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The integrated touristic villages: an Indonesian model of sustainable tourism?

Sylvine Pickel-Chevalier, I Komang Gde Bendesa and I Nyoman Darma Putra

ABSTRACT

The desa wisata terpadu policy was created in 1992 by the Indonesian government. Translated as integrated touristic villages, this model promotes an archetype of sustainable development adapted according to the characteristics of the local villages. Twenty-five years after the creation of this policy, it becomes relevant to examine its capacity to do so, by meeting the expectations of sustainable tourism, understood as a motor of global development and territorial integration. Because Bali remains the most important touristic destination in Indonesia, this study focuses on this special case, and more especially on three villages considered as model examples: Penglipuran, Tenganan and Jatiluwih. For each, have been studying its economic sustainability, analyzing whether tourism brings local economic development; its social sustainability, evaluating the capacity of tourism to foster cohesion among the inhabitants by maintaining the traditional local organization; and its cultural sustainability, examining the complex effects of tourism on the preservation of local heritage. The methodology is based on a multi-case study, through a qualitative approach composed of 12 interviews with actors and inhabitants among the local population involved in tourism. Our results show that the three villages are successfully meeting the expectations of sustainable tourism by favoring economic growth that enables the local population to keep their community alive through community-based management that globally respects the traditional organization. However, their sustainability remains fragile and needs to be improved through an increasingly efficient socio-economic model. It includes more flexibility to involve young qualified inhabitants, without gender prejudice, in order to avoid the ‘vicious circle’ of a lack of qualified human resources limiting their capacity for economic growth. Those results may be of interest to researchers who are involved with tourism and sustainability issues, but also to institutions and professionals working on the establishment of sustainable models of tourism in Bali or elsewhere.
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摘要

综合旅游村政策是印度尼西亚政府于1992年制定的。这一模式被翻译为综合旅游村落，提出了一种符合当地村落特点的可持续发展模式。在该政策实施25年之后，有必要审查其实现可持续旅游业预期的能力，因为旅游业被认为是全球发展和领土一体化的动
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Introduction

Bali is today a crossroads for domestic and international tourism that attracted over 8.6 million Indonesian visitors and more than 4.9 million foreign tourists in 2016 (Bali Government Tourism Office, http://www.disparda.baliprov.go.id/en/Statistics2). The latter come from Western countries – particularly Australia, Europe and North America – but also from Asia – China, Japan, Singapore, etc. Bali has in fact benefited from over a century of tourism development (Picard, 2010; Vickers, 2012), encouraging the redefinition not only of its economy but its societal organization (Hitchcock & Putra, 2007). In fact, tourism there has been boosted by the cultural and religious uniqueness of Bali – a small Hindu island within the largest Muslim country in the world, in terms of population. Tourism has taken advantage of what is available, yet has also changed its core offer. This tourism, which seems to have been an impelling force in Bali’s shift towards modernity, has produced significant effects on its social, cultural and religious organization (Picard, 1992, 2010; Vickers, 2012), as well as on its environment (Pickel-Chevalier, 2017; Pickel-Chevalier & Budarma, 2016). The enormous increase in tourism in Bali since the 1970s has created a double-edged phenomenon, boosting economic growth while generating growing feelings of discontent in relation to capital-intensive tourism development. Sentiments of this sort were identified as early as the 1990s (Picard & Vickers, 2017).

These reflections fused with the new international questions on the fairness of global development that emerged in the 1970s, leading to the creation of the sustainable development paradigm in Europe (1987) and therefore that of sustainable tourism (1992), which began to interest researchers in the social sciences field (Butler, 1999; Cater, 1993; Hunter, 1997; Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Liu, 2003, etc.). It is interesting to note that the quest for a different model of tourism, seeking to rebalance tourism development, arose as early as 1989 in Bali. It resulted in the creation of the Bali Sustainable Development Project (BSDP). The project ran from 1989 to 1994 (Yamashita, 2016, p. 134) and emphasized traditional Balinese culture as the foundation of sustainable tourism on the island. It favored the establishment in 1992 of the...
desa wisata terpadu policy which the Indonesian government defines as (cited in Yamashita, 2003, p. 104):

village areas which have an atmosphere reflecting the authenticity of the Balinese village in regards to social and cultural activities, everyday customs, buildings and the traditional use of space, which at the same time are able to provide the infrastructure, attractions, catering, and accommodation required for tourists.

Translated as ‘integrated touristic villages’, this model seeks to establish an archetypal of sustainable touristic development adapted to the characteristics of local villages in Indonesia.

As such, our objective is to question, 25 years after the creation of this policy, its capacity to do so. Therefore, we propose to analyze the ability of the desa wisata terpadu to meet the expectations of sustainable tourism which we understand to be a motor of global development and territorial integration, posing a challenge to researchers in social sciences, and to geographers in particular in their study of communities interacting with their environment. We embrace Hunter’s (1997, p. 860) notion that ‘The remit of sustainable tourism is extended to consider the role of tourism in contributing to sustainable development more generally’.

Because Bali remains the most important touristic destination in Indonesia, we have focused our study on this special case. As of 2017, 44 villages were officially registered on the island by the Ministry of Tourism of Indonesia as belonging to this category. Not all of them are perceived to be successful. Although our ultimate objective is to study a wide range of villages, including those less successful ones in order to also examine the constraints in their development, we decided to start with the detailed analysis of three of the most famous, considered by local and national authorities as model examples: Penglipuran, Tenganan and Jatiluwih (Figure 1).

Our objective is to understand is which ways they are defined as ‘successful’, according to the double expectation of the desa wisata terpadu policy and the sustainable tourism paradigm. In this context, even if we generally adopt Farrell’s (1999) ‘trinity’ definition of sustainability which posits the interpenetration of economic, social and environmental issues, in this study we focus only on the economic and socio-cultural effects of tourism in the villages. We can justify this choice, first, because of the definition of the desa wisata terpadu that prioritizes those issues over environmental ones; and second because we have already worked on the complexity of the tourism effect on nature in Bali, combining the two opposite phenomena of transformation and conservation (Pickel-Chevalier, 2017; Pickel-Chevalier and Budarma, 2016).

