

COLLABORATIVE CULTURAL TOURISM PLANNING IN KEMIREN, BANYUWANGI: A PRELIMINARY SEXTUPLE HELIX FRAMEWORK FOR CREATIVE ECONOMY DEVELOPMENT

Tafati Linia Larosa^{1a*}, Yovita Vivianty Atmadjaja^{2b}, Agus Riyanto^{3c}, Yohanes Handojo^{4d}

¹²³Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, University of 17 August 1945 Banyuwangi

⁴Faculty of Health, University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

^aE-mail: tafati@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^bE-mail: yovitavia@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^cE-mail: agusriyanto@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

^dE-mail: yohanesh@uvic.ca

(*) Correspondng Author

tafati@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 30-07-2026

Revised : 15-09-2026

Accepted : 30-09-2026

KEYWORDS

Creative Economy;

Cultural Tourism;

Digitalisation;

Kemiren Village;

Sextuple Helix

ABSTRACT

This study develops a preliminary collaborative cultural tourism planning framework for Kemiren Village, Banyuwangi, through a context-specific Sextuple Helix configuration. Qualitative document analysis examined four Indonesian-language focus group discussion (FGD) records dated April-May 2026, covering tourism-office, community-tourism, enterprise, and customary-community and environmental perspectives. Analysis and preliminary design were organised within an adapted Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation (ADDIE) process. The records identify cultural houses, rituals, performing arts, food and local enterprises as interconnected resources, alongside fragmented visitor management, limited documentation, uneven digital capabilities, enterprise constraints and environmental concerns. They also emphasise boundaries around sacred traditions and residential spaces. The proposed framework assigns responsibilities across academia, government, business, customary communities, environmental stewardship and digital practice. It connects cultural approval, service readiness, information maintenance and environmental review with proposed planning actions. These functional domains can overlap within individuals and organisations. Digitalisation is positioned as support for cultural learning, documentation and locally managed services. The contribution is an evidence-informed planning framework; effects on income, cultural transmission and environmental performance require subsequent implementation and evaluation.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTION

Cultural tourism connects the interpretation of heritage with questions about whose knowledge is represented, how visitors encounter local life and who benefits from tourism development. (Richards, 2025) identifies growing attention to intangible heritage, gastronomy, storytelling and the relationship between culture and place in contemporary cultural tourism research. For a living cultural village, these concerns extend beyond maintaining attractive sites. Tourism activities enter residential spaces, everyday practices and relationships through which cultural knowledge is transmitted. Planning therefore needs to address the conditions under which cultural experiences can be shared without subordinating community life to visitor demand.

Kemiren Village in Glagah District, Banyuwangi, East Java, is a living Osing cultural village where traditional houses, language, rituals, performing arts, food and household enterprises remain part of everyday community life. Cultural tourism planning in this setting must therefore coordinate visitor experiences with residents' cultural authority, privacy and livelihoods.

Creative tourism offers a relevant perspective on this relationship because it connects participation and learning with locally grounded cultural activity. (Duxbury et al., 2020) show how small-scale creative tourism initiatives can be organised through individual offers, thematic programmes, local networks, festivals and accommodation-based experiences. Their research in Portugal provides a comparative reference rather than evidence about Kemiren. In the present study, the value of this perspective lies in asking how local houses, food, performance and craft skills might support meaningful encounters while remaining embedded in the people and practices that sustain them.

Indonesian research has also examined connections between community-based tourism, local culture, digital technology and the creative economy, including a programme in Sidatapa Village (Setiawati & Syam, 2023). In Koto Sentajo Village, (Yasir et al., 2021) identify complementary roles for universities, government, business, communities and media within a Penta Helix communication model. These studies establish relevant points of comparison, but their locations and institutional arrangements are distinct from Kemiren. A local masterplan must therefore specify which responsibilities require coordination instead of importing an actor configuration without examining the needs it is intended to address. A Sextuple Helix approach provides a way to examine these intersecting responsibilities by making cultural, environmental and digital responsibilities explicit. (Carayannis et al., 2012) explicitly incorporate the natural environment into the Quintuple Helix innovation model. Environmental conditions are consequently part of the knowledge and innovation system, rather than an external consideration added after economic development. However, additional helices need substantive justification and operationalisation; a larger number does not itself demonstrate greater explanatory power (Leydesdorff, 2012).

Recent Indonesian studies reinforce the need for context-sensitive governance in tourism villages. (Suhandi et al., 2022) show that community participation in Wae Rebo is sustained through involvement across planning and implementation, while (Andjanie et al., 2023) identify institutional and community readiness as practical conditions for community-based tourism. In Kemiren itself, (Rozi, 2022) highlights participatory communication between government and community, and (Rohimah et al., 2024) report the importance of stronger coordination among tourism stakeholders. Collaborative-governance research similarly emphasises institutional design, principled engagement, trust and capacity for joint action rather than actor presence alone (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012). These studies sharpen the gap addressed here: the issue is not simply whether multiple actors are present, but how cultural authorisation, service capacity, digital maintenance and environmental review are assigned as explicit and accountable responsibilities within a living cultural village

A further comparison is provided by (Tuthaes et al., 2024), whose Hexa Helix study of ikat-weaving enterprises in Kupang involves government, business, universities, non-governmental organisations, mass media and the affected community. That configuration is not identical to the one used here. In this article, Sextuple Helix refers to a context-specific planning framework comprising academia, government, business, customary communities, environmental stewardship and digital practice. Environmental and digital responsibilities are represented by people and organisations; the natural environment and technology are not themselves treated as actors. The framework makes these responsibilities explicit while recognising overlap between domains.

