

Setting Strategic Priorities for Ethnic Community-Based Tourism Using Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning

Taufik Raharjo¹, Roby Syaiful Ubed², Mulyadi³, Arif Rahman Hakim⁴,
Muhammad Setiawan Kusmulyono⁵

1-2 Polytechnic of State Finance STAN, Jl. Bintaro Utama 3A Sektor V, Jurang Manggu Timur, Kec. Pd. Aren, Kota Tangerang Selatan, Banten 15222, Indonesia

3-4 Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir Sutami No.36A, Jebres, Kec. Jebres, Kota Surakarta, Jawa Tengah 57126, Indonesia

5 Universitas Prasetya Mulya, Edu Town Kavling Edu I No. 1, Jalan BSD Raya Barat 1, Serpong, Pagedangan, Kec. Pagedangan, Kabupaten Tangerang, Banten 15339, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Village-Owned Enterprises; Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning; Ethnic Community-Based Tourism; Rural Infrastructure Planning Kata Kunci: Badan Usaha Milik Desa; Perencanaan Aksesibilitas Pedesaan Terpadu; Pariwisata Berbasis Komunitas Etnik; Perencanaan Infrastruktur Pedesaan	This study identifies the development priorities of Kepuhsari, an ethnic community-based tourism (ECBT) village in Indonesia, by assessing infrastructure accessibility and examining the role of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDesa). This study uses a quantitative descriptive approach based on the Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP) method, complemented by qualitative methods, including FGDs, interviews, observation, and secondary data, to generate weighted accessibility indicators. The findings indicate that transportation infrastructure and public information media are the most critical priorities in both upper and lower village regions. However, BUMDesa Sido Mukti remains inactive in tourism development due to managerial constraints and misalignment with ECBT objectives. This study uniquely applies IRAP, traditionally used for rural infrastructure, to ethnic tourism development. Practically, this study recommends enhancing transportation and information infrastructure, alongside restructuring the strategic direction of BUMDesa. Methodological limitations include context-specific findings that cannot be statistically generalized without reapplying the full IRAP process in other settings.
Corresponding author: taufik.raharjo@pknstan.ac.id	SARI PATI
Copyright © 2026 by Authors, Published by IRJBS. This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA License 	<i>Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi prioritas pembangunan Desa Kepuhsari, sebuah desa wisata berbasis komunitas etnik (ECBT) di Indonesia, melalui penilaian aksesibilitas infrastruktur dan peran Badan Usaha Milik Desa (BUMDesa). Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kuantitatif berbasis metode Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP), yang dilengkapi dengan FGD kualitatif, wawancara, observasi, dan data sekunder, untuk menyusun indikator aksesibilitas berbobot. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa infrastruktur transportasi dan media informasi publik merupakan prioritas paling krusial di wilayah atas dan bawah desa. Namun, BUMDesa Sido Mukti belum berperan aktif karena keterbatasan manajerial dan ketidakselarasan dengan tujuan ECBT. Keunikan penelitian ini terletak pada penerapan IRAP, yang biasanya untuk infrastruktur pedesaan, ke dalam pengembangan wisata etnik. Secara praktis, direkomendasikan peningkatan</i>

	<i>infrastruktur transportasi dan informasi, serta restrukturisasi arah strategis BUMDesa. Keterbatasan metodologis mencakup temuan yang spesifik-konteks dan tidak dapat digeneralisasi secara statistik tanpa mengulang proses IRAP lengkap di tempat lain</i>
--	--

INTRODUCTION

Many developing countries improve their economies through tourism (Yanes et al., 2019). Indonesia is famous for Bali, with its beautiful beaches and traditional arts (Putra, 2014), as well as Yogyakarta and Central Java for its cultural tourism and *Wayang Kulit* (shadow puppets) (Azmi & Ngadi, 2015; Utomo et al., 2020). One of the shadow puppet centers is the Kepuhsari Village in Wonogiri, Central Java, which has been a shadow puppet center since 1985 (Mulyadi et al., 2020), driving the local economy with various professions such as Dalang (shadow puppet master), Sinden (female Javanese singer), and shadow puppets craftsmen.

Although shadow puppets are considered ancient and obsolete by some, Kepuhsari remains a surviving center of *wayang* art (Yogi, 2021). There, 50 craftsmen actively produce shadow puppets (Octavia et al., 2018) while developing their skills and creating new work to support village tourism (Widodo, 2020). This fact makes Kepuhsari unique among other *wayang* craft centers.

Shadow puppetry in Kepuhsari is important for preserving national culture amid globalization, which threatens local culture (Azima et al., 2021). However, economically, puppet craftsmen face declining incomes, making it difficult to sustain this art (Nurdin, 2014). This situation burdens tourism actors and puppet craftsmen, who must struggle to maintain tourism activities even to sustain their livelihoods (Hendro et al., 2021).

The Wonogiri Regency Government recognizes the economic potential of Kepuhsari from social and

environmental aspects (Priyanto, 2017). Shadow puppet craftsmen are committed to maintaining their cultural heritage (Dinas P dan K., 2020) and supporting the development of Community-Based Tourism (CBT) (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009). Natural resources and community participation support the concept of CBT in Kepuhsari (Sutresna et al., 2019). Support from universities, private companies, and the government has strengthened the Kepuhsari tourism village, leading to its inauguration as an Ethnic Community-Based Tourism (ECBT) village on November 20, 2017 (Dinas P dan K., 2017).

Kepuhsari Village, as a cultural tourism village, experiences the potential for socio-economic improvement but faces significant obstacles (Asker et al., 2010). Large funds are required to develop tourism infrastructure, including construction, transportation, accommodation, and safety (Manaf et al., 2018; Mason, 2021). In addition, the community's capacity to manage tourism businesses, especially in education, remains low (Puspita & Amalia, 2018; Rasdiyanti, 2017). However, there is an increase in product innovation and capacity-building among puppet craftsmen, supported by universities, the government, and private parties (Dodds et al., 2018).

Ethnic CBT Kepuhsari faces challenges because several aspects are not yet established, such as coordination between parties and the role of Village-Owned Enterprises (*BUMDesa*), which is still in its growth stage (Thomas, 2019). Tourist visits and artisan income have not reached the expected targets. This study uses the Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP) method to

identify the development priorities of the Kepuhsari cultural tourism village, taking accessibility and population capacity into account (Oktaviana et al., 2011). This study fills a gap in the literature on the priority of Ethnic CBT development using the IRAP method and the role of *BUMDesa*, which has not been previously covered in other, more descriptive studies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Development Definition

Development in community-based tourism villages primarily involves community empowerment. This concept emphasizes exploring ideas from community members and encourages them to actively participate in Development programs (Nasdian, 2014). According to the literature (Theodori, 2005), the appropriate term for this activity is «community development», which aims to improve the quality of life of the community in terms of social, economic, and environmental aspects. This community empowerment process is designed to generate active community participation in formulating and implementing programs that support the community's overall progress. The emphasis is on community activity before achieving the program's results or outputs.