Thus, we question the ways in which the desa wisata terpadu can be an efficient model of sustainable tourism development in Bali, by examining for each village:

- **its economic sustainability**, analyzing whether tourism brings economic development to the villages, and challenges, or not, the previous traditional agricultural system;
- **its social sustainability**, questioning the capacity of tourism to foster cohesion among the inhabitants by maintaining, or on the contrary restructuring, the traditional local organization of the villages. We consider notably the evolution of the
role of women and the propensity of tourism to facilitate, or not, their emancipation;

- *its cultural sustainability*, studying the complex effects of tourism on the preservation of local heritage, questioning the seemingly contradictory double movement of conservation/reinvention of traditions.

The contribution to knowledge that our work offers lies in a better understanding of an attempt to create an Indonesian model of sustainable tourism development, with the ambition to meet both international expectations and respect local traditional society, through three original models. The results of our work may be of interest to researchers and students in geography and in the social sciences in general, who are involved with sustainability issues, and/or the socio-economic and environmental effects of tourism in Indonesia and in Bali in particular. It should also be of interest to institutions and professionals working on the establishment of sustainable models of tourism in Bali or elsewhere in the world, illustrating the complex appropriation of a western paradigm into non-western societies and the flexibility and understanding of local cultures that it requires.

**Material and methods**

The aim of our work is to provide an in-depth understanding of tourism in particular sites in Bali, comparing the official definition (*desa wisata terpadu*) and objective (a model of sustainable development adapted to the characteristics of the local villages) to field analysis. Our epistemological position is structuralist constructivism, defined by Pierre Bourdieu as:
By structuralism [...] I mean that in the social world there exist [...] objective structures independent of the conscience and will of the agents, able to influence or dictate their practices or representations. By constructivism, I mean that there is a social genesis, on one hand, of the schemes of perception, thinking and actions that are constitutive of what I name habitus; and on the other hand, of the social structures, and in particular what I call fields (Bourdieu, 1987, p. 5).

This position postulates:

- First the need to take into account the cognition and subjectivity of the researcher. In this context, our research is based on a cross-cultural and multidisciplinary analysis, thanks to the partnership between a French geographer, a Balinese economist and a Balinese anthropologist. This collaboration helps to relativize the habitus of the researchers influencing the construction of their study object.

- Second the phenomenological relations of the studied populations with physical, historical and social structures. In the field of geography, it means that ‘The geographical spaces are the built production of human societies with natural materials, through their representations and techniques’ (Di Méo, 2016, p. 1). This approach induces the importance of a dialogism between theoretical models and fieldwork that favors the understanding of the complexity of social phenomena (Le Moigne, 1995; Morin, 1986). In this context, we argue that Geography, that is ‘neither idio- graphic neither nomothetic, since it is both’ (Scheibling, 2015, p. 231) is in a privileged position to study both the physical and phenomenological relationships of societies to territories, but within a dialog with other disciplines that favor a better understanding of the complexity (Morin, 1986).

As such, to analyze the ability of the ‘desa wisata terpadu’ to be an agent of sustainable development in Bali, meeting both international expectations and the local needs, we based our work on a multi-case-study methodology (Yin, 2018). Our ambition is to use empirical evidence from the three different sites, to compare their differences and similarities, in order to build a more holistic picture. This method provides access to data through a wide variety of tools, mixing secondary data with primary material which we collected and analyzed ourselves. In this context, we combine historical and statistical analyses with the results of our qualitative survey and our observations in the three villages selected. Although tourism research includes a wide range of methods (Richards & Munsters, 2010), we award priority to a qualitative approach that engages with those involved in this policy at different levels. We have chosen a qualitative approach that enables a deep understanding of the behavior, the social practices, but in particular the mental representations of the actors we interviewed, from the people in charge to the residents. We did not undertake a quantitative survey as that would not have allowed such precision. Besides, this method requires a large number of answers to be relevant, whereas the parent-population of the three villages remains small.

For these reasons, we implemented a qualitative project including a total of 42 hours of in-depth semi-structured individual interviews at Sahid Institute in Jakarta (December 2016) and in the villages (March 2017 and March 2018) and with a total of 12 people. The interviewees were both digitally recorded to provide a register of all
the answers and written down in notebooks for safety reasons (in case we had a technical problem with the recording). We examine the integrated touristic village policy, a top-down system which begins at the national decision-making level (Ministry of Tourism), from which it moves on to the local managers who are responsible for its application, and finally, the village residents it brings into the process. This led us to identify and interview the following social actors: (1) two representatives of the desa wisata terpadu policy working within the Ministry of Tourism in Jakarta, seeking to understand policy objectives and modus operandi, (2) nine village residents, among them five women, with diverse responsibilities in tourism development and (3) one Balinese tourist guide who takes tourists to the three villages, thus offering us an outsider’s perception of what recent evolutions in tourism of this type offers.

Those interviewed are (to preserve their anonymity we have provided just the first capital letter of their name) – Table 1.

We have access to the Ministry of Tourism through the relationship between the Universities of Angers and Sahid, some of whose academics are involved with the desa wisata terpadu policy. We made an appointment by telephone with the community leader and tourism manager in Penglipuran in order to organize interviews with them in the village. The inhabitants, both men and women, who we interviewed in the villages, were selected randomly during our stay because they were involved in tourism activities at different levels. We chose this random method to provide a more representative range of answers (they were not pre-selected). The interviews were conducted in English when the respondents could speak English, or in Balinese with simultaneous translation into English by the Balinese researchers when they could not. Finally, Mr. K. was selected by the Balinese members of the team for his long experience as a tourist guide for both domestic and international tourists in Bali.

The above-mentioned interviews were combined with a total of around 150 hours of participant observation (a total of 4 days at each site, with overnight stays in Jatiluwih and Penglipuran), conducted on-site in March 2017 and 2018. The results were manually coded and analyzed theme by theme differentiating, according to the subjects, the national and local authorities; the inhabitants – men and women could have different questions – and the guide. The objective was to understand the societal and geographical organization of each village but also to experience their tourism offers, examining their ability to reach sustainability criteria while respecting local specificities, emphasizing their strengths, difficulties and limits.

Although we combined secondary and primary data in our research, the purpose of our results and discussion section is not to introduce any new literature, but rather to use previously reviewed and presented literature to defend and position the results of the study.

Results and discussions

Are the desa wisata terpadu villages economically sustainable?

The tourism development of traditional villages: three opening process patterns

We chose three villages that are considered successful by the Chief of the Jury for the desa wisata terpadu policy, Mr. K., according to their visitor numbers, but also their
Table 1. Interviewed persons and topics of their interviews.

