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Abstract
This study aims to elaborate on tourism promotion on the government's official website to explain the challenge of pro-poor culinary tourism development in Indonesia. The qualitative content analysis was used to analyze 224 articles on the government's official tourism promotion website. The researchers read all the text and put code 1 for the information appearance and 0 for the absence. The number of information presentations indicated the government's focus. The government was not put pro-poor culinary tourism development as their focus. The provision of optimal benefits for the poor was not reflected in the promotion of culinary tourism on the government's official website. The challenge for the pro-poor culinary tourism development of the Indonesian government is to translate the goals of tourism development into adequate tourism promotion. The research limitation was that the researcher did not confirm the data through interviews with the website managers. Further research is recommended to conduct interviews with website managers to explain the reasons for choosing information on the website. There was limited research on the government's official culinary tourism promotion website. This study contributed to comprehending what the government should do to promote culinary in the poor alleviation context.
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A. INTRODUCTION
The pro-poor tourism agenda was the old thought. The concept of pro-poor tourism development has been published since 1997 as a reaction to tourism development which only benefits large investors (Goodwin, 2009). Tourism as the pro-poor agenda has a focus on poverty alleviation. The challenge was the involvement and provision of optimal benefits to tourism stakeholders who were included in the category of the poor (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007; Harrison, 2008).

One of the development goals in Indonesia is to address inequality (Bapenas, 2020, p. 3). Poverty is still a problem in Indonesia. The Gini ratio in Indonesia is 0.384. Indonesia still has many economic disparities (CBS Indonesia, 2021, July). The government plans tourism development to address the gap (Bapenas, 2017, p. 53; Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, 2020, p. 57). Tourism development has become the main agenda of the 2020-2024 National Medium-Term Development Plan IV in the field of strengthening economic resilience for quality economic growth (Bapenas, 2020, p. 4). In this context, tourism development should focus on the poverty alleviation agenda in Indonesia.

Food tourism is an integral part of tourism in Indonesia. Culinary as part of cultural tourism has a product portfolio of 60% of all Indonesian tourism products (Ministry of the Tourism Republic of Indonesia., 2014; 2018). Food tourism development has high potential because Indonesia has many food tourism resources (Palupi & Abdillah, 2019; Wijaya, 2019). Food tourism development can be carried out in areas that do not have particular tourism potential, as in the view of classical tourism
development regarding the critical position of nature tourism (Holden, 2006, pp. 17-23). Food tourism development can go hand in hand with other tourism (Hall & Sharples, 2003, p. 11).

The development of food tourism has the opportunity to provide optimal benefits for the poor. Culinary tourism development can help local communities (Pilato, Platania, & Séraphin, 2021; Scheyvens & Laeis, 2019) and small-capital business actors (Henderson, 2019; Purnomo, 2021b; Purnomo, 2016). Food tourism development also has the opportunity to build sustainable tourism (Alonso, Kok, & O’Brien, 2018).

Promotion is an essential part of the development of food tourism. The government's tourism promotion is needed to develop tourism (Amiruddin, 2020; Horng & Tsai, 2012). The promotion on the government's official website reflects the government's focus (Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018).

There was limited research on the government's official culinary tourism promotion website. The previous studies focus on the government's tourism promotion (Amiruddin, 2020; Rosmeli, Nurhayani, & Sari, 2020). Therefore, this study aims to elaborate on tourism promotion on the government's official website to explain the challenge of pro-poor culinary tourism development in Indonesia. This study contributed to comprehending what the government should do to promote culinary in the poor alleviation context.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

Culinary Tourism

The study of food tourism developed from wine tourism (Hall & Mitchell, 2001). The study of wine has its focus of study in food tourism and even has a particular journal, namely the Journal of Wine Research. The study of food tourism has led to the development of several terms, namely culinary, cuisine, gourmet, gastronomic, and food tourism. Hall and Sharples (2003, p. 11) explain the differences between these terms into five categories of food tourism.

First is gourmet tourism. This category is characterized by very close attention from visitors to food. On Gourmet tourism, visitors come specifically to enjoy food or drinks. Second is gastronomic tourism and cuisine tourism. This category is characterized by close visitor attention to food or drinks, and tourism trips are carried out to enjoy certain foods/drinks. The difference between gourmet and gastronomic tourism is that in gourmet tourism, enjoying food is the primary goal of visitors. UNWTO defines gastronomy tourism as visitors’ food experience while tours (UNWTO & Basque Culinary Center, 2019, p. 8). Visitors are food visitors, although enjoying food may not be their primary goal. The third is culinary tourism, characterized by close visitor attention to food or drinks as part of a tourist trip. The primary purpose of visitors is not to enjoy food. Food is part of a tourist trip. The leading tourist destination of visitors may be natural, artificial, or city tours.

