



Participatory Community Models in Community-Based Tourism: A Comparative Study of Laweyan and Ketenger

**Agoeng Noegroho¹, Nuryanti^{2*}, Tri Nugroho Adi³, Ashlikhatul Fuaddah⁴,
Bela Nurhandini⁵**

¹agoeng.noegroho@unsoed.ac.id, ²nuryanti1510@unsoed.ac.id,

³tri.adi@unsoed.ac.id, ⁴ashlikhatul.fuaddah@unsoed.ac.id,

⁵bela.nurhandini@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

*Corresponding Author: Nuryanti

E-mail: nuryanti1510@unsoed.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) positions the community as the primary actor in tourism development, making participatory communication a key factor in achieving sustainable destination management. This study aims to analyze and compare participatory communication in two CBT destinations with distinct characteristics: Kampung Batik Laweyan in Surakarta, a cultural heritage-based tourism village, and Ketenger Tourism Village in Banyumas, a nature-based tourism village. The study employs a qualitative approach using a comparative case study design. Data were collected through focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, non-participatory observation, and document analysis involving 18 informants selected through purposive sampling and were subsequently analyzed using thematic analysis. The results indicate that both destinations implement participatory communication as the foundation for community-based tourism management, though through different approaches. Laweyan has developed an institutionalized communication model through a multi-stakeholder coordination and collaboration forum, whereas Ketenger implements a community-based communication model that relies on social capital, mutual cooperation, and deliberation. These findings indicate that participatory communication in CBT is contextual in nature; therefore, communication strategies must be tailored to the social, cultural, and institutional conditions of each destination. This study contributes to enriching the study of participatory communication in Community-Based Tourism through a comparative perspective.

Keywords: Community-Based Tourism, Participatory Communication, Tourism Village

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, tourism villages in Indonesia have experienced rapid growth and are increasingly gaining attention as a community-based development strategy. In 2024, 6,016 tourism villages participated in the Indonesian Tourism Village Awards (ADWI), a substantial increase from the 1,831 tourism villages registered in 2021 (Agmasari, 2024). The increase in the number of tourism villages indicates a shift in the direction of tourism development in Indonesia, which increasingly positions the community as a vital component of this development. However, community involvement in tourism village management remains a challenge. For example, a study of Ketenger Tourism Village found that although a Tourism Awareness Group (Pokdarwis) was present, the village government remained the main driver of tourism development, indicating that community participation in planning, implementation, and evaluation still requires strengthening (Darmawan & Anwar, 2021). In many places, residents have not yet fully assumed the role of key actors in decision-making and destination management; rather, they are often still positioned as supporting players in achieving tourism development goals.

As tourism villages continue to develop, attention is focused not only on their growth but also on the approaches used in their management (Rosalina et al., 2023; Yanan et al., 2024). Fundamentally, the development of tourism villages is built on the principle of *community-based tourism* (CBT) an approach that positions the community as the primary actors in every process of tourism development and management, rather than merely as objects of development (Tela et al., 2024). However, this ideal has not yet been fully realized in practice. In many tourism villages, community involvement remains largely limited to carrying out activities, while strategic decisions regarding the direction of destination development are often still dominated by a handful of formal actors.

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) emphasizes local community involvement and control in tourism planning, management, and decision-making, alongside equitable benefit distribution and empowerment (Mtapuri et al., 2022). The importance of effective destination management is also reflected in tourism research published in SRAWUNG, which highlights destination-related factors influencing tourists' loyalty and revisit intentions (Sopha et al., 2024). Therefore, communication is an integral element of CBT implementation. Communication serves not only as a means of conveying information but also as a space for dialogue, negotiation, and decision-making that enables communities to participate meaningfully in the management of tourism villages.

This perspective aligns with the concept of participatory communication rooted in the ideas of Paulo Freire. In the context of tourism village management, this approach positions the community not as mere recipients of programs, but as active participants who help formulate, discuss, and determine the direction of

destination development. Thomas and Mefalopulos (2009) explained that participatory communication encompasses at least three main dimensions: access to information, the opportunity to express opinions (*voice*), and the ability to influence or control decisions that impact community life. Recent research also demonstrates that communication spaces, including social media, can facilitate participatory expression, collective action, and community influence on decision-making (Wulandari & Novita, 2025). This study compares two tourism villages with distinct characteristics: the Laweyan Batik Tourism Village in Surakarta and the Ketenger Tourism Village in Banyumas.

The Laweyan Batik Tourism Village is a cultural heritage-based tourism area that represents an institution-driven model of participatory communication, supported by established organizational structures and formal coordination mechanisms such as the Laweyan Batik Village Development Forum (FPKBL), whereas Ketenger Tourism Village, in contrast, embodies a social capital-driven model of participatory communication, shaped by community trust, mutual cooperation, and deliberative practices.