   Topic: The history of the policy; its objectives and global strategy.
2. Mr. P., 40 year old, male, Dec. 2016 – Facilitator for integrated touristic village development, Head of Tourism Department, Sahid Institute.
   Topic: The selection criteria, management; difficulties of the desa wisata terpadu policy; the successful ones and using which criteria; the less successful ones and the constraints.
3. Mr. I., 60 year old, male, March 2017 – Community leader and Penglipuran resident, in charge of managing all operational activities in the traditional village.
   Topic: History of the village; how administrative village (desa dinas) and traditional village (desa adat) laws are articulated; how tourism is managed in relation to both regulatory systems that are at work in the village; views on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing tourism model.
4. Mr. W., 30 year old, male, March 2017 – In charge of tourism management, under the supervision of Mr. I., and inhabitant of Penglipuran.
   Topic: Village tourism statistics; tourism management and its articulation with customary law; the socio-economic transformations brought about by tourism; views on the strengths and weaknesses of the existing tourism model.
   Topic: Her work, age, status at home and in the village; her dependence on/independence from her husband for money/decision-making; her perception of the evolution of her role in the community, and in her family, thanks to her work; her perception of the evolution of women’s status in the village thanks to tourism, now and in the future; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
   Topic: Her work, age, status at home and in the village; her dependence on/independence from her husband for money/decision-making; her perception of the evolution of her role in the community, and in her family thanks to her work; her perception of the evolution of women’s status in the village thanks to tourism, now and in the future; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
   Topic: Her work, age, status at home and in the village; her dependence on/independence from her husband for money/decision-making; her perception of the evolution of her role in the community, and in her family thanks to her work; her perception of the evolution of women’s status in the village thanks to tourism, now and in the future; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
   Topic: His work, age, status in the community and family; the socio-economic transformations brought about by tourism, including its impact on the division of labor; the evolution of the role of women and young people within traditional society; the local population’s involvement in tourism management and engagement with external actors; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
   Topic: His work, age, status in the community and family; the socio-economic transformations brought about by tourism, including its impact on the division of labor; the evolution of the role of women and young people within traditional society; the local population’s involvement in tourism management and engagement with external actors; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
10. Mr. N., 50 year old, male, March 2017 – Tenganan village inhabitant and tourist guide.
    Topic: His work, age, status in the community and family; the socio-economic transformations brought about by tourism, including its impact on the division of labor; the evolution of the role of women and young people within traditional society; the local population’s involvement in tourism management and engagement with external actors; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
    Topic: Her work, age, status at home and in the village; her dependence on/independence from her husband for money/decision-making; her perception of the evolution of her role in the community, and in her family thanks to her work; her perception of the evolution of women’s status in the village thanks to tourism, now and in the future; the positive and negative effects of tourism on traditional culture and identity.
12. Mr. T., 36 year old, male, March 2017 – Balinese tourist guide.
    Topic: How accessibility and quality of services in the villages have evolved, as well as the behavior, satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the tourists who visit them.

respect for the policy which requires the conservation of traditional village organization. These three villages are also very famous among the Balinese population and have received various kinds of awards or recognition. Although they are differently
organized, they have all maintained partial dependence on agriculture. Their inhabitants chose to open their villages to tourism several decades ago, leading them to establish a new, complex and delicate balance combining traditional and touristic cultures.

Penglipuran is a ‘customary village’. According to Mr. K., there are two political bodies in Bali: the administrative villages (desa dinas) and the customary villages (desa adat). Administrative villages apply national laws, whereas customary villages are in charge of the preserving traditions, culture and religion. Penglipuran is located in Bangli regency in a mountainous region. It covers an area of 112 hectares composed of 45 ha of bamboo forest, 58 ha of farmland and 9 ha of settlements. The village is regarded as traditional, particularly due to the layout of houses, respecting the Balinese religion which is a syncretic blend of shivaque Hinduism, Buddhism, and previous local animism. Our observation allowed us to observer that the houses are characterized by their regularity, placed on both sides of the main street which boasts a narrow entrance adorned by a gate and houses that stretch back towards the rear. The entrances to 50 out of the 76 houses in the village are used as shops (Figure 2). Penglipuran was declared an integrated touristic village in April 1993. It is regarded as the most successful of all the integrated villages, estimated by community leader Mr. I. and Mr. W. who is in charge of village tourism management to welcome over 250,000 tourists a year – the number of tourist stays is estimated for each village, since the local tourism management does not always keep a precise account of tourist visits. This has resulted in the establishment of 30 private homestays and 3 guest houses which are run by the community. Tourist attractions in addition to the architecture of the village include, according to Mr. W., dance performances, dancing and gamelan classes, trekking up Mount Batur and the Penglipuran Festival. The village received several awards and notably the Asia green homestay in 2014. It was ranked among the three top tourist destinations in Indonesia in 2016.

Jatiluwih is both an administrative and customary village. It is located in a rice paddy area, situated in the bottom of the Batukaru Mountain in the Tabanan regency. It is famous as one of the emblematic sites of the traditional irrigation system, or subak, and was registered on the UNESCO heritage list in 2012 as the ‘Cultural landscape of the province of Bali: the subak system as an example of the Tri Hita Karana philosophy’ (http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1194/). This listed system consists of a collection of 4 sites of rice terraces and their water temples covering 19,500 ha. It is worth noting here that the main objective of UNESCO classification is to conserve cultural and traditional social organization as well as the quality of the ‘natural’ landscape. The subak remains a living social organization, involving about 1200 water cooperatives and their populations, who manage the supply from each water source. Their continued existence is currently at risk. Jatiluwih village was selected to become an integrated touristic village in 1992. Its subak is amongst the oldest in Bali, mentioned as early as the 10th century in inscriptions, extending over 303 ha and including 562 farming households and 7 communities in 2015. It is the biggest subak in Catur Angga Batukaru and the one which has invested the most in its tourism dynamic, with the construction of accommodation options. According to Mrs. A., the accountant for tourism management in the village, Jatiluwih offers 5 homestays, 1 resort with 10 rooms and 5
restaurants. Mrs. A. claimed that in 2016 Jatiluwih was visited by 213,509 tourists, whereas in 2017 the figure reached 250,973, representing an increase of 17.5%.