Against this context, stakeholder accounts describe substantial cultural and creative resources but also fragmented coordination, weak documentation, uneven digital readiness and concerns about commercialisation. The problem addressed

is how these needs can be translated into a shared planning framework without separating cultural preservation from tourism services and local livelihoods. Accordingly, the study asks: (1) What cultural resources and management needs do stakeholders identify? (2) How can a Sextuple Helix approach organise the responsibilities required to address them? The article contributes a preliminary masterplan framework linking cultural safeguarding, experiential tourism, local enterprise, digital services and environmental stewardship. Its contribution lies in translating documented needs into linked decisions: who authorises cultural content, who confirms service and production capacity, who maintains booking information, and who reviews environmental pressures before activities expand.

METHOD

The study used qualitative document analysis within a research and development (R&D) framework in Kemiren Village, Glagah District, Banyuwangi, East Java, Indonesia. The development objective is a collaborative cultural tourism masterplan informed by local cultural resources and stakeholder needs. The findings reported here concern needs analysis and preliminary masterplan formulation. Implementation outcomes, formal validation scores and longitudinal effects are not reported; consequently, the masterplan is presented as a planning output rather than as an intervention of demonstrated effectiveness.

ADDIE (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation) was used only as an organising heuristic for the wider development agenda (Branch, 2009) not as a tourism-governance theory. Analysis identifies cultural assets, stakeholder needs, creative-economy opportunities and management constraints; Design links those findings to proposed responsibilities and priorities; and the reported portion of Development specifies elements of the proposed framework and supporting materials. Implementation and Evaluation remain future stages requiring documented trials, validation and outcome assessment. Table 1 therefore distinguishes what is evidenced in this article from what is planned for subsequent work.

Table 1. ADDIE Orientation and the Early-Stage Scope Reported in This Article

Stage	Application to the masterplan	Evidence or reporting status
Analysis	Map cultural resources, local enterprise, digital needs, visitor management and environmental concerns.	Qualitative needs and stakeholder accounts are reported in this article.
Design	Connect the identified needs with six collaboration domains and planning priorities.	A preliminary planning framework and proposed responsibilities are presented.
Development	Prepare the masterplan and specify supporting guides, cultural documentation and digital materials.	The article presents planning specifications; completion of all supporting products is not established.
Implementation	Trial agreed visitor arrangements, learning activities and digital services with relevant users.	A subsequent development task; no evaluated implementation results are reported here.
Evaluation	Review cultural appropriateness, usability, feasibility and community and environmental outcomes.	Proposed for further work; no validation ratings or impact measurements are presented.

Source: Authors' Synthesis of the Reported Research Design

The focus group discussions (FGDs) informing the masterplan involved a reported total of 50 participants: five representatives of the Banyuwangi Tourism Office; 15 members of Kelompok Sadar Wisata (*Pokdarwis*) Kemiren, the local tourism-awareness group; 15 customary community representatives; and 15 local micro, small and medium-sized enterprise (MSME) representatives. The four sets of minutes bear dates between 9 April and 3 May 2026. Their discussions addressed

cultural preservation, tourism governance, creative economy development, digital needs and environmental sustainability. The participant totals describe the consultation context; they are not used to estimate the prevalence of particular views.

The fourth record is explicitly titled as a discussion with the customary community and environmental observers. It reports their perspectives jointly and does not provide separate attendance counts for these roles. The four discussion groups should be distinguished from the six functional domains proposed for collaboration, which also envisage academic and digital partners. Inclusion of a partner in the masterplan does not establish that the partner supplied research data.

The empirical corpus for this article comprised four written FGD records concerning the collaborative cultural tourism masterplan in Kemiren. These narrative minutes, written in Indonesian, summarised issues, needs and recommendations rather than reproducing individual speakers' words. The article analyses the minutes as documents; it does not report a separate interview, observation or workshop dataset. The evidence therefore concerns the perspectives preserved in these records, rather than an independently verified inventory of all village assets or practices.

The corpus comprised 11 pages across four records. Each document bears the name of Tafati Linia Larosa, the first author, beneath its dateline. Table 2 identifies the records by stakeholder group, printed date and length. The source codes were assigned for this analysis and are used with page numbers in the findings. Printed dates identify the records; the minutes do not separately specify session start and end times, duration, recording arrangements or facilitator roles. All empirical excerpts in the article are paraphrases of the narrative minutes, not verbatim participant quotations.