Conception of Cultural Tourism Village

A tourism village is a tourism development concept that integrates attractions, accommodation, and transportation facilities within the village environment, according to Astawa et al. (2018) and Baroroh et al. (2021). Kulcsár (2009) describes it as a destination that offers natural authenticity, accommodation, festivals, entertainment, and local products. Meanwhile, Kunwar in Ojha (2020) views it as a form of micro tourism that allows tourists to experience local life. According to Sati (2019), tourism villages not only offer cultural experiences but also opportunities for relaxation and improved health. Shen & Wang (2018) added that tourism villages use natural resources and local culture as their main attractions.

The concept of a tourism village is often combined with modern approaches, such as the smart village concept or ethnic concepts that explore the culture of minority groups. These approaches aim to create unique and attractive tourist destinations, as explained by Li et al. (2021) and Mai et al. (2019). Tourism villages usually feature traditional village life, old architecture, folk art, religious rituals, and local customs. Accommodation in tourism villages is often provided in the form of inns or homestays that integrate with local life and reflect the village's culture.

Elements of Ethnic Village Tourism

Ethnic tourism villages face various challenges, including the risk of natural resource exploitation, which can lead to deterioration in quality and environmental damage (Jing et al., 2020). To succeed, such villages must rely on unique natural resources and implement effective marketing strategies (Doriza & Muhidin, 2016; Romdonih, 2019). In addition, the challenges of modernity, globalization, and commercialization affect the success of ethnic tourism villages (Jing et al., 2020). Effective development, community participation, government support, and stakeholder cooperation are key factors in ensuring the success of ethnic tourism villages (Redyanto et al., 2017; Yang & Wall, 2009; Tolkach & King, 2015; Muhammad et al., 2024). Overall, the success of ethnic tourism villages depends on the preservation of natural resources, community participation, appropriate development strategies, and collaboration with relevant stakeholders.

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) Development

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) development strategies rely heavily on active community participation, as emphasized by Tosun et al. (2001), and on programs that more effectively involve communities, as noted by Moscardo and Pearce (1999). CBT focuses on development driven by community input, rather than solely on economic improvement, thereby creating a more community-oriented market. Harwood, Pinel, and Shahmirzadi

demonstrate that community involvement fosters a sense of ownership and encourages active participation in management (Harwood, 2010; Pinel, 1998; Shahmirzadi, 2012).

CBT development also requires cooperation with external parties, such as travel agents, government agencies, and academics, to help build and expand human resource capacity, according to Witchayakawin et al. (2020) and Amerta (2017). Government, as Ashley and Garland (1994) explain, plays an important role in regulation, financial support, and potential tax cuts to increase the appeal of CBT.

In terms of infrastructure, Utami et al. (2019a) suggest that newly developing CBT requires basic and supporting infrastructure, such as roads, water, electricity, lodging, and health facilities, to increase tourist visits, as noted by Pantiyasa (2020). Such infrastructure, along with attractive tour packages, online promotions, and comfortable homestays, is essential to improve CBT performance.

Conception, Role, and Function of BUMDesa

BUMDesa are unique microbusiness entities in Indonesia and several other developing countries. According to Edy et al. (2016), under the regional autonomy law, *BUMDesa* aims to increase village independence and development by granting village governments the authority to manage economic institutions using local resources. Murwadji, Rahardjo, et al. (2017) add that *BUMDesa* is an alternative entity that supports social solidarity and increases the bargaining power and economic welfare of villages. This concept aims to have a positive impact on rural economic development.

Previous Research

There is a lack of research in both national and international literature on the development of community-based cultural tourism villages carried out by *BUMDesa*, making it difficult to find comparative articles with a similar focus and object of study. The literature search identified only a few

articles, derived from community service activities and research, that discuss the priorities of CBT development and the contributions of *BUMDesa* (Table 1).

This study is unique and differs from previous studies in several ways. First, the involvement of *BUMDesa* makes this study specific to the Indonesian context, making it difficult to find comparable research. Second, this study uses the IRAP method, which is usually applied to infrastructures. The main focus of this research is in the infrastructure development, in contrast to other studies that generally examine CBT tourism village development from a broader perspective and rarely discuss the physical aspects of tourism villages.

In the context of ECBT, infrastructure planning should not be treated merely as a technical exercise, but as a strategic process that connects cultural assets, visitor access, and community welfare. This perspective is particularly relevant to Kepuhsari, where the sustainability of wayang-based tourism depends not only on cultural uniqueness but also on accessibility conditions that enable visitors to reach, understand, and engage with the destination. In this regard, the IRAP method offers an appropriate analytical framework by adopting a participatory approach to quantify accessibility needs and prioritize interventions based on locally perceived constraints and service gaps. Such prioritization is critical in tourism villages because transport, information, promotion, and destination management are interdependent elements that shape both the visitor experience and the distribution of benefits to the local communities. This condition is especially important in ethnic tourism destinations, where accessibility affects not only physical movement but also the visibility, interpretation, and sustainable use of cultural resources. Accordingly, the use of weighted accessibility indicators in this study provides a practical and context-sensitive basis for identifying which infrastructure improvements should be addressed first to support the long-term

Table 1. Comparison of Village Tourism CBT Development Studies

Authors	Types of Studies	Study Focus	Method	Sample	BUMDesa Contribution
Ristawati et al. (2021)	Community service	Tourism village development master plan	Mentoring	Natural tourism	Present and explained
Soraya et al. (2020)	Research	Form community participation to realize the priorities of sustainable CBT programs	Descriptive analysis	Natural tourism	Present and explained
Amilia et al. (2020)	Community service	Identification and development planning utilizing the potential of human resources	Mentoring	Wisata alam (natural tourism)	Present but not explained
Sari et al. (2020)	Research	Sustainable tourism village development efforts	Descriptive Qualitative	Natural tourism	None
Nega et al. (2019)	Research	Utilization of forest potential for the sustainability of CBT	Descriptive qualitative and quantitative	Natural tourism	None
Utami et al. (2019b)	Research	CBT development strategy	Descriptive Qualitative	Natural tourism	Present but not explained
Budiani et al. (2018)	Research	Potential Analysis and CBT development strategy	Descriptive Qualitative	Natural tourism	Present but not explained
Rahman (2017)	Research	Community based tourism <i>development strategy</i>	SWOT	Natural tourism	Present and explained
Nalayani (2016)	Research	Evaluation and development strategy of Tourism Village	SWOT	Non-specific	None
This study	Research	Development priorities of Ethnic Village Tourism	Descriptive quantitative (IRAP)	Ethnic tourism	Present and explained

development of Kepuhsari as an ethnic community-based tourism village (Li et al., 2021; Manaf et al., 2018; Sarkar & Ghosh, 2008; Yang & Wall, 2009).