Lastly, there is Tenganan, which is also both an administrative and customary village. Located in the Karangasem regency and regarded as one of the most traditional Balinese villages, it was also selected to become a desa wisata terpadu. Recognized by European anthropologists prior to the 1970s as one of the island’s most secluded societies, Tenganan became famous for maintaining the Bali Aga, considered to be the original Balinese culture that predates the Hindu-Javanese immigration waves beginning in the 9th century. Its characteristics emerge from the preservation of some of the original Austronesian elements apparent in its cultural traditions, especially concerning marriage and membership of the village circle: only those born in the village can become full members of the community and get married in the village. However, Mr. N. explained:

This fact results in the problem of a decreasing population. In 1972, scientists came to conduct blood-tests to find the reason for this situation. They identified a genetic disease. Since that time, we have changed the law to allow marriage outside the village and organize a ceremony to allow them to be ‘reborn’ as a Tenganan inhabitant.

Besides, contrary to the rest Bali, the community is not led by a patriarchal system: ‘men and women have the same rights today regarding life and land ownership’ emphasized Mrs. Y. As such, the community leaders are not only men, but six couples (husbands and wives). As early as the year 1930, the isolated character of this village made it an attraction. According to the tourist guide Mr. T., tourists are attracted by
the Bali Aga culture that still holds on to the original traditions and ceremonies of the ancient Balinese, and by their traditional handcrafts such as the famous Geringsing double ikat textiles. They are also interested in the maintenance of the traditional layout and architecture. Although the village has developed tourism activities for almost the last 90 years, their inhabitants have chosen the restricted variety. M. N. explained: ‘There is no homestay in the village, to protect the culture and the life of the people, and not to disturb things too much. Visiting is ok but staying overnight is not allowed’. As such, there are no homestays available, to preserve the privacy of the villagers. According to M. N., they welcome around 30,000 tourists a year, with the biggest concentration in June and July at the time of the ‘Pandan Battle’ ritual tradition, consisting of friendly tournaments during a whole month of festivities.

The three villages offer different patterns of tourism development that depend on the choice of their community. Nonetheless, behind their diversity, their common characteristic is, according to M. P., their capacity to build tourism activities out of their traditions. Thus, our objective is to examine this process, since opening a living culture up to the public induces changes and evolution which can run deep in its attempts to reconcile the needs of the contemporary inhabitants and the expectations of the diverse contingent of tourists. The aim of these communities, as well as of the public authorities who work with them, is to use tourism to develop the villages, with the dual aim of favoring better living conditions for the inhabitants and helping them to maintain their traditional culture. We will now analyze if and how tourism has brought economic development to the studied villages.

**Economic development through diversification**

Despite their differences, the three integrated touristic villages studied here reveal some similarities in their social organization. They are more touristic sites than real destinations, by which we mean that they are more a place to visit than to stay. This is a definitive choice that has been made regarding Tenganan, as claimed by M. N., yet even in Penglipuran and Jatiluwih less than 10% of the tourists spend one night or more in the village. M. W., in charge of tourism management in Penglipuran, explained: ‘Most of the tourists only spend one day visiting. Only around 5% or 10% spend 2 days and 1 night or more’. The average time spent visiting Penglipuran and Tenganan is, according to our observations, even less, between one and three hours, depending on whether they take a local tour guide or visit freely. In Jatiluwih, the average time spent is longer: as indicated by the guide Mr. T., tourists stay between 2 and 6 hours in general depending on the trekking option they choose – lasting from 45 min to 4 hours (Figure 3) – and because people often enjoy the accommodation options – restaurants and cafes before or after trekking in the paddy. Some stay overnight to make several treks.

Thus, tourism in the three villages remains limited, in accordance with the expectations of the desa wisata terpadu as well as the philosophy of ‘alternative tourism’ which expects tourism to remain a diversification of the traditional economy by contributing to its maintenance. In Penglipuran, according to M. I. the village community leader, ‘Around 40% of the local population are farmers, 20% are government workers, 10% are cruise workers and 30% are tourism workers’. In Tenganan, the division of
work is complex since families accumulate multiple activities. M. N. explained that one third of village land is private and two thirds belongs to the communities. As such, even if less than 20% of people own land and are solely devoted to farming, most have regular agricultural activities as tenant farmers on private land or as users of the community land. He confirmed that:

around 30% of the villagers work in the production of handicrafts and most specifically in itak weaving, that is, making baskets from ata leaves or calligraphy on palm leaves called lontar. These producers can sell their products to the villagers who own shops in the main street of the villages, but also at outdoor markets or directly to the tourists from their own street stalls.

Thus, even if community leaders estimate that 30% of the population works in tourism (essentially shop-keepers and tourist guides), for most families it constitutes a secondary activity. The rest of the villagers (around 20%) work outside the village, in public and private areas.

In Jatiluwih, the community still lives by the subak system. Although not everyone works in the rice fields, the form of social organization that it imposes remains predominant. Furthermore, half of the 562 farming households are land-owners, holding property of different sizes. Agriculture continues to be the primary activity, yet has diversified. Mr. M. explained that rice production is still the number one activity, yet coffee, cacao and flowers are also produced. Tourism has become the main activity for some of the villagers who own the restaurants or resorts, but is still a form of diversification for most of the farmers offering homestays. Tourist guides are essentially farmers who are paid by the community to work for 15-day shifts before going back to the rice fields. Few of them, as yet, are actually able to take part in these activities, since not many of them speak English, and are thereby able to welcome those tourists who are predominantly international. As Mr. M. confided: 'Not all the farmers work in tourism in Jatiluwih, because not all the farmers can speak English. There are only five people working as guides in shifts'.

Tourism undoubtedly favors the economic development of the villages, allowing the maintenance of their population and even permitting slight growth since the second decade of the 21st century. Tenganan and Penglipuran each have around 230 families and Jatiluwih has more than 560 families. Tourism may not bring them wealth, yet it allows them to live in their village as part of the middle class, ranging from lower to higher. As such, Mr. N. from Tenganan said that the money he earns with his wife, he as a tourist guide and she as a producer and seller of gringsing to tourists, is enough for a good life in the village. Mr. I., community leader in Penglipuran, stated that: 'Tourism provides a positive impact for the economic development of the village; many of the villagers open small shops inside their houses, allowing them to reach middle-class positions'. However Mr. N. in Jatiluwih claimed: 'The quality of life for the farmers is poor or medium. Tourism brings better opportunities but people remain generally at a medium level'. This status is contingent upon the previous social position of the family, but also on its capacity to invest in tourism opportunities.