Table 2. Documentary Sources for the Stakeholder Analysis

Source Code	Documented Stakeholders	Printed Date	Pages
FGD-DIS	Banyuwangi Tourism Office	9 April 2026	3
FGD-POK	Pokdarwis Kemiren	26 April 2026	3
FGD-UMKM	Local MSME representatives	26 April 2026	3
FGD-ADAT	Customary community and environmental observers	3 May 2026	2

Source: Four unpublished FGD minutes. Codes identify documents, not individual participants.

Document analysis provides a qualitative approach to examining written records as research evidence (Bowen, 2009). For the present synthesis, the unit of analysis was a passage describing a cultural resource, constraint, need or proposed action. Each record was read in full, relevant passages were grouped by topic, and their source codes and pages were retained. The initial organising categories reflected the research questions: cultural resources, management needs and collaborative responsibilities. More specific issues, including ritual boundaries, production capacity, packaging costs and waste sorting, were retained from the records rather than reduced to a generic category of tourism promotion.

Stakeholder perspectives are reported at group level without naming individual speakers. The minutes bear the first author's name, so they should not be treated as records produced independently of the research team. The proposed cultural-access and publication protocols discussed in the masterplan concern future tourism activities; they do not establish that research participation or use of the minutes had already received ethical or community authorisation.

Stakeholder perspectives are reported at the group level without identifying individual speakers. Because the minutes bear the first author's name, they are treated as project-generated records rather than as independently produced accounts. The available project documentation does not record a formal institutional ethics committee approval or exemption number for the focus group discussions; accordingly, this article does not claim that formal ethical clearance had been granted. Participation in the underlying research was voluntary and based on written informed consent. Before participation, individuals were informed of the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their involvement, and their right to decline participation or withdraw at any stage without penalty. The findings are presented at the stakeholder-group level to protect participant confidentiality. The consent process is interpreted as authorisation to participate in the research and for the research team to analyse the resulting FGD records; it is not treated as unrestricted permission to disclose, reproduce, digitise, or commercially use culturally sensitive knowledge. Where the records concern customary practices, sacred traditions, or culturally restricted knowledge, the study reports only the information documented in the research records and does not infer broader community authorisation. Any subsequent public dissemination, digital reproduction, or commercial use of culturally sensitive material would require separate consultation and approval from the relevant cultural knowledge holders.

Topics were compared across the four records to identify shared concerns and differences in emphasis. For example, the MSME record describes *pecel pitik* as a local culinary product, whereas the customary-community record emphasises its ritual function. Both accounts were retained in deriving the proposed cultural safeguards. Needs were then mapped to the six collaboration domains and to proposed outputs and review questions in Tables 3 and 4. This is a comparison of documentary sources, not methodological triangulation with independently analysed interviews or observations. It does not establish consensus within or between groups. Accounts of visitor preferences, language use, institutional capacity and environmental conditions are interpreted as stakeholder perceptions; the proposed outputs remain planning implications rather than validated instruments or measured outcomes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Cultural Resources and Safeguarding

The stakeholder accounts present Kemiren as a living cultural village rather than a collection of isolated attractions. Traditional Using houses, language, performing arts, customary rituals, food, homestays and household enterprises form part of the same social environment. Pokdarwis participants associated the village's identity with cultural continuity in Kedaleman and Krajan, while the tourism office emphasised the need to preserve the relationship between tourism and residents' everyday lives (FGD-POK, p. 1; FGD-DIS, p. 1). The central planning issue is therefore integration: existing resources are numerous, but their presence alone does not provide a coordinated visitor experience or a shared system of cultural protection. The tourism office favoured experiences based on education, interaction and cultural preservation rather than mass tourism or the conversion of the village into a performance venue. Pokdarwis similarly described interest in traditional houses and everyday community life alongside scheduled performances (FGD-DIS, p. 1; FGD-POK, pp. 1-2). This is a stakeholder interpretation of visitor interests, not a measured change in market demand. Nevertheless, it establishes a planning priority within the reported discussions: cultural tourism should help visitors understand the village rather than merely increase the number of attractions offered to them.

Traditional Using houses occupy an important position in this account. They are both residential spaces and expressions of cultural memory and identity. Participants also identified cultural venues, including Sanggar Genjah Arum, Rumah Budaya Osing and Sapu Jagad, but described limited integration among them within village-level tourism management (FGD-POK, pp. 1-2). A coordinated route could link these resources where participation is agreed, while distinguishing public access, access by prior arrangement and spaces that remain private.

The emphasis on participation and learning is consistent with the discussion by (Duxbury et al., 2020) of locally embedded creative tourism networks. Applied as a planning implication for Kemiren, a house visit, food demonstration or arts activity could be connected through interpretation of the relationships between architecture, daily life and cultural practice. The objective would be a coherent learning experience rather than a larger volume of separate attractions. Whether particular residents and cultural practitioners wish to offer such activities, and on what terms, remains a matter for local agreement.

Customary-community participants drew a clear distinction between cultural presentation and the integrity of cultural practice. Traditions discussed included *Barong Ider Bumi*, *Tumpeng Sewu*, *mocoan lontar*, *selamatan*, *labuh nyingkal* and *rujukan*. Participants described these practices as carrying social, spiritual and ecological meanings (FGD-ADAT, p. 1). Their concern was not simply that tourism should avoid inaccurate presentation, but that cultural activities should retain their purposes within community life. The findings therefore do not support an assumption that every tradition can become a tourism product.