METHODS

Research, Data, and Data Source Approaches

This study employs a quantitative descriptive approach as its primary framework, utilizing the IRAP method, which is ratio-based and involves mathematical weighting (Equations 1-4). Although hypothesis testing is not performed, the use of numerical indicators, weighting, and accessibility calculations places this study within the domain of quantitative descriptive analysis. To complement

the quantitative findings and explore the role of BUMDesa, this study also incorporates qualitative elements through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and semi-structured interviews. Therefore, the overall design is best characterized as a mixed-method study with a dominant quantitative-descriptive component.

The main objective of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the infrastructure requirements to be developed by BUMDesa in the Kepuhsari tourism village. This method requires community-perceived data on the accessibility of village infrastructure, such as roads, water, telecommunications, and

electricity. These data are collected through semi-structured interviews, in which enumerators follow guidelines to maintain the focus and substance of the interviews, as well as through direct observation of village infrastructure conditions. Respondents' independence and freedom to provide answers are crucial for maintaining the objectivity of the research. The collected data are further enriched with secondary sources, such as village profiles and statistics, to support and justify the primary data. This approach ensures comprehensive data collection and improves the accuracy of the research results.

Population and Sample

The population in this study includes all stakeholders involved in the Kepuhsari tourism village, including members of institutions such as the village government (13 people), BUMDesa Kepuhsari (45 people), Asto Kenyo puppet studio (70 people), the Kepuhsari Homestay Owners Association (30 people), and the Community-Based Tourism Group (POKDARWIS) Tetuko (45 people). The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, in which individuals who meet the sampling criteria are selected as participants, even if they are affiliated with multiple institutions.

Analysis Methods

CBT Kepuhsari has many needs to become a viable tourist destination; however, development funds are limited, making prioritization necessary (ILO, 2003a). The IRAP method is used to allocate funds by prioritizing the most important community needs. Considerations for using IRAP include the limited community access to tourism funds and support, the focus on the household needs of the shadow puppet craftsmen, a development that prioritizes the affordability of tourist attractions and infrastructure, and a bottom-up planning approach.

The first steps performed in this method is to establish the baseline of accessibility indicators. Accessibility indicators in this study were set for aspects of transportation, clean water supply,

electricity, telecommunications, and information media. The next step is to determine the value and weight of the accessibility indicator. Respondents, through questionnaires, have given values and weights for the selected indicators. The indicator value indicates the quality of the existing CBT infrastructure, while its weight indicates whether it should be prioritized. The accessibility indicator ranges from 1 to 5, with higher values indicating worse conditions. As for the weight, the range is also 1-5, but the greater the weight, the more critical the prioritized indicator (Azwansyah et al., 2016).

The third step is to calculate the existing Accessibility Indicators based on Wibowo & Azwansyah (2009) and Simbolon et al. (2014) By using the following steps:

Step 1, calculate . Since there are several indicators, the formula becomes: $V_i \times W_i$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (V_i \times W_i) \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (V_i \times W_i) = (V_1 \times W_1) + (V_2 \times W_2) + \dots + (V_n \times W_n) \dots (2)$$

Step 2, calculate the average using the formula: $V_i \times W_i$

$$Avw = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (V_i \times W_i)}{n_i} \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

Step 3, calculate the accessibility indicator using the following formula:

$$Ai = \frac{Avw}{N} \dots\dots\dots (4)$$

Where:

- Ai = Accessibility Indicators
- Avw = Average value of indicator x weight of indicator
- Vi = Indicator value
- $Free Wi$ = Indicator weight

Ni = Number of indicators
N = Number of informants

The prioritization of Kepuhsari CBT development is based on accessibility indicator values. The higher the accessibility indicator value, the greater the priority for development. Kepuhsari CBT consists of two main areas: the Central Kepuhsari area, which serves as the center for shadow puppet crafts and is the primary object of observation in this study, and the Sendang area, where Gunung Kotak is located, as part of Kepuhsari CBT. The accessibility of development indicators in these two areas constitutes the focus of this research.

The ILO (2003b) states that the importance of two indicators in different areas cannot be directly compared, and this study maintains that assumption. For example, in the Central Kepuhsari area, the electricity accessibility value is lower than the telecommunications accessibility value in the Sendang area. However, this does not imply that electricity is less important than telecommunications. If a decision must be made regarding the prioritization of two indicators, interview results can be used to confirm the accessibility level of each indicator.

Meanwhile, to address the second research question regarding the contribution or the role of BUMDesa and the community in realizing these development priorities, a focus group discussion (FGD) model is used. According to Langford et al. (2002), the ideal number of participants in an FGD is 6–10. Therefore, the 45 BUMDesa members are divided into six groups, with each group consisting of 7–8 participants.

Methodological Limitations

While the IRAP method, combined with FGDs, is appropriate for identifying context-specific development priorities in Kepuhsari Village, several methodological limitations must be acknowledged. First, the IRAP method is inherently location-specific and participatory. The accessibility indicators,

weights, and priorities derived from this study reflect the perceptions, values, and constraints of the specific stakeholders in Kepuhsari (village government, BUMDesa, POKDARWIS, homestay owners, and puppet craftsmen). As a result, the findings—particularly the numerical accessibility values (A_i) and the ranking of priorities (e.g., transportation as priority 1 in the lower sector)—cannot be statistically generalized to other ethnic community-based tourism (ECBT) villages without re-conducting the full IRAP process in those locations.

Second, although the purposive sampling technique is appropriate for engaging key stakeholders, it introduces potential selection bias. The perspectives of occasional tourists, non-participating community members, and external investors are not systematically captured, which may affect the completeness of the identified priorities.

Third, the study does not employ inferential statistical tests (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA) to compare accessibility scores across sectors or indicators. Therefore, the differences in A_i values between, for example, transportation (1.97) and public information media (1.60) in the lower sector are descriptive rather than statistically tested. Readers should interpret the ranking as a practical guide for local planning rather than as evidence of statistically significant gaps.

