue, receives employment, participates in decision-making, and bears environmental and social costs.

Community-based tourism can potentially improve the distribution of benefits, but meaningful redistribution requires local control over productive assets, pricing, labour arrangements, strategic partnerships, and resource use. Tourism governance should therefore monitor distributional outcomes rather than relying primarily on aggregate indicators such as visitor growth, investment, or destination income. Sustainability assessment must consider ownership structures, employment quality, revenue distribution, environmental burdens, representation in decision-making, and access to grievance and compensation mechanisms. Such an approach shifts sustainable tourism from a general ethical aspiration towards a more concrete framework of tourism justice and institutional accountability.

Local Negotiation, Resistance, and Governmentality from Below

Local communities should not be understood merely as passive recipients of tourism policies or objects of governmental intervention (Carpio et al., 2026). The analysis indicates that communities may negotiate, reinterpret, and adapt official tourism programmes according to local priorities. They may accept infrastructure development while rejecting specific investment proposals, participate in formal destination organisations while maintaining informal community decision-making practices, or redirect public support towards activities that better correspond with local needs.

Local agency can also be expressed through everyday practices, including collective management of resource access, informal visitor rules, environmental monitoring, cultural revitalisation, local storytelling, mutual assistance, and decisions not to commercialise sacred or socially sensitive practices (Semwal, 2024). These actions may not always be formally identified as political resistance, yet they shape the boundaries within which tourism development occurs.

Resistance may also take more explicit forms, including public protest, legal advocacy, negotiation with government agencies, refusal to sell land, demands for benefit-sharing, alternative mapping, or the establishment of independent community enterprises (Esteve-Jordà & Scheidel, 2025). Selective compliance is another possible strategy, whereby communities participate in formal tourism programmes while maintaining their own rules, norms, and interpretations. Such processes demonstrate that power in tourism governance is relational rather than exclusively top-down.

This finding complicates a simple binary between state domination and community autonomy (Harikrishnan & Doyle, 2024). Governmentality can produce both compliance and agency. A programme designed to promote entrepreneurial self-management may simultaneously provide communities with resources that strengthen collective institutions. Similarly, policy classifications that simplify local identities may be strategically appropriated by communities to obtain legal recognition, funding, infrastructure, or greater political visibility.

The concept of governmentality from below is useful for explaining these processes. Communities also govern themselves through social norms, collective monitoring, mutual obligations, customary institutions, and locally developed forms of responsibility. These mechanisms can contribute to sustainability independently of formal government programmes and may sometimes possess greater social legitimacy because they are grounded in local experience and relationships.

Nevertheless, local self-government should not be romanticised. Community institutions can also reproduce hierarchy, unequal representation, or exclusion. Local autonomy alone does not guarantee democratic or sustainable outcomes. The appropriate role of the state is therefore neither to replace local institutions with standardised administrative structures nor to withdraw completely from governance. Instead, state institutions should create enabling conditions, safeguard rights, provide resources and technical support, strengthen accountability, and facilitate coordination among actors. Sustainable tourism governance becomes more meaningful when state support strengthens community capacity for self-determination rather than merely incorporating local organisations into predetermined development agendas.

4. CONCLUSION

This article has examined the politics of sustainable tourism governance in Indonesia through a qualitative case-study approach based on document analysis and literature review. Using Foucault's theory of power and governmentality as the principal framework, and drawing on collaborative governance, participation theory, political ecology, and commons theory, the article argues that sustainable tourism is a contested political field. The analysis identifies six central dynamics. Sustainability functions as a governmental rationality that organises policy objectives and produces governable subjects. Decentralisation reconfigures rather than eliminates state power. Community participation is formally recognised but often remains consultative or instrumental. Tourism governance involves struggles over expert and local knowledge. Neoliberal policy encourages communities to become entrepreneurial and self-responsible, although access to economic opportunities remains unequal. Finally, communities negotiate and contest tourism policies through collective organisation, selective compliance, local knowledge, and everyday resistance.

The central argument is that sustainable tourism cannot be assessed solely through environmental indicators, visitor numbers, investment values, or destination certification. It must also be evaluated through political questions concerning authority, recognition, representation, ownership, and distribution. A destination is not genuinely sustainable when ecological and cultural costs are transferred to local residents while decision-making and economic benefits remain concentrated elsewhere. A more democratic model of tourism governance requires participation that changes the distribution of power. It requires community access to information, meaningful authority over development decisions, recognition of local knowledge, inclusive representation, equitable benefit-sharing, and effective grievance mechanisms. Sustainable tourism should therefore be understood not simply as the

management of destinations but as the democratic governance of social, ecological, cultural, and economic relations.

