Challenges in the Development of Madurese Tourism

Nikmah Suryandari[1], Farida Nurul Rahmawati[2]

[1](Communication Department, Trunojoyo University, Indonesia)
[2](Communication Department, Trunojoyo University, Indonesia)
Corresponding author: nikmahsuryandari@trunojoyo.ac.id

ABSTRACT: The emergence of tourism in Indonesia stems from the fact that tourism often ignores the opportunity of local people to participate in tourism development in their own areas. The positive economy of tourism development is often enjoyed by people from outside the area. This paper discusses the challenges faced in the implementation of tourism entrepreneurship in Madura, East Java. This includes the challenges faced by Madurese people in developing the spirit of social and business entrepreneurs based on the results of research mentioned that the implementation of tourism entrepreneurship was largely developed at the initiative of the local population. The lack of support from the government in developing tourism entrepreneurship is one of the challenges they face in improving their standard of living. The findings of this study show that the participation of local communities in the development of Madurese tourism is very important.   The research findings can be used as a consideration for the Indonesian government to pay more attention and include local communities in the tourism development process, especially in developing the spirit of tourism entrepreneurs, as well as providing adequate support in the development of tourism businesses in Madura.
KEYWORDS: challange,local people, Madurese, tourism

I.   INTRODUCTION

Tourism has become one of the fastest growing industries in the last two decades[1]. The global tourism industry continues to be strong with 3 percent growth in Gross Direct Domestic Product (GDP)[2]. Globally, in 2015, tourism contributed 9.8% of world GDP and employed 277 million workers[2] Tourism in Indonesia also grew no less rapidly. As the fourth driver of state foreign exchange after oil / gas, palm oil and latex, Indonesian tourism is getting stronger. According to Indonesia's Statistics Agency, the number of international tourist arrivals has increased by 11.95 percent in February 2015. The number of international tourists who came to Indonesia between 2012 and 2014 was 8,044,462 million, 8,802,129 million and 9,435 million[3]

Although the Indonesian government emphasizes tourism development as one of the development sector's priorities, this approach has not been consistently implemented throughout the region. In Madura, there are only a few tourism activities[4]. The number of accommodations in Bangkalan and Sampang remained the same between 2005 and 2007. A slight increase was found in Pamekasan where the number of accommodation increased from 10 to 11 pieces and in Sumenep where the accommodation business increased from 5 to 7 pieces [4]. The number of recreational facilities that have the potential to be developed as tourist attractions is also small (a total of 48 pieces in four regions) (East Java Provincial Tourism Office, 2007). Therefore, it is not surprising that the island of Madura is considered to be the least popular tourist destination in East Java for both foreign and domestic tourists. This is indicated by the international arrival in Madura which is always very low. In 2007, Bangkalan, Sampang and Sumenep received only 164, 116, and 51 foreign tourists, while no foreign tourists visited Pamekasan[4].

Tourism destinations in Madura are focused on three aspects, namely: natural tourism, cultural tourism and artificial tourism. These three categories were then developed into several types such as adventure tourism, marine tourism, farm tourism and others.

The tourist destinations in Madura are grouped as follows:

Region	Natural Tourism	Cultural Tourism	Man Made tourism
Bangkalan	Siring Kemuning Beach, Rongkang Beach, Mount Geger	Tomb of KH M. Cholil, Mother Queen's Tears, Cow Racing Attractions, Great Tomb	City Recreation Park (TRK), PK-5 Family Tour

Sampang	Camplong Beach, Lebar Cave, Nepa Monkey Forest, Waterfall, Toroan Waterfall	Petik Laut Ceremonial, Cow Racing Attractions	
Pamekasan	Jumiang Beach, Talang Siring Beach, Batu Kerbuy Beach, Eternal fire	Sapi Sonok, Seremoni Tradisional Petik Laut, Pangeran Ronggo Sukowati, Makam Batu Ampar, Vihara Avalokitervara	
Sumenep	Lombang Beach, Slopeng Beach, Marine Park	Tomb of Asta Tinggi, Tomb of Asta Sayyid Yusuf, Tomb of Asta Buju'	Batik, Keris & Mask Making

Some experts argue that the tourism sector has the potential to be one of the means of economic improvement, especially through its ability to create jobs, export income and income for the region concerned, as well as individuals[5]

In the context of tourism development, the involvement and participation of local communities is the basis of tourism planning. The main idea of participatory approaches states that the local community should determine the purpose of tourism planning. This is done to ensure that tourism will be beneficial for the fulfillment of the needs and interests of local communities as well. This approach prioritizes social, cultural and environmental considerations, so that local residents will benefit from the activities[6].

