

TOURISM GOVERNANCE CRISIS (A Study on the Kampung Ketupat Tourism Destination, 2024)

Siti Hamidah¹
Bintoro Wardiyanto²
Kris Nugroho³
Budi Kristanto⁴

^{1,2,3}Universitas Airlangga
Jl. Airlangga No. 4-6, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

⁴Universitas lambung Mangkurat
Jl Brigjen H.Hasan Basry Banjarmasin, Kalimantan Selatan, Indonesia

Correspondence Email: siti.hamidah-2017@fisip.unair.ac.id

Submitted: 24 June 2025, Reviewed: 5 November 2025, Published: 31 December 2025

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the governance crisis in tourism management at the Kampung Ketupat, a community-based destination in Banjarmasin, Indonesia, in 2024. The city government promoted the district as a "community" tourism base, but, over time, tourist numbers declined, and services ceased at the beginning of 2024. A qualitative method is used, including in-depth interviews with local communities, government officials, and tourism stakeholders; field observations; and analysis of documents on tourism policies and plans. A thematic analysis was used to scrutinize the data for issues of how actors worked together and became a partnership, how they 'took' part in and engaged with power. The outcomes indicate that local institutions are weak, with existing rural development centred on power-based governance and symbolic community participation. Another dimension of engagement concerns the formal nature of the process and the extent to which planning and management structures engage in power-sharing. The political aspects, funding, and use of space remain dominated by state and non-community actors. This is a manifestation of social distance and spatial injustice, in which communities are excluded from spaces that have historically and culturally belonged to them. This research notes that the governance crisis is not merely technical or administrative. However, it is built on power asymmetry, an absence of accountability, and institutional incapacity to promote citizens' participation.

Keywords: Tourism governance; social exclusion; participation; Kampung Ketupat.

INTRODUCTION

Community-based tourism (CBT) has gained considerable popularity as an alternative development approach that offers better prospects for local well-being, cultural preservation, and social empowerment through the active participation of the community in the destination management process (Okazaki, 2008; Suyatna et al., 2024). CBT is not merely viewed as a means of achieving a fairer distribution of economic benefits but also as a tool for enhancing social resilience to the impacts of globalization and the commodification of tourism. Some sustainable tourism development policies have integrated CBT including the Tourism Law (Undang-undang) No. 10/ 2009 on Tourism, which promotes empowerment; the National Tourism Development Master Plan (RIPPARNAS) 2011–2025 that proposes CBT as a destination development strategy; and Village Tourism Program and

Vol.11, No.2, 2025
Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v11i2.64630
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

National Strategy for Sustainable Tourism Development (Kemenparekraf, 2021), which position local communities to exert responsible power in managing multisectoral community-based destinations.

However, CBT idealism can be at odds with the messiness of local governance. Recent findings reveal that the leading conceptual framework supporting CBT, namely, collaborative governance, faces real-world challenges. Ansell & Gash, (2008) stress that successful collaborative governance is contingent on favorable initial conditions, inter-stakeholder trust, facilitative leadership, and institutional capacity; all of which are often lacking in local Indonesian settings. So far, building the local community's capacity as an owner and director of CBT remains a focus in a few regional development programmes. For the most part, community engagement is window-dressing or token at best. Lacks of knowledge and unbalanced power positions between governments and communities result in unilateral domination over decision-making (Mahadiansar et al., 2023; Zein et al., 2024).

Some scholars identify a range of obstacles to the practice of collaborative governance, including narrow forms of participation and asymmetrical power structures among actors. Research by Khairul Rahman (2022) in *CosmoGov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, for instance, shows that the success of the model for collaborative governance in rural areas, including Kampar Regency area, is largely determined by the existence of inter-actor communication that works effectively (effective actors), a balance of power to continue collaboration to take place, and there is a local organization to facilitate cooperation. The main obstacles are excessive bureaucratization, limited community participation, and weak interagency coordination. The study also demonstrates the need to develop inclusive and adaptive structural arrangements (Rahman, 2022).

Collaborative leadership deficiency is another critical obstacle. As demonstrated by Manurung et al. (2022), community-based coastal management initiatives could not achieve satisfactory goals because there were no facilitative leaders who could link diverse stakeholders and build mutual trust. Unfavourable starting point, for example, the hidden conflicts, mutual distrust, and fragmented community are rarely resolved in advance of collaboration (Manurung et al., 2022).