Fourth is rural or urban tourism. This tour is characterized by a casual visitor's attention to food. Visitors come because there are different foods/drinks. Food is one of the tourist attractions of all the attractions offered by a tourist destination. Fifth, visitors eat or drink because they are thirsty or hungry while traveling. Food is not a consideration for visitors in visiting a tourist place. Visitors enjoy food because they are hungry and thirsty. Hall and Sharples (2003) see this category as a continuum of attention level and the number of visitors. Category 1-5 shows a lower level of attention but a higher number of visitors.

Referring to the five categories of food tourism, the term food tourism is a general term that does not describe a specific group of categories. The five categories of food tourism also explain the vital position of food tourism from the amount of food shopping can only explain the fifth category. Visitors as humans will undoubtedly feel hungry or thirsty during a tour, but they did not explain the place as a food tourism destination. Many studies explain the critical position of food tourism from the
amount of food shopping (Hendijani, 2016; Wijaya et al., 2016). Research on food tourism destinations is at least in the rural or urban tourism category to elaborate on the crucial position of food in tourism. Visitors come to food/beverage attractions because there is something different.

This study used the culinary tourism term because that term was used in Indonesia’s promotion and planning documents (Ministry of Tourism, 2015; Ministry of Tourism, 2016; Ministry of Tourism, 2018; Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, 2020; Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, 2021, March 8). The use of the term does not indicate the category of food tourism, according to Hall and Sharples (2003).

**Promotion in Food Tourism**

Development Food tourism development has two theoretical perspectives. First, the tourist-oriented side defines food tourism development based on the visitor’s preference as an outside factor. Second, the destination-oriented side perspective defines food tourism development based on tourism destination internal factors. Destination orientation conceptualization on food tourism viewpoint has a direct link with the place of food, a form of tourism, product, place, management, and marketing. Destination orientation overlaps with tourists’ motivations and experiences. A food tourist gets the cultural experience of a specific place through their food experience. Food as the medium reflects the cultural identity of a specific place. Food tourism as the destination has a relationship with food as a cultural product, tourist, management, and marketing to the outer and the inside community in specific place image building as a food tourism destination (Ellis et al., 2018). Culinary tourism development has to pay attention to food as a tourism attraction. The actors provided the food and the mechanism to manage and market a culinary tourism destination (Ellis et al., 2018; Kušen, 2010, 2017).

Promotion was essential to marketing (Kartajaya, Kotler, & Setiawan, 2017). Previous studies found that promotion was a government’s food tourism marketing strategy (Aleffi & Cavicchi, 2020; Horng & Tsai, 2012; Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). Promotion is part of marketing and management to develop food tourism destinations (Ellis et al., 2018).

The previous studies on government website content analysis found how the government promotes food as a tourism attraction (Okumus, Okumus, & McKercher, 2007; Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). The website promotion was a strategy to develop marketing effectiveness (Putra et al., 2018). The government website content analysis provides information about website characteristics and users (Zhou & DeSantis, 2005). In this research, the promotion on the government’s official website found the government’s focus (Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). The focus in the pro-poor tourism development context is the involvement and provision of optimal benefits to tourism stakeholders who are included in the category of the poor (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007; Harrison, 2008).

**Pro-poor Tourism Agenda**

Pro-poor tourism development strategy for poverty alleviation focused on urban or rural poor communities (Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007). Ideally, the poor are the main actors in tourism development to get the most benefits (Musavengane, Siakwah, & Leonard, 2019). However, the reality is that the poor are often marginalized in tourism development (Oviedo-García, González-Rodríguez, & Vega-Vázquez, 2019).

Several approaches to building pro-poor tourism development are sustainability development (Alonso, Kok, & O’Brien, 2018; Chok, Macbeth, & Warren, 2007), inclusive tourism development (Musavengane, Siakwah, & Leonard, 2019; Moreno de la Santa, 2020; Biddulph & Scheyvens, 2018; Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2018), and local tourism development oriented (Musavengane, 2018; Wen, Cai,
& Li, 2021; Scheyvens & Laeis, 2019). The inclusive tourism approach adds other marginalized groups, such as groups with disabilities (Gillovic & McIntosh, 2020), women (Rogerson, 2020), small-capital tourism actors (Kadi, Plank, & Seidl, 2019), and racial minorities (Rogerson & Rogerson, 2020). The previous study also found street food vendors for marginalized culinary tourism actors (Purnomo, 2021b). Local tourism development is oriented toward adding tourism business actors from local communities, such as farmers and fisherman (Scheyvens & Laeis, 2019; Alonso, Kok, & O’Brien, 2018; Fountain et al., 2021). All three focus on tourism development that focuses on equity, providing benefits to the marginalized, empowerment, and sustainable tourism development in the long term. These three approaches offer a development system that includes policy improvement, a development process that pays attention to various actors, and community involvement and empowerment.