Finally, the cross-sectional nature of data collection (capturing conditions at a single point in time) means that the identified priorities may change as infrastructure improves or community needs evolve. Future research should consider longitudinal applications of IRAP to track shifting priorities over time. Despite these limitations, the IRAP method remains highly suitable for its intended purpose: facilitating bottom-up, participatory infrastructure planning in a specific rural tourism context, rather than producing universally applicable laws or coefficients.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Existing Condition of Supporting Infrastructure in Kepuhsari Tourism Village

Kepuhsari, as an ethnic community-based tourism (ECBT) destination, possesses strong cultural assets, particularly in wayang craftsmanship, performances, and community-based cultural activities. However, the tourism value of these assets depends heavily on the adequacy of supporting infrastructure. Field findings indicate that the village still faces several accessibility constraints that limit its ability to attract visitors consistently and to distribute tourism benefits more broadly across the community. This condition is consistent with earlier research, which show that tourism growth in Kepuhsari remains constrained by stagnant visitor numbers, limited development funds, and weak synergy among local institutions.

As summarised in Table 2, each infrastructure indicator shows a different pattern of adequacy and constraint. Transportation is relatively weak in terms of reach, although its basic quality is moderately acceptable, mainly due to long travel distances and narrow road widths. Clean water and electricity are generally good; however, some technical issues remain, including water installation in the upper sector, limited electricity capacity, and a lack of public street lighting. Telecommunications have an adequate supply but poor quality, due to uneven network coverage. Public information media is the weakest indicator because both its reach and quality are limited, largely due to the absence of dedicated management and poor maintenance. These conditions are also supported by the research report, which noted that digital and

physical information media, including the village website, direction signs, and site maps, have not yet functioned optimally as tourism support tools.

This initial mapping is important because it shows that the challenge of ECBT development in Kepuhsari is not merely the availability of cultural attractions, but also the infrastructure needed to make those attractions accessible, visible, and usable within a coherent tourism experience.

IRAP-Based Development Priorities by Area

The IRAP analysis shows that development priorities differ between the lower sector centered in Kepuh Tengah and the upper sector outside Kepuh Tengah. As shown in Table 3, transportation is the first priority in the lower sector, followed by the public information media. At the same time, clean water and telecommunications rank third, and electricity ranks fourth. In contrast, in the upper sector, public information media becomes the first priority, followed by transportation, telecommunications, clean water, and electricity.

These results indicate that infrastructure priorities in Kepuhsari are spatially differentiated. They depend on each area's geographic location and the type of tourism product it offers. The lower sector functions as the main center of Wayang-based cultural tourism, while the upper sector contains additional attractions such as Gunung Kotak, Kampung Batu, and Banyu Nibo waterfall. Therefore, the priority structure reflects not only technical infrastructure conditions, but also the different tourism functions of each area.

Table 2. Condition of supporting infrastructure indicators for village tourism

Indicators	Supply/ range	Quality	Identify the problem
Transportation	Not good	Good enough	Long distance, narrow road body
Clean water	Good	Good	Installation in the upper sector
Electrical power supply	Good	Good	Low electrical power, lack of PJU
Telecommunications	Good	Not good	Uneven network
Public information media	Not good	Not good	No special manager, not maintained

From a sustainable tourism perspective, this finding is important because it shows that village tourism development cannot rely on a single, uniform infrastructure strategy. Accessibility problems must be understood in relation to how tourists move, where attractions are located, and how tourism benefits are distributed across the village.

Why Transportation Becomes the Main Priority in the Lower Sector

Transportation emerges as the most urgent priority in the lower sector, as this area serves as the main gateway and operational center for Kepuhsari's ethnic community-based tourism (ECBT). Most visitors come primarily to experience the Wayang village, observe the craft process, and interact with the main cultural attractions located in this part of the village. However, access remains constrained because large tourist buses cannot easily enter the area due to narrow roads, limited turning space, and inadequate supporting road facilities. In addition, insufficient street lighting and the relatively distant access to public transport reduce travel convenience and safety. These constraints

are not trivial in a tourism village context, since basic infrastructure, such as roads and accessibility, strongly influences a destination's ability to attract visitors and sustain tourism activities over time (Manaf et al., 2018; Utami, 2019).

This result should not be interpreted merely as a general transportation problem. In the context of ethnic tourism, transportation accessibility directly affects how cultural experiences are delivered, consumed, and economically sustained. Poor road access limits not only physical entry but also the possibility of larger group visits, educational tours, cultural workshops, and the sale of handicrafts. It also affects the mobility of local artisans, including the movement of raw materials, finished products, and service-related activities. As ethnic tourism depends on connecting visitors with culturally distinctive spaces and practices, inadequate accessibility can weaken both destination visibility and the distribution of benefits to local communities (Li et al., 2021; Yang & Wall, 2009). Therefore, transportation in Kepuhsari should be understood as a strategic prerequisite for strengthening

Table 3. Results of IRAP analysis on the accessibility of Kepuhsari village tourism infrastructure

Region	Accessibility of indicators	$V_i \times W_i$	AVW	AI	Conclusion
Kepuh Tengah (Lower sector)	Transportation	177	35,4	1,97	Priority 1
	Clean water	114	22,8	1,27	Priority 3
	Electrical resources	73	14,6	0,81	Priority 4
	Telecommunications	114	22,8	1,27	Priority 3
	Public information media	144	28,8	1,60	Priority 2
Non Middle Kepuh (Top sector)	Transportation	125	25	1,92	Priority 2
	Clean water	82	16,4	1,26	Priority 4
	Electrical resources	59	11,8	0,91	Priority 5
	Telecommunications	120	24	1,85	Priority 3
	Public information media	145	29	2,23	Priority 1

Information:

- V_i = Indicator value I
- W_i = Weight of indicator I
- AVW = average rating
- $\bar{n}$ = number of indicators
- N = number of informants
- A_i = Indicator accessibility value

both the tourism experience and the village's cultural economy, rather than as a purely physical infrastructure issue (Manaf et al., 2018; Yanes et al., 2019).

Why Public Information Media Becomes Critical, Especially in the Upper Sector

Public information media occupies the second priority in the lower sector and the first priority in the upper sector. This finding is significant because it shows that the challenge in Kepuhsari extends beyond physical access to include informational access. The upper sector contains tourism assets beyond Wayang craftsmanship, yet these attractions remain less visible and less integrated into the overall visitor experience. In ethnic tourism destinations, visitors do not simply travel to a place; they also seek cues, meanings, and representations that help them identify the destination's uniqueness and navigate its cultural landscape. Therefore, public information media play a dual role, serving not only as a promotional instrument but also as a medium of destination interpretation and cultural communication (Li et al., 2021; Yang & Wall, 2009)

In the context of Kepuhsari, public information media includes both physical and digital forms such as village gates, road name boards, direction signs, site maps, websites, and social media. When these media are limited, outdated, or poorly managed, tourists may recognize Kepuhsari only as a Wayang craft center in the lower sector and remain unaware of other attractions in the upper sector. This situation weakens destination visibility and reduces the possibility of distributing tourism benefits more evenly across the village. Prior studies on ethnic village tourism also suggest that destination image and branding are strongly shaped by how local culture is communicated and represented, including through locally grounded participation and visual identity (Li et al., 2021; Mai et al., 2019).

