



Governmentality within Collaborative Tourism Governance of the Nature Based Tourism

^{1*}I Gede Eko Putra Sri Sentanu, ²Fadillah Putra, ³Trenggono Pujo Sakti,
⁴Ahmad Fauzen, ⁵Klara Kumalasari
^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, ⁵STIA Malang, Malang
*Corresponding author: sentanu@ub.ac.id

Abstract

The tourism sector is a potential that must continue to be developed. Tourism is part of a strategic industrial sector and can generate foreign exchange. The development of the tourism sector shows a shift in the tourist travel model from industry tourism towards sustainability tourism which focuses more on nature-based tourism activities. Management of nature-based tourism is critical for society and the environment with basic resources. Apart from that, managing nature-based tourism in Bali requires support from the government and other actors to enhance tourist attraction and encourage regional development. The research purpose to analyze the governance of tourism collaboration in managing nature-based tourism. This research of critical theory on collaborative tourism governance through participation (sovereignty, disciplinary, and neo-liberal) as knowledge rules that governing tourism behavior. A critical perspective on collaborative governance within this framework would examine how ostensibly participatory and collaborative forms of governance in fact operate as techniques of power and control. The collaborative governance arrangements may be used by authorities to extend their reach and influence, by incorporating tourist citizens and civil society into governmental processes in governance nature-based tourism. This research uses the data collection literature study research method, namely by collecting, examining information or data about the results of different findings but still within the same theme from books, proposals, various applicable articles and journals, then compiling, explaining, so as to obtain conclusions. This research will show how governmentality of the operates both in tourism destinations and on a wider scale, often misses the link in conditioning tourist behavior and makes governance inefficient.

Keywords: *Participatory; Tourist Citizenship Behaviors; Nature-Based Tourism; Collaborative Governance; Governmentality*

Received July 18, 2024

Revised August 18, 2024

Published Agustus 31, 2024



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ©2018 by author.

Introduction

Nature-based tourism is a mobile activity formed by the capacity of tourists with mobility and socio-material infrastructure that cultural and natural flows are caused (Mehmetoglu, 2007; Fredman et al., 2012; Ruiz et al., 2019). This process encourages communities to be ready to be close to the tourism service landscape with a management dimension, and provides new knowledge about how the nature-based tourism industry can be supported through protection, sustainable natural resource management, public infrastructure, and policy access (Fredman et al., 2012).

Due to internal and external coordination and collaboration, which has been shown to result in increasingly fragmented tourism governance on natural resources, destination management organizations are constrained (Priskin, 2003; Keul, 2013). Although there is some flexibility in the governance of these natural tourism destinations, the functioning of this type of governance has not been well explored by research on destination management

organizations. The dialogic construction of tourists about scenery, culture, art, and landmarks is an example of Bali's tourism industry's destination management organization. Nevertheless, this industry's transformation frequently alters the paradigm that overlaps between growth and sustainable tourism governance (Hornbacher, 2021; Suyadnya, 2021; Vickers, 2011).

By adding normative theory into critical studies, this essay thus offers a new way of analyzing tourism governance and the research goal of natural tourist appeal. First, a framework for collaborative governance to explain the increasing number of actors involved in destination management and emphasize the need to move the conversation about nature-based tourism from the domain of management structures to that of governing arrangements (Beritelli et al., 2007; Beritelli, 2011; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Hall, 2011; Simona Franzoni, 2015; Sentanu et al., 2023). The second is the governmentality typology (Foucault & Senellart, 2008; Fletcher, 2010) as a theoretical link to collaborative governance and to gather a critical discourse analysis of thinking, acting, and being at the tourism governance level (Phillips et al., 2008; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010). Third, a critical investigation of the power mechanisms that influence tourism destination of the stakeholder collaboration (Church, A., 2006; Saito & Ruhanen, 2017) shows how different governance regimes operate empirically.

This method describes the impact of destination management organizations and is impacted by the scope of collaboratively framed tourism codes of conduct, the functioning of these various regimes, and the ways in which various governance processes at the scale of tourism code dimensions either strengthen or weaken tourism governance. Understanding tourism governance, which depends on firsthand and active experiences of industry contestation, is affected by this allogamy between collaborative governance and critical discussions of governmentality. Understanding tourism governance, which depends on personal and active experiences of industry contestation, is affected by this allogamy between collaborative governance and critical discourses of governmentality.