The discussion of *pecel pitik* illustrates this boundary. Participants described the food as more than a culinary speciality because of its place in particular ritual occasions. Likewise, the presentation of *Barong Ider Bumi* and *Tumpeng Sewu* for visitors was considered acceptable only insofar as the core ritual and cultural values were not altered (FGD-ADAT, p. 1). These accounts support a masterplan that distinguishes interpretation, hospitality and commercial exchange from activities governed primarily by customary obligations. The distinction should be specified by cultural custodians, rather than inferred by tourism promoters from visitor interest.

Reading the records together reveals a difference in emphasis: the MSME minutes list *pecel pitik* among products supporting local enterprise (FGD-UMKM, p. 1), while the customary-community minutes foreground its ritual role (FGD-ADAT, p. 1). These accounts need not contradict one another, but they show why a product listing cannot establish permission to commercialise every cultural use of a food. The proposed masterplan should separate ordinary culinary sales from ritual contexts and refer decisions about cultural representation to the relevant custodians.

A practical implication is to develop locally agreed cultural protocols before expanding promotional content or visitor packages. Proposed protocols could identify what may be observed, explained, photographed, recorded or shared online, and who can authorise each use. They could also distinguish permissions for educational interpretation from permissions for commercial promotion. These are recommendations derived from the reported concerns, not evidence that a formal permissions system is already operating. Their purpose would be to translate the community's stated boundaries into decisions that guides, enterprises and digital practitioners can follow.

Documentation and Cultural Learning

Cultural documentation emerged as a related need. Customary-community participants reported that village history, accounts of *Tumpeng Sewu*, *Selamatan Kebonan* and *Selamatan Kampung*, and explanations of local practices remained largely in oral memory (FGD-ADAT, p. 1). This does not make oral knowledge deficient; it highlights a concern about continuity and context when knowledge passes between generations or is adapted for external audiences. A planning response should support documentation with cultural knowledge holders, rather than replace oral transmission with a single externally authored description.

Participants also expressed concern about younger people increasingly using Indonesian rather than Using (FGD-ADAT, p. 1). The study does not measure language proficiency or the rate of language shift. The relevance of this account lies in its educational implication: cultural documentation could include the original language, local terms and explanations provided by knowledgeable speakers. Oral histories, narrated demonstrations and contextualised recordings could support both community learning and visitor interpretation. Public-facing materials would require decisions about accuracy and access, while culturally restricted material should not be made public simply because digital storage is possible.

This interpretation aligns with (Kusumastuti et al., 2024) who emphasise local values alongside technology adoption in sustainable tourism development. In Kemiren, the reported documentation needs suggest that technological development should begin with the purposes of cultural learning and safeguarding. The proposed archive would therefore be different from a promotional gallery. It would need to preserve context and identify the source of cultural explanations, while any wider dissemination would remain subject to the decisions of the relevant knowledge holders.

Creative Enterprise Capacity

The MSME discussion identified a diverse creative economy rather than a single tourism commodity. Activities included *udeng* production, hand-drawn and stamped *batik*, fruit seedlings, *kelemben*, squid crackers, cookies and traditional foods such as *apem contong*, *kucur*, *pecel pitik* and *kesrut*. Participants also identified local content creators as a potential resource for digital communication (FGD-UMKM, p. 1). These activities connect cultural skills with household livelihoods, but they differ in production processes, capacity and market access. A collective tourism programme should therefore accommodate variation rather than require every enterprise to adopt the same product format or sales channel.

The Sunday-morning culinary market was described as an important meeting point between local enterprises and visitors. In the stakeholder account, the market supports more than transactions: it provides opportunities to encounter local food and interact with the people who prepare it (FGD-UMKM, p. 1). This offers a basis for interpretation through product stories and demonstrations where producers wish to participate. It does not establish that all customers seek educational experiences or that demonstrations would necessarily increase revenue. These possibilities would need to be tested through appropriate, small-scale activities.

Enterprise participants reported irregular sales, limited marketing, packaging that they considered insufficiently appealing, rising packaging costs, unstable distribution and hesitation about using social media for promotion. Some businesses produced mainly after receiving orders, while the absence of a collective souvenir outlet or product gallery limited shared marketing opportunities. Batik producers also raised concerns about skills regeneration and the capacity to fulfil larger orders (FGD-UMKM, pp. 1-2). Taken together, these accounts show why a promotional campaign alone would be an

incomplete response: greater visibility would not resolve production constraints, fulfilment problems or the need to sustain craft skills.

The proposed enterprise agenda consequently combines product presentation with capacity development. Priorities include a shared product gallery or catalogue, photography and storytelling support, appropriate packaging, collective marketing and connections between local products and visitor packages. Craft demonstrations, short learning activities and apprenticeships could be considered where they are culturally appropriate and feasible for producers. These suggestions respond to the needs identified in the FGDs; the study does not report that such activities have already improved sales or employment. (Tuthaes et al., 2024) provide a useful comparison in showing how creative-enterprise collaboration also encounters governance and administrative difficulties, not only marketing constraints.