These challenges directly affect the success of CBT programs. Suyatna et al. (2024) Their study of the Nglanggeran tourism village shows that CBT can succeed only when supported by balanced power relations, shared ownership (co-ownership), and the integration of local values into the management system. When governance is carried out exclusively by external actors, local values are often sacrificed to short-term economic interests.

In this context, the governance crisis at the Kampung Ketupat tourism destination in Banjarmasin is a relevant case for examination. Kampung Ketupat was once designated as a community-based tourism destination through Mayor's Decree No. 610 of 2020 and was included in the strategic planning of the Banjarmasin City Tourism Development Plan (RIPPDA) 2022. However, in 2024, the area experienced stagnation and even decline. According to reports from Radar Banjarmasin and other local media, the Kampung Ketupat tourist attraction has ceased operations since before Ramadan 2024 due to a lack of visitors

and mismanagement by the investor (PT Juru Supervisi Indonesia). The investor acknowledged mismanagement that led to halted operations, facility damage, and abandonment of the area without maintenance. This condition was further aggravated by the disappearance of several assets and the decline of community activities in the surrounding area. (Ramadhan, 2024a, 2024b, 2024c). In the report, the Banjarmasin City Government stated that it could not interfere under the cooperation agreement; all authority had been delegated to the private investor. This suggests that basic tenets of collaborative governance, particularly transparency, full participation, and accountability, were not met. At the other end, local communities were alienated from management and from benefit sharing.

This paper examines the governance crisis that emerged in Kampung Ketupat in 2024 and how weaknesses inherent in its collaborative structure (and the absence of a genuine deliberative forum) contributed to it. This study is significant because it questions the paradox of community-based tourism by revealing how one example of a formally labelled CBT destination encountered governance challenges and addressed social exclusion. It does not emphasize management deficiencies but rather the interplay of unequal power relations, symbolic engagement, and spatial injustice as obstacles to collaboration. The Kampung Ketupat case constitutes a concrete empirical contribution to studies of governance by revealing a mismatch between policy narratives and practices, particularly in local tourism governance in Indonesia. Employing a qualitative perspective, the study exposes the role of the absence of inclusive and participatory governance in social exclusion and increased vulnerability to the sustainability of the collection destination. The Kampung Ketupat case is instructive. In the absence of a genuine commitment to the principles of collaborative governance, the concept of community-based tourism will remain merely platitudinous.

METHOD

This study employs qualitative research to provide a deep understanding of stakeholder collaboration in preservation activities for the Kampung Ketupat tourism in Banjarmasin, a contextual and specific case. This study is an empirical investigation, and primary data is collected through in-depth interviews, restricted participant observation, and policy documents. The research informants include villagers, community leaders, provincial-level government officials, and businesspeople who are directly or indirectly involved in managing the area. Furthermore, secondary data were obtained by reviewing regional policy documents, including the Master Plan for 2020–2022 of the Banjarmasin City Tourism Development (RIPPDA), the Regional Spatial Layout (RTRW) of Banjarmasin City, and the Mayor's Decrees concerning tourism area development.

Data were analysed according to Miles & Huberman's interactive analysis model (Miles & Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, 2018). This model comprises three main phases: data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions and verifying them. The analysis was conducted alongside the research activities to identify patterns, themes, and interrelations among the actors covered by the collaborative governance in Kampung Ketupat. As such, it

is not only a document-based study but also a field study that uses policy documents as another data source, employing triangulation to enhance the credibility of the findings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

These findings illustrate the presence of a tourism governance crisis in Kampung Ketupat, where fundamental principles of collaboration, such as equality, transparency, and accountability, do not function effectively. This crisis arises not merely from weak administrative coordination but from unequal power structures and the neglect of community participation rights in decision-making.

Power Relations in Collaboration

The study found that the city government and private partners were the dominant actors in the planning and development processes of the Kampung Ketupat tourism area. From the planning stage through implementation, policies and strategic decisions were made unilaterally by formal actors, with little meaningful participation from the local community. One informant stated:

“We were not involved in the planning, and even when the development was underway, our suggestions were not listened to at all.”

This statement illustrates that residents were positioned as objects of development rather than active subjects within the collaborative process. Power over the area's management was not negotiated equally; it was centralized in the hands of the city government and the investor, who controlled planning, financing, and operational management.