Our initial finding regarding the three cases studied, and which are considered 'successful', is that tourism brings economic development to the villages through
diverse patterns that depend on local investment and strategies. Their economic sustainability remains, nonetheless, fragile: if tourism allows for a diversification of activities which provide income and an improvement in living conditions, they remain moderate, without bringing wealth to the local population. Besides, this economic development and redistribution created by the tourism development of the villages, also raises the question of its social sustainability. Does tourism help to generate cohesion among the inhabitants by maintaining/respecting the local traditional organization, or does it on the contrary generate restructuring, including the transformation of the role of women?

**Does desa wisata terpadu preserve or restructure the villages? The social effects of tourism**

**A sustainable community-based tourism?**

The three villages studied here are characterized by a community-based management style, following the rules of the customary village. It was in the wake of this traditional societal organization that, in the 2010s, formal tourism organizations remaining under community management were created. Thus, the *desa wisata terpadu* meet the definition of community-based tourism, characterized according to Mowforth and Munt (2016, p. 103) by its capacity ‘to increase people’s involvement and ownership of tourism at the destination end’. The three villages respect the essence of the concept,
relying on the involvement of the local population in inviting tourists to visit their communities, generating income and employment. It also enables common benefits, since all villages use tourism development for, above all, community improvement. In each village, almost 60% of revenue from entry-tickets is retained by the communities for the organization of rituals and ceremonies. The rest is used for building maintenance in public areas and community activities, such as the regular organization of village councils. As Mrs. A., an accountant in Jatiluwih, explained: ‘The money goes to the community organization for rituals and public activities, so the villagers do not have to pay for the cost of them’.

Tourism in the village is also based on the idea of offering tourists the possibility of discovering local traditions and lifestyles, even if the process of tourism conversion induces adaptation, as M. P., facilitator for integrated touristic village development recalls. Nonetheless, the ability to meet western standards of accommodation and services varies from one village to another. According to our observations, we can emphasize that in Jatiluwih, the restaurants facing the rice fields meet those standards, as does the resort. Homestays in Penglipuran function at a more basic level, providing only frugal services. Wi-Fi is available nowhere except the front office. In Tenganan, the services are even more limited. A phone service is available only at the front gate, for use in case of emergency.

The differences in situation from one village to the next arise from a combination of economic capacity and local resistance to the requests of foreign tourism companies, as is the case in Tenganan. This situation seems to testify to the community’s ability to control their tourism development, as suggested by Mowforth and Munt (2016). Nonetheless, negotiation is never uncomplicated. Tourism is a ‘system of actors, activities and places’ (Knafou and Stock, 2003, p. 931) that mobilizes a combination of participants at every level, from global to local, including tourists themselves who, through their choices and activities, can be understood as co-producers of touristic sites. As such, the tourism development of the villages we studied further depends on the initiative of the public authorities. This impulse takes shape through communication, equipment and accessibility. As Mr. P. confirmed:

As integrated touristic villages, the three destinations have been included within Educational Tours, but have also relied on social networking with travel agencies. Besides, local governments have provided all of them with parking and safe roads in good condition in order to allow proper accessibility.

International institutions such as UNESCO may also play an important role, such as in the case of the village of Jatiluwih.

In this regard, it becomes clear that public authorities and international institutions are essential elements in the creation of a tourism project, providing scope through vision. However, without the deep involvement of the community, blueprints cannot go beyond mere good intentions. According to Iwahara (2016), the different ‘alternative’ tourism projects in Bali only succeed when locally appropriated and integrated into the previous village organization. In fact, according to M. K., only a few integrated touristic villages in Bali really work, and all of those that are successful can be characterized by a similar combination of actors, articulated through the strong contribution of the local population. Tourism management, as well as tourism
companies inside the villages, is all owned by the residents, even if they are able to employ outside staff when the need arises, although local skills may not be up to par, as is the case for the restaurants in Jatiluwih. All decisions connected to tourism remain community-based, incorporating traditional forms of organization based on common decisions made during regular meetings. As Mr. N. from Tenganan explained:

Bale agung is a meeting hall for the council, held every night, which the 6 main couples will attend. The meeting takes place from 8:30 pm. The agenda of the meeting is to solve any problem in the village’s daily life, including tourism management.

Penglipuran and Jatiluwih have developed the same kind of daily organization, even if the structure of the banjar is different, with only male members.

The three integrated touristic villages we study here can be defined as community-based tourism. Nonetheless this status does not protect them from societal difficulties. As we stated earlier, tourism, like all other human activities, brings about socio-economic changes (Knafou and Pickel-Chevalier, 2011) that can create tensions. The first negative impact that all those we interviewed mentioned is ‘the increasing competitiveness of the villagers which decreases harmony among the villagers’ as Mr. I., community leader of Penglipuran, regretfully revealed. Indeed, besides the income generated from entry-tickets, which is reserved for the community, the inhabitants of the villages are allowed to have their own businesses. In this manner, tourism brings about wealth redistribution that has generated a socio-economic evolution. It changes the atmosphere of the villages, which may then be perceived as ‘too commercial, with a different distribution of the economic profits that creates competition among villagers’ complained Mr. N. from Tenganan.

Communities are aware of this situation and try to find innovative solutions to at least decrease competition between tourism business owners. As such, local tourist guides are booked through the front office in all three villages, in order to establish a rotation system between them. This same philosophy is applied in Penglipuran for the reservation of homestays, as Mr. W. explained:

The village management has created a system called ‘take turn’ to prevent disloyal competition, especially for the reservation of homestays. Tourists who want to rent a room call or come to the front office and are given the homestay that has waited longest for a booking, in order to distribute rooms equally.

Furthermore, tourists who come to the villages on their own have access to all the houses that are open to tourism to buy souvenirs, but the ones who hire a local guide also follow the rotation system. Thus, if tourism inevitably brings social disparities to the villages, the question is above all, as Buckley (2012) reminds us, about what is ‘acceptable’ in terms of equality or inequality. In each village, the inhabitants have devised systems based on their own values and meant to promote an ‘acceptable’ balance for them, between customary ways and the inequality brought about by tourism. In this context, in order to maintain the traditional way of life, we observed that all three communities have concentrated tourism activity only in the main street. In Jatiluwih it is the main road, overlooking the rice fields, which is designed to receive most of the tourist infrastructure (accommodation, restaurants, parking areas, shops). In Penglipuran and Tenganan that do not have a view point of this kind, the tourist shops and services are located on the central street, whereas the rest of the village
remains traditional and not necessarily welcoming for the tourists who dare to venture there – they can be politely accompanied back to the main street where they are supposed to be. In Tenganan, especially, we observed a clear desire to keep a distance between today’s life and tourist activities which all need to stop in the evening.