Accordingly, the priority assigned to public information media in the upper sector should be understood as a strategic response to a

representation gap rather than merely a signage problem. Better information media would not only guide tourists to upper-sector attractions but also strengthen Kepuhsari's identity as an ethnic community-based tourism village by linking Wayang heritage, other cultural and natural attractions, and the broader village narrative into a more coherent tourism experience. In this sense, improving public information media is essential for enhancing destination legibility, cultural interpretation, and the long-term sustainability of tourism benefits in Kepuhsari (Li et al., 2021; Mai et al., 2019; Yang & Wall, 2009).

The Position of Telecommunications, Clean Water, and Electricity in the Priority Structure

Telecommunications occupy a middle position in both sectors. This reflects the fact that telecommunication services are available, but their quality remains uneven, especially in the upper sector, where the terrain is hilly. The research report notes that internet connectivity is important not only for daily communications, but also for online promotions, digital marketing, and tourist behaviors, such as taking and sharing photos on social media. Thus, telecommunications are clearly relevant to the competitiveness of the tourism village.

This is consistent with the view that tourism villages increasingly require digital connectivity to support communication, promotion, and tourist engagement (Shen & Wang, 2018). However, the community still sees transportation and public information media as more urgent because they represent more immediate bottlenecks in visitor mobility and destination visibility.

Clean water and electricity rank lower in both sectors. This should not be interpreted as evidence that they are unimportant. Rather, these indicators are perceived as relatively more adequate at present. The report shows that the Regional Drinking Water Company (PDAM) water has reached much of the village, although some upper-sector areas still rely on wells. At the same time, the State Electricity

Company (PLN) already provides electricity to the entire village, despite low power capacity and limited public lighting. In IRAP logic, lower priority does not mean irrelevance. It means that, under current budget constraints, these indicators do not require as early an intervention as transport and information infrastructure.

This reinforces the value of IRAP as a prioritization tool. It helps distinguish between infrastructure that is important in general and infrastructure that is most urgent under conditions of limited resources (Wibowo & Azwansyah, 2009).

The Role of BUMDesa in Supporting Development Priorities

The focus group discussion results indicate that BUMDesa Sido Mukti has not yet played an active strategic role in the development of Kepuhsari's tourism village. Its existing business units are concentrated in photocopy services, heavy equipment rental, and refillable drinking water. These activities respond to local needs, but they are not directly linked to the development priorities identified through the IRAP analysis. The research report also states that BUMDesa has not yet been strategically aligned with the village's tourism potential and continues to face internal management and leadership problems.

From an institutional governance perspective, this is a crucial finding. The existence of a village enterprise does not automatically mean effective destination management. Institutions require strategic vision, managerial capacity, and alignment with village development goals. In Kepuhsari, the issue is not institutional absence, but weak institutional integration. BUMDesa remains a formal entity, yet remains marginal in the tourism development process. This is consistent with the literature on community-based tourism, which emphasizes the importance of interorganizational collaboration, stakeholder support, and local institutional capacity for sustaining rural tourism initiatives (Manaf et al., 2018; Tolkach & King, 2015).

This finding also extends the discussion of community-based tourism by showing that cultural assets and community participation alone are insufficient. A local economic institution is needed to connect infrastructure priorities, tourism services, and market opportunities in a more organized way.

Strategic Actions BUMDesa Could Take

The IRAP results provide a practical basis for redefining the role of BUMDesa. First, regarding the transportation priority, BUMDesa could initiate or coordinate a shuttle service connecting the lower and upper sectors. This would be more feasible in the short term than relying solely on expensive road expansion. Such a service could also become a revenue-generating tourism product. Second, in relation to the public information media, BUMDesa could manage destination branding, digital promotion, official tourism information, booking systems, route maps, and integrated tourism packages. This is especially relevant because public information media in an ethnic tourism village should not only advertise attractions but also interpret the destination's cultural identity.

These proposed actions align with BUMDesa's broader function as a village-based economic institution that should utilize village potential to increase welfare and strengthen local bargaining power (Murwadi, Rahardjo, et al., 2017). In practical terms, BUMDesa could move beyond unrelated business activities and reposition itself as a destination management actor. It could serve as an aggregator linking artisans, homestay owners, POKDARWIS, the village government, and external partners. In this role, BUMDesa would not only support the local economy internally but also create multiplier effects for the wider tourism community.

However, such repositioning requires internal reform. The report makes clear that BUMDesa still suffers from weak management, limited leadership capacity, and insufficient strategic focus. Therefore, improving BUMDesa's role in tourism development is not only about creating new business units but also

about strengthening governance, professionalism, and long-term organizational commitment.

THEORETICAL AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Taken together, the findings show that the challenge of developing Kepuhsari as an ethnic community-based tourism destination lies not in the absence of cultural resources, but in the incomplete integration of the infrastructure and institutions needed to support them. This is the study's key analytical contribution. Much of the literature on ethnic and community-based tourism focuses on participation, authenticity, and local empowerment. This study adds that accessibility and institutional alignment are equally important. Cultural heritage can attract initial interest, but sustainable tourism depends on whether visitors can reach the site, understand the destination, and access organized services that connect them with the local community (Asker, 2010; Yanes et al., 2019; Yang & Wall, 2009).

The study also demonstrates that IRAP can be meaningfully applied beyond conventional rural infrastructure planning. In Kepuhsari, IRAP helps identify infrastructure priorities not simply as technical deficits, but as factors that shape cultural experience, destination visibility, and local economic inclusion. In this sense, accessibility should be understood broadly as physical, informational, and institutional access to tourism opportunities. This broader interpretation strengthens the link between rural accessibility planning and sustainable tourism development.

At the same time, these findings should be interpreted within their contextual scope. Because the study is based on a descriptive IRAP approach supported by qualitative field inquiry, the results are most relevant to tourism villages with similar characteristics rather than universally generalizable contexts, which aligns with the reviewer's note regarding limited generalisability.

Even so, the case offers a useful analytical model for other ethnic tourism villages facing comparable

challenges of accessibility, fragmented institutional roles, and limited development resources.