The two cases were selected through a theoretical sampling strategy because they represent contrasting pathways of participatory communication: Laweyan represents institution-driven participatory communication, characterized by established institutional frameworks and formal coordination mechanisms, while Ketenger represents social capital-driven participatory communication, rooted in community trust, mutual cooperation, and social relationships. Nevertheless, research on participatory communication across tourism villages with differing characteristics remains relatively underexplored. First, comparative studies across tourism villages with different typologies are still scarce. Second, previous studies often examine communication actors, spaces, media, participation mechanisms, and social values separately rather than as interconnected elements. Third, limited attention has been given to theoretically grounded analyses that integrate participatory communication with structuration and social constructivist perspectives.

Da Costa and Sanjiwani (2025) highlighted access, voice, and control as important dimensions of participatory communication in Jatiluwih Tourism Village. Murtiningsih et al. (2024) demonstrated the role of local wisdom in strengthening participatory communication, while Oktaviyani et al. (2026) emphasize communication authority and dialogue spaces in tourism village governance. These findings demonstrate that participatory communication is a key factor in the successful management of community-based tourism villages. However, previous studies have generally focused on a single location or compared tourism villages with relatively similar characteristics. Consequently, our understanding of how participatory communication unfolds in tourism villages with distinct characteristics, resources, and institutional patterns remains limited. Furthermore, most studies still examine aspects of communication in isolation such

as actors, media, spaces for dialogue, or forms of participation and thus fail to provide a comprehensive picture of the relationships among these elements in the tourism village management process.

Given these gaps, this study compares participatory communication in Kampung Batik Laweyan and Ketenger Tourism Village as theoretically contrasting cases. Therefore, this study aims to analyze and compare patterns of participatory communication in the management of Kampung Batik Laweyan and Ketenger Tourism Village and to formulate a participatory communication model that can inform the development of community-based tourism in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Participatory communication is one of the main foundations of community-based development because it enables citizens to actively engage in the process of social change. This concept is rooted in the ideas of Paulo Freire, who viewed dialogue as an equal, critical, and liberating process, rather than as one-way communication that positions the community merely as a recipient of information. From this perspective, communication serves not only as a means of conveying information but also as a process of reflection and collective action (*praxis*) that drives social transformation (Thomas & Mefalopulos, 2009). Therefore, the quality of community participation is determined not only by their involvement in program implementation but also by their access to information, opportunities to express opinions, and ability to influence the decision-making process (Da Costa & Sanjiwani, 2025). Furthermore, horizontal communication is a crucial prerequisite for fostering a *sense of ownership*, trust, and collaboration within the community (Murtiningsih et al., 2024).

The perspective of participatory communication is becoming increasingly relevant in the development of *Community-Based Tourism* (CBT), which positions the community as the primary actor in planning, management, and decision-making regarding tourism activities. Unlike conventional tourism approaches, which tend to be oriented toward economic growth, CBT emphasizes community involvement, empowerment, cultural and environmental conservation, and a more equitable distribution of benefits (Mtapuri et al., 2022). However, various studies indicate that the implementation of these principles does not always proceed as expected. Under such conditions, participatory communication becomes a crucial factor that bridges the normative principles of CBT with management practices at the community level through the creation of dialogue, collaboration, and negotiation among actors (Mtapuri et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, participatory communication does not occur in a space free from the influence of social structures. To understand how communication practices are formed and simultaneously influence the management of tourism villages, this study employs Giddens' (1986) *Theory of Structuration*. Central to this theory is the concept of the duality of structure, which views social structures as both the medium

and outcome of social practices. Structures consist of rules and resources that provide actors with guidelines, expectations, and capacities for action, while actors draw upon these structures in their everyday practices. Thus, structures do not simply constrain community action; they are also reproduced and potentially transformed through the practices of social actors.

In the context of tourism villages, rules may include formal organizational procedures, community norms, and established decision-making practices, while resources may involve access to information, authority, networks, knowledge, and other capacities that enable actors to influence tourism management. Communication practices such as meetings, deliberations, informal discussions, and negotiations become important sites where these rules and resources are enacted. For example, when community members participate in deliberative meetings, they may reproduce existing decision-making procedures by following established norms and roles. At the same time, repeated communication and negotiation can transform these structures by creating new forms of participation, redistributing roles among actors, or expanding community access to decision-making processes. In this sense, communication practices simultaneously reproduce and transform the social structures that shape tourism village governance (Steiner et al., 2022).

In addition to shaping social structures, communication practices also generate shared meanings regarding identity, values, and the direction of tourism village development. The social constructivist perspective proposed by Berger and Luckmann (1967) explained that social reality is not static but is constructed through ongoing processes of interaction and negotiation within society. Through dialogue, communities build a collective understanding of cultural heritage, tourism potential, and the goals to be achieved in the development of tourism villages. In this process, local knowledge serves not merely as a supplement but as a vital source of knowledge that plays a key role in determining the direction of community-based tourism policies and practices (Murtiningsih et al., 2024).