Literature Review and Research Focus

Nature-based tourism destination management

Beritelli (2011) traces the common thread from destination planning, to destination management to tourism governance. Assuming, it describes the complex reality of norms, rules of order, and conditions that shape behavior and shape the sustainability of destinations. Destination organizational management is often categorized as governance driven by tourist culture, and then responded to by the community or enterprise. Meanwhile, the tendency of destination management in effective enterprises, this governance limits stakeholder involvement because it relies on dominant enterprise interactions with the government (Beritelli et al., 2007). Thus, this tourism destination management represents various individuals and organizations involved in, and affected by, the tourism governance process—placing actors and policies as one of many approaches to governing behavior (Bramwell, 2011; Hall, 2011; Laws et al., 2011; Wang & Pizam, 2011).

Collaborative Tourism Governance

Sentanu et al., (2023) trace the conceptualization of tourism governance to management organizations, to public organizations (e.g., government) and private entities (e.g., business), and their interconnected networks and intermediations. There are two perspectives on tourism governance: horizontal (local, regional, and national contexts) and vertical (linking governance to management and civil society organizations) to the realm of consensus (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Bramwell, 2011; Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Sentanu et al., 2023). In other words, the diffusion of power and authority among multiple autonomous actors, rather than a top-down hierarchical control model.

While the effectiveness of tourism governance, depends on the context—that destinations can derive utility from community-based governance; local stakeholders compete, cooperate,

build trust, and construct institutions and networks that promote the common interests of the community by encouraging compliance with certain behaviors and rules (Svensson et al., 2005). In contrast, community-driven tourism governance focuses on informal networks of legally autonomous organizations that work together to achieve individual and collective goals in a destination and tends to examine how the interactions of these actors influence the social power of the community and guide development (Beritelli et al., 2007; Simona Franzoni, 2015; Svensson et al., 2005). The scale of the goal is also influenced by the scalar dimension through feedback relationships (Paavola et al., 2009). Volgger & Pechlaner (2014) found “the integrated nature of many tourism products, the dominance of fragmented small and medium enterprises and the role of community-owned resources are considered as important factors in inter-organizational cooperation in tourism destinations”. With this goal, the public sector and private entities were found to dominate tourism governance at the expense of local community actors (Moscardo, 2011). This calls for careful consideration of the imbalances of power between tourism producers, governors, and members of host communities (Church, A., 2006). Therefore, in our opinion, understanding collaborative tourism governance involves the power mechanisms that influence ecotourism governance at various scales. The following section establishes a governmentality framework at three scales. Once the governance typology is established at the ecotourism destination scale, it is extended to the tourist as local governance, the institutional as regional governance, and the state as national governance.

Governmentality in nature based-tourism

Governmentality is an illustration of the mechanisms of power that “direct the conduct of conduct” of individuals (Fletcher, 2010; Rose, et al., 2006; Dean, 2013). In other words, governmentality focuses on the reciprocal constitution of techniques of power and forms of knowledge (Dean, 2013). Every individual is conditioned in various ways and organized spaces, and at many scales to believe and indoctrinate certain knowledge that informs how to act toward oneself and in the world (Miller, 2009). These modes of discipline and punishment have been historically formed and operate to control behavior and beliefs (Andrews, 1993). The genealogy of discipline and punishment, revealing different histories and mechanisms of power, develops into different ways of governing in understanding various behaviors. Fletcher (2010) articulates three forms of governmentality; sovereignty; disciplinary; and neoliberal—as they apply to nature tourism. Although different typologies of governmentality are not mutually exclusive, they can coexist in any context, alternately in conflict or acting together (Fletcher, 2010).

Sovereign in nature-based tourism. Punishment is framed as a form of social good and decentralized law enforcement, the essence of which remains to force individuals to conform for fear of punishment (Foucault, 1995). In addition, Foucault (1995) argues, one should calculate punishment not based on the crime, but on the likelihood of its repetition....everything should be arranged in such a way that the perpetrator of the crime has no desire to repeat the crime, or the possibility of having imitators.....punishment is primarily directed at others, at all those who are potentially guilty. Punishment also includes security measures that accompany penalties such as “prohibitions on entry to certain areas,” which are described as “an economy of suspended rights” (Foucault, 1995).