**Tourism and women’s emancipation: a social improvement?**

Tourism also breeds complex social evolution, such as that regarding the place of women in society. Traditionally, Balinese society remains patriarchal, with some rare exceptions such as Tenganan, where the village council is led by six couples. In the other villages, although Balinese Hinduism officially claims that men and women are born free and have the same rights and duties, in reality, social position varies considerably according to gender (Long and Kindon, 1997). The desa adat rules are based on oral or written codes (awig-awig) which can differ from one village to the next (Hitchcock and Putra, 2007). Nonetheless, the desa adat are all composed of several banjars, which are more social subdivisions than real territorial ones. According to Byczek (2016, p. 221), the banjars can be ‘regarded as the most important reference group of the Balinese’. Yet these banjars are made up of married men, traditionally considered to be the head of the family. They meet at least several times a month, in order to oversee the religious and traditional life of the inhabitants. Women can participate by giving their opinion, especially to their husband, but are not able to make official decisions.

However, tourism is bringing about evolution in this arena. As observed in different countries (Cone, 1995; Moore & Wen, 2008; Sinclair, 1997; Swain, 1995), women who invest in tourism activities enjoy increased autonomy, which in turn slightly increases their social power, even if this does not mean actual equity. As stated by Sinclair (1997, p. 3): ‘Women obtain some power by providing men with increased material resources, while men retain much of their power owing to the persistence of many facets of traditional gender roles’. As such, in the three villages studied here, and according to our observations and interviews, women rarely have supervisory positions yet, but shops, homestays and even restaurants are mostly female-managed (Figure 4). In our study Mrs. R. owns a restaurant and homestay whereas Mrs. O. and Mrs. S. are souvenir traders in Penglipuran. As for Mrs. Y., she is a geringsing producer who create cloth and textiles to be sold.

This situation flows from the fact that these types of establishment and activity are more or less directly attached to the home, traditionally the women’s sphere. Thus, as Costa et al. (2017) argue social reproductive gender roles (taking care of the house and hosts) may influence productive roles (welcoming tourists). These activities give women the possibility to progress from the home-based informal economy to the formal economy, awarding them greater societal visibility. Nonetheless, even as business owners, women may remain under the tutelage of their spouse. As such, Mrs. S. said: ‘I still depend on my husband to take decisions, especially about money’, even if she earns her own from her business. The other women we interviewed made closely-related statements, but with some nuances. Mrs. N. explained that she can manage her own money, but only for specific activities. She explained to us that: ‘I can use my money by myself, but only for daily needs. More specifically, I use around 25% for kitchen utensils, 25% for religious ceremonies and 50% for the venture capital of my
Mrs. R. claimed that she can manage her own money, then reconsidered and added: ‘sometimes…’ Finally, Mrs. A., who is younger (23 years old, whereas the others are between 40 and 50), stated: ‘I was given the full right to use the money I earned for my needs, but I still partly gave it to my family’. These statements reveal different types of behavior, and maybe an evolution according to the generation, but which still depend on the openness of the husband who can allow, or not, his wife to be more independent. However, all the women we interviewed considered that working in tourism has brought them greater consideration in the village and at home. Mrs. R. refers to these changes asserting, ‘Now, my opinion is more taken in account!’ They all testified that working in tourism has brought them more respect from their family and from the community. In addition, they think that tourism generally brings about an improvement for women in the villages, because it gives them more visibility and relative independence. As such, Mrs. S. emphasized ‘tourism in my village results in better living conditions, especially for women because now women can be souvenir traders and run other businesses’, whereas Mrs. R. claimed: ‘Tourism is very good, because women can supplement the family income, and not always depend on the husband’.

Although gender prejudice persists – seen for example, in the preference for male guides, as it is not socially acceptable for a woman to be alone with foreign men – tourism activities accrue women a greater degree of social power, all the more so when combined with education, as demonstrated previously in other case studies (Tajeddini, Ratten, & Denisa, 2017). Education creates new opportunities to access formal sector jobs and even management roles, particularly within national and international companies. Today women may have access to the highest responsibilities in Indonesia, such as government ministries. In 2001, a woman became the President of Indonesia (2001–2004). This paradoxical situation shows the gap between the evolution of administrative and traditional

Figure 4. Woman in her shop selling Geringsing and souvenirs, on the main street of Tenganan, Authors’ photo, used with permission, 2017.
life, the latter still attached to a patriarchal system (despite some exceptions, such as in Tenganan or in Minangkabau in Western Sumatra). The maintenance of this local tradition can also be detrimental to village wealth. According to all the respondents we interviewed, the main problem villages face comes from the lack of a workforce with professional tourism skills. As such, Mr. W. stated that their major problem in Penglipuran is ‘the lack of human resources to work in the village because they cannot pay them high salaries. For now, there is no salary paid to the tourism managers in the village. Like me, they have to be volunteers, in addition to having another professional activity’. Indeed the local young people, who go to big cities to study, most often choose to stay in the southern region of Bali. There they work for international and national tourism companies, enjoy higher salaries and more comfortable daily lives and conditions (Bendesa & Aksari, 2017). This is all the more the case for young women, who are able to attain higher social status through access to top positions in companies, whereas within the villages they are barred from banjar decision making (except in Tenganan). Thus, even if there are more tourism opportunities in the resort and restaurants in Jatiluwih than in the other villages, Mrs. A. confessed: ‘In my opinion, the employment created in traditional villages is still limited. That is why, in my view, when someone, especially women, acquire higher education qualifications, they normally look for jobs outside their village’.

