



Sport Tourism Development in Jurangmangu Adventure Village: A Southeast Asian Perspective

Elang Purbha Sejati¹, Paphada Suebplai², Mario Ramil Pepito³

¹Department of Physical Education, Health and Recreation, Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

²Department of Tourism and Hospitality, Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon, Bangkok, Thailand

³Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Cebu, Cebu, Philippines

Article Info

Article history:

Received Feb 18, 2026

Revised Apr 10, 2026

Accepted Jun 12, 2026

OnlineFirst Jun 18, 2026

Keywords:

Adventure Tourism

Community-Based Tourism

Rural Tourism

Southeast Asia

Sport Tourism

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study aims to explore the current sport tourism potential and development challenges of Jurangmangu Adventure Village in Pemalang, Indonesia, and to derive cross-national comparative insights by examining analogous rural sport tourism governance experiences in Thailand and the Philippines.

Methodology: This study employed a qualitative descriptive approach within an interpretivist framework. Data were collected from March to August 2025 through structured interviews with purposively selected informants, complemented by observation and document analysis. Thematic analysis and triangulation ensured credibility. Findings are presented as an in-depth descriptive case study due to the limited but information-rich informant base.

Main Findings: Jurangmangu Adventure Village demonstrates strong sport tourism potential through Mount Slamet trekking, downhill mountain biking, agritourism, educational tourism, and community-based hospitality. However, development challenges remain in institutional governance, funding dependency, and digital promotion. The integrated family sport tourism model combining adventure activities and educational experiences represents a distinctive and scalable approach aligned with rural tourism practices in Southeast Asia.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study offers the first qualitative examination of Jurangmangu Adventure Village as an integrated rural sport tourism destination within a Southeast Asian comparative framework. By connecting Indonesian field evidence with Thailand and Philippine governance perspectives, the study provides new insights into community-based sport tourism development, highlighting transferable strategies for strengthening rural destination management and sustainability.

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



Corresponding Author:

Elang Purbha Sejati,

Department of Physical Education, Health and Recreation, Faculty of Social Science Education and Sports,
Universitas PGRI Semarang, Semarang, Central Java, 50232, Indonesia

Email: elang.sejati@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Sport tourism has emerged as one of the fastest-growing sectors in the global tourism industry, recognized as a strategic instrument for economic development, destination competitiveness, community empowerment, and sustainable regional growth [1]-[3]. As a form of tourism motivated by participation in or observation of sporting activities, sport tourism generates multiplier effects across hospitality, transportation, food services, and local retail sectors, with particularly significant implications for rural destinations seeking alternative economic development pathways [4]-[7]. Beyond economic contributions, sport tourism contributes to sustainable development by

Journal homepage: <http://cahaya-ic.com/index.php/JTHPE>

promoting active lifestyles, environmental awareness, and the utilization of local natural and cultural resources while requiring careful management of social and ecological impacts [7]. Countries across Southeast Asia have increasingly incorporated sport tourism into regional development strategies by leveraging natural landscapes and cultural assets through adventure tourism, outdoor recreation, cycling, trekking, and water-based sport activities [8]-[10].

In Indonesia, sport tourism has gained increasing policy attention as a strategic instrument for rural economic development and community welfare improvement. The implementation of Village Law No. 6/2014 has strengthened the institutional foundation for village-based economic development through Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), which function as community-oriented economic institutions for managing local resources and improving rural livelihoods [11], [12]. The post-pandemic recovery period has further accelerated interest in outdoor and nature-based recreational activities, including cycling, trekking, and adventure tourism, reflecting broader shifts toward experiential and sustainable tourism consumption [13], [14]. However, despite the institutional support provided by BUMDes, rural tourism development continues to face structural challenges, including limited managerial capacity, governance issues, financial constraints, and difficulties in sustaining long-term investment for tourism infrastructure development [15].

Jurangmangu Adventure Village, located in Pulosari District, Pemalang Regency, Central Java, represents a compelling case of community-based sport tourism development governed through the village enterprise BUMDes Sinergi Guna Niaga. Situated on the slopes of Mount Slamet, the destination integrates highland trekking, downhill mountain biking, agritourism, educational tourism, and community-based hospitality into a diversified rural adventure tourism model. The integration of multiple tourism products within rural destinations reflects a broader shift toward experiential tourism development, in which visitors increasingly seek authentic interactions with local environments, cultural resources, and community-based activities [16]-[19]. The destination has navigated the COVID-19 disruption period and developed expanded infrastructure, including mountain biking facilities and glamping accommodation, to attract broader visitor segments beyond specialized sport participants. Such diversification is consistent with contemporary rural tourism strategies that emphasize resilience, product innovation, and the creation of multi-experience destinations capable of accommodating diverse visitor motivations, including family-oriented recreational needs [20], [21]. This diversified destination model combining sport-intensive activities with educational and recreational programming represents an emerging form of rural adventure tourism that merits systematic scholarly examination.

Despite its rich natural and institutional assets, the development trajectory of Jurangmangu Adventure Village has been shaped by a series of structural constraints. Financial capital scarcity, limited institutional capacity, and dependence on external support are frequently identified as major challenges affecting the sustainability of rural tourism enterprises, particularly in developing destinations where local organizations often face difficulties in mobilizing long-term investment resources [22], [23]. In the case of Jurangmangu Adventure Village, destination development has relied on external assistance from government programs, tourism institutions, cycling organizations, and community networks. Governance centralization within a small enterprise management structure may influence the inclusiveness of decision-making processes and limit broader community engagement, which remains a critical issue in community-based tourism implementation [24]. Promotional capacity also remains a challenge for rural tourism destinations, as limited digital capabilities and weak online market positioning can restrict their ability to reach broader visitor segments beyond established tourism communities [25].

Previous studies on Indonesian sport tourism have generated valuable insights into specific sport activities and destination contexts; however, existing research remains fragmented and has rarely examined the interaction between multi-activity sport tourism development, governance mechanisms, financial sustainability, and community participation. This limitation reflects a broader issue in sport tourism research, where studies have often emphasized event impacts, visitor experiences, or individual sport activities rather than examining destination-level governance and long-term development processes [26], [27]. Research on rural tourism development indicates that destination success depends not only on natural attractiveness but also on institutional coordination, stakeholder collaboration, knowledge exchange, and adaptive management strategies [28]. At the regional level, Southeast Asian countries have developed diverse community-based tourism governance approaches, including Thailand's participatory tourism models and the Philippines' local government-supported tourism initiatives, which provide comparative lessons for strengthening rural destination management and improving community empowerment mechanisms [29], [30].

The novelty of this study lies in three contributions. First, it provides the first comprehensive qualitative analysis of Jurangmangu Adventure Village as a multi-activity sport-educational rural tourism destination, integrating physical infrastructure, visitor experiences, community livelihood impacts, governance, and development challenges within a unified framework. Second, it introduces and empirically grounds the concept of the integrated family sport tourism model, in which active sport experiences for one family member serve as the primary draw while enriching parallel programming is available for non-sporting accompanying members, as a distinctive competitive strategy for rural adventure destinations. Third, it situates the Indonesian case within a

three-country Southeast Asian comparative framework incorporating analytical contributions from Thailand and the Philippines, generating cross-national governance lessons with policy transferability across comparable ASEAN contexts.