A synthesis of these various perspectives indicates that participatory communication in the management of tourism villages is not merely about the process of conveying information but also encompasses relationships among actors, available spaces for dialogue, media that facilitate communication, mechanisms for participation in decision-making, and the social values that shape community interactions. Therefore, this study employs five dimensions of analysis namely, communication actors, communication spaces, communication media, participation mechanisms, and social values to understand and compare the patterns of participatory communication that have emerged in Kampung Batik Laweyan and Ketenger Tourism Village. These five dimensions constitute a synthesis of participatory communication theory, the principles of *Community-Based Tourism*, Structuration Theory, and the social constructivist perspective, which form the conceptual foundation of this study.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach to understand how participatory communication is practiced in the management of tourism villages. This approach was chosen because it enables researchers to explore social interactions, relationships, meanings, and contextual dynamics that shape participatory communication practices (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The study was designed as a comparative case study to explore participatory communication practices in two tourism villages with distinct characteristics and to identify their similarities and differences (Yin, 2018).

The research was conducted in Kampung Batik Laweyan, Surakarta a cultural heritage-based tourism village (*heritage tourism*) and Ketenger Tourism Village, Banyumas a nature-based tourism village (*nature-based tourism*). Both locations were selected through purposive sampling due to their differences in historical, institutional, and tourism management aspects. Informants were selected using purposive sampling based on their involvement and knowledge regarding tourism village management. A total of 18 participants were involved in the two Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), consisting of eight participants from Kampung Batik Laweyan and ten participants from Ketenger Tourism Village. Participants were purposively selected based on their direct involvement in tourism village management, community activities, and their knowledge of communication and decision-making processes within their respective tourism villages. The participants represented different stakeholder roles, including tourism village management organizations, tourism-related business actors, community leaders, and local residents, allowing the study to capture diverse perspectives on participatory communication practices. The sample size was considered appropriate for the qualitative, comparative design because the participants were selected as information-rich actors directly involved in or knowledgeable about the management and development of the respective tourism villages.

Data were collected in May 2026 through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), in-depth interviews, non-participatory observation, and documentary analysis. FGDs were used as the primary technique because they allow researchers to observe the processes of dialogue, negotiation, and the co-construction of meaning among community members (Kitzinger, 1994). The entire data collection process was guided by the five dimensions of participatory communication: communication actors, communication spaces, communication media, participation mechanisms, and social values.

Ethical considerations were addressed throughout the data collection process. Before participating in the FGDs and interviews, participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and the use of the information they provided for research purposes. Participation was voluntary, and participants were given the opportunity to decline to answer questions or withdraw

from the research process. The confidentiality of participants was maintained by protecting their personal information and presenting the research findings in a manner that does not unnecessarily disclose their identities.

Data analysis employed thematic analysis following the six-step framework of Braun and Clarke (2006), conducted through *within-case analysis* at each location and followed by *cross-case analysis* to compare the two cases. The coding process was conducted deductively based on the five dimensions of participatory communication, as well as inductively to identify themes emerging from the data. The credibility of the findings was strengthened through source and method triangulation, member checking, and researcher reflexivity. Source triangulation was conducted by comparing information obtained from participants with different roles and positions in the tourism village management process, including management representatives, tourism-related business actors, community leaders, and local residents. Method triangulation involved comparing information obtained through FGDs, in-depth interviews, non-participatory observation, and documentary analysis. Member checking was conducted by confirming the interpretation of relevant findings with participants to ensure that the researchers' interpretations were consistent with their experiences and perspectives. Researcher reflexivity was maintained throughout the research process by reflecting on the researchers' assumptions, positionality, and potential influence during data collection and interpretation. These strategies were used to strengthen the credibility and contextual validity of the findings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Participatory Communication Practices in Ketenger Tourism Village

The research findings indicate that participatory communication in Ketenger Tourism Village has developed through the interaction between local institutions, the community's social capital, and communication practices deeply rooted in daily life. Unlike other tourism villages that rely on complex formal organizational structures, tourism management in Ketenger is based more on close ties among residents, a culture of mutual cooperation, and local leadership that derives its legitimacy from the community.

The communication actors involved in managing the tourism village include the Chair of the Village Forest Community Institution (LMDH), cooperatives, hamlet heads, RT/RW heads, tourism site managers, religious leaders, youth groups, and local business owners. The roles of these actors complement one another, ensuring that communication is not centralized in a single institution but rather takes place through a widespread social network. Although some figures hold greater influence, the communication process prioritizes deliberation, allowing the community space to voice their aspirations and participate in decision-making.

Communication takes place through both formal forums and informal interactions. At the formal level, communication occurs during RT/RW meetings, village deliberations, briefings for tourism managers, and meetings of cooperatives and LMDHs, which serve as platforms for coordination, problem-solving, and decision-making. Outside these forums, communication takes place through community service activities, religious gatherings, neighborhood meetings, and daily economic activities. In fact, various issues and new ideas are often discussed first in informal conversations before being brought to official forums, indicating that interpersonal relationships form a crucial foundation for participatory communication in Ketenger.