Such a pattern is indicative of a ‘top-down’ approach, which contradicts the principles of collaborative governance, highlighted by Ansell and Gash (2008), face-to-face dialogue, trust, and interdependence among actors matter. Without dialogue and trust-building mechanisms, collaboration remains ritualistic and symbolic, as observed in Kampung Ketupat, where community involvement materialised only at the very end of planning processes for ceremonial openings intended to promote tourism. At the same time, policy and project remained subservient to bureaucratic elites and private-sector priorities.

The predominance of formal actors echoes Chaperon’s (2017) observations on the extent to which public- and business-led tourism ventures marginalise local communities from important decision-making processes. These are the underlying conflicts that cause friction and ultimately hinder community-based tourism. In Indonesia, Suyatna et al. (2024) also observed a similar trend in Nglanggeran Village, in which the dominance of external institutions and local elites suppressed community initiatives by producing uneven crop distribution benefits that could be enjoyed only by certain groups.

Moreover, this asymmetry of power fails to confer policy legitimacy. Emerson et al. (2012) note that productive partnerships depend on inclusive leadership, transparent communication systems, and deliberative arenas that allow critique and negotiation of interests. The lack of policy assessment meetings, public reporting systems, or instruments

for redressing the organization and management of Kampung Ketupat signals weak accountability and transparency.

There is also cultural marginalization due to the predominance of the government and investors. Consistent with Lefebvre's (1991) theory of the production of space, spaces generated by dominant actors lose their social and cultural significance as they are recast to favour economic and political imperatives, and in the case of Kampung Ketupat, a unique land and buildings that used to present a tradition and local identity had been turned into a tourist space being bureaucratically managed based on market interest orientation, having nothing to do with what people expected.

Thus, power relations in the collaborative management of Kampung Ketupat reveal structural inequalities between state actors, private entities, and the community. Collaboration, which should be participatory, instead becomes an instrument for reproducing power, thereby disregarding deliberative justice and citizens' rights to space.

Social Exclusion as a Manifestation of Spatial Injustice

Social exclusion is one of the most visible manifestations of the tourism governance crisis occurring in Kampung Ketupat. Although the area was developed as a community-based tourism destination, field realities indicate that residents were instead excluded from both management processes and the economic benefits generated. In practice, residents were not actively involved in managing the destination, whether as tourism business operators, workers such as cleaning staff, security personnel, and parking attendants (who were recruited from outside the village), or as partners in policymaking. Their position was reduced to that of mere "spectators" of tourism activities occurring within their own living space.

The informant stated that those responsible for security, cleaning, and parking were hired externally. This reflects a lack of respect for local potential and capacity, which could have informed the project's sustainability. Such a circumstance is the feature of what can be termed structural social exclusion - "a systematic practice in which participation in the development process is unfairly denied to specific communities" (Silver, 1994).

This phenomenon does not stand alone. Okazaki (2008) posits that most Community-Based Tourism (CBT) initiatives are not successful because they cannot create an environment that fosters equal participation and power sharing. Where actors such as the government and the private sector are in control, communities become mere objects of development and have only symbolic participation. This situation is reinforced by the findings of Suyatna et al. (2024), in their work on the village of Nglanggeran, Yogyakarta, which demonstrates that the intervention of external actors in tourism projects tends to reinforce local elitism and generate new social hierarchies within the community while reducing collective grassroots initiatives.

Exclusion in tourism affects not only the economy but also identity and culture. Lefebvre (1991) acknowledges this by warning that space is not merely physical but a social production shaped by interactions, history, and shared meanings. When residents' living space is converted into a tourism zone managed by external forces, community identity

gradually fades. Residential autonomy is lost over one's own lived space, which was once inherited and, in turn, historically and culturally made sense of.

This has created a contradiction within the community, resulting in an anomaly in its spatial claim and control. Soja (2010) calls spatial injustice – in that not all distributions of benefits, rights, and power over space are equal. For Kampung Ketupat residents, economic exclusion is accompanied by symbolic and social alienation in their everyday spaces.

Therefore, social exclusion in Kampung Ketupat cannot be understood merely as an administrative failure or a technical mistake; rather, it should be understood as the result of undemocratic and non-specialized governance. Policy changes and institutional design enhancements are required to ensure that residents not only participate in tourism development but also in its direction, equitably and sustainably.