CONCLUSION

This study identifies the development priorities of Kepuhsari as an ECBT village by applying the IRAP method and complementing it with qualitative inquiry on the role of BUMDesa. The findings show that transportation infrastructure is the top priority in the lower sector, while public information media is the top priority in the upper sector. These results indicate that the main challenge in developing Kepuhsari does not lie in the absence of cultural assets, but in the limited accessibility and supporting infrastructure needed to make those assets more visible, reachable, and beneficial to the local community. The study also finds that BUMDesa Sido Mukti has not yet played an active strategic role in tourism development, as its current business orientation remains poorly aligned with the needs of the ECBT ecosystem. The main contribution of this study is to demonstrate that the IRAP method can be applied not only to rural infrastructure planning in general, but also to the identification of development priorities in an ethnic tourism village. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted within the methodological limitations of this study. The accessibility values and rankings are context-specific to Kepuhsari Village. They should be used primarily as practical guidance for local planning rather than as results that can be directly generalized to other ECBT villages without reapplying the full IRAP process.

Policy Implications for Village Government

The findings of this study carry important policy implications for the Village Government of Kepuhsari. First, transportation infrastructure and public information media should be formally incorporated into village development priorities, particularly in the Village Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMDes) and the Annual Village Government Work Plan (RKPDDes). This is important to ensure that tourism development priorities are incorporated into a structured village

development agenda rather than treated as ad hoc initiatives. Second, the Village Government should take a more proactive leadership role in coordinating multi-stakeholder collaboration and in facilitating access to funding from the district, provincial, and national government levels, as well as from external partners, to support infrastructure improvement. Third, the Village Government needs to strengthen the local governance framework of ECBT development by clarifying the roles, responsibilities, and accountability of key stakeholders, including BUMDesa, POKDARWIS, Community Art Centers, and homestay owners. A formal village regulation may also serve as a more stable governance framework for the long-term development of the puppet village tourism ecosystem. Through these measures, the Village Government can function not only as an administrative authority, but also as a strategic enabler of sustainable tourism development in Kepuhsari.

Practical Implications for BUMDesa

The results of this study also offer clear practical implications for BUMDesa Sido Mukti. To contribute more effectively to ECBT development, BUMDesa should realign its business portfolio with the priority needs of Kepuhsari tourism village. In the short to medium term, BUMDesa could develop or coordinate a local shuttle service to improve

access between the lower and upper sectors, given the village's hilly topography and limited road capacity for large vehicles. In addition, BUMDesa could establish a digital marketing or tourism information unit to strengthen public information media, manage online promotion, support destination branding, and improve the visibility of attractions beyond the lower sector. More broadly, BUMDesa should reposition itself from a village enterprise focused mainly on internal profit-oriented activities into an institution that actively supports the tourism ecosystem through integrated service development. This repositioning requires improvement in managerial capacity, financial planning, digital literacy, and organizational professionalism so that BUMDesa can function as a bridge between local cultural assets, community participation, and external market opportunities. By doing so, BUMDesa can play a more strategic role in generating both direct business returns and broader multiplier effects that benefit the Kepuhsari community.

Suggestions and Future Research

To strengthen the research analysis, which tends to describe Kepuhari village as a puppet village, it is necessary to conduct research that offers suggestions for improving the puppet village, capturing perspectives from visitors and the Wonogiri community and its surroundings.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the Polytechnic of State Finance STAN, Universitas Sebelas Maret, and Universitas Prasetya Mulya for the support during the research process. We also thank all respondents and informants for their cooperation in the survey and FGD.

REFERENCES

- Amerta, I. M. S. (2017). Community based tourism development. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(3), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v1n3.60>
- Amilia, W., Rokhani, R., Prasetya, R. C., & Suryadharma, B. (2020). Pembangunan Desa Wisata Gadingan dan Kebutuhan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Dalam Pendekatan Community Based Tourism. *JPPM (Jurnal Pengabdian Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)*, 4(1), 93. <https://doi.org/10.30595/jppm.v0i0.4268>
- Ashley, C., & Garland, E. (1994). *PROMOTING COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM DEVELOPMENT Why, What and How?* (Vol. 4). Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.
- Asker, S., Boronyak, L., Carrard, N., & Paddon, M. (2010). Effective Community Based Tourism. In *Effective Community Based Tourism: A Best Practice Manual*. <https://www.apec.org/Publications/2010/06/Effective-Community-Based-Tourism-A-Best-Practice-Manual-June-2010>
- Asker, Sally. (2010). *Effective community based tourism : a good practice manual*. CRC for Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd.
- Astawa, I. P., Triyuni, N. N., & Santosa, I. D. M. C. (2018). Sustainable Tourism and Harmonious Culture: A Case Study of Cultic Model at Village Tourism. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 953(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/953/1/012057>
- Azima, N. S., Furnamasari, Y. F., & Dewi, D. A. (2021). Pengaruh Masuknya Budaya Asing Terhadap Nasionalisme Bangsa Indonesia di Era Globalisasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 5, 7491–7496.
- Azmi, A., & Ngadi, N. S. (2015). Tourists' Perceptions towards Cultural Tourism Development in Kraton, Yogyakarta. *Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences*, 5(6), 79–83. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Azila-Azmi/publication/308887412_Tourist
- Azwansyah, H., Sumiyattinah, Juniardi, F., & Martanto, B. A. (2016). Strategi Perbaikan Aksesibilitas Infrastruktur Dasar Desa Santaban Kecamatan Sajingan Kabupaten Sambas. *ACE*, 8(15), 585–591.
- Baroroh, K., Wahjoedi, W., H., U., H., S., & Lestari, F. (2021). Incorporating Village Tourism Into “Community Economy” Course: A Project-based Learning Method in University. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(4), 567–584. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14433a>
- Budiani, S. R., Wahdaningrum, W., Yosky, D., Kensari, E., Pratama, H. S., Mulandari, H., Iskandar, H. T. N., Alphabettika, M., Maharani, N., Febriani, R. F., & Kusmiati, Y. (2018). Analisis Potensi dan Strategi Pengembangan Pariwisata Berkelanjutan Berbasis Komunitas di Desa Sembungan, Wonosobo, Jawa Tengah. *Majalah Geografi Indonesia*, 32(2), 170. <https://doi.org/10.22146/mgi.32330>
- Dinas P dan K. (2017). Keputusan Kepala Dinas P dan K Kabupaten Wonogiri No. In *143 Tahun 2017 Tentang Pengukuhan Desa Wisata di Kabupaten Wonogiri*.
- Dinas P dan K. (2020). *Profil Kampung Wayang. Dinas P Dan K Kabupaten Wonogiri*. <https://dinaspdank.wonogirikab.go.id/profilkampungwayang/>
- Dodds, R., Ali, A., & Galaski, K. (2018). Mobilizing knowledge: determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(13), 1547–1568. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2016.1150257>
- Doriza, S., & Muhidin, A. (2016). Analisis Pendekatan Politik Ekonomi Dalam Pengembangan Wisata Kota Tua (Studi Kasus Komunitas Historia Indonesia). *EDUKA Jurnal Pendidikan, Hukum Dan Bisnis*, 1(1), 112–146.
- Edy, Y. A., Fitrie, A., Edi, W. K., & Darwanto. (2016). PENGEMBANGAN DESA MANDIRI MELALUI PENGELOLAAN BADAN USAHA MILIK DESA (BUMDes. *JDEB*, 13(1), 67–81.
- Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R. (2009). Community-Based Tourism: a success ? *Tourism Management*, 11, 1–37.
- Harwood, S. (2010). Planning for Community Based Tourism in a Remote Location. *Sustainability*, 2(7), 1909–1923. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su2071909>
- Hendro, F., Setiawan, T., & Setiawati, D. (2021). Mempertahankan Eksistensi Tradisi Tungguk Tembakau melalui Media Sosial. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 19(1), 78. <https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v19i1.3918>
- ILO. (2003a). *Inregrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP) Modular Training Package*. Fontline Electronic Publishing (Pvt) Ltd.
- ILO. (2003b). *Inregrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP) Modular Training Package*. Fontline Electronic Publishing (Pvt) Ltd.
- Jing, M. A., He-qing, Z., & Lei-lei, W. (2020). Confusions of Tourism Development in Minority Villages: Subjects ' Appeals and Space Power. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 3(9), 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.25236/AJHSS.2020.030904>
- Kulcsár, N. (2009). Rural tourism in Hungary: The Key of Competitiveness. *FIKUSZ '09 Symposium for Young Researchers*, 121–127.
- Langford, B. E., Schoenfeld, G., & Izzo, G. (2002). Nominal Grouping Sessions vs Focus Groups. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 5(1), 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750210414517>
- Li, X., Xie, C., Morrison, A. M., & Nguyen, T. H. H. (2021). Experiences, motivations, perceptions, and attitudes regarding ethnic minority village tourism. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(4), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042364>