This study only focuses on promotions carried out by the government in supporting the involvement of poor or marginalized groups in the development of food tourism. Referring to previous research, poor and marginalized groups are groups with disabilities, women, small-capital tourism actors, local producers (farmers and fishers), and racial minorities. Referring to the literature review in the promotion section, the existence of poor and marginalized groups denoted the government’s focus on this group.

C. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used website qualitative content analysis. The data source was the government’s official tourism promotion website, managed officially by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy. The website is https://www.indonesia.travel. The culinary tourism information on the website was found in two links, namely "Culinaries" and "Culinary & Wellness." The 51 articles have been found in the "Culinaries" link and 173 in the "Culinary & Wellness" link. The 224 articles were the data source.

The analysis started with arranging the conceptual references to determine grouping and coding information (Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). The data is grouped into two categories. The first was a culinary tourism attraction. This group is analyzed by the presence of the name of food, the origin of food, and local food. The second was the culinary business actors especially poor or marginalized actors. The culinary business actors were restaurants (Bristow & Jenkins, 2018; de Albuquerque Meneguel, Mundet, & Aulet, 2019) and food manufacturers (Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2016). The factory and restaurant were the significant capital actors (Purnomo, 2021a). The poor or marginalized actors were street food vendors, local producers (farmers and fishers), disabled, women, and small-capital tourism actors.

The presence of information is analyzed by the presence of text and images (Jenkins, 1999). The data grouping referred to the direct word representing food name, food place, name of local food, disability, women, street vendors, farmers, and fishers. The local food information referred to the local food data (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2005; Von Holzen & Arsana, 2012, 2015). The text and images were fixed differently in the promotional video (Kong, LaVallee, Rams, Ramamurthi, & Krishnan-Sarin, 2019; Purnomo, 2016b). The presence of information denoted the focus of promotion (Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). The method was different from the complete content analysis. The researcher did not code, classify, or describe the codes and groups (Kleinhæksel et al., 2020).

The researcher processed by counting the presence of the information. The researchers read all the text and put code 1 for the information appearance and 0 for the absence. The number of information presentations indicated the government’s focus.
D. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The content analysis results of 224 articles found that information about the names of food and beverages found in 136 articles or 60.7%. The number of articles containing food names in the "Culinary" link is more (82.4%) than in the "Culinary & Wellness" link (54.3%). Information about the origin of food is found in 54% of articles. The number of articles on the "Culinary" link is still higher, which is 78.4%, compared to the articles on the "Culinary & Wellness" link (46.8%). Information about local food appears the least compared to other information. This information only appeared in 45.1% of articles, with the "Culinary & Wellness" link appearing in only 39.9%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culinary Tourism Attraction Category</th>
<th>The Presence of Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food name</td>
<td>2 4 36 2.4 4.3 0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin of food</td>
<td>0 1 21 8.4 6.8 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local food</td>
<td>2 9 01 2.8 9.9 5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from the contents of the article on https://www.indonesia.travel website.
Notes: 1 = link "Culinary"; 2 = link "Culinary & Wellness"; 3 = total
Final confirmation on November 8, 2021

Information on culinary business actors appears in 37.5% of the 224 articles. Based on link addresses, 39.2% of articles are on the "Culinary" link and 37% on the "Culinary & Wellness" link. The image of culinary business actors is mostly about restaurants, cafes, and hotels. The detailed information on the food factory was not found. The food factory was reflected in souvenir food producers and shop figures. The restaurants, cafes, hotels, souvenir food producers, and shop images denoted significant capital actors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor or Marginalized Actors Category</th>
<th>The Presence of Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culinary business actors</td>
<td>20 64 84 39.2 37 37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or marginalized actors</td>
<td>4 19 23 7.8 11 10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed from the contents of the article on https://www.indonesia.travel website.
Notes: 1 = link "Culinary"; 2 = link "Culinary & Wellness"; 3 = total
Final confirmation on November 8, 2021

Information on street food vendors, small-capital tourism actors, farmers, and fishers was found in 10.3% of articles. No specific information was found regarding disability and women. The street food vendor’s information has appeared in the text and image. However, the fisher and farmer’s information did not appear in the community-based tourism context but in the beaches.
and villages tourism area. The farmers and fishers were not placed as the local producers but food sellers.

The government's culinary tourism promotion has focused on the culinary tourism attraction. Information about the name of the food or drink is already in more than 50% of the articles. Food was the main tourist attraction in culinary tourism (Ellis et al., 2018; Okumus, Okumus, & McKercher, 2007; Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). Therefore, the emergence of information about local food was still less than 50%. Local food has received particular attention in the study of food tourism. Local food strengthens the local identity and tourist authenticity experience (Sims, 2009; Wijaya et al., 2017). Indonesia has a variety of local foods that have the potential as culinary tourist attractions (Palupi & Abdillah, 2019; Wijaya, 2019). The amount of information about local food indicated that the government is still unaware of the critical position of local food in the development of culinary tourism.

The amount of the food origin information is not comparable to the information about the name of the food. Tourism as a destination is related to a particular place (Ellis et al., 2018; Kušen, 2010, 2017). Tourists associate dining experiences with tourist attractions (Björk & Kauppinen-Räisänen, 2019; Hsu & Scott, 2020). The mention of local food is related to the place of origin of the food and its maker (Scheyvens & Laeis, 2019). Information about the place of origin of food is essential in the development of culinary tourism. Adequate information about the place of origin of food strengthens the formation of an image as a culinary tourism destination (Ellis et al., 2018).

General information about culinary business actors is found in less than 50% of articles. Information on poor or marginalized actors is only available in 10.3% of articles. This number denoted that the government still pays more attention to the significant capital actors than the poor or marginalized actors.

The amount of information about poor or marginalized actors is the least compared to other information. The promotion focused on tourism development (Yousaf & Xiucheng, 2018). Promotion of the website as part of marketing effectiveness shows the characteristics of the website and its users (Putra et al., 2018; Zhou & DeSantis, 2005). The lack of information about poor or marginalized actors indicated the government's lack of attention to these actors.

The government's promotion has not been adequate in supporting pro-poor culinary tourism development. The poor should be the main actors in tourism development (Musavengane, Siakwah, & Leonard, 2019). The lack of information about local producers demonstrated that the government had not made local tourism development their orientation (Musavengane, 2018; Wen, Cai, & Li, 2021; Scheyvens & Laeis, 2019). The absence of information on disability and women indicated that there had been no attention to these two marginal groups.

E. CONCLUSION

Culinary tourism is a niche yet powerful sector in the tourism industry, offering travelers a unique way to engage with the culture, history, and people of a destination. It's commendable that the government recognizes this potential and has made efforts to promote culinary tourism through its official channels. Highlighting 'Culinary' and 'Culinary & Wellness' establishes a promising platform for potential tourists to explore the gastronomic delights a region has to offer.

The government has promoted culinary tourism on its official website. Culinary has been promoted in the links "Culinary" and "Culinary & Wellness." The calculation of the number of occurrences of information denoted that the government has promoted food as a culinary tourism attraction. This promotion was not comparable to the promotion regarding the origin of food and local food.
However, the focus appears to skew towards the promotion of food as a mere attraction, rather than emphasizing its deep-rooted connections to the locale, its people, and their traditions. The richness of a culinary experience lies not just in the food but in understanding its origins and the hands that craft it. By not paralleling the promotion of local food and its origins, an essential aspect of the culinary narrative remains untapped.

The issue of pro-poor culinary tourism is another critical area that requires attention. True sustainable tourism ensures that the benefits are felt by everyone involved, especially those in marginalized communities. By neglecting the information about the poor or marginalized actors in the culinary sector, the government misses an opportunity to foster inclusive growth and demonstrate the comprehensive benefits of tourism.

It’s evident that while the government has outlined the reduction of disparities as a developmental goal in tourism, the translation of this goal into tangible promotional strategies remains inconsistent. Positioning marginalized communities at the forefront of promotions not only addresses equity but also offers tourists a more authentic and grounded experience. Achieving a balance where over 50% of promotional content revolves around these marginalized actors could serve as a benchmark for inclusivity.

Ultimately, while the government’s endeavors to promote culinary tourism are a step in the right direction, ensuring that this promotion is both holistic and inclusive will be key to realizing the full potential of this sector. Only through such an approach can we hope to showcase the true essence and depth of the nation’s culinary heritage while also ensuring that the fruits of tourism are equitably distributed.
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