

# Evaluation of the Implementation of the Tourism Village Program in Economic and Environmental Development (Study in Pasar Seluma Village, Seluma Regency, Bengkulu Province)

Nabila Nur Syafiah, Henny Aprianty, Hernowo Novy Yanto

Public Administration Study Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Prof. Dr. Hazairin Sh, Bengkulu

Email: [nabilanursyafiah@gmail.com](mailto:nabilanursyafiah@gmail.com)

## Article Info

Keywords:  
Evaluation,  
Tourism Village,  
Local Economy,  
Environment,  
CIPP Model.

## Abstract

This study aims to evaluate the implementation of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma Village, Seluma Regency, Bengkulu Province, with a focus on its contribution to community economic development and environmental conservation. The tourism village program is expected to serve as a sustainable development strategy based on local potential. The research method employed is descriptive qualitative, with data collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation. The research informants consist of 10 individuals, including the village head, village officials, tourism managers (Pokdarwis and BUMDes), MSME actors, community leaders, and local residents. Data analysis was carried out using the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product) developed by Stufflebeam, and further analyzed with the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing). Data validity was tested through source and technique triangulation. The findings indicate that the tourism village program has had a positive impact in creating economic opportunities and increasing community income through small businesses and the promotion of local potential. However, the program's implementation still faces challenges, including limited infrastructure, low community awareness of environmental conservation, and limited human resource capacity. In terms of the environment, greater community participation is needed to protect tourist areas, especially the beach, from ecological damage. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen local institutions, enhance support from local government, and provide continuous training and socialization to realize a tourism village that is economically and environmentally sustainable.

## 1. Introduction

Indonesia is known as a country rich in abundant natural resources, widely spread across rural areas. However, this potential has often not been optimally utilized. To address the challenges of rural development, the government has begun promoting strategies based on local potential through the village tourism program. This program is designed to improve community welfare while preserving the environment as part of sustainable development.

Regulatively, the village tourism program is supported by various national policies. Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages affirms that villages have the authority to manage their interests based on community initiatives. In addition, Ministerial Regulation of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Permendes PDTT) No. 13 of 2020 on Priority Use of Village Funds explicitly encourages the allocation of village funds for tourism

development as a means of boosting the economy and promoting environmentally conscious development. This support also aligns with the 2020–2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN), which emphasizes rural development based on local potential and strengthening regional competitiveness.

In Bengkulu Province, particularly in Pasar Seluma Village, Seluma Regency, the village tourism program has been developed as an effort to improve the village economy through the utilization of natural tourism potential. The village has promising coastal areas and a nature park that remain underutilized. The village government, together with the community, has undertaken several initiatives, such as building road access and basic tourist facilities, as well as promoting local potential through village activities.

The development of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma is inseparable from

the regulatory and regional policy framework that supports it. One of the main legal foundations is Seluma Regency Regulation No. 4 of 2017 on the Regional Tourism Development Master Plan 2017–2025, which sets out strategies for tourism development as an effort to improve the people's economy and regional income. This regulation emphasizes that the tourism sector must be developed based on local potential, including in rural areas such as Pasar Seluma Village (Seluma Regency JDIH, 2017). The government's support for tourism is outlined in Regional Regulation No. 4 of 2017, Section Six on Tourism Institutional Development Strategies, Article 18, which includes:

- a. Encouraging tourism awareness groups in strategic and development tourism areas;
- b. Developing training and certification programs in tourism planning, management, and control;
- c. Promoting cooperation in tourism with internal and external stakeholders for area management and development;
- d. Strengthening partnerships between local governments, tourism businesses, creative communities, hobby groups, and other institutions;
- e. Enhancing "tourism awareness" among officials, entrepreneurs, and communities to foster environmentally conscious tourism activities;
- f. Improving procedures and services in regional tourism investment.

Seluma Regency Regulation No. 4 of 2017, Article 18 paragraph e, which emphasizes the enhancement of "tourism awareness" among officials, entrepreneurs, and communities, highlights that tourism development must prioritize sustainability and environmental care. The regulation underscores that one of the policy directions is to foster tourism awareness among officials, business actors, and the wider community. The goal is not only to stimulate tourism as an economic driver but also to instill awareness of protecting and preserving the environment.