This emphasis on capacity and local control is consistent with (Scheyvens, 1999) who links tourism empowerment to community control and equitable benefit. The Kemiren records add an important qualification for cultural destinations: potential economic value does not override cultural authority. Enterprise opportunities therefore remain conditional on custodial decisions about ritual meanings, permissible representation and the terms on which cultural practices may enter commercial exchange.

Digital Information and Skills

Digital information was another recurrent concern in the Tourism Office and Pokdarwis accounts. Participants reported existing use of Instagram and a Google Maps presence, but described tourism information as insufficiently integrated with information on packages, cultural events, local history, products, booking and management contacts (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-POK, pp. 1-3). Their comments referred to the situation discussed in the April 2026 minutes and should not be treated as an audit of the village's current online presence. The underlying issue is the organisation and maintenance of information rather than the mere absence of a particular platform.

The proposed digital response includes a clearly organised tourism website or dedicated tourism section, an events calendar, local product information, booking contacts and coordinated social media content. Documentary videos and short-form cultural content could support education as well as promotion. Each function would require an identified person or team to maintain information, respond to enquiries and coordinate with cultural custodians and service providers. A technically attractive interface without these responsibilities would not address the coordination problems described by stakeholders.

(Gretzel et al., 2015) describe tourists as active contributors to the creation of smart tourism experiences. This observation is relevant to the proposed use of visitor information and feedback, but it does not justify unrestricted recording or redistribution of cultural material. In the Kemiren planning context, visitor participation would need to operate within locally agreed cultural boundaries. The same distinction separates a connected service system from indiscriminate content production: digital communication should improve appropriate access to information while respecting the conditions under which the information was shared.

Digital literacy should also be linked to the tasks that residents and enterprises actually undertake. The needs described in the FGDs include preparing product photographs, writing accurate descriptions, answering enquiries, updating information and managing bookings (FGD-DIS, pp. 1-2; FGD-POK, pp. 2-3; FGD-UMKM, p. 2). Training organised around these tasks would be more directly responsive to the findings than training assessed only by attendance. (Sukaris & Kirono, 2025) similarly highlight the importance of digital literacy and collaboration in addressing infrastructure and internet-access constraints in village tourism. For Kemiren, continuing maintenance and support are proposed as part of implementation; their effectiveness is not assessed in this study.

Visitor Management and Institutional Coordination

Visitor management revealed a closely related institutional problem. The tourism office identified the need to clarify arrival points, parking, reception, guiding, routes, available activities, local products and visitor etiquette. *Pokdarwis* reported uncertainty about where visitors should be directed and what activities could be offered without disrupting the village's character (FGD-DIS, pp. 1-2; FGD-POK, p. 2). These accounts point to an operational gap between the existence of cultural resources and the coordination required to receive visitors appropriately.

Participants discussed reservation-based experiences such as homestays or live-in programmes, cooking activities, learning *Gandrung* dance, exploring traditional music and visiting traditional houses (FGD-DIS, p. 1; FGD-POK, p. 2).

Advance arrangements could help match visitor expectations with the availability of residents and practitioners. The proposed masterplan should therefore connect booking information with the actual people, spaces and activities involved. It should also clarify what happens when an activity is unavailable, rather than assume that cultural practitioners can perform or receive guests whenever tourists arrive.

Pokdarwis described its non-profit orientation alongside constraints in guiding, package management, marketing and visitor services (FGD-POK, p. 3). This combination should not be read as a contradiction: community-oriented tourism still needs organisational capacity and clear working arrangements. A proposed division of responsibilities would identify who coordinates enquiries, who provides each service and how community interests are represented in decisions. (Yasir et al., 2021) offer a comparative example of the interdependence of actors in tourism-village communication. In Kemiren, however, the precise distribution of authority and resources needs to be negotiated locally rather than assumed from the existence of a community tourism group.

Environmental Stewardship

Environmental concerns were interwoven with the institutional discussion. The tourism office highlighted parking, traffic, waste, cleanliness, the use of residential space and the village’s capacity to accommodate visitors. Customary-community participants and environmental observers regarded cleanliness as relatively good but identified increasing plastic waste as a concern. They advocated stronger household-level waste sorting rather than assigning responsibility only to tourism managers (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-ADAT, pp. 1-2). These accounts indicate perceived pressures and priorities; no waste-composition study, traffic survey or numerical carrying-capacity assessment is reported.

Participants also referred to the weakening of ecological traditions, including *Rebo Wekasan* associated with water sources. They identified animal manure as a potential biogas resource, while noting equipment costs, limited interest in organic fertiliser and perceptions that the process was impractical (FGD-ADAT, pp. 1-2). These observations should be treated as opportunities and barriers requiring further assessment, not as proof that a biogas project is technically or financially feasible. The immediate planning implication is to connect environmental learning, cultural documentation and practical waste-management responsibilities before committing to untested infrastructure.