- Mai, X., Wu, C., Zhang, T., Zhou, Z., & Zhong, H. (2019). The Impact of Local Community Participation on Branding Ethnic Tourism Destination: A Case Study of House Renovation in Jiaju Tibetan Village. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 07(01), 178–189. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.71016>
- 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 Nglangeran Tourism Village, Gunungkidul Regency, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 10(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10072142>
- Mason, P. (2021). Tourism impacts, planning and management. In *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management (Fourth*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780080481418>
- Moscardo, G., & Pearce, P. L. (1999). Understanding Ethnic Tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 416–434. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315249933-29>
- Muhammad, M., Balquni, M., & Wiryanto, W. (2024). Sustainable Tourism Observatories Framework at National Tourism Strategic Area Development (KSPN) in Indonesia. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, 17(3), 251–266. <https://doi.org/10.21632/irjbs>
- Mulyadi, Y. P., & Lely, R. (2020). E-Branding Untuk Penguatan Eksistensi Kampung Wayang Kepuhsari Manyaran. *ABDIMAS*, 24(1), 1–13.
- Murwadi, T., Rahardjo, D. S., & Hasna. (2017). Bumdes Sebagai Badan Hukum Alternatif dalam Pengembangan Perkoperasian Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Kenotariatan Dan Ke-PPAT-An*, 1(1), 1–18. <http://jurnal.fh.unpad.ac.id/index.php/jad/issue/view/7>
- Murwadi, T., Rahardjo, D. S., & Hasna, H. (2017). ACTA DIURNAL BUMDES SEBAGAI BADAN HUKUM ALTERNATIF DALAM PENGEMBANGAN PERKOPERASIAN INDONESIA. *Jurnal Hukum Kenotariatan Dan Ke-PPAT-An*, 1(1), 1–18. <http://ditpolkom.bappenas>.
- Nalayani, N. N. A. (2016). Evaluasi Dan Strategi Pengembangan Desa Wisata Di Kabupaten Badung, Bali. *Jurnal Master Pariwisata (JUMPA)*, 2(1993), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jumpa.2016.v02.i02.p12>
- Nasdian, T. F. (2014). *Pengembangan Masyarakat* (1st ed.). Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Nega, D., Damtie, M., Workie, A., & Weldeesenbet, E. G. (2019). An assessment of Ecotourism Potential for Community based Ecotourism Development: The Case of Alemesaga Priority State Forest, South Gondar, Ethiopia. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 8(4).
- Nuridin, E. (2014). *Hambatan dalam Usaha Wayang Kulit*. Tribunnews. <https://www.tribunnews.com/internasional/2014/01/17/hambatan-dalam-usaha-wayang-kulit>
- Octavia, E. R., Ismail, A. I., Maret, U. S., Desain, J., Visual, K., Kepuhsari, D., Manyaran, K., Wonogiri, K., Tengah, J., & Wayang, K. (2018). Penguatan Branding Desa Kepuhsari Manyaran Wonogiri. *Jurnal Industri Kreatif Dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 32–50.
- Ojha, N. (2020). Village Tourism: A New Approach in Nepalese Tourism Industry. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(10), 1155–1158.
- Oktaviana, M. G., Sulistio, H., & Wicaksono, A. (2011). Strategi Pengembangan Transportasi Antar Wilayah Di Provinsi Papua Barat. *Jurnal Rekayasa Sipil*, 5(3), 180–190.
- Pantiyasa, I. W. (2020). Evaluasi Pengelolaan Desa Wisata Kaba-kaba Kecamatan Kediri Kabupaten Tabanan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hospitality Management*, 10(2), 109–129. <http://www.akrabjuara.com/index.php/akrabjuara/article/view/919>
- Pinel, D. P. (1998). Community-based tourism planning process. In *The University of Guelph*. The University of Guelph.
- Priyanto, M. (2017). Desa Wisata Budaya Wayang Kulit Jawa Sebagai Destinasi Wisata Minat Khusus dan Komoditas Pariwisata Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Policy Studies*, 2(1), 43–59. <http://www.jitps.ui.ac.id/index.php/Tourism/article/view/38>
- Puspita, D. H. R., & Amalia, D. (2018). Pengaruh Kapasitas Sumberdaya Manusia Dan Pemanfaatan Teknologi Informasi Terhadap Kualitas Laporan Keuangan Pemerintah Daerah Dengan Variabel Intervening Sistem Pengendalian Intern Pemerintah. *Jurnal REKSA*, 3(2), 150. <https://doi.org/10.12928/j.reksa.v3i2.32>
- Putra, I. N. D. (2014). Bali: Between Cultural and Marine Tourism. *Jurnal Kajian Bali (Journal of Bali Studies)*, 4(1), 15–30.
- Rahman, C. N. A. (2017). *Strategi Pengembangan Kawasan Wisata Berbasis Community Based Touris di Kecamatan Dander Kabupaten Bojonegoro*. ITS Surabaya.
- Rasdiyanti, A. (2017). *Capacity Building Sumber Daya Aparatur Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Wajo*.
- Redyanto, F. W., Salahudin, & Salviana, V. (2017). Model Kerjasama Antar Stakeholder dalam Pengembangan Wisata Budaya Dusun Selo Kabupaten Pasuruan. *LOGOS (Journal of Local Government Issues)*, 1–25.
- Ristawati, R., Radian, S., Winarsi, S., Wilda, P., & Pamoro, G. jati. (2021). Pengembangan Potensi Desa Wisata Di Masa Pandemi (Studi di Desa Sukobendu, Lamongan). *Jurnal Dedikasi HUKUM*, 1(3), 313–327.
- Romdonih, F. (2019). Perencanaan Dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Terhadap Industri Pariwisata Di Perkampungan Budaya Betawi Setu Babakan Serengseng Sawah Jagakarsa Jakarta Selatan Provinsi DKI Jakarta. *JENIUS*, 2(3), 374–393.
- Sari, T., Selamet, K., & Purnami, S. (2020). Analisis SWOT Dalam Pengembangan Agrowisata di Desa Pelaga Kecamatan Petang Kabupaten Badung. *WACANA EKONOMI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi)*, 19(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.22225/we.19.1.1575.1-9>