This means that all activities related to tourism—from site development, attraction

management, to facility provision—must consider their impact on the surrounding environment. Environmental preservation, resource sustainability, and local values that maintain harmony with nature are essential considerations. This aligns with the spirit of sustainable tourism, which not only seeks economic gains but also strives to balance social, cultural, and ecological aspects.

On this basis, the development of the tourism village in Pasar Seluma is directed not only at increasing community income but also at preserving the integrity of the natural environment. This regulation serves as an important guideline for the village government and local communities in designing tourism programs and activities so that they remain environmentally friendly and beneficial for the sustainability of future generations.

Furthermore, Seluma Regent Regulation No. 14 of 2017 mandates the Department of Tourism, Youth, and Sports to be responsible for the development and management of tourism villages. Article 9 specifies its duties, which include managing and developing tourism infrastructure and facilities, supporting tourism businesses, fostering creative economy enterprises, promoting tourism, and managing destinations.

This structural support is further strengthened by Seluma Regent Regulation No. 21 of 2017, which outlines the tasks of the Department of Community and Village Empowerment in assisting village potential development, including tourism as a driver of the local economy. Article 3 of this regulation states that the department is tasked with implementing governance in community and village empowerment, organizing community empowerment in villages and sub-districts, and overseeing village and sub-district development and guidance based on the principles of autonomy and delegated authority.

Specifically, Pasar Seluma Village also obtained additional legal grounding through the reclassification of its area from a nature reserve to a nature tourism park (Taman Wisata Alam/TWA) covering approximately 17 hectares, which allows for the legal and

structured management of natural potential for community-based tourism (Media Sinar Dunia, 2024). This is further reinforced by the designation of the village as a Kampung Bahari Nusantara program location by the Indonesian Navy, which positions coastal tourism as one of the main development clusters to directly boost the local economy (Warna Bengkulu, 2024).

The presence of these various policies and programs indicates that the development of the tourism village in Pasar Seluma is not merely a local initiative but is also fully supported by both local and national government policies as part of strategies for economic development and environmental preservation based on village potential.

However, the implementation of this program faces significant challenges, both economically and environmentally. Low awareness has led to limited participation in protecting tourist areas from ecological damage. Problems in infrastructure and basic facilities remain the main obstacles in developing the tourism area professionally. These challenges show that the development of the tourism village in Pasar Seluma has not yet fully balanced the economic and environmental aspects.

Overall, the potential of tourism villages to enhance local economies is quite significant. Sutrisno (2020) explains that the development of tourism villages can encourage the growth of micro and small enterprises such as homestays, culinary businesses, and tour guide services. Unfortunately, according to Puspitawati (2020), the low capacity of human resources remains a common obstacle in managing community-based tourism.

Another weakness lies in the aspect of promotion. Yulianto (2021) highlights that digital promotion is crucial in today's era, yet many tourism villages have not been able to fully utilize social media to reach potential tourists. In Pasar Seluma Village, limited access to technology and low digital literacy hinder the dissemination of tourism information more widely.

Evaluating the implementation of the tourism village program is necessary to

determine the extent of its success and effectiveness in improving the economy and preserving the environment in Pasar Seluma Village. Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman (2004) define program evaluation as a systematic process to assess the design, implementation, and outcomes of a program to provide a rational basis for decision-making.

This study is expected to provide an objective overview of the evaluation of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma Village. The results will not only serve as a foundation for improving local policies but may also be replicated in other villages with similar potential facing the same challenges. In the long run, a well-managed tourism village program can generate a multiplier effect in strengthening the local economy and promoting sustainable environmental conservation.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

#### **2.1.1 Public Policy**

Public policy refers to a set of government actions designed to address public problems. Dye (2017) defines it as "whatever governments choose to do or not to do," while Anderson (2018) emphasizes it as a purposive course of action developed by governmental actors in response to public issues. Its main characteristics include: addressing public problems, involving governmental actors, serving the public interest, and being legally and politically accountable (Howlett, Ramesh, & Perl, 2020). Thus, public policy functions not only as an administrative instrument but also as a vehicle for realizing social values.