According to research data Dian Yulie Reindrawati[7] the gloomy condition of Madura tourism shifted slightly when the start of suramadu bridge operation. Data shows that in Bangkalan there is an increase in tourism business. In 2010, there were 425 tourism businesses in Bangkalan. This figure increased sharply in 2013 by 510. The number of tourist travel agencies in Bangkalan as many as 17 pieces in 2010 and increased to 40 pieces in 2013.

The great tourism potential in Madura, should be a means of improving the welfare of the community. The involvement of local residents in the tourism sector should be able to have an impact on two sectors at once, namely the economic field and aspects of nature and cultural conservation. In the economic aspect, people will get financial benefits that can increase their economic capacity. In terms of nature and cultural conservation, people must increase their natural and cultural potential.

Compared to other regions in East Java, all regions in Madura have the highest percentage for people living below the poverty line. In 2010, in Bangkalan 28.12 percent of the total population lived in poverty, while in Pamekasan and Sumenep, the percentage was slightly different, namely, 22.47 percent, and 24.61 percent, respectively (TNP2K 2011). Worse, in Sampang, 32.47 percent of people live in poverty. The high percentage of poverty rates has positioned Sampang as the poorest area in East Java, while Bangkalan, Pamekasan and Sumenep are not too different conditions[8]. A significant contributing factor to poverty is the unemployment rate in all four madurese regions with Bangkalan having the highest percentage of unemployment (5.79 percent), followed by Pamekasan (3.53 percent), Sumenep (1.89 percent) and Sampang (1.77 percent) [8]

Economically, Madura relies on agriculture, but due to its relatively poor soil and dry climate, Madurese agriculture has very low productivity [9] This along with other problems, such as limited economic activity, rapid migration and isolated locations, has accounted for Madura's status as a marginal and forgotten island [9].

Poverty and marginalized situation in Madura encourage tourism as one of its efforts to change. Some scholars argue that tourism does have the potential to be a means of improving the regional economy, particularly through its ability to create jobs, export revenues and revenues for governments and individuals [10]. However, on the other hand tourism often ignores the opportunity of local people to participate in tourism. Tourism often only makes the local community as a spectator in its own area. Positive tourism economy is often only enjoyed by those who come from outside the region. Therefore, research that raises entrepreneurship in the field of tourism is absolutely necessary, so that the independence of community tourism can be formed and seen. The increasingly squirming development of tourism in Madura raises questions about how tourism is able to move the economic wheels of madurese people. Community participation in social entrepreneurship in the field of tourism becomes a questionable thing. In particular, this study analyzed the various challenges that arise in efforts to implement tourism social entrepreneurship. This is important for tourism as a way forward to lift the economy of madura island. In the end, it is expected that local communities can participate in tourism development in their area.

II. METHODS

The research locations are in Bangkalan, Sampang, Pamekasan, and Sumenep regencies. The time of field data collection is carried out in May-September 2021. The technique of informant selection is done purposively. That is, informants are selected based on certain criteria. The criteria for the selection of informants are as follows: 1) Are the local residents of Madura. Meanwhile, the population is those domiciled in a region of at least 6 months (BPS, 2014), 2) Informants are business actors in the field of tourism. The types of tourist businesses according to the Central Statistics Agency[11] are those who strive in the field of accommodation, restaurants, travel agencies, beauty salons, barbershops, billiards, tennis courts, badminton, swimming pools, sports arenas , fitness centers, and meeting halls [11]. In this research, entrepreneurs who have businesses in the field of tourism are those who are entrepreneurship in the field of accommodation, restaurants, travel agencies, souvenirs, food / beverages around tourist attractions.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Community participation in tourism development

Although tourism has been seen as a fast track for development in developing countries, the process of developing tourism does not always work well. A tourism development dilemma, as noted by Telfer & Sharpley (2008), is often unavoidable. On the one hand, tourism has the potential to foster economic and social development, but on the other hand, tourism can only benefit local elites, privileged citizens or multinational corporations that may have very high social and economic costs. In developing countries, tourism is usually implemented through a top-down planning approach and decision-making is largely based on intervention from government agencies and large multinational tourism companies. As a result, external dominance, foreign capital and marginalization of local communities are common[12]

Local communities in developing countries often only benefit small from tourism. It is associated with local people being exploited and has little power to control the tourism development process. They do not have access to financial resources, which are often only available to outside investors, and have a voice that is almost unheard of [13] . In fact, local communities in developing countries are often excluded from tourism development, especially in terms of decision making and management of tourism development [14]