(Carayannis & Campbell, 2021) position ecology and environmental protection as integral to knowledge and innovation. Applied here as a planning perspective, this means that environmental considerations should influence the selection and management of tourism activities, rather than appear only as a concluding statement about sustainability. The proposed masterplan would therefore link visitor arrangements to residential comfort, waste-management practices and the protection of culturally significant places. Decisions about expansion would require further local evidence on these conditions.

Integrating Responsibilities in the Masterplan

Across these themes, the contribution of the Sextuple Helix approach is to make responsibilities visible. Government can align policy with implementation support; academia can support research, documentation and learning; business can organise viable products and services; and customary communities can exercise cultural authority. Environmental stewards and digital practitioners address responsibilities that might otherwise remain secondary to promotion. Table 3 translates these six domains into proposed roles. It is a planning synthesis of the findings, not a claim that six equally represented or formally constituted stakeholder groups have already formed an integrated governing body.

Table 3. Proposed Responsibilities Within the Context-Specific Sextuple Helix Framework

Collaboration Domain	Responsible Actors	Proposed Contribution to the Masterplan
Academia	Researchers, educators and relevant academic partners.	Support cultural documentation, needs analysis, learning materials and subsequent evaluation.
Government	Village government, tourism office and relevant public agencies.	Connect the plan with policy, facilitation, institutional support and visitor-management coordination.

Business	MSMEs, homestay operators and other participating tourism enterprises.	Develop feasible products and services, strengthen production and packaging, and coordinate agreed offers.
Customary community	Cultural custodians, practitioners, residents and community tourism representatives.	Define cultural boundaries, review interpretation and shape visitor activities around community life.
Environmental stewardship	Environmental observers, community organisers and relevant public or technical partners.	Coordinate waste sorting and protection of significant places; review parking, waste and residential pressures before proposed activities expand.
Digital practice	Local content creators, information managers and digital technology partners.	Maintain information and booking contacts; publish offers only after providers confirm capacity and cultural custodians approve relevant content.

Source: Authors' planning synthesis of the reported stakeholder needs.

The six-domain configuration is a contextual adaptation; roles overlap and require local agreement.

The six domains are functional distinctions, not mutually exclusive identities. A resident may be a cultural practitioner, entrepreneur and environmental organiser, while a university may contribute to both research and digital development. The proposed configuration should therefore be assessed by whether it clarifies decisions and accountability, rather than by whether all participants can be placed in separate categories. This is consistent with the argument by (Leydesdorff, 2012) that extensions of helix models require empirical justification. The present study identifies reasons to make digital and environmental responsibilities explicit, but does not test whether a six-domain model outperforms alternative governance arrangements.

Two linked decisions illustrate the intended value of separating these responsibilities. First, a booking or product listing would require confirmation of availability and fulfilment capacity from the provider, alongside cultural approval where interpretation is involved; a digital administrator would maintain only the agreed offer (FGD-POK, pp. 2-3; FGD-UMKM, pp. 1-2; FGD-ADAT, p. 1). Second, a proposed expansion of a route or event would require review of parking, residential access and waste arrangements by the relevant community, government and environmental actors before additional promotion (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-ADAT, pp. 1-2). These are proposed decision sequences derived from the records, not procedures shown to have been adopted or tested.

Coordination also needs to address possible tensions rather than presume that collaboration automatically produces agreement. The reported boundaries around rituals may conflict with promotional ambitions, while the need for visitor access may conflict with residential privacy. Enterprise promotion may also generate requests beyond available production capacity. A proposed coordination forum could review these issues with relevant cultural custodians, *Pokdarwis*, producers and supporting partners. Its membership, decision rules, authority and resource commitments would need to be agreed during further development. No formal consensus procedure or settled allocation of benefits is claimed here.

The masterplan priorities are consolidated in Table 4. The table translates the priorities arising from the reported problems into proposed outputs and monitoring questions. These monitoring questions are not validated indicators and do not have predetermined numerical targets. Their role is to show what evidence would be needed to judge implementation: whether cultural information is appropriately reviewed, services are reliable, enterprises can participate, residents' concerns are addressed and environmental responsibilities are carried out. This shifts the planning emphasis from a list of projects to the conditions under which each project could be useful.

Table 4. Proposed Masterplan Priorities and Monitoring Questions

Priority	Proposed Output	Suggested Monitoring Question
Cultural safeguarding and documentation (FGD-ADAT, p. 1;	An inventory and contextualised cultural records, with locally agreed access and interpretation protocols.	Have the relevant cultural custodians reviewed the material and the conditions of its use?