This study therefore aims to explore the current sport tourism potential and development challenges of Jurangmangu Adventure Village; to examine the perspectives of tourists, community members, and destination managers; to analyze the governance and financing mechanisms shaping the destination's development trajectory; and to derive cross-national governance lessons applicable to analogous rural sport tourism destinations in the region. The study contributes to sport tourism development theory by grounding the integrated family sport tourism model in empirical evidence, to community-based tourism governance theory by situating the BUMDES model within a comparative ASEAN framework, and to applied tourism policy by generating actionable recommendations that account for both the structural limitations of village enterprise governance and the institutional innovations available from Thailand and the Philippines.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design situated within an interpretivist epistemological framework. Qualitative inquiry was selected because the primary research objectives exploring sport tourism potential, examining stakeholder perspectives, and conducting cross-national governance comparison require context-sensitive, meaning-oriented analysis that quantitative instruments are not positioned to generate [31], [32]. A descriptive design was applied to systematically describe and interpret observed phenomena and participant accounts as they occur naturally in the field setting, without experimental manipulation [33]. The cross-national comparative dimension was incorporated through analytical contributions from co-authors Sueblai (Thailand) and Pepito (Philippines), each providing expert knowledge of their respective national governance frameworks grounded in published literature and institutional familiarity. Ethical clearance was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of Universitas PGRI Semarang prior to data collection.

2.2 Research Setting and Participants

Fieldwork was conducted at Jurangmangu Adventure Village, Pulosari District, Pemalang Regency, Central Java, Indonesia, between March and August 2025. The research setting encompassed the complete territorial extent of the destination, including the Mount Slamet trekking basecamp and trail network, the Jurangmangu Bike Park downhill circuit and loading trail, the home-stay accommodation network, agricultural and livestock education areas, and the Bukit Subuh family glamping area.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling, a technique appropriate for qualitative inquiry in which information-rich cases are intentionally selected to illuminate the research questions rather than to represent a statistical population [34]-[36]. Three stakeholder categories were targeted. The inclusion and exclusion criteria applied in participant selection are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Stakeholder Category	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Tourist Informants	Active visitor at the destination during the research period; minimum one completed sport activity (trekking or cycling); willingness to provide informed consent	Day visitors without meaningful sport activity participation; visitors unwilling to provide informed consent
Community Informants	Permanent resident of Jurangmangu village; directly involved in or economically affected by tourism operations	Non-residents; individuals with no direct engagement with tourism activities
Managerial Informants	Holding formal or operational management role at the destination or within the village enterprise; direct decision-making authority at time of research	Former or retired managers; officials without active operational responsibilities

All participants provided voluntary written informed consent prior to participation. Purposive sampling applied across all three stakeholder categories.

The criteria in Table 1 ensured that participants were selected on the basis of their direct relevance to the research objectives and their capacity to provide information-rich accounts of the destination's current sport tourism conditions. Restricting managerial informants to individuals with active operational responsibilities at the

time of research minimized retrospective bias and ensured that accounts reflected the current governance and management realities of the destination [32], [37].

2.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected from primary and secondary sources using three complementary instruments [38]-[40]. Primary data were obtained through: (1) structured interviews using a pre-validated interview guide covering demographic profiles, activity motivations, satisfaction assessments, facility perceptions, and developmental perspectives; (2) direct observation of spatial layout, physical infrastructure condition, visitor-community interaction patterns, and operational management practices across multiple field visits; and (3) participant response documentation capturing stakeholder perspectives on tourism impacts, governance, and challenges.

Secondary data were obtained through document analysis of the most recent available village demographic monograph (Monografis Desa Jurangmangu), government correspondence, visitor records from the 2024 annual mountain bike competition, official social media documentation from the destination's accounts, and national tourism authority publications from Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. The village demographic monograph is cited as baseline contextual data; it does not represent a current census, but provides the foundational community profile against which tourism-induced livelihood changes are interpreted. The interview guide was subjected to expert validation by a sport tourism specialist at Universitas PGRI Semarang prior to fieldwork deployment. The cross-national comparative data were contributed by co-authors Suebplai and Pepito through expert analytical contributions grounded in published national literature.

2.4 Research Instruments

Multiple instruments were deployed in an integrated data collection strategy corresponding to the different research variables and stakeholder categories. Table 2 presents the complete research instrument framework.

Table 2. Research Instruments by Variable, Technique, Instrument, and Scale

Variable	Indicator	Data Collection Technique	Instrument	Scale / Type
Sport Tourism Physical Assets	Trekking route conditions, bike park infrastructure, amenities, accessibility, facility adequacy	Direct observation; document analysis	Structured Observation Sheet; Document Analysis Checklist	Descriptive/Nominal
Institutional and Governance Assets	Village enterprise governance capacity, management quality, community participation, financing mechanisms	Structured interviews (managerial); document analysis	Interview Guide Managerial; Document Checklist	Descriptive/Narrative
Visitor Profile and Motivations	Socio-demographic characteristics, travel behavior, activity preferences, information sources	Structured interviews (tourist informants)	Interview Guide - Tourist	Nominal/Descriptive
Visitor Perceptions and Satisfaction	Cleanliness, facility adequacy, accessibility, overall satisfaction, revisit intention	Structured interviews (tourist informants)	Interview Guide - Tourist	Ordinal (Descriptive Likert-type)
Community Participation and Livelihood Impacts	Employment absorption, income generation, home-stay participation, decision-making involvement	Structured interviews (community informants)	Interview Guide Community	Descriptive/Narrative
Development Challenges	Financing constraints, infrastructure gaps, governance limitations, promotion	Structured interviews (all stakeholders); observation	Interview Guides; Field Notes	Descriptive/Narrative

Variable	Indicator	Data Collection Technique	Instrument	Scale / Type
Cross-National Comparative Data	deficits, external funding dependency Community-based tourism governance models, sport tourism policy frameworks, rural enterprise structures in Thailand and the Philippines	Analytical contribution by co-authors based on national expertise and published literature	National policy documents; academic literature; expert analytical notes	Descriptive/Comparative

Expert validation of all interview guides by a sport tourism specialist at Universitas PGRI Semarang prior to fieldwork. Co-author analytical contributions (final row) underwent internal peer review by all three authors before integration into the comparative analysis section.

Table 2 demonstrates that the study employed a multi-instrument, multi-source data collection strategy designed to capture the physical, institutional, human, and contextual dimensions of sport tourism development simultaneously. The triangulation of three primary data collection methods structured interviews, direct observation, and document analysis across seven analytical variables ensured comprehensive coverage of the research objectives while minimizing the risk of single-source data limitations inherent in qualitative case study designs [41]-[43].

2.5 Data Analysis Techniques

Data were analyzed inductively through a concurrent collection-analysis process consistent with established qualitative research practice [44]-[47]. The analytical procedure involved four iterative stages: (1) data reduction through selective coding and categorization of field notes, interview transcripts, and documents; (2) data display through organization of reduced data into structured thematic matrices and descriptive narratives; (3) pattern identification and thematic construction through cross-case analysis of tourist, community, and managerial accounts; and (4) theory-informed interpretation linking empirical findings to the sport tourism development and community governance literature. Data credibility was ensured through source triangulation (cross-checking accounts from tourists, community members, and managers), method triangulation (cross-referencing interview data against observational records and documentary evidence), and member checking of key interpretive conclusions with managerial informants.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Geographical and Community Profile of the Research Site

Jurangmangu Village is located in Pulosari District, Pemalang Regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia. The village lies at an average elevation of approximately 1,200 meters above sea level and covers a total area of 547 hectares. Geographically, it is bordered by Karangaru Village to the north, Gunungsari Village to the east, state forestry areas to the south, and Gambuhan Village to the west. The village is accessible from the center of Pemalang Regency through the Pemalang–Randudongkal arterial road, at an approximate distance of 50 kilometers. Recent improvements to road infrastructure, supported by regional government funding, have reduced travel time to approximately 60 minutes by private vehicle, thereby enhancing physical accessibility for residents, visitors, and tourism-related activities.