Tourism development in developing countries often contrasts with participatory tourism planning approaches. Participatory tourism planning promotes goodwill through cooperation with local communities and is seen as the main focus and center of tourism development[15]. The involvement and participation of citizens in the area is the basis for successful tourism planning[16]. Murphy was one of the first figures to promote the importance of community engagement in tourism initiatives. The main idea of the participatory tourism approach supported by Murphy[17] was that every local community should determine the purpose of tourism planning. It is important to ensure tourism that meets local needs and interests. This approach recognizes that social, cultural, and environmental considerations need to be included in tourism planning. Thus, local residents should also benefit from tourism planning[6], [17]

Lack of community support is also one of the main problems of tourism planning in developing countries. This is in contrast to the principle of sustainable tourism which requires a long-term perspective and broad-based participation in the field of tourism, especially in policy formulation, decision-making and implementation at all levels.

Community participation in the process of tourism development has been widely recognized as something important [18], [19]. It is believed that the participation of locals in tourism planning will create a successful tourism industry (Grybovych et al. 2011, Timothy 2002). However, if the aspirations of locals are ignored in tourism planning, hatred and hostility towards tourism can occur and this may have the potential to damage the tourism industry itself[20]. In addition, the involvement of citizens in the decision-making process in developing countries is important because tourism will generate benefits for the community[21]

The term 'community participation' has been interpreted by scholars in different ways[22]. Community participation can refer to collaboration[23], community involvement in the decision-making process[24], or multi-stakeholder approaches in decision making, all of which are referred to participatory planning as tourism (Timothy 1999). Key factors in community participation related to input from locals include contribution, influence, redistribution of power and control, knowledge and skills of locals in decision-making[22]. This includes empowering the community with a consultation process that provides the community with opportunities.

To choose, make decisions and implement those decisions, as well as by increasing self-esteem and pride in cultural traditions through recognition beyond cultural values and uniqueness [25]. Therefore, participation should place an emphasis on the resources, needs and decisions of the community, where opportunities are provided for local communities to mobilize their own resources, determine their own needs, and make their own decisions[6].

The term 'community participation' has been interpreted by scholars in different ways [22]. Community participation can refer to collaboration , community involvement in the decision-making process or multi-stakeholder approaches in decision making, all of which are referred to participatory planning as tourism[26]

Key factors in community participation related to input from locals include contribution, influence, redistribution of power and control, knowledge and skills of locals in decision-making[22]. This includes empowering the community with a consultation process that provides the community with opportunities. To choose, make decisions and implement those decisions, as well as by increasing self-esteem and pride in cultural traditions through recognition beyond cultural values and uniqueness [27]. Therefore, participation should place an emphasis on the resources, needs and decisions of the community, where opportunities are provided for local communities to mobilize their own resources, determine their own needs, and make their own decisions[6].

Community participation can occur in two stages: in the decision-making process and in benefiting from the development of tourism. Participation in the decision-making process refers to empowering local citizens to determine their own goals for development, as well as consultation so that hopes and concerns related to tourism can be minimized. Participation also includes the involvement of other stakeholders in the decision-making process and tourism development. Tourism benefits refer to increased income, and employment and education opportunities for locals [28]

At both stages the involvement of locals in decision-making and in tourism benefits is closely intertwined[19]. The involvement of locals in decision-making affects the benefits of tourism, and vice versa [19]

For example, if there is no involvement of local stakeholders in decision-making, disparities in tourism benefits may occur[29]. Li's [30] study results show otherwise, despite findings showing low participation of locals in decision-making, local people are happy with tourism as they receive satisfactory benefits from tourism.

In response to a wide variety of changes in society, new unconventional approaches are emerging across all walks of life. One trend that has had a big impact is that businesses have a social purpose and a responsibility to create benefits for society. Social entrepreneurship — an approach that emphasizes entrepreneurial creativity, drive and a talent for solutions to social or environmental problems — is one of the few movements gaining attention and popularity. Social entrepreneurship is well developed in areas such as agriculture, finance, electronics, and health. However, so far social entrepreneurship has not developed in the tourism and hospitality sectors. This is surprising given the unique characteristics of social entrepreneurship especially in the field of community-based tourism which can provide opportunities for social entrepreneurs to change goals and ensure more benefits flow to local community areas. The relationship between social entrepreneurship and tourism is almost never explored.