Disciplinary in nature-based tourism. This disciplinary describes how individuals begin to instill ideas and knowledge, which lead them to choose certain behaviors and avoid others. Foucault(1995) asserts that “discipline is the art of order, the technique of changing order...which transforms the many things that are confusing, useless, or dangerous into the many things that are orderly.” In critical sociology, how docile bodies are manipulated consciously and subconsciously through various drives to conform to cultural norms (Turner, 1982).

Neoliberal in nature-based tourism. Neoliberal governmentality is the art of government that ‘weaves individual aspirations with market demands’ (Hofmann, 2015), or the general strategy of using market principles to regulate human action in many developing areas including social relations and the use of natural resources (Fletcher, 2010; Foucault,

2008). Foucault (2008: 242) mentions, the economization of the social field, which involves the economic model (supply-demand) and investment-cost-profit so that it makes the model of social relations and existence itself, a form of individual relations with himself, time, people around him, groups and families. The logic of the market that permeates the operation of state functions, so that core government institutions, if not privatized, operate the same enterprise models, which then force individuals to internalize rationality as enterprises (Burchell, 1993; Ferguson & Gupta, 2002). This new modality of government works by creating autonomous mechanisms to achieve governmentality results through the transfer of risk to enterprises or individuals and accountability as subjects "empowered to discipline themselves" (Ferguson & Gupta, 2002). Disciplinary governmentality is necessary "to construct the rational economic actors that underlie neoliberal governance by instilling the subject's self-perception as a self-interested and competitive individual through mechanisms that encourage types of behavior" (Fletcher, 2010). However, unlike disciplinary governance, which involves the internalization of certain norms, neoliberal governance operates through the manipulation of external incentives to direct behavior with a cost-benefit ratio to increase the expenditure associated with undesirable actions and vice versa, the neoliberal subject is "someone who can be governed, someone who responds systematically to systematic modifications artificially introduced into the environment" (Foucault & Senellart, 2008). In the tourism sector in Bali, the demise of sustainable tourism as a panacea for the impacts of mass tourism at the community level has led academics to call for tourism destination management to refocus on the politics behind tourism (Pedersen et al., 2024).

Method

This paper is based on an example of a case study of empirical research on nature tourism driven by tourist capacity in Bali, which illustrates the application of critical discourse analysis; thinking, doing, being (Phillips et al., 2008; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010). Thus, the disclosure of strategic narratives that are produced, stabilized, and made to appear natural or legitimate (Phillips et al., 2008). In this case, the collaborative governance agenda can help reveal power relations in the management of destination organizations, especially nature-based tourism areas and objects. In line with the opinion Foucault & Senellart (2008) that discourse is a coherent knowledge system in governing actions by ignoring alternatives.

Indeed, discursive collaborative governance coverage becomes a mosaic of stakeholders, something that goes beyond the dichotomy management structures (top-down) and (bottom-up) with power, whose characteristics are in the bureaucratic body (rule of law, functions, tasks, impersonal, and institutional) for the balance between experts in the consensus of knowledge that is autonomous in social initiatives (Beritelli et al., 2007; Beritelli, 2011; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Hall, 2011; Simona Franzoni, 2015; Sentanu et al., 2023), but the determinant of power becomes critical in the legitimacy and authority of the collaborative governance agenda, especially participatory in tourism governance. Thus, the dimension of the tourism code of ethics becomes a way of power in implementing change. As an output, data is analyzed through thematic categorization by revealing how to govern tourists.

Results and Discussion

The nature based-tourism governance impact with dimensions

Foucault & Senellart (2008) argue that power refers to the realm of relations with the term governmentality as an analysis of power relations. The last section explains the three components of governmentality which according to Foucault & Senellart (2008) suggests is valid for the analysis of ways of steering individuals and are valid when "dealing with phenomena on a completely different scale", such as; "the management of the whole social body".

In this spirit, the dimensions of the code of ethics for tourism with the understanding of collaborative governance as a different perspective or microscopic perspective by directing tourist behavior—tourist destination, destination places, and so on. In other words, this individual behavior is governing in a complex network of government-mentalities that comes from various scales of codes of ethics for tourist. In the global guide, promoting responsible, sustainable, and universally open tourism (UNWTO, 1999). Then from that, the application of tourism ethics in the development of tourist destinations in Indonesia can be done through several things; the principle of the tourism code of ethics, the implementation of *SaptaPesona*, the concept of *Tri Hita Karana* (Trisna Semara et al., 2022). As the result, this is a guideline for tourists to; respect the culture, traditions, and customs of local community; maintain environmental cleanliness and sustainability; avoid drug abuse, prostitution, and other illegal activities; respect the rights of local communities, such as access to natural resources and the environment, respecting and complying with; applicable regulations and laws in the tourist destination; being polite and courteous in interacting with local communities, and supporting efforts to preserve culture and the environment in tourist destinations. In other words, different perspectives can help explain the mechanisms of power that have significant influence in different contexts.