According to the latest available village monograph, Jurangmangu Village has a total population of 1,313 residents distributed across approximately 400 households and seven hamlets (Monografis Desa Jurangmangu). The demographic and occupational datasets available for the present study, however, comprise 605 recorded residents. These records are used as baseline socioeconomic information to describe the initial community structure prior to the expansion of tourism-related economic activities. Interviews with destination management stakeholders indicated that the overall population structure has remained relatively stable, while participation in tourism-related occupations has increased following tourism development in the village.

Table 3. Baseline Age Distribution of Recorded Residents in Jurangmangu Village

Age Group	Number of Residents
0–5 Years	57
6–20 Years	124
21–60 Years	301
Above 60 Years	123
Total	605

Source: Monografis Desa Jurangmangu. The table presents available baseline demographic records used for contextual analysis.

As shown in Table 3, residents aged 21–60 years constituted the largest share of recorded residents. This indicates the availability of a substantial productive-age population capable of supporting community-based tourism development through employment participation, entrepreneurship, and involvement in destination management. A relatively large productive population therefore represents an important social asset for developing tourism initiatives while sustaining community participation as a central element of local development.

Table 4. Baseline Occupational Distribution of Recorded Residents in Jurangmangu Village

Occupation Type	Count (Persons)	Percentage (%)
Landowner Farmers	390	64.5
Agricultural Laborers	54	8.9
Industrial Laborers	1	0.2
Construction Workers	5	0.8
Traders and Merchants	5	0.8
Civil Servants	2	0.3
Informal and Service Workers	35	5.8
Other and Unrecorded	113	18.7
Total	605	100.0

Source: *Monografis Desa Jurangmangu*. Occupational records represent available baseline data prior to the expansion of tourism-related employment opportunities.

As presented in Table 4, agriculture was the dominant livelihood sector among recorded residents, with landowner farmers representing 64.5% of documented occupations. This finding indicates that Jurangmangu Village historically depended primarily on agricultural activities as the main source of household livelihood. Subsequent tourism development, however, has contributed to a gradual process of livelihood diversification, in which tourism-related activities have emerged as complementary economic opportunities alongside existing agricultural practices.

Field observations and stakeholder interviews indicate that community participation in tourism has expanded through a range of service-based activities, including guiding services, porter assistance, homestay management, food and beverage enterprises, coffee production and sales, and souvenir-related businesses. These emerging activities reflect a transition from a predominantly agriculture-based livelihood structure toward a more diversified, community-based tourism economy.

Within this transformation, sport tourism has functioned as an additional economic pathway that supports local livelihood diversification while drawing on the village's natural and cultural resources. The growth of tourism-related employment has not displaced agricultural activity but has operated as a complementary sector that strengthens household income opportunities, broadens community involvement, and contributes to the long-term sustainability of the destination.

3.2 Sport Tourism Infrastructure Assessment

The physical infrastructure of Jurangmangu Adventure Village currently encompasses five primary sport and recreation components at varying stages of operational maturity. The Mount Slamet trekking route, the destination's longest-established and most operationally mature asset, is managed through a cooperative agreement with the national forestry authority. The route encompasses twelve designated waypoints from the basecamp at 1,146 meters above sea level to the summit at 3,378 meters, traversing diverse ecological zones. The full trail profile is documented in Table 5.

Table 5. Trail Profile of Jurangmangu–Mount Slamet Trekking Route

Waypoint	Name	Elevation	Key Vegetation	Notable Fauna
Basecamp	Jurangmangu	1,146 m	Residential area	—
Post 1	Pondok Pinus	1,216 m	Pine forest	Javanese eagle, bulbul, plover
Post 2	Kedung Warak	1,347 m	Mixed hardwoods	Civet, wild boar, jungle fowl
Post 3	Sampyang Pasang	1,504 m	Cemara, Baros, Wuru	Leopard, barking deer, langur
Post 4	Sampyang Gringging	2,017 m	Gringging, Pasang, Mayang	Leopard, barking deer, sunbirds
Post 5	Sampyang Gembirung	2,127 m	Gembirung, Cemara	Whiskered yuhina, Javan eagle
Post 6	Sampyang Rangkah	2,328 m	Kematus, Dregel, Sahang	Leopard (black), civet, spotted deer
Post 7	Sampyang Rangkah (Upper)	2,513 m	Gorang, Gringging, Kematus	Wild boar, black panther, Javan hawk-eagle

Waypoint	Name	Elevation	Key Vegetation	Notable Fauna
Post 8	Sampyang Gorang	2,874 m	Edelweiss, Gorang, Ihing	Mountain plover, Javan eagle, civet
Post 9	Pos Gua (Cave Post)	2,995 m	Ihing, Kemalus, Edelweiss	Langur, leopard, plover
Gateway	Pelawangan	3,030 m	Edelweiss, Ihing, Kematus	Leopard, langur
Summit	Mount Slamet Summit	3,378 m	Alpine zone	Rare endemic species

Source: Jurangmangu Adventure Village; field observation (March–August 2025). Elevations expressed in meters above sea level.

The trail profile in Table 5 demonstrates the ecological richness of the route, traversing six distinct vegetation zones and supporting diverse highland fauna including Javan eagle, leopard, black panther, barking deer, and langur. The availability of twelve designated waypoints facilitates staged trek options for participants with varying fitness levels, expanding the potential visitor base beyond experienced mountaineers to include recreational hikers and family groups undertaking partial ascents. Such trail segmentation and adaptive visitor experiences are recognized as important strategies in outdoor and nature-based tourism development to accommodate diverse visitor capabilities and enhance destination accessibility [48], [49].

The mountain biking infrastructure constitutes the destination's most strategically differentiated offering. Designed by a local founder with competitive cycling experience and developed with support from the Indonesian Sport Cycling Federation and affiliated cycling communities from Bandung, the Jurangmangu Bike Park is now fully operational, including the recently completed uphill loading trail that was the final major infrastructure gap requiring resolution. Current specifications are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Jurangmangu Bike Park Trail Specifications

Trail Segment	Distance	Elevation Range	Character	Current Status
Special Stage 1	~2.3 km	1,200–1,300 m above sea level	General downhill, forest terrain	Operational
Special Stage 2	~2.4 km	1,200–1,300 m above sea level	Bukit Subuh traverse, technical	Operational
Special Stage 3	~1.2 km	1,200–1,300 m above sea level	Short technical descent	Operational
Special Stage 4 (Competition Only)	~1.4 km	Village level	Urban integration course; unique obstacles	Competition events only
Loading Trail (Uphill Access)	~1.8 km	Village to ~1,300 m above sea level	Mechanized uphill access for cyclists and bicycles	Operational

Source: Field observation (March–August 2025); destination manager interview. All trail segments are currently operational. The loading trail enables mechanized uphill transport of cyclists and bicycles, eliminating the need for manual portage.

The completion of the loading trail is a particularly significant development for the destination's market positioning. Previously, cyclists were required to manually carry bicycles uphill to trail starting points a physical barrier that excluded recreational riders, beginner-to-intermediate skill levels, and family cyclists. The operational loading trail now enables the full range of cycling visitor types to access the park, directly activating the integrated family sport tourism model described in Section 3.6.