Entrepreneurial activities are dynamic activities[31]. According to Brock & Steiner [32], social entrepreneurship is the creation of social impact by developing and implementing a sustainable business model which draws on innovative solutions that benefit the disadvantaged and, ultimately, society at large. Certo & Miller [33] defines social entreprenurship as a process in which it involves the recognition, evaluation and exploitation of various opportunities to generate social values. These social values are the fulfilling of basic needs such as food availability, health and education. Social entrepreneurship is an activity that emphasizes achieving common goals [34]. It is also emphasized that social entrepreneurship is carried out in social, economic, environmental and cultural contexts[35]. Social entreprenurship promotes solutions to social problems. It is further said that social entrepreneurs are people who identify failures in society and transform them in business opportunities, namely by recruiting and motivating others to take advantage of opportunities[36]

In this research the concept of tourism entrepreneurship is interpreted as a social entrepreneurship activity in the field of tourism. In the sense of efforts to meet the basic needs of the community is done through tourism activities or businesses. Tourism entrepreneurs are defined as people who do tourism business activities that inspire and encourage the activities of the surrounding community to participate in tourism business activities. Here there is a strong effort from someone to change themselves and others by doing tourism business activities.

The results of the study mentioned that the government's lack of support to the business world is often an obstacle to the development of social entrepreneurship tourism itself. The government that should support community participation in entrepreneurship on the one hand did not support efforts to grow the motivation of entrepreneurship. What one of the informants and several others said implies this.

The government, on the one hand, is expected to be an agent that encourages change, it turns out that on the other hand it is the one that democratizes the efforts of change. People who are very hopeful through government policies that encourage them to move forward and grow, it turns out that instead considered by some people as a party that is 'less hopeful'. This situation makes it difficult for entrepreneurs to build their business.

The development of social entrepreneurship is also constrained by the lack of ability and skills from human resources (HR), theabsence of people with a high ethos and spirit of learning is also considered to be another obstacle. There are concerns that if the perpetrator of social entrepreneurship is desperate and stops to hire local people, then it could be that he will take labor from outside his area. If this happens then the economic spin will leak outwards, no longer rotating in the area. Local people are not impossible to just be spectators. Some informants have indicated this. Informant A for example, as a tourism entrepreneur he was eager to recruit locals in his travel business, but the lack of interest and knowledge from the surrounding residents made him better recruit Surabaya people.

IV.   CONCLUSION

Related to tourism entrepreneurship, it can be conveyed that there are government efforts to encourage the emergence of entrepreneurial spirit until the realization of entrepreneurial activities in the community, in this case the community around the tourist attraction. This is seen with some communities that actively participate in tourism entrepreneurial activities. But in the middle of the road, the entrepreneurial activity is hampered by dilemmas created because the government does not pay attention to what the community wants. The 'inability' of local communities to change on the one hand and the need for tourism knowledge and skills is one example of incompatibility between government and society. This is what in the future must be more considered and anticipated by the government. Do not let on the one hand the entrepreneurial efforts and community participation around the tourist attractions be grown, but on the other hand indirectly it turns out that these activities decrease the spirit and spirit of entrepreneurship itself. As a result, of course, people become not benefited in tourism development. Public participation in tourist attractions is low. Although tourism businesses have the spirit and efforts to advance the economy but these efforts are still very limited, namely they are limited to only concerns to family, close friends, neighbors. This is because the efforts made are still small scale, traditional and limited.

The implementation and development of tourism entrepreneurship is currently still constrained by several things including not well coordinated relationship between the government and entrepreneurs. The government by some participants appears to be seen not as a partner or partner, but rather seen as a party that interferes with their business processes. In addition, there are government policies that are considered confusing to entrepreneurs themselves. As a result, entrepreneurs are reluctant to cooperate with other entrepreneurs. In addition, low education levels and an age that is no longer productive are also other obstacles in the implementation of Madurese tourism development. This greatly influences the breadth of informant insights in the search for new breakthroughs in entrepreneurship.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. Cornelissen, The Global Tourism System: Governance, Development and Lessons from South Africa. Routledge, 2017.
[2]   WWTC, "The Review 2015," 2015. https://wttc.org/ (accessed Nov. 06, 2015).
[3]   Badan Pusat Satistik, "BPS," 2015. http://www.bps.go.id/ (accessed Dec. 10, 2015).
[4]   Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi Jawa Timur, "Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi," 2007. .
[5]   B. K. Sharma, "Discursive representations of difference and multilingualism in Himalaya with Michael Palin," Int. J. Multiling., vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 226–243, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14790718.2018.1431239.
[6]   C. Tosun, "Stages in the emergence of a participatory tourism development approach in the Developing World," Geoforum, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 333–352, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2004.06.003.
[7]   D. Y. Reindrawati, "Tantangan dalam implementasi social entrepreneurship pariwisata di Pulau Madura," Masyarakat, Kebud. dan Polit., vol. 30, no. 3, p. 215, 2017, doi: 10.20473/mkp.v30i32017.215-228.
[8]   TNP2K, "Indikator kesejahteraan daerah provinsi Jawa Timur [Indicator of welfare of East Java Province].," 2011. http://data.tnp2k.go.id.
[9]   D. J. Rachbini, "Conditions and consequences of industrialization in Madura," Across Madura Strait Dyn. an Insul. Soc., pp. 209–220, 1995.
[10]   B. Sharma, P. Dyer, J. Carter, and D. Gursoy, "Exploring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of tourism on the Sunshine Coast, Australia," Int. J. Hosp. Tour. Adm., vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 288–311, 2008, doi: 10.1080/15256480802096092.
[11]   BPS, "Badan Pusat Statistik," 2014. http://www.bps.go.id/ (accessed Nov. 13, 2015).
[12]   A. Liu and G. Wall, "Planning tourism employment: A developing country perspective," Tour. Manag., vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 159–170, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2004.08.004.
[13]   M. Mowforth and I. Munt, Tourism and Sustainability: Development, globalisation and new tourism in the Third World. Taylor & Francis, 2015.
[14]   E. S. Victor Teye, Sevil F. Sönmez and Teye, "RESIDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD TOURISM