Policy Incoherence

The governance crisis in Kampung Ketupat's tourism development is also reflected in the incoherence between policy formulation and its on-the-ground implementation. Several official regional policies, such as the Regional Tourism Development Master Plan (Rencana Induk Pengembangan Pariwisata Daerah (RIPPDA) Kota Banjarmasin, 2022) dan and the Mayor's Decree No. 610/2020 on the Designation of Community-Based Tourism Areas in Banjarmasin City, normatively emphasize the importance of participatory and community-based tourism. However, in practice, the management of the area tends to follow a technocratic and investor-centric approach. Residents are not involved in technical planning, and work contracts as well as governance arrangements are determined unilaterally by government and private actors.

This discontinuity indicates the presence of a gap between the dimension of strategic policy formulation (policy intention) and its implementation at the technical level (policy implementation). According to Hudson et al. (2019) policy implementation often fails not due to poor design, but because of a "policy implementation gap, a disconnect between planning and realization, resulting from the complex nature of systems and the variability of local contexts. In the case of Kampung Ketupat, there is no mechanism or bridging institution capable of ensuring that the participatory vision embedded in strategic policies is implemented at the operational level. As a result, what is written in planning documents tends to remain normative rhetoric with little influence on reality.

This is compounded by poor inter-agency collaboration among government and non-government actors. Emerson et al. (2012) underscore system integration in terms of collaborative governance, predominantly through shared understanding and principled engagement. In the lack of common framing and cross-actor perseverance, policies tend to work in siloes, lose coherence, and are too vulnerable to sector stakeholders' interests.

Discontinuity is also manifest in the dispersion of authority. The philosophy of decentralization holds that local government is empowered to respond more closely to local people's policy needs (Faguet, 2014). However, in the context of Kampung Ketupat, the authority that would have reinforced people's control over the government was delegated to

private partners without transparency. This gives rise to structural bias, in which public policy is no longer oriented toward the common good but is replaced by business logic.

This indicates that inclusive policymaking alone is insufficient; successful tourism governance also depends on an implementation system that is coherent, flexible, and responsive to local conditions. On the other hand, in the absence of any body responsible for integrating planning, implementation, and evaluation across sectors and stakeholders, governance is open to fragmentation and failure. The research of Mandarano's (2009) finds, once again, that the effectiveness of collaborative governance is heavily influenced by the institutional capacity to promote cross-actor communication and to manage competing interests.

Therefore, the gap between policy and practice in managing Kampung Ketupat is not solely due to an administrative error but also to a lack of institutional infrastructure and weak political will to embrace participatory and equitable tourism.

Absence of Accountability and Transparency Mechanisms

One significant symptom of the governance crisis in Kampung Ketupat is the absence of a system of good governance with respect to accountability and transparency, which makes it inaccessible to the community, particularly residents in the tourism area. Field observation also reveals that at the destination site, there is no open management process; the community is not informed about who manages the area, how tourism revenues are shared, or how decisions concerning the tourist destination are made and implemented.

This is an example of opaque governance, i.e., a closed and unapproachable form of governance for citizens in terms of democracy (Fox, 2007). Where there is collusion or the closed control of knowledge within a compact group of elites, public decision-making over the use of space can be open to abuse, conflicts of interest, and a lack of reflexivity between policies and lived community experiences. This is not just because it undermines the principle of public accountability, but also because such a move blunts community members' sense of ownership of their historically inherited spaces.

In their institutionalist approach to the collaborative governance regime, Emerson et al. (2012) emphasize the role of accountability as a key component of CAFFAB's operation, thereby ensuring fairness and sustainability. In the absence of transparent, participatory accountability mechanisms associated with collaborative processes, we can have something that is not true collaboration but rather "pseudo-collaboration." In cases like this, a formally accountable mechanism in the public sector is transferred to private hands without social or political oversight.

The lack of discussion platforms and regular updates for villagers, as in Kampung Ketupat, also reflects the breakdown of two-way communication between the government and the community. Fung (2006) contends that mechanisms for deliberative participation—citizen forums, social audits, and public consultations— are critical instruments for promoting transparency in local product development. When these platforms are absent or are treated as a ritualistic formality, citizens lose the opportunity to express their concerns,

criticise policy, and hold managers to account. When considered in the Indonesian context, these results also support arguments that collaboration here is more akin to co-option, in which residents are positioned as adjuncts symbolically rather than as genuine partners.