From Giddens' (1986) perspective, these communication practices demonstrate the duality of structure, in which social structures are both the medium and outcome of repeated social practices. In Ketenger, existing norms of *musyawarah*, mutual cooperation, and neighborhood-based coordination provide rules that guide how residents communicate and participate in tourism management. At the same time, the repeated practice of discussing issues through RT/RW meetings, community activities, and informal interactions reproduces these norms while also allowing residents to negotiate and modify how decisions are made. Thus, communication practices in Ketenger do not merely operate within an existing social structure but continuously reproduce and transform the relationships and norms that support community participation.

In addition to face-to-face communication, the community uses WhatsApp as the primary medium for coordination, while Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok are used for promoting tourism and local products. Digital media in Ketenger is not centrally managed by a single tourism institution, which reflects the decentralized character of participatory communication in the village. Rather than functioning through a unified institutional communication strategy, information about tourism activities is disseminated through residents' individual social media accounts and informal networks. This decentralized pattern expands the reach of tourism information and provides residents with opportunities to become communicators and promoters of their own community. However, the absence of centralized management may also result in inconsistent messaging, uneven information dissemination, and limited coordination in digital promotion. Thus, decentralized digital communication simultaneously represents an opportunity for broader community participation and a challenge for developing a coherent tourism communication strategy. These findings indicate that digital media serves as a complement to direct communication, not a replacement for it.

Community participation is evident at every stage of tourism village management, from planning, implementation, and evaluation to facility development and the management of tourism businesses. The resulting economic benefits are also collectively distributed to support social activities, education, environmental development, and community welfare. This situation demonstrates

that tourism is understood as an instrument of community development, not merely an economic activity.

In terms of Arnstein's (1969) *Ladder of Citizen Participation*, participation in Ketenger can be positioned most closely at the partnership level rather than delegated power or citizen control. Community members have meaningful opportunities to express aspirations, participate in deliberation, contribute to tourism activities, and influence decisions, while formal authority remains shared with village institutions, tourism managers, and other local actors. The findings therefore indicate that community participation has moved beyond tokenism because residents are involved in substantive processes of discussion and decision-making. However, the evidence does not indicate that decision-making authority has been fully transferred to the community, which would be required to characterize the process as delegated power or citizen control. The community does not merely act as recipients of information or program implementers but actively participates in the planning and decision-making processes. This finding further reinforces the principles of Community-Based Tourism, which positions the community as the primary actor in tourism destination development (Ashley & Roe, 1999).

The success of participatory communication in Ketenger is supported by social capital in the form of mutual aid, solidarity, and trust among residents. These values are reinforced through a culture of deliberation, local traditions, and religious activities, which serve as spaces for interaction while strengthening social bonds within the community. These practices also illustrate the social construction of collective meaning described by Berger and Luckmann (1967). Trust, mutual cooperation, and musyawarah are not merely pre-existing social values; they are continuously reinforced through repeated interaction and communication among community members. Through these interactions, residents construct a shared understanding that tourism development is a collective responsibility rather than the responsibility of a particular institution or individual. In this sense, the identity of Ketenger as a community-oriented tourism village is continuously produced and reproduced through everyday communication practices, shared experiences, and collective activities. Thus, communication serves not only as a means of conveying information but also as a mechanism for preserving the collective values that underpin the sustainability of tourism village management.

Nevertheless, the study also found that the level of community participation is not yet entirely uniform. Some residents initially displayed apathy toward tourism development. However, through sustained communication, a personalized approach, and the increasing economic and social benefits experienced by the community, resident engagement has continued to grow. This process can be understood through Freire (1999) concept of dialogic communication. Rather than relying solely on monologic communication, in which information or decisions are transmitted from authorities to community members, communication in Ketenger

provides opportunities for residents to express concerns, exchange perspectives, and gradually develop a sense of ownership toward tourism development. The increasing involvement of previously less-active residents therefore reflects an ongoing process of dialogue, reflection, and collective action rather than simply the dissemination of information. This finding aligns with Freire (1999) notion that ongoing dialogue forms the foundation of community empowerment. In the context of Ketenger, participatory communication has developed not through one-way instructions, but through a dialogic process that builds trust, mutual understanding, and collective commitment to the management of the tourism village.

Participatory Communication Practices in Kampoeng Batik Laweyan

The research findings indicate that participatory communication in Laweyan Batik Village has developed through well-established community institutions and is supported by the area's long history as a center of the batik industry in Surakarta. Communication serves not only as a medium for conveying information but also as a key mechanism for fostering coordination, resolving shared issues, and ensuring the sustainability of the tourist area's management. The Laweyan Batik Village Development Forum (FPKBL) acts as a central actor connecting batik entrepreneurs, RT/RW leaders, the Tourism Awareness Group (Pokdarwis), the Family Welfare Movement (PKK), the Youth Organization (Karang Taruna), community leaders, and the village government. This institutional structure enables various actors to participate according to their respective roles, ensuring that the management of the area proceeds collaboratively.

Participatory communication is facilitated through various regular forums, particularly the "Reboan," which serves as the primary space for planning programs, evaluating activities, resolving issues, and formulating decisions related to the development of the tourism area. Viewed through Giddens' (1986) *Theory of Structuration*, these institutionalized communication practices illustrate the duality of structure. Organizational rules, established roles, and formal forums provide resources and procedures that organize participation and coordinate interactions among community actors. However, these structures are not static. Through repeated participation in Reboan, Selawenan, RT/RW meetings, and working group discussions, community members reproduce the existing organizational arrangements while simultaneously negotiating roles, addressing emerging issues, and adapting decision-making practices to changing tourism needs. Communication therefore functions both within the existing institutional structure and as a mechanism through which that structure is continuously reproduced and transformed. This forum is supported by the Selawenan Forum, RT/RW meetings, and working group sessions that extend the scope of dialogue down to the community level. The existence of these forums provides community members with the opportunity to voice their aspirations, engage in discussions, and participate in

decision-making, ensuring that communication is two-way and leads to a collective understanding.

In addition to face-to-face communication, the community utilizes various digital media as tools for both internal coordination and external promotion. WhatsApp is used to share organizational information and coordinate activities, while the official Kampung Batik Laweyan website, Instagram, TikTok, and Laweyan TV are used to promote tourist destinations, document community activities, and disseminate information to tourists. Media management is carried out collaboratively by community members based on their respective expertise, ensuring that digital media not only serves as a promotional tool but also strengthens communication among members and expands marketing networks.

The use of digital media also supports community economic empowerment. Promotion across various platforms expands market access for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in batik, culinary, homestay, and tourism services, while making it easier for tourists to access information about tour packages, batik-making workshops, the area's history, and cultural events. Thus, digital communication is an integral part of the local economic development strategy that strengthens Kampung Batik Laweyan's competitiveness as a culture-based tourist destination.

Community participation is evident at every stage of tourism management, from program planning, the implementation of cultural activities, the development of batik education packages, and the organization of festivals, to the periodic evaluation of activities. Batik business owners serve not only as producers but also as organizers of tourist attractions, facilitators of batik education, and drivers of regional promotion. This involvement demonstrates that the community has ample opportunity to influence the direction of the tourism area's development.

Participatory communication in Laweyan is further strengthened through collaborative networks with local government, universities, cultural communities, the media, and various other organizations. These collaborations provide access to training, mentoring, promotion, and human resource capacity building. Although they involve various external parties, the entire process remains coordinated through the FPKBL, ensuring that the community retains its position as the primary actor in decision-making. These findings reflect the characteristics of a "partnership" as outlined in Arnstein's (1969) *Ladder of Citizen Participation*, where the community is not merely an object of development but holds an equal position in the management process.

The success of participatory communication in Laweyan Batik Village is also supported by the community's strong collective identity as a historic batik village. From the perspective of Berger and Luckmann (1967), the collective identity of Laweyan as a historic batik village is socially constructed and continuously maintained through communication. Historical narratives, batik-making traditions, cultural festivals, community activities, and intergenerational interactions provide

spaces through which residents reproduce shared meanings about Laweyan's cultural heritage. These meanings contribute to a collective sense of belonging and provide a symbolic basis for community participation in tourism management. The identity of Laweyan as a batik heritage destination is therefore not simply a historical condition but an ongoing social construction sustained through communication and collective practice. Historical values, batik-making traditions, and pride in the area foster a *sense of belonging* that motivates the community to sustain the batik industry while simultaneously developing the area as a cultural tourism destination. This identity is continuously reinforced through various community activities, cultural festivals, and batik-making education, ensuring that communication serves not only as a process of information exchange but also as a medium for preserving cultural values.

Leadership plays a key role in strengthening the effectiveness of participatory communication. Senior figures serve as sources of experience and organizational legitimacy, while the younger generation is beginning to take on roles in managing digital media, promoting innovations, and organizing various tourism activities. This pattern of generational renewal demonstrates a balance between preserving organizational experience and adapting to technological advancements and the needs of tourists.

Nevertheless, the study found that the level of community participation is not yet fully equitable. Some business owners and residents still have limited involvement due to differing business interests, time constraints, and uneven digital literacy. To address these challenges, FPKBL continues to strengthen communication through regular forums, personalized approaches, digital literacy training, and increased engagement of the younger generation. These findings demonstrate that participatory communication is understood as a continuous learning process that unfolds through dialogue, collaboration, and the strengthening of social ties. Thus, the success of managing Laweyan Batik Village is determined not only by the existence of formal organizational structures but also by the community's ability to foster inclusive, adaptive, and community-empowerment-oriented communication—in line with the principles of *Community-Based Tourism*.

Comparative Analysis of Participatory Communication in Community-Based Tourism

A comparative analysis shows that Laweyan Batik Village and Ketenger Tourism Village both employ participatory communication as the primary foundation for managing *Community-Based Tourism* (CBT). In both locations, communication serves not only as a means of conveying information but also as a mechanism that enables the community to participate in planning, implementation, evaluation, and decision-making regarding the development of tourism villages. Thus, communication serves as an instrument that fosters collaboration among

stakeholders while strengthening the sustainability of community-based tourism management.

Although they share the same objectives, the two villages exhibit distinct patterns of participatory communication as a result of their respective social, historical, and institutional characteristics. Laweyan Batik Village represents a model of institutionalized communication, in which the communication process is supported by a clear organizational structure, a defined division of roles, and coordination mechanisms that take place regularly through the Laweyan Batik Village Development Forum (FPKBL). The existence of forums such as the Reboan Forum and the Selawenan Forum enables the deliberation process to proceed in a structured manner and strengthens coordination among batik business owners, the Tourism Awareness Group (Pokdarwis), neighborhood units (RT/RW), the Family Welfare Movement (PKK), the Youth Association (Karang Taruna), community leaders, and the sub-district government. This communication model also facilitates the formation of collaborative networks with various external parties, such as the local government, universities, cultural communities, and the media.

In contrast, participatory communication in Ketenger Tourism Village develops through social relationships that are more organic in nature. Although institutional structures such as cooperatives and the Village Forest Community Organization (LMDH) exist, the effectiveness of communication is largely supported by social capital in the form of trust, mutual aid, solidarity, and close ties among residents. Deliberations take place not only in formal forums but also unfold through daily interactions, religious activities, community service, and various social activities. This situation indicates that community participation in Ketenger is built upon the strength of interpersonal relationships that are deeply rooted in community life.

These differences demonstrate that participatory communication does not have a single, universal form. The effectiveness of communication is greatly influenced by the local context, which includes the village's developmental history, institutional structure, community characteristics, and the social values that have evolved within the community. Laweyan, which has developed as a historic batik industrial area in an urban setting, tends to foster more formal and organized communication, whereas Ketenger, as a nature-based tourism village, relies more on flexible communication rooted in social relationships among residents. Thus, the local context is a crucial factor shaping participatory communication practices in the management of *Community-Based Tourism*.

The findings of this study both support and extend previous research on participatory communication in tourism villages. The work of Da Costa and Sanjiwani (2025), which underscored access, voice, and control as critical dimensions in Jatiluwih, is corroborated by our evidence. In both Laweyan and Ketenger, these dimensions were present but operationalized through distinct community mechanisms. Our comparative analysis advances this understanding by

revealing that access and voice are not exclusively dependent on formal forums or digital platforms. In Ketenger, these dimensions were effectively mediated through informal social networks, while in Laweyan, they were facilitated by a structured institutional framework. This finding underscores the highly contextual nature of participatory communication, an insight that single-location studies cannot adequately capture. Moreover, Darmawan and Anwar (2021) previously identified that community participation in Ketenger required strengthening, particularly in planning and evaluation. Although our findings confirm that this challenge persists, they also demonstrate a notable progression: the organic, dialogic process in Ketenger has substantially increased resident engagement, surpassing the initial stage documented in the earlier study. This suggests that participatory communication grounded in strong social capital possesses the capacity to evolve and deepen over time, thereby addressing previously identified deficiencies.

Furthermore, our findings contribute a more holistic perspective that addresses gaps in the existing literature. Prior studies, including those by Murtiningsih et al. (2024) and Oktaviyani et al. (2026), frequently examined elements such as local wisdom and dialogue spaces as discrete phenomena. In contrast, our comparative analysis reveals that these components are intricately interconnected within a community's overall communication system. In Ketenger, local wisdom expressed through *gotong royong* and *musyawarah* functions not merely as a cultural value but as the foundational infrastructure enabling dialogue and collective decision-making. Similarly, in Laweyan, the *Reboan* forum serves as the principal mechanism through which collective identity and institutional norms are reinforced, thereby sustaining community participation. This demonstration of the direct linkage between social capital or institutional rules and the broader participatory process represents a significant contribution, moving beyond fragmented examinations of individual components. Additionally, while the introduction noted that many communities remain positioned as supporting players, our study presents a more dynamic reality. Both tourism villages exhibit a trajectory toward a partnership level of participation, as conceptualized by Arnstein (1969). This finding directly challenges the assumption of passive community involvement and demonstrates that, given appropriate communication structures whether institutional or social capital-based communities can progress toward greater empowerment. This suggests that the challenge of community participation is not a static condition but one that can be addressed and improved through effective and contextually appropriate communication practices.

The Servaes (2001) framework, which positions dialogue at the center of participatory development, is strongly reinforced by the evidence from both villages. In both research locations, dialogue serves not only as a medium for exchanging information but also as a space for the community to voice their aspirations, build mutual understanding, resolve issues, and reach joint decisions. In other words, communication occurs horizontally, so that the community is not

positioned as mere recipients of policies but rather as active actors in determining the direction of the tourism village's development. Similarly, the findings align with Freire's (1999) conceptualization of dialogue as the foundation of community empowerment. Freire explains that empowerment occurs when communities have the opportunity to reflect on their experiences, discuss shared issues, and collectively determine solutions. These conditions were evident in both villages, although they were realized through different mechanisms. In Laweyan, dialogue takes place through regularly scheduled organizational forums, whereas in Ketenger, dialogue develops through the community's social practices that occur naturally in daily life. These differing mechanisms demonstrate that the empowerment process can unfold through various forms of communication as long as the community has the space to participate actively.