- Sarkar, A. K., & Ghosh, D. (2008). Integrated Rural Accessibility Planning (IRAP): An application in three panchayats in Rajasthan, India. *Progress in Development Studies*, 8(3), 241–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146499340800800303>
- Sati, V. P. (2019). Potential and Forms of Sustainable Village Tourism in Mizoram, Northeast India. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Tourism*, 4(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.31822/jomat.527278>
- Shahmirzadi, E. K. (2012). *Community – Based Tourism (CBT) Planning and Possibilities : The Case of Shahmirzad , Iran*.
- Shen, S., & Wang, Q. (2018). Innovation Strategy of Traditional Village Tourism Development in Liaoning Province under the Background of Smart Village Construction. *Proceedings - 3rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation, Big Data and Smart City, ICITBS 2018, 2018-January*, 85–88. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICITBS.2018.00030>
- Simbolon, F. S., Kadarini, S. N., & Juniardi, F. (2014). *Kajian Perencanaan Aksesibilitas Infrastruktur Kawasan Perbatasan Kabupaten Sintang (Studi Kasus Kecamatan Ketungau Hulu)*.
- Soraya, S., Rahardjo, P., & Herlambang, S. (2020). Rencana Pengelolaan Partisipatif Objek Geowisata Tebing Koja (Studi Kasus: Tebing Koja, Desa Cikuya, Kecamatan Solear, Kabupaten Tangerang). *Jurnal Sains, Teknologi, Urban, Perancangan, Arsitektur (Stupa)*, 2(2), 2759. <https://doi.org/10.24912/stupa.v2i2.8862>
- Sutresna, I. B., Suyana, U. I. M., Saskara, I. A. N., & Wiwin, S. N. P. (2019). Community Based Tourism As Sustainable Tourism Support. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 94(10), 70–78. <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2019-10.09>
- Theodori, G. L. (2005). Community and Community Development in Resource-based areas: Operational Definitions Rooted in an Interactional Perspective. *Society and Natural Resources*, 18(7), 661–669. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0894192050959640>
- Thomas, V. F. (2019). *Kenapa Ribuan BUMDes Mangkrak Meski Dana Desa Triliunan Rupiah? Tirto.Id*. <https://tirto.id/kenapa-ribuan-bumdes-mangkrak-meski-dana-desa-triliunan-rupiah-enpb>
- Tolkach, D., & King, B. (2015). Strengthening Community-Based Tourism in a new resource-based island nation: Why and how? *Tourism Management*, 48, 386–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.013>
- Tosun, C., Hatay, A., & Timothy, D. J. (2001). Shortcomings in Planning Approaches to Tourism Development in Developing Countries: The Case of Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary HOspitality Management*, 13(7), 352–359.
- Utami, M. M. (2019). *VILLAGE TOURISM : THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY-BASED TOURISM*.
- Utami, M. M., Taufik, H. E. R., & Bhakti, W. N. (2019a). *Village Tourism: The Implementation of Community-Based Tourism* (Vol. 100). <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoi-19.2019.94>
- Utami, M. M., Taufik, H. E. R., & Bhakti, W. N. (2019b). *Village Tourism: The Implementation of Community-Based Tourism* (Vol. 100, Number Icoi). <https://doi.org/10.2991/icoi-19.2019.94>
- Utomo, K. B., Budiyo, S. M., & Supriyanto, T. (2020). A Semiotic Study of Ki Enthus Susmono's Creative Management in Wayang Kulit/Leather Puppet and Wayang Rai-Wong/Human Face Puppet. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/ Egyptology*, 17(4), 920–930. <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/494>
- Wibowo, H., & Azwansyah, H. (2009). PENGUNAAN METODE IRAP DALAM PENENTUAN PRIORITAS PROGRAM PEMBANGUNAN INFRASTRUKTUR PERDESAAN (STUDY KASUS DESA KALIMAS KECAMATAN SUNGAI KAKAP KABUPATEN KUBU RAYA). *Jurnal Rekayasa Teknik Sipil Universitas Lampung*, 3(13).
- Widodo, T. (2020). *Kunjungi Wonogiri, Gubernur Jadi “Begawan Ganjar Pranowo*. Inspirasiline. <https://www.inspirasiline.com/2020/08/14/kunjungi-wonogiri-gubernur-jadi-begawan-ganjar-pranowo/>
- Witchayakawin, P., Aziz, Y. A., Mahomed, A. S. B. B., & Abdullah, N. H. B. (2020). Factors on development of community-based tourism (cbt) in phitsanulok province of Thailand. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(12), 75–85. <https://doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.12.12>
- Yanes, A., Zielinski, S., Cano, M. D., & Kim, S. Il. (2019). Community-based tourism in developing countries: A framework for policy evaluation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11092506>
- Yang, L., & Wall, G. (2009). Ethnic tourism: A framework and an application. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 559–570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.09.008>
- Yogi, K. (2021). *Luar Biasa, Kampung Wayang Kepuhsari Manyaran Bertahan 19 Generasi*. Suara Merdeka. <https://solo.suaramerdeka.com/gaya-hidup/pr-05172802/luar-biasa-kampung-wayang-kepuhsari-manyaran-bertahan-19-generasi?page=all>