#### **2.1.2 Policy Formulation**

Policy formulation is a critical stage within the policy cycle, encompassing problem identification, agenda-setting, and the design of alternatives. Lasswell (1956) outlined seven stages later simplified into five: problem identification, formulation, adoption, implementation, and evaluation (Dunn, 2018). During formulation, alternatives are compared based on effectiveness, efficiency, and political feasibility, often influenced by political

interests, interest groups, and empirical evidence (Jann & Wegrich, 2019).

### 2.1.3 Policy Actors

Public policy involves both formal and informal actors. Sabatier and Weible (2014) classify them into government actors (executive, legislative, bureaucracy), non-government actors (NGOs, academia, media), and interest groups (business associations, unions, local communities). Within policy networks, interactions are horizontal and coalition-based. In rural contexts, village heads, local councils, and community leaders play crucial roles (Agrawal & Ribot, 1999).

### 2.1.4 Public Policy in Village Development

Public policy serves as a strategic tool for enhancing rural welfare through local potential development. Law No. 6/2014 on Villages provides a legal basis for participatory village development. Effective rural policy must be contextual, participatory, and sustainable, accommodating local traditions and values (Chambers, 1997). Success depends on institutional capacity, regulatory support, and community participation (Pranadji, 2020).

## 2.2 Policy Implementation

### 2.2.1 Definition and Purpose

Policy implementation translates policy decisions into practice. Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) define it as actions directed toward achieving policy goals. Its effectiveness depends on the alignment between policy design and local context (Grindle, 1980).

### 2.2.2 Models of Implementation

Implementation can be analyzed through three models:

1. **Top-down** – stresses clear goals, strong bureaucracy, and political support (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983).
2. **Bottom-up** – highlights the discretion of street-level bureaucrats and local adaptation (Lipsky, 1980).
3. **Hybrid** – combines both approaches through policy communication models that

integrate top-down directives with bottom-up responses (Goggin et al., 1990).

### 2.2.3 Determinants of Implementation Success

Key factors include communication, resources, implementers' commitment, and bureaucratic structure (Edwards III, 1980). Social, political, and economic contexts also shape outcomes (Grindle, 1980).

### 2.2.4 Implementation of Village Tourism Policy

Village tourism policies aim to foster community-based development. Local governments act as facilitators, regulators, and catalysts (Nugroho, 2019). Success requires government commitment, institutional strengthening, community involvement, and cross-sectoral synergy (Yuliarmi et al., 2021). Sustainable tourism must integrate infrastructure, training, local values, and environmental preservation (Sunaryo, 2013).

## 2.3 Policy Evaluation

### 2.3.1 Concept

Policy evaluation systematically assesses effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance (Patton, 2008). It examines both outputs and long-term impacts (Weiss, 1998).

### 2.3.2 Objectives and Benefits

Evaluation provides feedback, identifies barriers, and guides policy renewal (Rist, 2008). It enhances transparency, planning, and resource efficiency (Bamberger et al., 2016).

### 2.3.3 Methods

Quantitative approaches rely on statistical analysis, while qualitative approaches focus on process and context (Patton, 2008). Theory-based evaluation links policy activities with expected outcomes (Weiss, 1998).

### 2.3.4 Evaluation of Village Tourism Programs

Evaluation measures the extent to which rural tourism contributes to

employment, cultural preservation, and environmental sustainability (Sari, 2019). Active community participation, government oversight, and multi-stakeholder collaboration are critical (Putra et al., 2020).

### 2.3.5 Evaluation Models

Common models include:

- **CSE-UCLA Model** (Alkin, 1969),
- **Goal-Oriented Model** (Tyler),
- **CIPP Model** (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007),
- **Discrepancy Model** (Probus).

This study adopts the **CIPP model**, focusing on Context, Input, Process, and Product, which provides a comprehensive framework for both formative and summative evaluation.

## 2.4 Village Tourism

### 2.4.1 Concept and Characteristics

Village tourism integrates tourism with rural life and local wisdom. Its features include cultural authenticity, natural environments, active community involvement, and integration of resources (Suansri, 2003). It aligns with community-based tourism principles (Okazaki, 2008).

### 2.4.2 Objectives and Benefits

Village tourism enhances welfare, preserves culture, promotes local identity, and supports sustainability (Sunaryo, 2013; Nugroho et al., 2021).

### 2.4.3 Participatory Management

Community-based management ensures that residents act as key stakeholders. Participation ranges from information-sharing to full control (Timothy, 1999). Local institutions such as Pokdarwis play a decisive role (Pusparini & Wahyono, 2020).