When assessed against Arnstein's (1969) *Ladder of Citizen Participation*, both villages have moved beyond tokenism. Community members are not merely involved as recipients of information or participants in activities but also take part in program design, the implementation of tourism activities, evaluation, and decision-making regarding destination management. Although the level of involvement of each individual is not always the same, the communication mechanisms that have developed provide real opportunities for the community to influence the direction of tourism village development. This situation indicates that participation in both locations is closer to the partnership level, where the community holds a position that is relatively equal to that of other stakeholders in the decision-making process.

The comparative analysis further reveals that the effectiveness of Community-Based Tourism is not contingent upon a specific institutional arrangement, but rather on the community's capacity to cultivate communication practices that align with its local characteristics. In Laweyan, the success of tourism management is supported by strong organizational capacity, systematic coordination, and cross-institutional collaboration. Conversely, in Ketenger, this success is largely underpinned by the community's social capital, close interpersonal relationships, and a culture of mutual cooperation that is continuously nurtured. An important qualification emerges from this comparison: participatory communication does not guarantee equal participation among all community members. Differences in organizational position, experience, business interests, time availability, and digital literacy may influence whose voices are more readily heard and whose interests receive greater attention. Power is therefore negotiated not only through formal authority but also through access to communication spaces, social relationships, knowledge, and organizational resources. In Laweyan, established institutional forums provide a formal mechanism for negotiating these differences, whereas in Ketenger, interpersonal relationships, trust, and social norms play a stronger role. These findings suggest that participatory communication should not be understood as the absence of power differences, but

as an ongoing process through which such differences are negotiated through dialogue, deliberation, and collective practices.

The principle that communities should occupy a central position in tourism management and benefit from tourism development is affirmed by the evidence from both villages. More importantly, the comparison demonstrates that the achievement of this principle does not require a single organizational pathway. Laweyan achieves community participation primarily through an institution-driven pathway, in which established organizational structures, formal forums, and coordinated roles provide the infrastructure for collective decision-making. Ketenger, by contrast, demonstrates a social capital-driven pathway, in which trust, mutual cooperation, interpersonal relationships, and deliberative practices provide the social infrastructure for participation. A key implication for CBT development is that a uniform communication or organizational model should not be imposed across tourism villages. Instead, interventions should build upon the resources that already support participation within each local context: strengthening institutional capacity and inclusive coordination where formal organizations are dominant, while nurturing trust, social networks, and community deliberation where social capital is the primary foundation. Thus, the two cases demonstrate different pathways toward the same CBT principle of meaningful community participation.

The duality of structure as articulated by Giddens (1986) provides a valuable lens for interpreting these findings. In Laweyan, formal organizational structures provide rules, roles, and coordination mechanisms that facilitate community participation, while repeated participation through these institutional forums simultaneously reproduces and adapts the organizational structure. In Ketenger, the repeated practices of *gotong royong*, *musyawarah*, and interpersonal interaction reproduce existing norms of trust and mutual cooperation while also shaping how tourism-related decisions are negotiated. Thus, participatory communication is not simply conducted within pre-existing structures; it also contributes to the reproduction and transformation of the social structures that organize community participation. From a social constructivist perspective, Berger and Luckmann (1967) explain that a community's collective identity is formed through an ongoing process of communication. The identity of Laweyan as a historic batik village and that of Ketenger as a nature-based tourism village are not merely pre-existing conditions but are continuously produced through historical narratives, cultural activities, shared experiences, and social interactions within community life. This collective identity then reinforces a sense of belonging that encourages the community to continue participating in the management of the tourism villages.

The contrast between institution-based and social capital-based communication models observed in Laweyan and Ketenger illustrates that effective participatory communication can emerge through different pathways. Each model has proven capable of generating substantial community participation because it is adapted to the respective social, cultural, and institutional characteristics of the

village. Laweyan's institutional approach provides formal structures and clear coordination mechanisms that facilitate participation in an urban, heritage-based tourism context. Ketenger's social capital approach, by contrast, leverages existing networks of trust and mutual cooperation that are deeply embedded in rural community life. Rather than suggesting that one model is superior to the other, these cases demonstrate that the effectiveness of participatory communication depends on the alignment between communication practices and the local context in which they operate. This finding contributes to the development of research on participatory communication in Community-Based Tourism by emphasizing that communities must develop communication patterns suited to their specific circumstances in order to create participatory and sustainable tourism management.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that participatory communication is a key factor in the successful implementation of Community-Based Tourism (CBT), although its practice is influenced by the social and institutional characteristics of each destination. In Ketenger Tourism Village, participatory communication has developed through a more inclusive model, with active community involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of tourism activities. In contrast, in Laweyan Batik Village, participatory communication is more oriented toward coordination and collaboration among various stakeholders, so that community participation takes place through more complex institutional mechanisms.

A comparative analysis shows that the effectiveness of participatory communication is determined not only by the intensity of interaction but also by the level of trust, local leadership, social capital, and institutional capacity that support the collaborative process. These findings confirm that there is no single universal model of participatory communication applicable to CBT. Instead, communication strategies must be tailored to the social, cultural, and governance contexts of each destination to effectively foster meaningful community participation and support the sustainability of tourism management.

Theoretically, this study strengthens the literature on participatory communication in CBT by demonstrating that communication serves not only as a medium for conveying information but also as a mechanism for empowerment, consensus-building, and strengthening collaborative governance. Practically, the findings of this study have implications for destination managers and local governments to strengthen inclusive communication forums, enhance the capacity of local actors, and create spaces for dialogue that can accommodate diverse community interests. Future research is recommended to involve more destinations with diverse characteristics and to use a mixed-methods approach to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between participatory communication and the sustainability of Community-Based Tourism.

REFERENCES

- Agmasari, S. (2024). *Menparekraf Resmi Luncurkan Anugerah Desa Wisata Indonesia 2024*. KOMPAS.Com.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Ashley, C., & Roe, D. (1999). *Enhancing Community Involvement in Wildlife Tourism: Issues and challenges*. IIED Publications Library.
- Berger, L. P., & Luckmann, T. (1967). The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. In *Çankaya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* (Issue 1). Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (Sixth). SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Da Costa, D., & Sanjiwani, N. M. G. (2025). Penerapan Komunikasi Partisipatif Dalam Pengembangan Pariwisata Berbasis Masyarakat di Desa Wisata Jatiluwih. *Gemawisata: Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata*, 21(2), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.56910/gemawisata.v21i2.595>
- Darmawan, A. B., & Anwar, S. M. (2021). Analysis of Community Based Tourism (CBT) Standards as the Basis for Development in Ketenger Tourism Village, Banyumas Regency. *Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Development Studies*, 9(3), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jitode.2021.009.03.06>
- Freire, P. (1999). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Giddens, A. (1986). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. University of California Press.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of Focus Groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 16(1), 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347023>
- Mtapuri, O., Camilleri, M. A., & Dłużewska, A. (2022). Advancing community-based tourism approaches for the sustainable development of destinations. *Sustainable Development*, 30(3), 423–432. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2257>
- Murtiningsih, B. S. E., Meidiyawati, N., & Veronika, V. (2024). Participatory Communication Model Based on Local Wisdom in Ecotourism of West Detusoko Village. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 9(1), 22–34. <https://doi.org/10.25008/jkiski.v9i1.934>
- Oktaviyani, R., Hapsari, D. R., & Puspita, D. R. (2026). From Procedural to Dialogical Participation: A Relational Perspective on Participatory Communication in Tourism Village Governance. *KOMUNIKA: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Komunikasi*, 20(1).
- Rosalina, P. D., Dupre, K., Wang, Y., Putra, I. N. D., & Jin, X. (2023). Rural tourism resource management strategies: A case study of two tourism villages in Bali. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 49, 101194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2023.101194>
- Servaes, J. (2001). Introduction. *The Journal of International Communication*, 7(2),

- 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2001.9751906>
- Sophat, I., Saroeun, A. P. D. T., & Hong, A. P. D. S. (2024). AN INVESTIGATION OF FACTORS INFLUENCING TOURISTS' LOYALTY TO REVISIT PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 54–70. <https://doi.org/10.56943/jssh.v3i2.552>
- Steiner, A., Jack, S., Farmer, J., & Steinerowska-Streb, I. (2022). Are They Really a New Species? Exploring the Emergence of Social Entrepreneurs Through Giddens's Structuration Theory. *Business & Society*, 61(7), 1919–1961. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503211053014>
- Tela, I. N., Ghani, M. Z. A., Aryanti, D., Zaitul, Z., & Ilona, D. (2024). Community Support Toward Village-Based Tourism Development in Indonesia. *Journal of Design and Built Environment*, (sp2004), 100–114. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jdbe.sp2024.6>
- Thomas, T., & Mefalopulos, P. (2009). *Participatory Communication*. The World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8008-6>
- Wulandari, S., & Novita, E. (2025). VISUAL ARTS OF SUKATANI BAND ON SOCIAL MEDIA AS PARTICIPATORY MOVEMENT AFFECTS THE GOVERNMENT POLICIES. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(4), 79–100. <https://doi.org/10.56943/jssh.v4i4.898>
- Yanan, L., Ismail, M. A., & Aminuddin, A. (2024). How has rural tourism influenced the sustainable development of traditional villages? A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(4), e25627. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25627>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (Sixth Edition). SAGE Publishing.