Supporting amenities and educational tourism components complement the core sport activities. A comprehensive summary of all destination facilities is presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of Jurangmangu Adventure Village Amenities and Facilities

Facility	Description	Status	Role in Tourism
Trekking Route - Mount Slamet	Twelve-waypoint route from basecamp at 1,146 to summit at 3,378 meters above sea level	Fully operational	Primary sport tourism asset
Jurangmangu Bike Park	Four special stages plus a fully operational uphill loading trail	Fully operational	Primary sport tourism asset
Home-Stay Network	More than 21 households; IDR 200,000–350,000 per night	Operational	Accommodation and community income
Pine Forest Area	At 1,200 meters elevation; resin tapping demonstration	Operational	Educational and scenic tourism

Facility	Description	Status	Role in Tourism
Coffee Garden	Intercropped with pine trees; locally processed coffee for sale	Operational	Agri-education and souvenir sales
Vegetable Plantations	Tomato and cabbage growing plots	Operational	Educational tourism for families
Broiler Chicken Farm	Community-owned; cool highland microclimate	Operational	Educational tourism and livelihood
Mosque and Prayer Halls	One central mosque and two smaller prayer halls	Operational	Religious facilities for visitors
Public Toilet Facilities	Upgraded facilities at the village hall	Operational	Basic visitor amenity
Emergency Ambulance	Village-level emergency medical coverage	Operational	Visitor safety infrastructure
Bukit Subuh Family Area	Glamping and camping ground; operational since 2024	Fully operational	Family recreation hub

Source: Field observation and stakeholder interviews (March–August 2025).

Table 7 reveals a destination at a mature stage of development, with all primary sport tourism assets and supporting amenities fully operational. Particularly noteworthy is the Bukit Subuh Family Area, which opened in 2024 as a glamping and camping facility designed specifically to accommodate non-cycling family members accompanying sport-active visitors. The home-stay network has expanded beyond the original 21 households, with accommodation pricing increasing to IDR 200,000–350,000 per night, reflecting improvements in quality and growing demand. The 21-unit network represents a meaningful community-based accommodation offering that generates household income while preserving the authentic village hospitality experience valued by nature-based tourists [8].

3.3 Visitor Profile, Motivations, and Perceptions

The tourist informant a 21-year-old male self-employed resident of Pemalang Regency and repeat visitor attending specifically for downhill mountain biking, provided a comprehensive profile of current visitor characteristics and perceptions. The full visitor profile is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Visitor Socio-Demographic and Psychographic Profile

Variable	Characteristics
Age	21 years
Gender	Male
Origin	Pemalang Regency
Education Level	Senior High School
Occupation	Self-employed
Mode of Transport	Private vehicle (car)
Travel Companion	Peer group (friends)
Primary Motivation	Recreational hobby cycling
Visit Frequency	More than three times (repeat visitor)
Duration of Stay	More than 24 hours (overnight stay)
Information Sources	Social media and peer recommendation
Primary Activity	Downhill mountain biking
Overall Satisfaction	Very satisfied
Intention to Revisit	Yes
Main Positive Attribute	Complete trail system including loading trail; accessible for all skill levels
Main Concern	Limited food variety at destination; digital payment not yet available

Source: Primary data, structured interview (March–August 2025).

The visitor profile in Table 8 reflects the characteristics of an active sport tourism participant with strong destination loyalty, consistent with documented patterns of repeat visitation among cycling enthusiasts in nature-based settings [50]. The high overall satisfaction assessment and clear revisit intention indicate a strong core visitor experience. Notably, the primary concerns identified, limited food variety and the absence of digital payment facilities represent manageable, addressable service gaps rather than fundamental infrastructure deficiencies, suggesting that the destination has progressed beyond the infrastructure constraint phase into a service quality optimization phase.

The use of social media and peer recommendation as the dominant information channels reflects behavioral patterns documented among Indonesian nature-based tourists, where digital platforms and electronic word-of-mouth increasingly influence destination awareness, travel inspiration, and visitation decisions [51]-[53]. Peer referral is particularly important for a destination with limited formal marketing capacity, as word-of-mouth from satisfied repeat visitors constitutes the primary promotional mechanism beyond the destination's Instagram presence. This dependence on organic promotion underscores the strategic value of the visitor's high satisfaction and expressed revisit intention as a marketing asset.

3.4 Community Engagement and Livelihood Impacts

The community informant, a 38-year-old male small entrepreneur, articulated a broadly positive assessment of the destination's livelihood impacts on village residents. Key economic benefits identified included employment absorption through porter and guide services along trekking and cycling routes, income generation through food, beverage, and souvenir sales, and homestay revenue from households renting rooms to overnight visitors. These findings are consistent with previous sport tourism research highlighting that active tourism activities can generate local economic multipliers through employment creation, increased demand for hospitality services, and greater participation of local communities in tourism supply chains [54]-[56].

A particularly notable finding concerns the transformative impact of tourism development on household sanitation infrastructure. The informant noted that prior to the destination's establishment, the majority of households in the immediate settlement lacked private bathrooms. The tourism-driven requirement to provide quality home-stay accommodation has catalyzed widespread bathroom construction and renovation across the village, with several households subsequently investing in tiled facilities and hot water. This tangible improvement in quality of life extends beyond direct tourism income, encompassing broader infrastructure development and community-level benefits associated with sport tourism growth in rural Indonesian contexts.

Community participation in destination governance has improved in recent years. Quarterly community meetings have been introduced through which tourism planning priorities and revenue distributions are discussed, representing a step toward the participatory governance model advocated by [8]. However, decision-making authority over major capital investments remains concentrated in the enterprise management board. This governance concentration while enabling focused strategic direction limits the diversity of perspectives and community buy-in that characterize the most resilient community-based tourism models, an issue the cross-national comparison in Section 3.8 addresses directly.

Unlike previous studies that have predominantly conceptualized community participation in sport tourism as economic involvement through employment creation and local business opportunities, this study reveals a more complex transformation process. The Jurangmangu case demonstrates that sport tourism development may generate broader social improvements, such as household infrastructure enhancement and service capacity development, while simultaneously creating new governance challenges related to decision-making inclusion and institutional representation. This finding extends existing community-based tourism literature by highlighting that successful rural sport tourism development requires not only economic participation but also adaptive governance mechanisms that ensure long-term community ownership and legitimacy.

3.5 Development Challenges and Current Intervention Status

Despite its substantive progress, Jurangmangu Adventure Village continues to face several development challenges. Table 9 presents the key challenge areas alongside their specific manifestations, current interventions, and assessment of current status.

Table 9. Current Development Challenges, Interventions, and Status Assessment

Challenge Area	Specific Issue	Current Intervention	Status and Assessment
Financial Capital	Village enterprise institutional mandate prioritizes short-term revenue over long-term tourism infrastructure investment	Multi-source external funding from regional government budget, national tourism ministry, Indonesian Sport Cycling Federation, and affiliated cycling communities	Ongoing; destination development pace remains dependent on external grant availability and political cycles
Sport Infrastructure	Uphill loading trail for the Bike Park was completed only recently	Provincial tourism office grant and volunteer contribution from cycling federation	Largely resolved; loading trail now fully operational, enabling recreational and family cycling
Institutional Governance	Decision-making authority concentrated in a small village enterprise management board; limited	Quarterly community meetings introduced; gradual shift toward participatory governance	In progress; community participation in planning is increasing

Challenge Area	Specific Issue	Current Intervention	Status and Assessment
Promotion and Marketing	formal community involvement in strategic planning		but formal structural reform has not yet occurred
	Limited digital presence; destination primarily known through Instagram and word-of-mouth within cycling communities	Social media content diversification; reinstatement of annual mountain bike competition as a regional promotional event	In progress; online visibility improving but reach beyond enthusiast cycling networks remains limited
Human Resource Capacity	Tourism service providers lack formal hospitality and guiding training	On-the-job learning; informal mentoring from experienced guides	Partial; service quality varies across home-stay operators and guides; no formal certification programme in place

Source: Primary data, stakeholder interviews (March–August 2025).