### 2.4.4 Challenges and Strategies

Challenges include inadequate infrastructure, limited human resources, market access, and sustainability risks (Widari

et al., 2022). Strategies involve capacity building, integration into regional planning, product diversification, digital promotion, and multi-stakeholder partnerships (Kementerian Desa, 2020).

### 2.4.5 Environmental Dimension

Village tourism development must integrate sustainability principles (WCED, 1987). Ecological resilience (Holling, 1973; Walker & Folke, 2006) and ecotourism theory (Fennell, 2008) highlight the need for conservation, education, and community participation in maintaining ecological balance.

## 3. Research Methods

### 3.1 Research Design

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach, aiming to understand social phenomena experienced by research subjects, such as behavior, perceptions, motivations, and actions, in their natural context. As suggested by Moleong (2018), qualitative research is flexible and adaptive, allowing researchers to adjust methods and data collection techniques according to research needs. The focus lies in obtaining in-depth insights through detailed description, analysis, and interpretation of patterns and themes.

### 3.2 Research Location and Duration

The study was conducted in Pasar Seluma Village, Seluma Selatan District, Seluma Regency, Bengkulu Province, over a period of two months.

### 3.3 Research Instruments

Research instruments serve as tools to collect relevant data in alignment with the study's objectives (Sugiyono, 2023; Purwanto, 2018). The evaluation of the village tourism program was analyzed using the CIPP model (Stufflebeam, 2007), covering four dimensions: context, input, process, and product.



**Table 1. Research Instruments**

Aspect	Indicators	Data Source	Data Collection
<b>Context</b>	Program objectives, community needs, supporting policies, local potential	Village officials, community leaders	Interview, Documentation
<b>Input</b>	Funding allocation, human resources, infrastructure, planning strategies	Village head, tourism groups (Pokdarwis), officials	Interview, Documentation
<b>Process</b>	Program implementation, community participation, institutional roles, challenges and solutions	Pokdarwis, MSMEs, community	Interview, Observation, Documentation
<b>Product</b>	Impact on income, MSME growth, cultural and environmental preservation, sustainability	MSMEs, community	Interview, Observation, Documentation

### 3.4 Research Informants

Informants were selected using purposive sampling, targeting individuals with knowledge, experience, and direct involvement in the tourism program. A total of 10 informants were identified, including village officials, program managers, MSME actors, community leaders, and residents.

### 3.5 Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through three main techniques:

1. **Observation** – Direct field observation of program implementation.
2. **Interviews** – Semi-structured interviews to capture perceptions, experiences, and insights.
3. **Documentation** – Collection of secondary data and official records related to the program.

### 3.6 Data Validity

To ensure trustworthiness, data validation employed several techniques:

- **Source triangulation** – Comparing data across different informants.
- **Method triangulation** – Using interviews, observation, and documentation simultaneously.
- **Member checking** – Confirming interpretations with participants.
- **Audit trail** – Maintaining detailed documentation of research activities.

### 3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis followed Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) interactive model, consisting of:

1. **Data reduction** – Filtering and simplifying field data.
2. **Data display** – Presenting data in narrative, table, or matrix format.
3. **Conclusion drawing and verification** – Developing and validating findings through iterative interpretation.

### 3.8 Research Schedule

The research was conducted over eight weeks, covering preliminary studies, instrument design, data collection (interviews, observations, documentation), data validation, analysis, report writing, and final revision.

## 4. Result and Discussion

### 4.1 Research Findings Based on the CIPP Evaluation Model

This study applied the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model developed by Daniel L. Stufflebeam to assess the effectiveness of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma Village. The model provides a systematic framework for evaluating programs by examining context, input, process, and product dimensions, thereby offering a comprehensive understanding of program relevance, resource efficiency, implementation, and outcomes.

Data were collected through observation, in-depth interviews, and document analysis. The CIPP approach was employed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the program and to provide evidence-based recommendations for sustainable policy development in Pasar Seluma and other regions with similar characteristics.