REFERENCES

- Anil Dawan, & Mega Larasati, A. (2023). Menjadikan Perempuan Papua Yang Berdaya (Study Analisa GESI Terhadap Perempuan Papua Sebagai Agen Perdamaian dan Kohesi Sosial). *Jurnal Inada: Kajian Perempuan Indonesia Di Daerah Tertinggal, Terdepan, Dan Terluar*, 5(1), 68-83. <https://doi.org/10.33541/ji.v5i1.4707>
- Carpio, C. O., Narimin, R. S., Raveche, J. R. C., & Sarles, B. S. (2026). Participatory governance and the empowerment of coastal communities through eco-tourism education. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 11(1), 97-102.
- Creswell, J. W. (2021). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. SAGE publications.
- Dalimunthe, M. A. (2022). Keterampilan Komunikasi Antarbudaya Mahasiswa Malaysia di Kota Medan. *Langgas: Jurnal Studi Pembangunan*, 1(2), 82-89.
- Dalimunthe, M. A., Suhendar, A., Ritonga, A. R., Nasution, F. A., Nasution, L. N., & Batubara, P. E. O. (2024). Effectiveness of waste management site reduce, reuse, recycle program in improving ecological citizenship. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1352(1), 012040. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1352/1/012040>
- Dalimunthe, M. A., Syam, A. M., Suhendar, A., & Al-Mujtahid, N. M. (2024). Deconstructing Islamic Cyberculture: Mitigating Inferiority and Cancel Culture in Virtual Space. *OPINI: Journal of Communication and Social Science*, 1(2), 12-26.
- de Lurdes Calisto, M., Costa, T., Afonso, V. A., Nunes, C., & Umbelino, J. (2023). Local governance and entrepreneurship in tourism-a comparative analysis of two tourist destinations. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 14(27), 22-38.
- Esteve-Jordà, C., & Scheidel, A. (2025). Do laws provoke or prevent green grabbing? A systematic review. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 52(7), 1493-1517.
- Fatima, M., Ata, G., & Rizwan, A. (2023). Institutional pressures and sustainable business practices: A case of strategic environmental management. *Global Economics Review*, 8(1), 196-212.
- Griffin, R. (2025). Governing platforms through corporate risk management: the politics of systemic risk in the Digital Services Act. *European Law Open*, 4(2), 223-253.
- Harikrishnan, S., & Doyle, J. (2024). Understanding the role of physical spaces in social de-segregations: Spatial lessons from Kerala and Northern Ireland. *Land Use Policy*, 146, 107315.
- Khater, M., Ibrahim, O., Sayed, M. N. E., & Faik, M. (2025). Legal frameworks for sustainable tourism: Balancing environmental conservation and economic development. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 28(22), 3693-3714.
- Kholil, S., Ismail, I., Dalimunthe, M. A., Suhendar, A., & Rambe, R. F. A. K. (2024). Strengthening Religious Moderation through PTKIN and SIT Collaboration to Build Social Harmony. *JlPI (Jurnal Ilmu Perpustakaan Dan Informasi)*, 9(2), 228-236.
- Kurniawati, D., Dalimunthe, M. A., Kholil, S., Ritonga, A. R., & Pratama, T. A. (2025). Reduction of microplastics through waste management: Evaluation of water quality and health risks in the communication policy of the ministry of environment and forestry. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1445(1), 12043.
- Li, Z., Lin, Y., Hooimeijer, P., & Monstadt, J. (2024). Heritage conflict evolution: Changing framing strategies and opportunity structures in two heritage district redevelopment projects in China. *Geoforum*, 149, 103959.
- Lynch, B., Ryan, A. A., O'Neill, M., & Penney, S. (2022). The factors that influence care

- home residents' and families' engagement with decision-making about their care and support: an integrative review of the literature. *BMC Geriatrics*, 22(1), 873.
- Muallidin, I. (2026). Leadership as institutional mechanism: authority, governance direction and institutionalized structure. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 1-17.
- Munthe, R. N., Nasution, K. A., Hasugian, G. I. P., Surbakti, C. N. B., Nasution, M., Hermawan, D., & Dalimunthe, M. A. (2026). Budaya Meme Sebagai Media Kritik Sosial Generasi Z Di Kota Medan. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 4(1), 5746-5760.
- Ohorella, N. R., Fauziah, D., & Dalimunthe, M. A. (2024). Brand Awareness Communication Strategy in Setujuan Coffee Marketing on Instagram Social Media. *Komunika*, 20(02), 46-57.
- Pradnyana, I., Lubis, S. N., Sabrina, T., & Ikhsan, E. (2025). Cultural Tourism as a Catalyst for Rural Development: A Spatial-Econometric Study of a Tourism Village in North Sumatra, Indonesia. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & Planning*, 20(7), 3095.
- Purba, A. M., Dirbawanto, N. D., & Dalimunthe, M. A. (2025). Urban digitalization through clean energy: policies and communication of Medan City government towards "Medan Smart City." *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1445(1), 12067.
- Purnomo, S., & Purwandari, S. (2025). A comprehensive micro, small, and medium enterprise empowerment model for developing sustainable tourism villages in rural communities: A perspective. *Sustainability*, 17(4), 1368.
- Ristiawan, R., Huijbens, E., & Peters, K. (2023). Projecting development through tourism: Patrimonial governance in Indonesian geoparks. *Land*, 12(1), 223.
- Ritonga, A. R., Dalimunthe, M. A., Veronica, A., & Ginting, L. D. C. U. (2023). The Effectiveness of Social Media As A Promotional Medium Of The University Of Sumatera Utara (USU) Library. *Talenta Conference Series: Local Wisdom, Social, and Arts (LWSA)*, 6(3), 16-20.
- Saragih, K. W., Suhendar, A., Damanik, J., Girsang, R. N., Saragi, S. R., & Ningrum, W. C. (2025). Juvenile Delinquency in the Perspective of Criminology in Indonesia: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal Analytica Islamica*, 14(1), 208-218.
- Semwal, R. (2024). *Enhancing cultural sensitivity and safeguarding heritage sites*.
- Siregar, A. R. R., Kurniawati, D., & Dalimunthe, M. A. (2025). MARKETING COMMUNICATION MODEL OF THE MUHAMMADIYAH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION IN MEDAN CITY IN BUILDING THE ORGANIZATION'S BRAND IMAGE. *Journal Analytica Islamica*, 14(2), 657-670.
- Suhendar, A., Ridayani, Azis, D., Mohd Yusoff, M. Z., & Rini Utami, A. (2024). Optimizing citizenship education for ecological awareness: Analysis of the effectiveness of the lihat sampah ambil (LISA) program in environmental conservation. *Journal of Professional Learning and Sustainable Education*, 1(1), 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.62568/jplse.v1i1.50>
- Suhendar, A., & Saragih, K. W. (2025). THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE FIRST PRINCIPLE OF PANCASILA TO THE FORMATION OF MODERATE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER IN THE DISRUPTION ERA. *Journal Analytica Islamica*, 14(2), 1215-1225.
- Suhendar, A., Syam, A. M., & Ritonga, A. R. (2023). Efektivitas Instagram Sebagai Ruang Motivasi Hijrah Mahasiswa IAIN Lhokseumawe. *Komunika*, 19(02), 12-20.
- Suhendar, A., Taufika, R., Rachmatsyah, R., Yusuf, R., Fajri, I., Mohd Yusoff, M. Z., & Adawiah, R. (2023). Eco-literacy and sustainable citizenship: The role of the school environment in shaping responsible environmental behavior. *Sekumpul: Journal of Multidisciplinary Education Sciences*, 1(1), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.62568/jomes.v1i1.13>
- Turčinović, M., Vujko, A., & Stanišić, N. (2025). Community-led sustainable tourism in rural areas: Enhancing wine tourism destination competitiveness and local

- empowerment. *Sustainability*, 17(7), 2878.
- Ukur, J., Suhendar, A., Sirait, I. R., Ababbil, T. N., & Anshari, N. N. (2025). STRENGTHENING DIGITAL-BASED CIVICS EDUCATION IN PREVENTING CYBERBULLYING AMONG VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AT SMK PRAMA ARTHA SERBELAWAN. *Journal Analytica Islamica*, 14(1), 488-498.
- Widhiasthini, N. W., Subawa, N. S., Fong Emmerson, M., Yanti, N. K. W., Utami, M. S. M., Kusuma, P. S. A. J., Dewi, P. P., & Sudharma, K. J. A. (2024). Public regulation urgency in cryptocurrency based on administrative reform for Bali sustainable tourism. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2312657.
- Zikargae, M. H., Woldearegay, A. G., & Skjerdal, T. (2022). Assessing the roles of stakeholders in community projects on environmental security and livelihood of impoverished rural society: A nongovernmental organization implementation strategy in focus. *Heliyon*, 8(10).