Table 9 reveals that the destination's most acute challenges have shifted from physical infrastructure deficiencies, largely resolved through external grant funding and federation support toward institutional and organizational dimensions. The governance centralization challenge, the ongoing external funding dependency, and the promotion reach limitation are systemic issues that cannot be resolved through single capital investments but require sustained organizational reform and strategic capacity-building. This transition from infrastructure constraints to governance and marketing challenges is consistent with patterns documented in comparable Indonesian rural tourism destinations, where initial infrastructure improvements are followed by more complex challenges related to institutional governance, stakeholder coordination, destination management, and market development [57], [58].

The financial capital challenge deserves particular attention. The village enterprise's institutional mandate, which prioritizes activities with measurable short-term revenue potential over longer-horizon investments, creates structural tension in managing a tourism destination whose infrastructure development costs are substantial and whose returns materialize over extended periods. This financing gap has historically been bridged through external grants from the regional government budget, the national tourism ministry, the Indonesian Sport Cycling Federation, and private cycling community donors. Such a multi-source financing model is common in emerging tourism destinations; however, reliance on external funding streams may create uncertainty in development continuity due to changing institutional priorities, administrative procedures, and governance arrangements [59].

This finding contributes to previous rural tourism development studies by identifying a sequential evolution of destination challenges. Earlier research has frequently emphasized accessibility, infrastructure limitations, and attraction development as primary barriers for emerging destinations [57], [58]. However, the Jurangmangu case illustrates that once fundamental infrastructure constraints are addressed, the dominant challenges may shift toward organizational capacity, financial sustainability, and governance restructuring. Therefore, destination maturity should not be assessed solely through physical development indicators but also through institutional readiness and the ability of local organizations to manage continuous growth.

3.6 The Integrated Family Sport Tourism Model

The most distinctive and strategically significant element of Jurangmangu Adventure Village's current development model is what this study identifies as an integrated family sport tourism approach: a destination design in which active sport experiences for one family member constitute the primary draw, while parallel enriching programming is simultaneously available for accompanying non-sporting family members.

The practical manifestation of this model combines downhill mountain biking and trekking with coffee garden tours, vegetable and livestock educational visits, the newly operational Bukit Subuh glamping and camping area, and proximity to Guci Hot Springs in adjacent Tegal Regency. This constellation of offerings enables a family unit with heterogeneous recreational preferences to derive high aggregate satisfaction from a single destination visit, a value proposition increasingly important in the post-pandemic outdoor recreation landscape where family nature-based tourism has accelerated [60], [61].

The fully operational loading trail has been critical to realizing this model in practice. Previously, only committed downhill cycling enthusiasts willing to carry bicycles uphill would visit the Bike Park. The mechanized loading trail now enables casual recreational cyclists including family members who accompany sport-active cyclists to participate comfortably in mountain biking activities, transforming the Bike Park from a specialist enthusiast venue into a family recreation facility. Combined with the Bukit Subuh glamping area providing accommodation attractive to families with children, the destination now possesses all the components necessary

to market effectively to the family adventure tourism segment, which represents the fastest-growing visitor segment in Indonesian outdoor tourism [62], [63].

3.7 Theoretical and Policy Implications

The Jurangmangu Adventure Village case enriches theoretical understanding of rural sport tourism development in developing-country contexts in three respects. First, it demonstrates that village enterprise governance, despite structural financing limitations, can successfully incubate multi-activity sport tourism destinations when supported by external partnerships, institutional collaboration, and strategic destination development initiatives. Second, it provides empirical support for integrated sport tourism models that combine multiple recreational activities and services to accommodate heterogeneous visitor segments, a perspective increasingly relevant in rural adventure tourism development. Third, it illustrates how rural tourism destinations often evolve from initial infrastructure development toward more complex governance, marketing, and institutional capacity challenges as destinations mature [54], [64].

From a policy standpoint, several implications are salient. Road and sport infrastructure investment must precede or accompany tourism promotion efforts, since physical accessibility functions as a ceiling on visitor satisfaction independent of asset quality. Previous research on destination development highlights that accessibility, infrastructure readiness, and service capacity are fundamental prerequisites for competitive tourism destinations [65]. The village enterprise financing model requires supplementary mechanisms, including dedicated rural tourism development funds, blended finance instruments combining grants and loans, or facilitated private co-investment to bridge the gap between enterprise revenues and the capital requirements of competitive tourism infrastructure [22], [66]. Sport tourism events, such as the annual mountain bike competition, serve not only as revenue generators but also as high-leverage destination marketing vehicles that enhance destination visibility, stakeholder engagement, and long-term tourism value beyond their immediate economic returns.

3.8 Cross-National Comparative Perspective: Thailand and the Philippines

The challenges and development strategies documented at Jurangmangu Adventure Village are not unique to the Indonesian context. Across Southeast Asia, rural sport tourism destinations governed by community enterprise structures face structurally similar tensions between short-term revenue mandates, long-term infrastructure investment needs, and inclusive community participation in governance. This section presents comparative analytical perspectives contributed by co-authors Sueblai (Thailand) and Pepito (Philippines) to situate the Indonesian case within a broader regional framework and identify transferable governance and financing lessons. Table 10 presents the structured comparative analysis.

Table 10. Cross-National Comparative Analysis of Rural Sport Tourism Governance: Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines

Dimension	Indonesia (Jurangmangu Adventure Village)	Thailand (Community-Based Tourism Model)	Philippines (Barangay Cooperative Model)
Governance Model	Village-owned enterprise (BUMDES) under Village Law No. 6/2014; dual mandate of short-term revenue generation and community welfare	Village-level community-based tourism cooperatives under the Tourism Authority of Thailand's Community Tourism Policy 2022; supported by Sub-district Administrative Organizations	Barangay Government cooperatives under Republic Act No. 7160; tourism managed by barangay-level ecotourism committees
Primary Sport Tourism Activity	Downhill mountain biking, highland trekking (Mount Slamet), agritourism integration	Trekking, nature cycling, cultural sport tourism (e.g., Doi Inthanon region); Muay Thai experiential tourism in urban-rural linkage zones	Highland trekking, eco-adventure cycling, community-based water sports (e.g., Kawasan Falls, Cebu highlands)
Financing Mechanism	Largely grant-dependent: regional government budget, national tourism ministry, Indonesian Sport Cycling Federation, cycling communities; limited enterprise own-revenue	Tourism Authority of Thailand grants, One Tambon One Product programme revenue diversification, provincial tourism fund allocation; lower grant dependency than Indonesia	Local government unit tourism development fund, national social welfare grants, private sector co-investment; revenue-sharing mechanisms under barangay tourism by-laws
Community Participation Level	Broad economic participation (porter, home-	High formal participation through community-based	Variable; barangay ecotourism councils provide

Dimension	Indonesia (Jurangmangu Adventure Village)	Thailand (Community-Based Tourism Model)	Philippines (Barangay Cooperative Model)
Family Tourism Integration	stay, food sales); limited formal governance involvement; enterprise board decisions concentrated in a small management core Integrated model: cycling and trekking for sport-active members combined with coffee garden, vegetable farm, livestock education, and glamping for accompanying families	tourism committee structures; village tourism plans require multi-stakeholder endorsement; gender-inclusive governance requirements Established family eco-resort model in community-based tourism villages (e.g., Chiang Rai highlands); family package bundling well-developed within Tourism Authority of Thailand frameworks	a formal participation channel; actual community decision-making power depends on local political dynamics Family adventure packages emerging in Visayas highland destinations; Cebu urban proximity enables family day-trip model
Key Development Challenge	Governance centralization within village enterprise; ongoing external funding dependency; limited promotion reach beyond enthusiast cycling networks	Over-reliance on Tourism Authority of Thailand marketing support; risk of commodification of authentic community-based experiences; increasing competition from urban adventure parks	Fragmented governance across barangay units; limited inter-barangay coordination; infrastructure investment constrained by barangay revenue base
Transferable Lessons for Jurangmangu		Tourism Authority of Thailand multi-stakeholder governance model offers a structural template for transitioning to participatory multi-board governance; One Tambon One Product programme provides a revenue diversification and independence model	Barangay revenue-sharing by-laws offer a legal mechanism template for distributing tourism income more equitably across community members; Cebu private co-investment model is relevant to the Bukit Subuh glamping development

Indonesia data: primary fieldwork (March–August 2025, this study). Thailand data: Suebplai (co-author) contribution based on Pongwirithon & Awirothananon (2021), Rathindra & Suebplai (2023), and Tourism Authority of Thailand (2022). Philippines data: Pepito (co-author) contribution based on Reyes & Pepito (2024) and national ecotourism governance literature.