FGD-DIS, p. 2)		
Visitor routes and learning experiences (FGD-DIS, pp. 1-2; FGD-POK, p. 2)	Agreed arrival and guiding arrangements, visitor etiquette and reservation-based cultural activities.	Can visitors follow the arrangements without disrupting residents or expecting unavailable activities?
Institutional coordination (FGD-DIS, pp. 2-3; FGD-POK, pp. 2-3)	A locally agreed division of responsibilities connecting <i>Pokdarwis</i> , government, communities and other partners.	Are enquiries, decisions and problems directed to an identified responsible person or group?
Creative enterprise development (FGD-UMKM, pp. 1-3)	A shared product catalogue or gallery, packaging and marketing support, and opportunities for skills regeneration.	Can participating enterprises fulfil offers, access shared promotion and sustain relevant skills?
Digital information and services (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-POK, p. 3; FGD-UMKM, p. 2)	Maintained tourism information, an events calendar, booking contacts and approved educational content.	Is information accurate and updated, and are enquiries and cultural-content issues addressed?
Community capacity and learning (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-POK, p. 3; FGD-UMKM, p. 2)	Task-based support for guiding, cultural interpretation, product photography and digital administration.	Can participants undertake the relevant tasks in practice, beyond attending training?
Environmental stewardship (FGD-DIS, p. 2; FGD-ADAT, pp. 1-2)	Coordinated waste-sorting education, protection of significant places and review of visitor-related pressures.	Are waste, traffic and residential concerns documented and considered before expanding activities?

Source: Authors' planning synthesis of the four FGD records identified in Table 2

Each priority lists its documentary basis. Proposed outputs and monitoring questions have not been validated.

A proposed implementation sequence would first establish cultural permissions, participating actors and the basic information needed for coordination. Agreed visitor routes and a limited set of experiences could then be trialled alongside manageable digital information and enterprise support. Expansion should follow review of the trial, including feedback from residents and cultural practitioners as well as visitors and enterprises. This sequence is an author-proposed planning implication, not a completed timetable. Costs, responsible institutions, implementation dates and baseline targets still require negotiation and documentation in the operational masterplan.

The educational relevance of the findings extends beyond visitor learning. Cultural documentation, craft regeneration, guiding and digital communication all involve the circulation of knowledge among residents, practitioners and younger people. The proposed approach links these forms of learning to everyday responsibilities rather than treating education as a separate tourism attraction. For example, a culturally reviewed explanation of a local food can serve community documentation, guide preparation and visitor interpretation, while the decision to withhold a ritual recording can itself express a locally defined boundary of appropriate learning. These are implications of the reported cultural concerns, not measured educational outcomes.

Theoretical Implications for Sextuple Helix Governance

The findings refine the application of helix thinking in a living cultural destination in two ways. First, the six domains are analytically more useful as overlapping responsibility domains than as six discrete actor categories. The same resident, enterprise, public agency or university can perform several functions, so the explanatory value of the framework lies less in counting helices and more in clarifying decision rights, accountability and coordination. This shifts the emphasis from institutional membership toward the functions through which knowledge and decisions are organised, extending the relational logic of Triple Helix thinking (Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000) while responding to (Leydesdorff, 2012) caution that additional helices require empirical justification.

Second, the findings suggest a sequencing condition that is not explicit in generic helix models: in a living cultural village, innovation and promotion are bounded by cultural authorisation and environmental review. Digital publication, visitor expansion and enterprise promotion should follow, rather than precede, confirmation of cultural permission, local service capacity and environmental acceptability. This complements collaborative-governance theory, which emphasises shared processes and capacity for joint action (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012) and tourism-governance scholarship that cautions against treating collaboration as inherently harmonious (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). The theoretical contribution is therefore a context-specific shift from actor multiplication to sequenced, responsibility-based governance.

Study Limitations

Several limitations constrain the interpretation of the findings. The findings rely on stakeholder accounts and do not establish the preferences of all residents or visitors. The corpus consists of four narrative summaries, all bearing the first author's name, rather than verbatim transcripts or independent records of each speaker's contribution. The minutes may omit disagreement, contextual detail and less prominent views. Their common attribution may also produce shared framing across groups, so repeated themes cannot be treated as independent confirmation. The combined customary-community and environmental record does not allow those perspectives to be separated by individual speaker. Recruitment procedures, within-group differences and the frequency of particular views cannot be reconstructed from the minutes alone. Without baseline and follow-up measurements, the study cannot attribute changes in income, employment, language transmission or environmental quality to the proposed masterplan. Nor does the material demonstrate the completion and validation of every ADDIE stage. Subsequent work should document the actual implementation process, examine differences within stakeholder groups and evaluate both intended benefits and possible burdens. The value of the present article lies in articulating an evidence-informed planning agenda while keeping its proposed outcomes distinct from established findings.

CONCLUSION

The principal finding is that Kemiren's central tourism-planning challenge is not a shortage of cultural resources but the coordination of how those resources is interpreted, accessed and connected with local livelihoods. Across the four FGD records, cultural safeguarding, visitor management, enterprise capacity, digital information and environmental responsibilities repeatedly appear as interdependent rather than separate issues.

The theoretical contribution is a context-specific refinement of the Sextuple Helix approach: the six domains are better understood as overlapping governance responsibilities than as six separate stakeholder categories. The findings further suggest a sequencing principle in which cultural authorisation and environmental review set boundary conditions for digitalisation, enterprise promotion and visitor expansion.