Insufficient accountability and transparency take a toll not only administratively but also structurally. This information, along with the lack of public oversight, favours an unfair distribution of benefits, horizontal conflicts within the population, and the reinforcement of distrust in public institutions. Thus, the process of forming sustainable tourism governance should begin with the development of an information-delivery and accountability system that opens all stages of planning to societal control as its legitimate space, from planning through execution to evaluation.

Accessibility Gaps and Socio-Economic Barriers

Given weak transparency and accountability, the entrance-fee policy in Kampung Ketupat constitutes an additional barrier to public access to the tourist site. Some informants reported that the fee—disproportionate to the facilities and experiences available—is also a deterrent for visitors from lower-income groups. There is no relationship between the use of such a policy in maximizing short-term revenue and the inclusive accessibility principle in tourism governance (Okazaki, 2008; Suyatna et al., 2024). Community-based tourism should be open and participatory rather than the result of purely commercial considerations.

This critical analysis echoes recent research in tourism studies, revealing how the commercialisation of public spaces tends to exacerbate social exclusion. In the case of Kampung Ketupat, the policy of charging entrance fees alters perceptions of the space from a public space for everyone to gather to a private market accessible only to those who can afford to enter. The social implications of this include declining visitor numbers, diminished community ownership of the bottomlands, and the erosion of the area's role as a shared recreational space. This implies that governance models insensitive to the socio-economic conditions of space use can not only indirectly lead to the failure of tourism destinations but also significantly accelerate it.

Beyond weak accountability and transparency, the entrance-fee policy in the Kampung Ketupat tourism area has become a major barrier to the public's right of access to that space. A few informants mentioned that people in low-income areas do not feel welcome to visit because the cost is disproportionate to the value of the experiences and facilities. This reflects a disconnection between tourism promotional policies and actual street culture trends, which they do not consider in terms of public needs or purchasing power.

The foundational principles of community-based tourism development are inclusivity and affordability. As Okazaki (2008) notes, the Community-Based Tourism (CBT) model should be guided by participation (inclusive and equitable), including in the use and enjoyment of public spaces. However, when access is limited through economic measures such as fees and levies, without service improvements or transparency in the use of funds, residents are excluded not only as actors but also as users. This confirms the critique raised by Dangi and Petrick (2021), who argue that market-oriented tourism development

projects have been unable to translate into on-the-ground community-level benefits, as fiscal efficiency often overrides social justice.

Moreover, the entrance fee system has transformed public perceptions of tourism spaces. A space once marked as being part of the everyday life of its users, to go for family recreation, traditional festivals, or just an open social place has now acquired a sign value from where one can profit. In Lefebvre (1991) terms, the commodification of space is the creation and regulation of space in line with capitalist or state forces rather than for social or cultural reasons. For Kampung Ketupat, this conversion has resulted in a decline in residents' identification with and social bonding to the place.

The social costs of this policy cannot be overstated. It has not only reduced the number of visitors but also created social distance among residents and between residents and tourism spaces. The community that is supposed to be part and parcel of the tourism ecosystem finds itself an outsider in a policy that does not serve its best interests. This is an indication of the state's inability to achieve spatial justice, which Soja (2010) has argued that its right in space means that every citizen has a right to participate in and experience space rather than seeing it subsumed by capitalism or elitism.

If these policies are not rectified, the destination's tourist vibrancy is in jeopardy. Even the most successful hookups rely on more than physical attraction to endure; without social support from family and guests, many hookups will not. Openness, inclusiveness, and affordability are the keys to resuscitating a fair and sustainable tourism ecosystem.

Hence, the power-relations imbalance, social exclusion, spatial injustice, and lack of public accountability indicate that the governance crisis in Kampung Ketupat is systemic, spanning the political, social, and cultural dimensions of tourism development.