Rather than positioning Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines as equivalent comparative cases, this analysis uses regional perspectives to identify transferable governance principles applicable to rural sport tourism destinations. This approach addresses a limitation in previous sport tourism literature, where cross-country discussions often remain descriptive and provide limited guidance for destination-level institutional improvement.

The comparative analysis in Table 10 reveals three cross-national patterns with direct implications for Jurangmangu's future development. First, governance structure is the critical differentiator between sustainable and grant-dependent community sport tourism enterprises. Thailand's Tourism Authority of Thailand-supported community-based tourism model achieves lower external funding dependency through legislated multi-stakeholder governance requirements and the One Tambon One Product programme's product diversification strategy. For Jurangmangu, the practical implication is that establishing a formal multi-board governance structure incorporating representatives from the broader village community, the Indonesian Sport Cycling Federation, the provincial tourism office, and private sector actors, would distribute decision-making authority while simultaneously unlocking new financing eligibility [67], [68].

Second, the Philippines' barangay revenue-sharing by-law mechanism, which mandates that a specified proportion of tourism entry and activity fees be redistributed directly to participating community households, offers a legal template for addressing the governance centralization challenge. Currently, tourism income flows through the enterprise management accounts and is redistributed at the board's discretion. A formal revenue-sharing protocol modeled on Philippine barangay by-laws could formalize community equity in income distribution while preserving operational authority over capital allocation decisions [69], [70].

Third, the integrated family tourism design already embedded in the destination's model finds support in the growing emphasis on community-based and nature-based tourism products that combine multiple experiences

for diverse visitor groups. Research on rural tourism development indicates that integrated tourism packages combining recreation, education, cultural interaction, and nature experiences can enhance visitor engagement, extend length of stay, and increase local economic benefits compared with single-attraction models [57]. The Bukit Subuh glamping facility, combined with the operational loading trail enabling recreational family cycling, positions the destination to pursue this multifunctional tourism model. Similar patterns have been observed in Southeast Asian rural tourism destinations, where diversification of activities and community participation are increasingly important strategies for strengthening destination competitiveness.

The integrated family sport tourism model identified in this study extends previous sport tourism research that has largely focused on athletes, sport events, and destination attractiveness as the primary units of analysis. While previous studies have demonstrated the economic and experiential value of sport tourism activities, limited attention has been given to how destinations can accommodate heterogeneous visitor groups in which participants and non-participants travel together. The Jurangmangu case provides empirical evidence that family-oriented integration can function as a strategic destination innovation by transforming sport facilities from specialized activity sites into inclusive multi-experience tourism environments. This contribution expands the conceptual understanding of rural sport tourism by positioning family inclusiveness and experience diversification as important dimensions of destination competitiveness.

3.9 Limitations and Future Research Directions

Several limitations of this study must be acknowledged. First, the tourist and community informant bases are small, reflecting the reality that Jurangmangu Adventure Village is a small community destination with limited stakeholder diversity. The tourist sample in particular comprises a single informant, which substantially constrains the generalizability of visitor perception findings. Future research should deploy larger, systematically sampled visitor surveys to generate statistically robust insights into demand patterns, visitor satisfaction drivers, and willingness-to-pay characteristics across different visitor segments.

Second, the study's focus on supply-side infrastructure and stakeholder perceptions means that market demand dynamics are only partially characterized. Third, the cross-national comparative analysis, while grounded in published literature and co-author expertise, does not include primary field data from Thailand or the Philippines; it therefore represents an expert analytical contribution rather than a full comparative field study. Future research should conduct primary fieldwork at analogous community-based tourism destinations in Thailand and barangay ecotourism sites in the Philippines for a full three-country comparative investigation.

4. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Jurangmangu Adventure Village has evolved into a substantively developed rural sport tourism destination, with fully operational trekking and mountain biking infrastructure, a newly completed uphill loading trail enabling recreational and family cycling, and a recently opened glamping facility that operationalizes the destination's integrated family sport tourism model. The destination's primary developmental bottleneck has shifted from physical infrastructure constraints, largely resolved through external grant funding and federation partnerships, toward institutional governance centralization and the associated financing dependency on external sources.

The study's most significant conceptual contribution is the identification and empirical grounding of the integrated family sport tourism model as a distinctive and scalable competitive strategy for rural adventure destinations. By combining downhill cycling and highland trekking with agritourism, educational programming, and glamping accommodation, the destination effectively addresses the family sport tourism tension, the challenge of serving sport-active members and their non-sporting accompanying family members simultaneously within a single destination visit. This model, validated through cross-national comparison with analogous Thai community-based tourism approaches and emerging Philippine highland destination concepts, offers a transferable template for rural adventure tourism development across Southeast Asia.

Key recommendations for continued development include: establishing a formal multi-stakeholder governance board to reduce enterprise board concentration and unlock diversified financing; implementing a transparent tourism income revenue-sharing protocol to strengthen community equity; sustaining annual sport tourism event programming as a regional marketing vehicle; formalizing family sport tourism package offerings that combine cycling and trekking with glamping, agri-education, and complementary attractions; and pursuing co-investment partnerships with private hospitality operators. Future research should deploy large-sample visitor surveys, conduct primary comparative fieldwork at community-based tourism destinations in Thailand and the Philippines, and track the destination's governance evolution over a multi-year horizon to assess the long-term effectiveness of the integrated family sport tourism model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend sincere gratitude to the management of Jurangmangu Adventure Village, the village enterprise board of BUMDES Sinergi Guna Niaga, and all community members, visitors, and local stakeholders who participated in this study. Special appreciation is directed to the Department of Physical Education, Health and Recreation at Universitas PGRI Semarang for institutional support, and to the expert validator who reviewed the research instruments prior to fieldwork deployment. The authors also thank the Tourism Authority of Thailand's Community-Based Tourism Division and the University of Cebu's Research Office for supporting the co-authors' analytical contributions to the cross-national comparative framework. Ethical clearance was granted by the Research Ethics Committee of Universitas PGRI Semarang. This research received no specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization, E.P.S., P.S., and M.R.P.; Methodology, E.P.S. and P.S.; Validation, P.S. and M.R.P.; Formal Analysis, E.P.S.; Investigation, E.P.S.; Resources, E.P.S., P.S., and M.R.P.; Data Curation, E.P.S.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, E.P.S.; Writing – Review & Editing, P.S. and M.R.P.; Visualization, E.P.S.; Supervision, P.S. and M.R.P.; Project Administration, E.P.S.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGY

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Pellow and S. Scheld, *Africa and urban anthropology: Theoretical and methodological contributions from contemporary fieldwork (1st ed.)*. 2023. doi: 10.4324/9781003003533.
- [2] M. Jiménez-García, J. Ruiz-Chico, A. R. Peña-Sánchez, and J. A. López-Sánchez, "A bibliometric analysis of sports tourism and sustainability (2002–2019)," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 7, pp. 1-18, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12072840.
- [3] E. Happ, "Tourism destination competitiveness with a particular focus on sport: The current state and a glance into the future – a systematic literature analysis systematic literature analysis," *J. Sport Tour.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 66–82, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14775085.2021.1888775.
- [4] H. Park and J. F. Kovacs, "Arts-led revitalization, overtourism and community responses: Ihwa Mural Village, Seoul," *Tour. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 36, pp. 1–9, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100729.
- [5] A. Chersulichtomino, M. Perić, and N. Wise, "Assessing and considering the wider impacts of sport-tourism events: A research agenda review of sustainability and strategic planning elements," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1-18, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12114473.
- [6] R. Mousavi, M. O. Najafabadi, S. M. Mirdamadi, and S. J. F. Hosseini, "Rural sports and local games: Missing link between sports tourism development and sustainability," *J. Sport Tour.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 201–223, 2022, doi: 10.1080/14775085.2022.2058069.
- [7] D. Streimikiene, B. Svagzdiene, E. Jasinskis, and A. Simanavicius, "Sustainable tourism development and competitiveness: The systematic literature review," *Sustain. Dev.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 259–271, 2021, doi: 10.1002/sd.2133.
- [8] UNWTO, *International Tourism Highlights*. Madrid: UNWTO, 2019, doi: 10.18111/9789284421152.
- [9] M. K. Giango, R. Hintapan, M. Suson, I. Batican, L. Quiño, and L. Capuyan, "Local support on sports tourism development: an integration of emotional solidarity and social exchange theory," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 1-26, 2022, doi: 10.3390/su141912898.
- [10] U. Nugraha, E. Yuliawan, Palmizal, and R. Mardian, "Determinants of community participation in the development of sports tourism in the area of Sipin Lake Jambi City," *J. Sport Area*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 33–46, 2022, doi: 10.25299/sportarea.2022.vol7(1).7308.
- [11] S. Winarsi and O. Moechthar, "Implementation of the law principles of good corporate governance in Indonesian Village-Owned Enterprise (BUMDes)," *Yuridika*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 635–656, 2020, doi: 10.20473/ydk.v35i3.21637.
- [12] A. F. Aritenang, "The role of social capital on rural enterprises economic performance: A case study in Indonesia Villages," *SAGE Open*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1-13, 2021, doi: 10.1177/21582440211044178.
- [13] G. P. Putra, E. Y. Ali, and D. Susilawati, "Analysis of the potential and challenges of nature-based sport tourism in West Java," *Act. J. Phys. Educ. Sport. Heal. Recreat.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 653-659, 2025, doi: 10.15294/active.v14i2.28279.
- [14] R. Anggraini, R. Z. Lingga, and D. A. Aliandrina, "The influence of motivation and satisfaction on event return in cycling tourism events," *Media Wisata*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 245–259, 2025.
- [15] T. Ultari and Khoirunurrofik., "The role of village-owned enterprises (BUMDes) in village development: Empirical evidence from villages in Indonesia," *J. Perenc. Pembang. Indones. J. Dev. Planning*, 8(2), 256-280, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1-25, 2024, doi: 10.36574/jpp.v8i2.559.
- [16] T. H. Ngo and S. Creutz, "Assessing the sustainability of community-based tourism: A case study in rural areas of Hoi An, Vietnam," *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-21, 2022, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2022.2116812.
- [17] M. Cheng, L. Zhang, X. Zhang, and Y. Li, "Does rural sports tourism promote the sustainable development of the

- destination? Based on quasi-experimental evidence of sports and leisure towns in China,” *J. Clean. Prod.*, vol. 486, pp. 1-14, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.144537.
- [18] G. Richards, “Designing creative places: The role of creative tourism,” *Ann. Tour. Res.*, vol. 85, pp. 1-11, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2020.102922.
- [19] S. M. Rasoolimanesh, S. Seyfi, C. M. Hall, and P. Hatamifar, “Understanding memorable tourism experiences and behavioural intentions of heritage tourists,” *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 1–14, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100621.
- [20] P. Brouder *et al.*, “Reflections and discussions: Tourism matters in the new normal post COVID-19,” *Tour. Geogr.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 735–746, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14616688.2020.1770325.
- [21] J. M. Cheer and A. A. Lew, “Understanding tourism resilience: Adapting to social, political, and economic change,” *Tour. Geogr.*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 457–465, 2020.
- [22] R. Nunkoo, B. Seetanah, J. Jafari, and R. V Sannasee, “Tourism and economic development: A review of the literature,” *J. Hosp. Mark. Manag.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 255–276, 2020.
- [23] T. Lan, Y. Yang, Y. Shao, M. Luo, and F. Zhong, “The synergistic effect of natural disaster frequency and severity on inbound tourist flows from the annual perspective,” *Tour. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 39, pp. 1-21, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100832.
- [24] R. Scheyvens and R. Biddulph, “Inclusive tourism development,” *Tour. Geogr.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 589–609, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14616688.2017.1381985.
- [25] J. Hakim *et al.*, “Digital transformation enhances tourism competitiveness, sustainability, and visitor experience in the digital era,” *J. Commer. Manag. Tour. Stud.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 142–152, 2026, doi: 10.58881/jcmnts.v5i1.242.
- [26] F. Bazzanella *et al.*, “The role of sports events in developing tourism destinations : A systematized review and future research agenda,” *J. Sport Tour.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 77–109, 2023, doi: 10.1080/14775085.2023.2186925.
- [27] M. Morfoulaki, G. Myrovali, K. Kotoula, T. Karagiorgos, and K. Alexandris, “Sport tourism as driving force for destinations’ sustainability,” *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 1–21, 2023, 10.3390/su15032445.
- [28] M. Volgger, G. Erschbamer, and H. Pechlaner, “Destination design: New perspectives for tourism destination development,” *J. Destin. Mark. Manag.*, vol. 19, pp. 1-26, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100561.
- [29] T. T. S. Tran, N. Németh, M. S. I. Sarker, and Z. Yuan, “Community-based tourism in Southeast Asia,” *Conf. Proc.*, 2024, doi: 10.35511/978-963-334-499-6-Tran-et al.
- [30] C. Dolezal and M. Novelli, “Power in community-based tourism: Empowerment and partnership in Bali,” *J. Sustain. Tour.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 271–288, 2022, doi: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1838527.
- [31] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.)*. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2018.
- [32] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2023.
- [33] I. Korstjens and A. Moser, “Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 6 : Longitudinal qualitative and mixed-methods approaches for longitudinal and complex health themes in primary care research,” *Eur. J. Gen. Pract.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 118–124, 2022, doi: 10.1080/13814788.2022.2053106.
- [34] F. Nyimbili and L. Nyimbili, “Types of purposive sampling techniques with their examples and application in qualitative research studies,” *Br. J. Multidiscip. Adv. Stud.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 90–99, 2024, doi: 10.37745/bjmas.2022.0419.
- [35] K. A. Campbell, E. Orr, P. Durepos, and L. Li, “Reflexive thematic analysis for applied qualitative health research reflexive thematic analysis for applied qualitative health research,” *Qual. Rep.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 2011–2028, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5010>.
- [36] L. Busetto, W. Wick, and C. Gumbinger, “How to use and assess qualitative research methods,” *Neurol. Res. Pr.*, vol. 2, no. 14, pp. 1–10, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>.
- [37] B. Lobe, D. Morgan, and K. A. Hoffman, “Qualitative data collection in an era of social distancing,” *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 19, pp. 1–8, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1609406920937875.
- [38] I. Janis, “Strategies for establishing dependability between two qualitative intrinsic case studies: A reflexive thematic analysis,” *Field methods*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 241–255, 2022, doi: 10.1177/1525822X211069636.
- [39] R. H. Adler, “Trustworthiness in qualitative research,” *J. Hum. Lact.*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 598–602, 2022, doi: 10.1177/08903344221116620.
- [40] S. L. Craig, L. B. McInroy, A. Goulden, and A. D. Eaton, “Engaging the senses in qualitative research via multimodal coding: Triangulating transcript, audio, and video data in a study with sexual and gender minority youth,” *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 20, pp. 1–12, 2021, doi: 10.1177/16094069211013659.
- [41] K. D. S. Santos, M. C. Ribeiro, D. E. U. Queiroga, I. A. P. Silva, and S. M. S. Ferreira, “The use of multiple triangulations as a validation strategy in a qualitative study,” *Cien. Saude Colet.*, vol. 25, pp. 655–664, 2020, doi: 10.1590/1413-81232020252.12302018.
- [42] B. P. Neupane, N. Dahal, R. K. Dhakal, M. K. Hasan, J. A. Villarama, and B. G. Fabros, “Data collection methods in qualitative research: researchers’ reflections,” *Front Res Metr Anal*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 1-9, 2026, doi: 10.3389/frma.2026.1778160.
- [43] J. L. Johnson, D. Adkins, and S. Chauvin, “A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research,” *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 1-9, 2022, doi: 10.5688/ajpe7120.
- [44] M. E. Kiger and L. Varpio, “Thematic analysis of qualitative data: AMEE Guide No. 131,” *Med Teach*, vol. 42, no. 8, pp. 846–854, 2020, doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2020.1755030.
- [45] D. A. Byrne, “Worked example of Braun and Clarke’s approach to reflexive thematic analysis,” *Qual Quant*, vol. 56, pp. 1391–1412, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y.
- [46] V. Braun and V. Clarke, *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications, 2022.