The practical implication is to begin implementation with agreed cultural permissions, identified responsible actors, verified service capacity and maintained information, followed by limited trials of visitor routes, learning experiences and enterprise support. Digitalisation should serve this coordination and learning functions rather than operate as an end in itself. The principal limitation is that the evidence consists of four project-generated narrative FGD summaries without verbatim quotations, baseline measures or evaluated implementation. The framework therefore remains preliminary. Future research should document implementation, validate the proposed roles and monitoring questions, examine within-group differences, and assess both benefits and possible burdens for residents, cultural custodians, enterprises and the local environment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors gratefully acknowledge Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP), Dana Indonesia Raya, and the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Indonesia for the financial support provided for this research. The authors also thank the Banyuwangi Tourism Office (Dinas Pariwisata Kabupaten Banyuwangi, Dispar) for sharing its perspectives on cultural tourism planning and development. The authors are grateful to the people of Kemiren Village, particularly customary community representatives, cultural practitioners, Pokdarwis Kemiren, participating local enterprises, and environmental observers, for sharing their knowledge, experiences, and aspirations. Their contributions informed the identification of local

needs and the formulation of the proposed collaborative masterplan, with particular attention to cultural preservation, community well-being, creative economy development, and environmental sustainability.

REFERENCES

- Andjanie, I. F., Asyifa, N., Pratama, R. K., & Furqan, A. (2023). Strengthening Community Involvement: An In-Depth Exploration of the Community-Based Tourism (CBT) Approach in Lamajang Tourism Village, Bandung Regency. *Jurnal Kepariwisata Indonesia: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Kepariwisata Indonesia*, 17(2), 182–205. <https://doi.org/10.47608/jki.v17i22023.182-205>
- 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>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 411–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586>
- Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional Design: The ADDIE Approach*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09506-6>
- Carayannis, E. G., Barth, T. D., & Campbell, D. F. (2012). The Quintuple Helix innovation model: Global warming as a challenge and driver for innovation. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2192-5372-1-2>
- Carayannis, E. G., & Campbell, D. F. J. (2021). Democracy of Climate and Climate for Democracy: The Evolution of Quadruple and Quintuple Helix Innovation Systems. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 12(4), 2050–2082. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-021-00778-x>
- Duxbury, N., Bakas, F. E., Vinagre De Castro, T., & Silva, S. (2020). Creative Tourism Development Models towards Sustainable and Regenerative Tourism. *Sustainability*, 13(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010002>
- 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>
- Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The Dynamics of Innovation: From National Systems and “Mode 2” to a Triple Helix of University–Industry–Government Relations. *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(99\)00055-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4)
- Gretzel, U., Sigala, M., Xiang, Z., & Koo, C. (2015). Smart Tourism: Foundations and Developments. *Electronic Markets*, 25(3), 179–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-015-0196-8>
- Kusumastuti, H., Pranita, D., Viendyasari, M., Rasul, M. S., & Sarjana, S. (2024). Leveraging Local Value in a Post-Smart Tourism Village to Encourage Sustainable Tourism. *Sustainability*, 16(2), 873. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16020873>
- Leydesdorff, L. (2012). The Triple Helix, Quadruple Helix, ..., and an N-Tuple of Helices: Explanatory Models for Analyzing the Knowledge-Based Economy? *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 3(1), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-011-0049-4>
- Richards, G. (2025). Cultural Tourism: An Integrative Review. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 21(4), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.18089/tms.20250402>
- Rohimah, Anom, I. P., Sudiarta, I. N., & Suardana, I. W. (2024). Management of Kemiren Tourist Village Based on Culture in Banyuwangi Regency. *Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, 9(30), 145–152. <https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v9i30.6210>
- Rozi, F. F. (2022). Komunikasi Pembangunan Desa Kemiren Kabupaten Banyuwangi Sebagai Desa Wisata Budaya. *The Commmercium*, 5(3), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.26740/tc.v5i3.48279>
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the Empowerment of Local Communities. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 245–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00069-7)

- Setiawati, R., & Syam, N. K. (2023). Community Based Tourism (CBT) Program: Tourism Village Development Based on Local Culture, Digital Technology, Creative Economy in Sidatapa Village, Buleleng Regency. *Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Bisnis*, 11(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.46806/jkb.v11i1.985>
- Suhandi, A. S., Novianti, E., Oktavia, D., Khan, A. M. A., & Simatupang, W. P. (2022). Community Participation Process in Community-Based Tourism Development in Waerebo Traditional Village, Manggarai Regency, Flores. *ASEAN Journal on Hospitality and Tourism*, 20(2), 67–82. <https://doi.org/10.5614/ajht.2022.20.2.05>
- Sukaris, S., & Kirono, I. (2025). Digital Transformation For Sustainable Village Tourism. *Jurnal Manajerial*, 12(01), 108. <https://doi.org/10.30587/jurnalmanajerial.v12i01.9447>
- Tuthaes, L. C., Toda, H., & Lake, P. (2024). Hexa Helix's Collaboration in Creative Economy Development Based on Local Wisdom: Case Study of Ikat Weaving MSMEs in Kupang City. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, 16(1), 171–185. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.16.2024.171-185>
- Yasir, Y., Firzal, Y., Sulistyani, A., & Yesicha, C. (2021). Penta Helix Communication Model Through Community Based Tourism (CBT) for Tourism Village Development in Koto Sentajo, Riau, Indonesia. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 37(3), 851–860. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.37316-718>