This skills drain is a crucial problem for the future of the village, since young educated villagers appear to be the key to allowing the community to work towards the construction of a local socio-economic balance, combining conservation and adaptation to the modern world. Their knowledge of customs, combined with tourism management skills, is important in this regard, as shown by the cases of Mr. W., SMK (vocational school) graduate, and Mr. M., who graduated from the Negeri Singaraja School. Yet, the temptation for young people to leave their native villages and emigrate to big cities with higher economic potential is all the more important in the cases we study here because the monetary returns on tourism remain low. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that between 45% and 60% of the entry ticket price goes directly to the region, leaving the community with the remainder. In order to escape from this situation, the leaders of Tenganan decided not to collect fees at the entrance. As Mr. N. explained: ‘There is no revenue from tickets; there are no tickets, we only receive donations from visitors. The idea is to avoid the regional government tax from the revenue. The income goes solely to the village’. This system, which is not completely legal, is also risky since the community depends on the generosity of visitors, without any fixed prices. This complex situation weakens the social sustainability of the development model for the villages that are then at risk of being locked into a ‘vicious cycle’, with a lack of qualified human resources limiting their capacity for economic growth, and a lack of material wealth that encourages their inhabitants to leave.

**Does tourism enhance or re-invent heritage? A combination of cultural tourism and touristic culture**

**Tourism and culture: a co-construction**

Villages are characterized by a complex process involving the constant reconstruction of local societal models, combining conservation and innovation. This phenomena
further identifies the ambiguous relationships between communities and their heritage. The latter is defined by O. Lazzarotti (2003, p. 692) as ‘a set of attributes, performances and activities attached to a non-contemporary object […]’. This means that not everything is heritage: its determination results from collective choices, promoting construction of memory through the recognition of common milestones, as Richards (2000) has demonstrated. Based on a Western principle of linearity of time, this notion of heritage results in a distancing of the past in relation to the present as linked to the phenomenon of ring-fencing. The past is therefore fixed so as to be protected in its current state and shared with future generations. This choice to ring-fence memory requires complicated relationships with culture, defined as ‘the grouping together of ideal products available in a given social reality’ (Lussault, 2003, p. 216).

In some ways, heritage which fixes the assets of the distant past is then opposed to culture, enshrined in a contemporary time-frame and therefore subject to constant change, under internal but also external influences. The complexity of the relationship of the Balinese to their heritage (Picard, 2017; Vickers, 2012) comes from the fact that, although partially a legacy from a previous generation, it cannot be ring-fenced into the past, but remains a part of their contemporary culture. Thus, Balinese society illustrates the continuous process of reinvention of tradition, as in the concept developed by Hobsbawm and Ranger (2012). It is a process to which tourism contributes, through complex relationships. The dialectic between tourism and heritage, one feeding off the other (Richards, 2000) stems from the fact that tourism comes partly from the enhancement of the natural and cultural environment that it covets and transforms, due as much to modernization as to forms of preservation that are based on arbitrary fixations (Pickel-Chevalier, 2014).

Tourism as an ambivalent agent of cultural reinvention, questioning Balinese identity

This ambiguous co-construction is very relevant in the three villages that we studied. Rather than threatening or enhancing local heritage, tourism helps to revitalize it, moving from the inspiration of legacy to the reality of reinvention. The village of Tenganan, for example, is notably famous for the production of geringsing, a textile created using the double ikat method with traditional natural colors. Geringsing is regarded by the Balinese as sacred cloth, endowed with supernatural properties to keep impurities and danger out of the village as well as protecting humans from baleful influences. As Mrs. Y. explained:

Many people from other villages in Bali and from abroad come to here to buy geringsing, because it is used in ritual ceremonies, especially for the transition from one phase of life to the next, like baby birthing ceremonies, tooth filling ceremonies, and other rituals. It is also used in case of animal sickness. The color of geringsing makes it very sacred for healing and for protecting people from bad spirits. The word gering means sickness, and sing means no, so geringsing means ‘no sickness’. It is made up of 3 natural colors: black that represents liquid; red for heat; and yellow for the air. The combination of all three in the pattern provides balance, keeping the three body element in harmony. We traditionally have 25 motifs, such as the Cakra motif, puppet motif, cempaka motif, tali dandan motif.

The quality of the weaving, reinforced by its mystical reputation, helps to spread the Geringsing’s fame, now well known among the international tourist population. To
meet increasing demand, the production process has changed, offering varying qualities at different prices. Mrs. Y. stated that:

Originally to make geringsing, we needed two and a half years. If the first coloring is not good, we have to dye the thread several times to get the color, every six months. Now the drying process in the sun can be faster: we can make geringsing in only a few months, but the color fades, so we need to soak the thread many times to get a bright color. We have three different qualities at different prices, but each family has to keep one of very good quality for their own ceremonies.

This adaptation favors the continuity of local production, as heritage but also as a contemporary culture providing a living for nearly 50 families in the village (Figure 5).

This situation is also reflected in the Pandan Battle that has become the biggest attraction in the village. The tradition is based on friendly duels between all the male villagers, who fight each other armed with a tied packet of thorny ‘pandan’ leaves. According to tradition, participating in the Pandan Battle is an obligation for Tenganan males, and serves as a rite of passage into manhood for young men. Today this tradition has become doubly crucial for the inhabitants: in addition to its ritual meaning, it is also an important source of income for the village. According to M. N., it attracts around 300 tourists a day during the month-long ceremony. For this reason, the event has been re-thought and adapted to accommodate a large stream of visitors, as Mr. N. explained. Today, even foreign males may take part in the fights, as part of the game. This is an example of how tourism may favor the creativity of the local population, but not without a certain ambiguity, insofar as the Balinese are expected to display and perform their ‘Balinese-ness’ (Kebalian: Balinese identity). The latter, of course, is not a fixed entity, but rather the result of a long historical and continuous process of transcultural construction, fed from influences which are internal (communities leaders, Balinese intelligencia) but also external (Picard, 2010, 2017).

Penglipuran also provides evidence of this phenomenon. Firstly, the so-called typical architecture of the houses and the layout of the village which has attracted thousands of tourists as a ‘traditional Balinese village’ is actually the outcome of repairs made for President Suharto’s planned visit in 1991 which in fact never took place (Yamashita, 2016, p. 135). This means that its aesthetic appearance is not the fruit of spontaneous historical evolution, but of a design that was made to fit expectations regarding a model of a ‘perfect’ traditional Balinese village, which today gives it its singularity and identity. This process is repeated with regard to village handicraft production. Today, inhabitants sell not only local products such as baskets made from bamboo or paintings on bamboo leaves, but also food and products which they buy in other markets to re-sell (fabric, coffee, food). That is why M.W. would like to encourage new creations from the inhabitants. He claimed:

Villagers produce their homemade food such as potato donuts, herbal drinks and many other things for their own consumption and for the tourists. Sometimes they sell it outside the village such as in the market. But they buy a lot of handicrafts outside the village and resell them at home. These are all the same which is why we need to make more local handicrafts, through our home production system, with the dual purpose of attracting tourism and increasing local identification.
These dynamics, which incorporate the invention of tradition, was initiated three years ago, around the Penglipuran village festival, a five-day culture and arts event organized in the month of December. According to Mr. I., the festival provides a better image of Penglipuran culture, even if it has been, in fact, created for the tourists.

This reinvention of culture, initially for tourism development but eventually reappropriated by the local population as a symbol of their pride, is also perceptible in the reshaping of the environment, from the productive land to the esthetic landscape. As such, the Penglipuran bamboo forest has been redesigned as a tourist walkway with the creation of paved paths through the woods and the marking out of different kinds of trees with explanatory signs. Jatiluwih village illustrates the most striking example of this territorial mutation by reconstructing the rice fields as a landscape. The fields are covered with trekking paths of varying lengths that run through the paddy (Figure 3). They all converge in front of the restaurants on the main street, offering a ‘view over the rice paddy’. This means that the community has begun to re-imagine their farming land as a playground which requires an element of planning. This induces the villagers to combine their own farming perception of the fields (fertility, productivity) with the foreign one (external spectators), bringing together two divergent
interpretations of the land – utilitarian versus scenic. Once again, we can here identify the complex effects of tourism: on the one hand it has severe effects on Balinese society and the environment, where many hectares of rice fields dramatically disappear every year under pressure from the building industry. On the other hand it has a paradoxical status as the major force behind the preservation of the rice paddy, redefined as a living heritage, a dynamic illustrated by its registration on the UNESCO world heritage list in 2012 as the ‘Cultural landscape of the province of Bali’.

**Conclusion**

The objective of our study was to question the sustainability of the desa wisata terpadu. We chose a multi-case methodology to exploit the empirical material to try and build a more holistic picture in order to understand, through the villages officially considered as successful for a start, their organization and modus operandi. In this context, we looked at consecutively Pengpliuran, Tenganan and Jatiluwih, their economic, social and cultural sustainability, mainly defined as a contribution to economic growth, social cohesion and cultural enhancement.

Our results show the complexity of the effects of tourism, which are always plural and sometimes contradictory. First, we can agree that our three case studies are successful because they meet the expectations of both the desa wisata terpadu and sustainable tourism policy, being based on ‘social and cultural activities, everyday customs, buildings and the traditional use of space’, and at ‘the same time [being] able to provide the infrastructure, attractions, catering, and accommodation required for tourists’. Their tourism development has brought income to the inhabitants that allow them to keep their community alive, as notably illustrated by the increase in their local populations. In addition, tourism in the three villages can be defined as community-based, respecting and integrating on the whole the previous social organization. We can argue that this achievement depends on the involvement of all the inhabitants. We observed that the three villages each proposed a singular pattern that has been collectively chosen in the village – according to the local organization that can include inequality in community decision-making, especially when linked to gender.

However, despite the apparent success of these so-called model examples of integrated touristic village, we can identify some limitations. First, if tourism brings about economic growth, it remains moderate. It is a diversification of activity that can enable the local population to reach middle-class status, but not wealth. As such, incomes are not high enough to persuade the young qualified generation to stay, and they are more tempted by making a career in the international resort in southern Bali. Yet, for the three villages, the lack of human resources is the main difficulty when it comes to securing the future of their community.

Second, we demonstrated that even within this ‘sustainable design’, tourism causes significant societal transformations. If the communities endeavor to maintain their traditional activities and ways of life, the process of opening villages up to the public requires changes – opening houses, transforming ceremonies, modifying practices that can even lead to a decrease in the original quality of products, etc. Besides, the
investment of the local population in tourism is not homogeneous. As such, tourism creates a redistribution of wealth, and hence of social position, that engenders restructuring and new inequalities between families. This situation can become a source of tension, perceived in the three villages as a ‘decrease of harmony’ between the inhabitants.

Nevertheless, these transformations are ambivalent since they can also contribute to the sustainability paradigm, based on a western ideology of equality and individual liberty. As a matter of fact, tourism clearly results in the empowerment of women. Admittedly it remains limited, hardly ever leading to gender equality. However, women today contribute substantially to the development of tourism in their village through the creation of services (accommodation, catering and production of handicrafts) that are associated with their traditional activities (household management, production of cloth and utensils such as baskets, etc.) This situation gives them the possibility of opening their businesses and earning their own money. Even if it does not, in the traditional villages dominated by the banjar system, give them total autonomy, it provides them with more visibility and respect, a fact that they are deeply grateful for.

In addition, our study also reveals that the complexity of tourism is clearly perceived by the local population, and they understand both the necessity to develop this activity and the difficulties that it generates. In the three villages, the respondents demonstrated their awareness of the ambiguous intrinsic relationships between their traditional activities and ways of life and their tourism development. Tourism is, above all, for them an instrument for maintaining their village which will be threatened by desertification without the economic diversification provided by tourism. However, the relationships between tradition and tourism remain complex, echoing the difficulties of trying to unite the conservation of culture with openness to modernity. This ambition takes shape in different ways in the three villages, but it is also a dynamic motor for the revitalization of culture. The necessity to assert their local specific characteristics for economic purposes in the competitive tourism sector of Bali has led them to claim their distinctive identity, which is, to a certain extent, a community and evaluative construction. In fact, such new creations are neither traditional nor ‘fake’. Rather, they are the results of a living culture, and unique because they are co-produced by the local population and tourists, with a desire to perpetuate a social idea of Balinese-ness. The latter meets the expectations of the local population who unconsciously appropriate the image of themselves conveyed by tourists, and this thereby confirms the specific, ambiguous role of tourism as an agent of both transformation and conservation of their culture and heritage.

The study of these three villages, which are presented as successful, shows that the desa wisata terpadu can be defined as a mode of sustainable tourism which is well adapted to Balinese society in its diversity. A sustainability that nonetheless remains fragile and needs to be based on a socio-economic model with strengthened efficiency. It includes more flexibility to integrate young qualified inhabitants, without gender prejudice, in order to avoid the ‘vicious circle’ of a lack of qualified human resources limiting their capacity for economic growth, and a lack of material wealth that encourages their inhabitants to leave.
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