#### **4.1.1 Context Evaluation**

The establishment of Pasar Seluma as a tourism village is strongly driven by its natural potential, including beaches, estuaries, and rivers located near residential areas. Interviews with village leaders, community representatives, and local stakeholders emphasized that this natural advantage, combined with the decline of agricultural land and limited employment opportunities, necessitated alternative sources of income. The tourism program was therefore perceived as a strategy to enhance local welfare, create new jobs, empower SMEs, and preserve local culture and traditions. Overall, the context shows a strong geographical and socio-economic foundation for program implementation.

#### **4.1.2 Input Evaluation**

The program relies on three main resources: (1) natural resources such as beaches, estuaries, and rivers as primary tourist attractions; (2) human resources, including local communities and unemployed graduates, empowered through the Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes); and (3) financial resources, primarily from Village Funds, with partial support from ministries and potential donors. Although resources are available, limitations in funding and human capacity remain challenges for program optimization.

#### **4.1.3 Process Evaluation**

Program planning and implementation were conducted through participatory mechanisms, involving village assemblies (Musrenbangdes), annual work plans (RKPDs), and BUMDes management. Community participation included identifying tourism potentials, constructing supporting

infrastructure (roads, parking, and public facilities), and maintaining environmental cleanliness. Strategic planning was aligned with national and regional government agendas, especially after the legal reclassification of Pasar Seluma Beach from a nature reserve to a Tourism Park in 2024. This policy shift enabled legal and structured management of tourism development.

#### **4.1.4 Product Evaluation**

The expected outcomes of the program include: (1) improved community welfare through the development of SMEs, (2) creation of local employment opportunities, (3) increased village and regional revenue, (4) preservation of local culture and traditions, and (5) promotion of sustainable rural tourism. However, interviews highlighted that financial constraints and limited capacity of human resources pose significant challenges to achieving the program's full potential.

In summary, the CIPP evaluation indicates that the Pasar Seluma tourism village program is contextually relevant and strategically aligned with national policies. Nevertheless, optimization requires greater financial support, capacity building for local human resources, and stronger collaboration with external stakeholders to ensure long-term sustainability and inclusivity.

#### **4.1.4. Product Evaluation**

##### **4.1.4.1 Program Achievement**

Findings from interviews with village officials, BUMDes representatives, community leaders, SME actors, and residents indicate that the initial objectives of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma have been achieved, albeit on a limited scale. Across informants, there was consistent agreement that the program has been implemented as planned, with activities running smoothly and without major obstacles.

Two primary achievements were identified:

1. **Community Welfare Improvement** – particularly through the empowerment of

SMEs that directly benefit from tourism activities.

2. **Institutional and Community Support Strengthening** – the program has encouraged greater participation from villagers and increased commitment from the village government, although support from regional government and external stakeholders remains limited.

Several respondents emphasized that the achievements remain gradual and have yet to reach a larger scale. This suggests that while the initial objectives have been realized, further efforts are needed in financing, promotion, and infrastructure development to ensure broader and more sustainable impacts.

#### 4.1.4.2 Program Impact

The program has generated measurable positive impacts on local economic activities, particularly for SMEs operating around tourist sites. Most respondents confirmed that household incomes have increased through food and beverage sales, parking services, and recreational equipment rentals, particularly during holidays and special events.

The Head of Village and BUMDes representatives highlighted that tourism activities, though still modest, have revitalized previously underutilized spaces into active economic hubs. Community members and SME actors similarly reported enhanced business opportunities and higher turnover. Moreover, beyond direct economic benefits, the program has increased the visibility of Pasar Seluma as a local tourism destination, gradually attracting visitors from outside the region.

Despite these gains, several respondents noted that the scale of impact remains limited. The positive economic effects are primarily concentrated among those directly involved in tourism-related activities. Nonetheless, the tourism program has laid a strong foundation for future expansion, both in terms of economic growth and socio-cultural interaction, as villagers become more open and adaptive to visitors from diverse backgrounds.

#### 4.1.4.3 Program Sustainability

There is broad consensus among stakeholders that the tourism village program should be sustained and further developed into a modern and competitive destination. The Village Head and village officials confirmed that the program has been integrated into medium- and long-term development plans, aiming to establish tourism as an icon of both Pasar Seluma Village and Seluma Regency.

Community leaders, BUMDes, and SME actors emphasized that the long-standing natural appeal of Seluma Beach, inherited from previous generations, provides a strong basis for sustainability. Informants also expressed aspirations for the program to expand its scale, modernize infrastructure, and increase recognition at the provincial and even national levels.

Sustainability, however, will depend heavily on two factors: (1) consistent government support at both village and regional levels, and (2) active community participation in program management. With these conditions met, Pasar Seluma's tourism village program holds significant potential to evolve into a modern, sustainable, and economically impactful rural tourism model.

### 4.2. Discussion of Findings Based on the CIPP Evaluation Model

This study applied the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) evaluation model to analyze the implementation of the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma. The discussion below integrates field findings with theoretical perspectives and previous studies.

#### 4.2.1. Context Evaluation

The evaluation indicates that the program is highly relevant to local needs and potentials. Pasar Seluma possesses natural resources such as beaches, estuaries, and rivers that are strategically valuable for rural tourism development. The initiative emerged as a response to the declining role of fisheries and agriculture as the main sources of livelihood. These findings align with Rossi, Lipsey, and



Freeman (2004), who argue that program relevance must be rooted in community needs and socio-economic contexts.

However, challenges remain, particularly regarding land status, as the area was previously designated as a nature reserve, and limited technical and administrative support from local government has slowed implementation. This underlines the need for multi-sectoral collaboration to ensure a more structured and sustainable tourism development strategy.

#### 4.2.2. Input Evaluation

The findings reveal that while basic resources are available, human capacity development has been insufficient. Funding is largely sourced from Village Funds and community contributions through BUMDes, but allocation is primarily directed toward physical infrastructure, with limited investment in human resource development such as tourism management training, hospitality skills, and digital marketing.

The absence of structured training until mid-2025 reinforces the argument of Yulianto (2021) that rural tourism requires strengthened human capital, particularly in digital promotion. Furthermore, dependency on a single funding source exposes the program to risks associated with policy and budget fluctuations. These results are consistent with Edwards III (1980), who emphasizes that communication and resource availability are critical factors in successful policy implementation.

#### 4.2.3. Process Evaluation

Community participation is relatively high, especially in managing SMEs and supporting tourism activities. Nevertheless, environmental management—such as waste handling, sanitation, and spatial order—remains inadequate. The absence of a formal monitoring and evaluation system has resulted in sporadic and uncoordinated program management.

These findings correspond with Van

Meter and Van Horn's (1975) theory that structured supervision and evaluation mechanisms are essential for policy effectiveness. Strengthening participatory monitoring, supported by transparent reporting and incentive systems, is thus necessary to ensure accountability and long-term program quality.

#### 4.2.4. Product Evaluation

The program has produced tangible positive outcomes, particularly in generating new employment opportunities and increasing household incomes through tourism-related SMEs. This economic contribution has revitalized local businesses and enhanced community visibility. However, environmental challenges such as coastal abrasion and weak conservation measures remain pressing issues. According to Weiss (1998), program evaluation should account not only for immediate economic gains but also for long-term sustainability, including environmental impacts. In this context, Pasar Seluma requires stricter environmental policies, community-based conservation practices, and improved infrastructure such as waste management facilities and sanitation systems to balance economic development with ecological preservation.

#### 4.2.5. Integration with Previous Research

The findings of this study reinforce and extend previous research on rural tourism and CIPP-based program evaluation:

1. **Context** – Consistent with Rossi, Lipsey, and Freeman (2004), the program is contextually relevant as it leverages untapped local potential and is supported by regulatory changes, including the reclassification of the conservation area into a Tourism Park through Regional Regulation No. 4 of 2017.
2. **Input** – Echoing Yulianto (2021) and Edwards III (1980), the study confirms that limited human capacity and financial dependence remain barriers to optimal implementation. Capacity building in

digital marketing and diversified funding strategies are critical.

3. **Process** – The lack of structured monitoring aligns with Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), who highlight the importance of oversight structures for effective policy implementation.
4. **Product** – Similar to Weiss (1998), this study emphasizes that evaluations must consider long-term impacts, particularly environmental sustainability, alongside short-term economic benefits.

Overall, the integration of CIPP findings demonstrates that while the Pasar Seluma tourism village program has achieved significant progress in economic empowerment, its sustainability depends on institutional strengthening, multi-source funding, human resource development, and environmental management.

## 5. Closing

### 5.1 Conclusion

Based on the CIPP evaluation (Context, Input, Process, Product), the tourism village program in Pasar Seluma is considered feasible to continue and has strategic potential as a community-based rural development model. The findings reveal several key points:

1. **Context** – The program is highly relevant to local needs and potentials, particularly natural and cultural resources. However, structured planning and multi-sectoral support remain crucial to optimize sustainability.
2. **Input** – The program utilizes village funds, BUMDes, and community involvement, but financial dependency and limited human capacity hinder effective implementation. Capacity building and funding diversification are therefore essential.
3. **Process** – Community participation is active, particularly in SME management. Nevertheless, weaknesses in environmental management, waste handling, and the absence of a formal monitoring system reduce effectiveness. Strengthening governance through SOPs and monitoring mechanisms is needed.

4. **Product** – The program has generated positive economic outcomes, including income growth and SME expansion. Yet, environmental challenges, especially coastal abrasion, threaten long-term sustainability.

Overall, the program demonstrates significant potential to become a sustainable model of community-based tourism. Achieving this requires simultaneous reinforcement across all CIPP components, particularly in governance, human resources, and environmental protection.

### 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, several recommendations are proposed for policymakers and stakeholders:

1. **Strategic Planning** – Develop a comprehensive tourism village master plan incorporating clear vision, mission, objectives, strategies, and measurable indicators, with active involvement of local communities, academics, and private actors.
2. **Capacity Development** – Strengthen human resources through continuous training in tourism management, hospitality, digital marketing, financial management, and environmental conservation. Establish a dedicated facilitation and supervisory team.
3. **Funding Diversification** – Reduce reliance on village funds by establishing partnerships with local government, private sector, donor agencies, and national programs. Explore alternative financing models such as tourism cooperatives and transparent retribution systems.
4. **Monitoring and Evaluation** – Implement a systematic M&E framework involving periodic reports, quarterly reviews, and independent audits. Leverage digital platforms (e.g., village tourism websites, management applications) for transparent data management.
5. **Environmental Sustainability** – Apply eco-tourism principles by integrating conservation, community empowerment, and environmental education. Enforce zoning regulations, waste management policies, and natural resource protection.

With these measures, Pasar Seluma can be positioned as a best-practice model of sustainable rural tourism at the district and provincial levels. Furthermore, the community-based tourism governance model developed here has strong potential for replication in other rural contexts with similar characteristics. Future research should examine institutional dynamics, policy frameworks, and socio-cultural factors influencing the success of rural tourism programs.

### Bibliography

- Agrawal, A., & Ribot, J. (1999). Accountability in decentralization: A framework with South Asian and West African cases. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 33(4), 473–502.
- Alkin, M. C. (2011). *Evaluation essentials: From A to Z*. Guilford Press.
- Anderson, J. E. (2018). *Public policymaking* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., & Mabry, L. (2016). *RealWorld evaluation: Working under budget, time, data, and political constraints*. SAGE Publications.
- Bappenas. (2020). *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN) 2020–2024*. Kementerian PPN/Bappenas.
- Bupati Seluma. (2017). *Peraturan Bupati Seluma Nomor 14 Tahun 2017 tentang Tugas dan Fungsi Dinas Pariwisata, Pemuda, dan Olahraga Kabupaten Seluma*. <https://jdih.selumakab.go.id>
- Bupati Seluma. (2017). *Peraturan Bupati Seluma Nomor 21 Tahun 2017 tentang Tugas dan Fungsi Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dan Desa Kabupaten Seluma*. <https://jdih.selumakab.go.id>
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dunn, W. N. (2018). *Public policy analysis: An integrated approach* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Dye, T. R. (2017). *Understanding public policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Edwards, G. C. III. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Fandeli, C., & Mukhlison, A. (2000). *Pengembangan ekowisata*. Liberty.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2012). *Evaluation for the public good: Lessons from the field of evaluation*. SAGE Publications.
- Goggin, M. L., Bowman, A. O., Lester, J. P., & O'Toole, L. J. (1990). *Implementation theory and practice: Toward a third generation*. HarperCollins.
- Grindle, M. S. (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2020). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Jann, W., & Wegrich, K. (2019). Theories of the policy cycle. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of public policy analysis: Theory, politics, and methods* (pp. 43–62). CRC Press.
- Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi. (2020). *Strategi nasional pengembangan desa wisata*.
- Kementerian Pariwisata dan Ekonomi Kreatif. (2021). *Pedoman umum pengembangan desa wisata*. Kemenparekraf.
- Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Media Sinar Dunia. (2024, January 12). Status

- cagar alam menjadi taman wisata alam di Desa Pasar Seluma resmi disahkan. Warna Bengkulu.  
<https://www.warnabengkulu.co.id/berita/status-cagar-alam-jadi-twa-pasar-seluma>
- Moleong, L. J. (2021). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (Revised ed.). Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nugroho, I. (2011). *Ekowisata dan pembangunan berkelanjutan*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Nugroho, R. (2019). *Public policy: Dinamika kebijakan, analisis kebijakan, manajemen kebijakan*. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Nugroho, I., Negara, P. D., & Soeprbowati, T. R. (2021). Community empowerment in sustainable tourism development: A case of rural tourism in Indonesia. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 12(2), 404–411.
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 351–362.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Permendes PDTT. (2020). *Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 13 Tahun 2020 tentang Prioritas Penggunaan Dana Desa Tahun 2021*.
- Pranadji, T. (2020). *Desa dalam pusaran kebijakan: Studi kebijakan pengembangan desa di Indonesia*. IPB Press.
- Pusparini, R., & Wahyono, H. (2020). Penguatan kapasitas kelembagaan desa wisata melalui Pokdarwis. *Jurnal Pariwisata Nusantara*, 2(1), 15–28.
- Puspitawati, D. (2020). Capacity building dan peran kelembagaan dalam pembangunan desa wisata. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 9(1), 45–57.
- Putra, I. D. A., Prabawa, I. K. G., & Yuliana, S. (2020). Evaluation of community-based tourism in Bali: A case study of desa wisata in Gianyar. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 18(3), 319–336.
- Rahyono, F. X. (2009). *Kearifan lokal dalam perspektif budaya*. Balai Pustaka.
- Rist, R. C. (2008). The road to the future: The role of evaluation in the learning process. *World Bank*.
- Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (2014). *Theories of the policy process* (3rd ed.). Westview Press.
- Sari, R. (2019). Evaluasi program desa wisata di Kabupaten Yogyakarta: Perspektif pembangunan berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pembangunan*, 22(2), 157–171.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Sunaryo, B. (2013). *Kebijakan pengembangan destinasi dan pemasaran pariwisata*. Gava Media.
- Suansri, P. (2003). *Community-based tourism handbook*. Responsible Ecological Social Tour Project.
- Sutrisno, E. (2020). Dampak ekonomi pengembangan desa wisata terhadap kesejahteraan masyarakat. *Jurnal Pariwisata Nusantara*, 2(1), 15–26.
- Suryani, N., & Kusumawati, A. (2021). Religiusitas dan potensi lokal sebagai daya tarik pariwisata spiritual di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pariwisata Nusantara*, 3(2), 99–110.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003). The CIPP model for evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 31–62). Springer.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). *Evaluation theory, models, and applications*. Jossey-Bass.
- Timothy, D. J. (1999). *Participatory planning: A*

view of tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 371–391.

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488.

Warna Bengkulu. (2024, March 5). Desa Pasar Seluma ditunjuk sebagai Kampung Bahari Nusantara oleh TNI AL. *Warna Bengkulu*. <https://www.warnabengkulu.co.id/berita/kampung-bahari-nusantara-seluma>

Weiss, C. H. (1998). *Evaluation: Methods for studying programs and policies*. Prentice Hall.

Widari, D., Handayani, P. W., & Kusnandar, K. (2022). Tantangan pengelolaan desa wisata di era digital: Sebuah studi kasus di Jawa Tengah. *Jurnal Pariwisata dan Perhotelan*, 8(1), 77–89.

Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2004). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). Pearson.

Yulianto, I. (2021). Pemanfaatan media digital dalam pengembangan desa wisata. *Jurnal Komunikasi dan Teknologi Informasi*, 9(2), 101–112.

Yuliarmi, N. N., Gede, A. A., & Kurniawan, M. A. (2021). Implementation of tourism village development policy in Bali: The role of local government and community participation. *Journal of Regional and City Planning*, 32(1), 1–17.