Following the footsteps of Foucault & Senellart (2008) thoughts on liberal and neoliberal, it is hoped that collaborative governance framework will be useful as a tool for criticizing reality; a critique of governmentality that to be released; against the governmentality that reforms through governmentality is opposed and misused is limited. In order to bear fruition, Fletcher (2010) articulates three forms of governmentality; sovereign; disciplinary; and neoliberal. Although different typologies of governmentality are not mutually exclusive, they can coexist in any context, alternately in conflict or acting together (Fletcher, 2010). Given this, the following section establishes the governmentality analysis of three types of scales. Once the governance typology is established at the scale code of ethnic tourism in nature-based tourism destinations, it is extended to the part of tourists as local-scale governance, institutions as regional-scale governance, and the state as national-scale governance.

The tourist as local scale governance

On a tourist scale, it includes interactions between stakeholders and use of resources. In general, referring to the concept of *SaptaPesona*; conditions that are realized in order to attract tourists to visit an area with dimensions; safe, orderly, clean, cool, beautiful, friendly, and memorable. Specifically in Bali, it is familiar with the concept of *Tri Hita Karana* as a balance of life (Sudama, 2020). In the results of empirical sociological research, Suyadnya (2021) refers to the harmonization of space, where tourism industry planning policies and strategies require balance with nature. Thus, creating quality and experiential tourist destinations is a manifestation of tourism governance.



Figure 1 Pocket Card Foreign Tourist in Bali (<https://bali.com/bali/travel-guide/practical-tips-must-know/etiquette-how-to-behave/>)

However, this concept is essentially part of the governance of harmonization, which is seen as the main foundation in the authority of areas and nature-based tourist attractions. Meanwhile, natural tourist destinations are heterogeneity of the wider tourism industry in most destinations, and are often the first to be present to determine the steps and style of further destination development. In environmental anthropology notes, Roth & Sedana (2015) illustrates the terrace rice field tourist attractions as heritage tourism. In other words, cultural power is often a resource of authority and power in tourist attractions. The empirical case study research of Abdillah et al., (2022) highlights the intangible cultural products of Balinese dance art that grow as tourism promotions, maximize tourist experiences, and show that cultural identity as a cultured society. This implies the innovative development of "traditional arts" as part of everyday life in the living culture of the community.

However, in the sophistication of cultural power, the digitalization of spiritual tourism (yoga, retreat, and agnihotra) through virtual coaching in service marketing provides a touch of tourist experience to visit Bali (Sutarya, 2024). Thus, the structure of the digitalization of spiritual tourism is part of the docile bodies and souls into the practice of enlightenment and the meaning of life for tourists. To date, the quality of tourist experience has become a dynamic in tourism travel that affects power through the dimensions of the tourist code of ethics and vice versa, because interested actors seek to obtain utility, with tourism service infrastructure to reinforce the externality of visitor ethics and disciplinary behavior in the culture of dualism. Iverson (2010) noted, cultural conflicts between tourists and visitors in Bali are crucial, the most concerning of which are noisy behavior, drunkenness, and lack of respect for host-community. Nevertheless, foreign tourists are late to realize the culture of dualism through expatriate culture that leads to contradictory actions when there is an original Balinese culture that can be enjoyed. Thus, the guide for foreign tourists when visiting Bali (**Figure 1**) serves as a code of ethics for tourism to promote tourist citizenship behaviors in Bali.

This shows how actions are taken with maintaining the relationship of socio-cultural order between tourists and the host-community. However, the disclosure of etiquette and attitudes

(norms, customs, manners, wisdom) for foreign tourists, as part of a subtle normalization with the exception of non-dominant forms of expression of tourist citizenship behaviors. Meanwhile, discipline of governance becomes a mode primarily of conditioning behavior at destinations, to understand what norms should be reinforced and to account for them in the articulation of new and inclusive visitor etiquettes that enhance destination appeal. Thus, considering the determinant impacts of tourist destinations, influencing developments, explains the confluence of overlapping forms of governmentality operating at the small scales at which these processes are realized.

Institutional as scale governance regional

Institutional governance at a regional scale can help how competing destination interests, broader public goals, and investment activities are regulated (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). Sudama (2020) emphasized that the main conflict in the concept of Balinese cultural power is symbolic capital is often between social capital and natural capital with spiritual capital, for the continuation of activities for personal and group gain. The dialogical contestation of cultural power often changes, depending on the governmentalities in which it operates. In the political anthropology notes of McDonald & Wilson (2017) the way to model governing society is to use security jargon to gain power in Bali by declaring to protect culture. On the one hand, this security power is re-embodied with customary sanctions under the authority of the customary elite "*bendesa*" and on the other hand, involving the control of the customary guard "*pecalang*" by forming volunteer alert groups, security guards, and private security, as well as surveillance cameras (Hishiyama, 2010).

In the institutional dimensions it has become a colla-borative governance regime, which is subject to the institutional conditioning of nature-based tourism. This means how to order the mobility of foreign tourists when the destination becomes the main domain of the core multiple stakeholders which are subject to tourism governance. In the pervasiveness of cultural power, Hornbacher (2021) offers a moral ecological dimension, for the affirmation of environmental warriors in improving biodiversity; environmental engineering, permaculture, and education in mass tourism prevention. As a resolution of the order of tourist mobility, the triadic mix in resources sovereignty is a form of balance (Rosalina et al., 2023) in orderliness of tourists, especially the domain of tourism governance.

However, the expansion of the economic model and cost-investment-profit as an individual model relating to others in various fields of social relations (Foucault & Senellart, 2008; Fletcher, 2010) influences the order of foreign tourists in the mobility in the various tourist destination experiences. In partial consensus, it provides a number of great benefits from the possibility of the multiple stakeholders in governance priorities, but it is necessary to understand the local perspective and how regional mechanisms operate in the socio-cultural order. Apart from that, the multiple stake-holder as a regional is one way out for destination management or governance in sustainable nature-based tourism by modality of cultural institutional.

State as scale governance national

The state as national governance, acts to decide which investment activities are encouraged or not encouraged, strategies for marketing the image of the state, transportation (access) and investment, setting entry and exit taxes, providing incentives, administering, and recovering criminal activities, and ensuring overall national stability (Bramwell, 2011; Bramwell & Lane, 2011; Hall, 2011). Suyadnya (2021) sociological research notes mention that the "golden triangle" area, which triggers investment in accommodation and infrastructure through public-private, to facilitate the tourism industry into a cosmopolitan space; hotels, villas, bungalows with interactive lifestyles, where this area is classified as "super-gentrified" due to the very high demand for land for investment, business, and

residence. On the contrary, the formation of the country's image in tourism promotion through the making of the film "eat pray love" establishes Bali as a brand narrative of art, culture, yoga, spirituality, and nature where de facto marketing replaces the official local destination marketing campaign, as the result in negative economic income but has limited benefits because the products offered are not illicit (Bell, 2019). As a result, the expansion of tourists in spiritual journeys as an agenda for self-actualization by modality, culture and mobility.

Meanwhile, the geo-arbitrage in Bali's areas and tourist attractions has accelerated with mobility to be nature-based and improving the work-life balance needed among digital nomads by expressing that happiness is greater in nature than in the city (Haking, 2017). With that goal, this spirituality is integrated into knowledge-capitalism carrying out interdependent, knowledge-intensive, and project-based work, which appears far as a low cost of living. Haking (2017) suggests that host communities should engage in digital nomad hubs, despite having different priorities and not realizing the importance of joining the digital nomad community. As a domino effect, attracting the attention of FIFO (fly in fly out) workers of the tourism operator business to Bali by offering low-cost, comfortable, in mice planner (Sanders et al., 2016). As a result, the competitiveness of the tourism market offers dimensions; affordable prices, comfort, and social opportunities for foreign tourists. Beyond the price dimension, opportunity to experience other cultures is a key domain in tourist mobility (Sanders et al., 2016). In line with the empirical case study of the political economy of the tourism sector in Bali Pedersen et al., (2024) that this material stimulates neoliberal processes, because it offers comparative naturalness of scenery and culture, which creates new opportunities for increased mobility and capital.

To date, the intergovernmental organization agreement through the international mobility program (digital nomad visa and second home visa) that directs the normalization of the digital nomad community and FIFO community, is the main way to disciplinary the quality of tourist citizenship behavior caused by "seasonal" mass immigration to the island of Bali. On the other hand, the imperative of the tourist tax for foreign tourists is used as an allocation of cultural and environmental protection funds, which of course requires support from regional core institutions and citizens, in ecological and cultural investments that influence the internalization of the quality of sustainable tourism governance. Ferreira et al., (2020) recommends the stakeholders engagement with a dimensions of nature-based solutions (eg, urban forests, biodiversity, urban green space, green infrastructure, biophilic infrastructure) that have a participatory impact, where the polycentric type is a way out for citizens and stakeholders to incentive and disincentive of social, environmental, and economic benefits.

Understanding the changing role of the state in governing behavior in the neoliberal era is critical. This implies that the market as an autonomous structure separate from the main role of the state is a form of intervention in the impact of the market, in order to ensure free and fair transactions and to reduce negative externalities (Fletcher, 2010). Foucault & Senellart (2008) argue that neoliberalism is best characterized by the state intervening to enable the market and extend market rationality to other domains. In other words, the state provides sovereign support for the priva-tization of natural tourist areas and attractions and intervenes in what was once considered an open access domain to create resources that are owned, regulated, and managed as direct market goods is something concrete.

Conclusion

Natural based-tourism is a critical resource for destinations in Bali. These places are also contested spaces with multiple mechanisms of power and conditioning of visitor behavior and access to these spaces. The understanding of these dynamics contextualizes the multiple-stakeholders and dimensions of tourism codes of conduct involved in governing nature-based

tourism destinations and incorporates typologies of governance processes into an analysis of how different tourism code regimes operate and intersect. Empirically, how do governance at the nature-based tourism destination level that are embedded in these codes of conduct overlap to mutually reinforce and strongly condition behavior (e.g.; foreign tourist pocket card and global and government-sponsored rules or compete and make governance a binary opposition). In addition, this collaborative tourism governance approach demonstrates analytical in assessing existing governance processes and has the potential to assist in the creation of effective governance matrices by involving multiple stakeholders and multiple dimensions of tourism codes of conduct. Utilizing a collaborative governance framework, it can incorporate the realities of destination-level governance practices and respond to policies across stakeholder groups, and governance typologies, to achieve desired outcomes.

Alternatively, the application of unintended top-down governance to nature-based tourism destinations could benefit from a framework to determine the form and scale of tourism codes of conduct that support governance regimes by directing their rejection towards the most effective methods and scales. Future research, both in critical studies and tourism governance, could build on this study to analyze governance processes that occur in specific contexts. Sustainable tourism studies could analyze governance regimes and their interactions across scales of tourism codes of conduct against different normative frameworks to develop practical approaches to adhering to certain standards of knowledge-systems by facilitating socially and environmentally destructive actions.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank those who have helped in the preparation of this article. This research was funded by the Directorate of Research and Community Service (DRPM) with contract number 553.2/UN10.C20/PM/2024 dated May 7, 2024 for mono year funding

References

- Abdillah, Y., Supriono, S., & Supriyono, B. (2022). Change and innovation in the development of Balinese dance in the garb of special interest tourism. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1), 2076962. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2076962>
- Bell, Dr. C. (2019). The New Age Tourism Brand-Wagon in Ubud, Bali: Eat Pay Love! *South Asian Research Journal of Arts, Language and Literature*, 01(03), 74–82. <https://doi.org/10.36346/sarjall.2019.v01i03.003>
- Beritelli, P. (2011). Tourist destination governance through local elites Looking beyond the stakeholder level. St. Gallen: University of Switzerland.
- Beritelli, P., Bieger, T., & Laesser, C. (2007). Destination Governance: Using Corporate Governance Theories as a Foundation for Effective Destination Management. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507302385>
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.576765>
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 411–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586>
- Bramwell, B., & Sharman, A. (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 392–415. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(98\)00105-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00105-4)
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies: Towards an Integrationist Methodology. *Journal of Management Studies*, 47(6), 1213–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00883.x>

-
- Church, A., C., T. (2006). Tourism, politics and the forgotten entanglements of power. In *Tourism, Power and Space*.
- Ferreira, V., Barreira, A., Loures, L., Antunes, D., & Panagopoulos, T. (2020). Stakeholders' Engagement on Nature-Based Solutions: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability*, 12(2), 640. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020640>
- Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentalism: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, 8(3), 171. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.73806>
- Foucault, M., & Senellart, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fredman, P., Wall-Reinius, S., & Grundén, A. (2012). The Nature of Nature in Nature-based Tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(4), 289–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2012.752893>
- Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 437–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.570346>
- Hishiyama, K. (2010). Uneasy society in Indonesia: With special attention to the gated community and CCTV in Bali. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(1), 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.01.006>
- Hornbacher, A. (2021). Bali's environmental crisis: Between moral ecology and global climate discourse. *Social Anthropology*, 29(1), 245–248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.13006>
- Iverson, T. J. (2010). Cultural conflict: Tourists versus tourists in Bali, Indonesia. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4), 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506181011081488>
- Keul, A. (2013). Finding power in nature tourism. *Political Geography*, 33, 63–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2012.12.006>
- McDonald, M., & Wilson, L. (2017). Trouble in paradise: Contesting security in Bali. *Security Dialogue*, 48(3), 241–258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010617692925>
- Mehmetoglu, M. (2007). Typologising nature-based tourists by activity—Theoretical and practical implications. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 651–660. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.02.006>
- Pedersen, D., Engel, S., & Sheridan, L. (2024). The Impact of Neoliberalism on Crisis Management in Bali's Tourism Sector. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2024.2366408>
- Phillips, N., Sewell, G., & Jaynes, S. (2008). Applying Critical Discourse Analysis in Strategic Management Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 770–789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107310837>
- Priskin, J. (2003). Issues and Opportunities in Planning and Managing Nature-based Tourism in the Central Coast Region of Western Australia. *Australian Geographical Studies*, 41(3), 270–286. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-8470.2003.00234.x>
- Rosalina, P. D., Wang, Y., Dupre, K., Putra, I. N. D., & Jin, X. (2023). Rural tourism in Bali: Towards a conflict-based tourism resource typology and management. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2223076>
- Roth, D., & Sedana, G. (2015). Reframing Tri Hita Karana: From 'Balinese Culture' to Politics. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 16(2), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2014.994674>
-

-
- Ruiz, J. B., Lamers, M., Bush, S., & Wells, G. B. (2019). Governing nature-based tourism mobility in National Park Torres del Paine, Chilean Southern Patagonia. *Mobilities*, 14(6), 745–761. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2019.1614335>
- Saito, H., & Ruhanen, L. (2017). Power in tourism stakeholder collaborations: Power types and power holders. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 189–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.01.001>
- Sanders, D., Willson, G., Susomrith, P., & Dowling, R. (2016). Fly in to work; fly out to Bali: An exploration of Australian fly-in-fly-out (FIFO) workers leisure travel. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 26, 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2015.11.002>
- Sentanu, I. G. E. P. S., Haryono, B., Zamrudi, Z., & Praharjo, A. (2023). Challenges and successes in collaborative tourism governance: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 33, 3302. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v33i.2669>
- Simona Franzoni. (2015). Destination Governance for Sustainable Tourism. *J. of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 3(6). <https://doi.org/10.17265/2328-2169/2015.12.001>
- Sudama, I. N. (2020). Conflict within tri hitakarana's fields: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 6(6), 8–23. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v6n6.992>
- Sutarya, I. G. (2024). On-off hybrid spiritual tourism in the new normal era. *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEAMJ-09-2023-0063>
- Suyadnya, I. W. (2021). Tourism Gentrification in Bali, Indonesia: A Wake-up Call for Overtourism. *Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.7454/MJS.v26i2.12930>
- Vickers, A. (2011). Bali rebuilds its tourist industry. *Bijdragen Tot de Taal-, Land- En Volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, 167(4), 459–481. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-90003580>
- Online book
- Haking, J. (2017). Digital Nomad Lifestyle A Field Study in Bali [KTH Royal Institute of Technology School of Industrial Engineering and Management]. <https://kth.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1182328/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Trisna Semara, I. M., Eka Mahendra, I. W., & Wirawan, P. E. (2022). *Kode Etik Pariwisata*. IPB Internasional Press.
- UNWTO. (1999). *Global Code of Ethic for Tourism*. <https://api2.kemendikbud.go.id/file/download/10711>