- [47] M. Forbes, "Thematic analysis: A practical guide," *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 132–135, 2022, doi: 10.1177/1035719X211058251.
- [48] S. H. Mackenzie and J. Goodnow, "Adventure in the age of COVID-19: Embracing constraints, exploring opportunities, and creating new adventures," *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.*, vol. 36, pp. 1-13, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jort.2021.100454.
- [49] C. M. Pickering, J. G. Castley, and W. Hill, "Understanding visitor impacts and management responses in protected areas," *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.*, vol. 35, pp. 1-11, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jort.2021.100405.
- [50] L. A. Buckley, "Planning and writing your dissertation literature review: A guide for final year degree veterinary nursing students (part one)," *Vet. Nurs. J.*, vol. 35, no. 9–12, pp. 339–343, 2020, doi: 10.1080/17415349.2020.1824141.
- [51] V. Gaffar, B. Tjahjono, T. Abdullah, and V. Sukmayadi, "Like, tag and share: Bolstering social media marketing to improve intention to visit a nature-based tourism destination," *Tour. Rev.*, vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 451–470, 2021, doi: 10.1108/TR-05-2020-0215.
- [52] F. Zahrudny, P. J. S. Siagian, N. Salsabila, I. M. A. A. Kusuma, and T. T. Firdalia, "Exploring digital tourist behavior among young visitors at Indonesian cultural heritage destinations: A mixed-method study," *Tour. Sci. J.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 34–49, 2025, doi: 10.32659/tsj.v11i1.437.
- [53] R. E. Hidayat, A. Alimuddin, S. Suhairi, and D. Nugroho, "Peran electronic word of mouth dalam mempengaruhi keputusan berkunjung ke wisata alam taman waru," *Adzkiya J. Huk. dan Ekon. Syariah*, vol. 90, no. 01, pp. 1–14, 2021, doi: 10.32332/adzkiya.v9i01.2493.
- [54] V. Herbold, H. Thees, and J. Philipp, "The host community and its role in sports tourism - exploring an emerging research field," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 24, pp. 1-26, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su122410488.
- [55] P. C. Sogas, I. F. Molina, A. A. Battle, and J. M. R. Vilchez, "Economic and social yield of investing in a sporting event: sustainable value creation in a territory," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1-15, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13137033.
- [56] M. R. A. Mollah, G. Cuskelly, and B. Hill, "Sport tourism collaboration: A systematic quantitative literature review," *J. Sport Tour.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 3–25, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14775085.2021.1877563.
- [57] P. D. Rosalina, K. Dupré, and Y. Wang, "Rural tourism: A systematic literature review on definitions and challenges," *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.*, vol. 47, pp. 134–149, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.03.001.
- [58] Firdaus, S. Hardjosoekarto, and R. M. Z. Lawang, "The role of local government on rural tourism development: Case study of Desa Wisata Pujonkidul, Indonesia," *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. Plan.*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 1299–1307, 2021, doi: 10.18280/ijstdp.160710.
- [59] M. Yusuf and K. Khoirunrofik, "The relationship of village funds with village economic development: A village level study in Indonesia," *J. Bina Praja*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 493–504, 2022, doi: 10.21787/jbp.14.2022.493-504.
- [60] A.-M. Lebrun, C.-J. Su, and P. Bouchet, "Domestic tourists' experience in protected natural parks: A new trend in pandemic crisis?," *J. Outdoor Recreat. Tour.*, vol. 35, pp. 1-11, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jort.2021.100398.
- [61] O. Rantala, T. Salmela, A. Valtonen, and E. Höckert, "Envisioning tourism and proximity after the anthropocene," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1–16, 2020.
- [62] L. Kusdibyo, C. B. Septyandi, and R. Kania, "Examining tourist visit intention to nature-based tourism in post-covid-19 pandemic," *KnE Soc. Sci.*, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 387–401, 2023, doi: 10.18502/kss.v8i12.13687.
- [63] T. Andrianto, A. F. A. Hutahaean, and E. Susanto, "How the readiness of nature-based attraction during pandemic COVID-19? Revisit the implementation of the CHSE certification," *J. Indones. Tour. Hosp. Recreat.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 169–180, 2022, doi: 10.17509/jithor.v5i2.48353.
- [64] M. Kabil, S. Priatmoko, R. Magda, and L. D. Dávid, "Blue economy and coastal tourism: A comprehensive visualization bibliometric analysis," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. 1-25, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13073650.
- [65] L. S. Stone, P. K. Mogomotsi, and G. Mogomotsi, "The impacts of COVID-19 on nature-based tourism in Botswana: Implications for community development," *Tour. Rev. Int.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 135–150, 2021, doi: 10.3727/154427221X16098837279958.
- [66] R. Baggio and R. Sainaghi, "Network analysis of tourism destinations: The role of stakeholder collaboration," *Tour. Manag.*, pp. 453–466, 2022, doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-88389-8_21.
- [67] M. A. Wakil, Y. Sun, and E. H. W. Chan, "Co-flourishing: Intertwining community resilience and tourism development in destination communities," *Tour. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 38, pp. 1-18, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100803.
- [68] A. Morrison, *Marketing and managing tourism destinations (2nd ed.)*. Routledge, 2022.
- [69] A. Giampiccoli and D. Glassom, "Community-based tourism in protected areas: Elaborating a model from a South African perspective," *Adv. Hosp. Tour. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 106–131, 2021, doi: 10.30519/ahtr.741805.
- [70] L. Gayo and J. Katonge, "The impacts of community-based tourism on local livelihoods in communities adjacent to national parks in Northern Tanzania," *Cogent Soc. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1-21, 2025, doi: 10.1080/23311886.2025.2569757.