DEVELOPMENT," pp. 668–688, 2002.

[15]   H. C. Choi and E. Sirakaya, "Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism," Tour. Manag., vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1274–1289, 2006, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.018.

[16]   C. M. Hall, Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships. Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2008.

[17]   P. E. Murphy, Tourism: A Community Approach (RLE Tourism). Taylor & Francis, 2013.

[18]   O. Grybovych, D. Hafermann, and F. Mazzoni, "Tourism planning, community engagement and policy innovation in Ucluelet, British Columbia," Stories Pract. Tour. policy Plan., pp. 79–103, 2011.

[19]   L. Lamberti, G. Noci, J. Guo, and S. Zhu, "Mega-events as drivers of community participation in developing countries: The case of Shanghai World Expo," Tour. Manag., vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 1474–1483, 2011, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.12.008.

[20]   J. Zhang, R. J. Inbakaran, and M. S. Jackson, "Understanding community attitudes towards tourism and host-guest interaction in the urban - Rural border region," Tour. Geogr., vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 182–204, 2006, doi: 10.1080/14616680600585455.

[21]   S. Roberts, "An exploratory analysis of factors mediating community participation outcomes in tourism," Community Dev., vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 377–391, 2011.

[22]   N. C. Saxena, "What is meant by people's participation?," J. Rural Dev., vol. 17, pp. 111–114, 1998.

[23]   T. Jamal and A. Stronza, "Collaboration theory and tourism practice in protected areas: Stakeholders, structuring and sustainability," J. Sustain. Tour., vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 169–189, 2009.

[24]   F. and M. B. Aref , Redzuan, "Barriers of Community Participation toward Tourism Development.pdf," pp. 936–940, 2008.

[25]   S. Cole, Tourism, culture and development. Channel View Publications, 2008.

[26]   D. J. Timothy, "Participatory planningA view of tourism in Indonesia," Ann. Tour. Res., vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 371–391, 1999.

[27]   S. Cole, Tourism, Culture and Development: Hopes, Dreams and Realities in East Indonesia. Channel View Publications, 2008.

[28]   D. J. Timothy, Participatory Planning: A View of Tourism in Indonesia. 1999.

[29]   R. Madrigal, "Residents' perceptions and the role of government," Ann. Tour. Res., vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 86–102, 1995.

[30]   W. Li, "Community decisionmaking participation in development," Ann. Tour. Res., vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 132–143, 2006.

[31]   J. C. Braga, T. Proença, and M. R. Ferreira, "Motivations for social entrepreneurship–Evidences from Portugal," Tékhne, vol. 12, pp. 11–21, 2014.

[32]   D. D. Brock and S. Steiner, "Social Entrepreneurship Education: Is it Achieving the Desired Aims?," SSRN Electron. J., no. February 2009, 2011, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1344419.

[33]   S. T. Certo and T. Miller, "Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts," Bus. Horiz., vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 267–271, 2008.

[34]   A. Steinerowski, S. L. Jack, and J. Farmer, "Who are the Social'Entrepreneurs' and What Do They Actually Do?," Front. Entrep. Res., 2008.

[35]   P. A. Dacin, M. T. Dacin, and M. Matear, "Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here," Acad. Manag. Perspect., vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 37–57, 2010.

[36]   J. L. Thompson, "The world of the social entrepreneur," Int. J. public Sect. Manag., 2002.