CONCLUSION

This study argues that the governance of community-based tourism in Kampung Ketupat exemplifies institutional failure, characterised by power asymmetry, a lack of deliberative inclusiveness, social exclusion, and a broader governance gap. Community participation is largely symbolic within an exclusive governance structure, thereby perpetuating social exclusion and a general deficit of governance. This is compounded by the distance between policy design and practice, due to weak accountability mechanisms and fragmented coordination among actors. Entrance fee regulation is also indicative of the marketisation of public space, which runs counter to the principles of spatial justice. Thus, an integrative governance framework must be developed to redress these structural mismatches and place inhabitants as the primary subjects of tourist space governance.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Dangi, T. B., & Petrick, J. F. (2021). Enhancing the role of tourism governance to improve collaborative participation, responsiveness, representation and inclusion for

Vol.11, No.2, 2025
Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v11i2.64630
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

- sustainable community-based tourism: A case study. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 7(4), 1029–1048. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-10-2020-0223>
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Faguet, J. P. (2014). Decentralization and Governance. *World Development*, 53, 2–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.002>
- Fox, J. (2007). The uncertain relationship between transparency and accountability. *Development in Practice*, 17(4–5), 663–671. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469955>
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review*, 66(SUPPL. 1), 66–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x>
- Hudson, B., Hunter, D., & Peckham, S. (2019). Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: can policy support programs help? *Policy Design and Practice*, 2(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378>
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). The Production of Space. In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts, Second Edition* (Basil Blac). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315565125-7>
- Mahadiansar, M., Alfiandri, A., & Syuzairi, M. (2023). *Analysis of Collaborative Governance in Tourism Based on Coastal Community Empowerment in Indonesia* (Issue Shimba). Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-150-0_2
- Mandarano, L. A. (2009). Social network analysis of social capital in collaborative planning. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22(3), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920801922182>
- Manurung, Y. S., Maarif, S., Samuel, T., Toruan, L., & Swastanto, Y. (2022). Partnership As a Means of Collaborative Governance To Achieve Coastal Community'S Resiliency in Indonesia. *CosmoGov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 8(2), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v8i2.42469>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), 511–529. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost782.0>
- Keputusan Walikota Nomor 610 Tahun 2020 tentang Penetapan Daerah Tujuan Wisata Berbasis Masyarakat di Kota Banjarmasin, (2020).
- Peraturan Daerah Kota Banjarmasin Nomor 6 Tahun 2021 tentang Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah Kota Banjarmasin Tahun 2021 - 2041, (2021).
- Rencana Induk Pengembangan pariwisata Daerah (RIPPDA) Kota Banjarmasin, (2022).
- Rahman, K. (2022). *COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IN RURAL AREA*. 8(2), 164–178. <https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v8i2.41125>
- Ramadhan, W. (2024a). *Nasib Tragis Destinasi Wisata Kampung Ketupat: Belum Setahun Sudah Tutup*. Radarbanjarmasin.Jawapos.Com. <https://radarbanjarmasin.jawapos.com/banua/1974625789/nasib-tragis-destinasi-wisata-kampung-ketupat-belum-setahun-sudah-tutup>
- Ramadhan, W. (2024b). *Nasib Tragis Wisata Kampung Ketupat: Pemko Banjarmasin Enggan Ikut Campur*. Radarbanjarmasin.Jawapos.Com. <https://radarbanjarmasin.jawapos.com/bisnis/1974633149/nasib-tragis-wisata-kampung-ketupat-pemko-banjarmasin-enggan-ikut-campur>
- Ramadhan, W. (2024c). *Nasib Tragis Wisata Kampung Ketupat Banjarmasin, Investor: Akibat Manajemen Salah Urus*. Radarbanjarmasin.Jawapos.Com. <https://radarbanjarmasin.jawapos.com/bisnis/1974636173/nasib-tragis-wisata-kampung-ketupat-banjarmasin-investor-akibat-manajemen-salah-urus>
- Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms. *International Labour Review*, 133(January 1994), 531–578.

Vol.11, No.2, 2025
Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v11i2.64630
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

- Soja, E. (2010). Seeking Spacial Justice. In *Eure* (Vol. 37 nro.111). <http://www.scielo.cl/pdf/eure/v37n111/art08.pdf>
- Suyatna, H., Indroyono, P., Yuda, T. K., & Firdaus, R. S. M. (2024). How Community-based Tourism Improves Community Welfare? A Practical Case Study of ‘Governing the Commons’ in Rural Nglanggeran, Indonesia. *International Journal of Community and Social Development*, 6(1), 77–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25166026241228717>
- Zein, M. H. M., Mahedar, S. J., & Septiani, S. (2024). Kolaborasi Multi-Stakeholder dalam Pengelolaan Sampah: Evaluasi Model Governance di Indonesia. *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4, 13893–13905. <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative>