

The Opportunity Development of Urban Tourism Without Gap: Case of Bogor City

Agustina Multi Purnomo

Faculty of Social and Politic, Djuanda University
agustina.m@unida.ac.id

Abstrak

Pengembangan pariwisata Kota dapat mengurangi kesenjangan pembangunan di kawasan perKotaaan, namun juga selalu memberikan pembatasan akses untuk komunitas miskin Kota. Penelitian ini memandang komunitas miskin Kota sebagai penyedia layanan wisata skala kecil. Penelitian ini menjelaskan peluang yang disediakan pemerintah untuk penyedia layanan wisata skala kecil di dalam kebijakan pemerintah Kota Bogor. Penelitian ini menggunakan analisis tiga aktivitas produksi ruang melalui analisis dokumen kebijakan dan observasi terbatas. Penelitian menemukan kebijakan pembangunan pariwisata tidak memadai dalam mengurangi kesenjangan dalam pembangunan pariwisata melalui pemberian kesempatan pada penyedia layanan wisata skala kecil. Penelitian ini menyarankan untuk memasukkan penyedia layanan wisata skala kecil sebagai fokus pembangunan wisata Kota, memberikan akses resmi terhadap pusat Kota, dan memasukkan penyedia layanan wisata skala kecil dalam propaganda pariwisata.

Keywords: kesenjangan pembangunan, komunitas miskin Kota, Kota Bogor, wisata Kota

Abstract

Urban tourism development can eliminate the development gap in urban areas, but on the contrary, it almost always gives close access to the substandard urban community. Micro-scale tourism providers represent substandard urban communities. This study examined the opportunities provided by the government on micro-scale tourism providers in Bogor City's tourism development policies. The analysis of three space production activities was arranged by analyzing policy documents and limited observation. The study found that tourism development policies are insufficient to overcome gaps in urban tourism development through opportunities given to micro-scale tourism providers. The study suggests that tourism development policy has to insert the micro-scale tourism providers as the focus of City tourism development, provide legal access to the City center area, and include them in tourism propaganda.

Keywords: Bogor City, development gap, substandard urban community, urban tourism

A. INTRODUCTION

The development gap is a problem in Indonesia. The Gini ratio in Indonesia was 0.381 (CBS Indonesia, 2020). Regional governments carry out the strategy for resolving this gap problem according to the spirit of decentralization of development in Indonesia, with tourism development as one of the independent innovation configurations in local government (Bapenas, 2017). Urban tourism is a potential product to be developed to overcome the disparity in development outcomes in the region because it is considered a positive contribution to urban development and City residents' well-being (Cosma 2012). However, significant capital owners almost always own urban tourism and exclude the substandard urban community (Manuel-Navarrete & Redclift 2012; Mullins, 1991). Therefore, the development of tourism in developing countries is vulnerable to the provision of substandard urban communities (Ismail & Baum 2006). The substandard urban community only can be involved in micro-scale tourism providers in Bogor City (Purnomo 2016a, b).

Tourism development is a socio-spatial process that aims to increase the City's attractiveness to attract visitors' attention or the tourist gaze (Urry 2002). The space production approach emphasizes socio-spatial processes in making a place to be a tourist destination. Lefebvre (1991) explained the production of space with three space production activities; First, spatial practices are carried out by people in the space as a reaction from the representation of space and space of representation. Second, the representation of space is conceptualized through understanding scientists, urban planners, social planners, or anyone who supports it or urban governance in this

* Corresponding author

Received: August 03, 2021; Revised: Oktober 09, 2021; Accepted: November 11, 2021

paper. Third, the space of representations is a space that directly lives through the images and symbols associated by its inhabitants and experts who provide interpretation and inspiration about space.

The government plays a role in all three space production activities. The government encourages spatial practice, representations of space, and space of representations in developing urban tourism space. The City government is the determinant of tourism development because the power of the government can be more than an economic force in determining the configuration of space in the City (Brenner & Elden 2009; Ritzer & Goodman 2016). Urban governance interests directed urban tourism development only for economic growth and left the community development because it is more profitable (Mordue, 2007). The role of government can be assessed from the opportunities provided by the government to the substandard urban community through urban tourism development policies (Donnelly 2017; Lin 2015; Luo et al. 2016; Manuel-Navarrete & Redclift 2012; Nasongkhla & Sintusingha 2013).

Spatial practice is observed from the existence of micro-scale businesses on urban tourism development policies. Previous studies have shown that urban tourism development focuses on the form of tourism services provided, the extent of the tourism space units, the boundaries that separate space, and who can access the inner urban tourism spaces (Lin 2015; Mordue 2007; Nasongkhla & Sintusingha 2013).

Representation of space activity observed from the City government's activities to determine the shape of urban tourism space. A place of tourism exists because it was built by the City government as a place of tourism (Levevre 1991). The tourism development process is similar to forming a City center because the City center is a strategic place that supports City branding as a tourist destination (Mordue, 2007). The City center was built through the City spatial planning process. Large investors can only access the City center area without any specific policies from the City government (Gottdiener & Hutchison 2011).

The space of representations is observed from what, who, and how the propaganda of urban tourism is conducted. The domination occurs because all aspects that are out of the image that will be built will be taken off. Thus, propaganda indirectly excludes the urban poor who are not following the image of urban tourism and simultaneously excludes the substandard urban community from the downtown area (Lin 2015).

This study examines the opportunities provided by the government on micro-scale tourism providers in Bogor City's tourism development policies. The research results can provide an overview of the impact of tourism development policy in overcoming the gap in urban tourism development.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

Bogor City was chosen because it has a character that is close to the study objectives. Bogor City is a part of the Jakarta Metropolitan Area, the most urbanized and globalized area in Indonesia (Indraprahasta & Derudder, 2019; Winarso, Hudalah & Firman, 2015). The tourism sector accounts for 40.63% of the Bogor City tax revenue (BPS Bogor City 2017). Domestic tourist visits to Bogor City in 2011-2016 increased by 207.7%, and foreign tourists increased by 458.08% (BPS Bogor City 2020). The case of Bogor City was discussed using secondary data (policy documents, analysis of promotional content and tourist publications and urban spatial plans) and observation. The document was analyzed based on the opportunities given to micro-scale tourism providers in documents. Observations were made to confirm the information from documents.

The role of urban governance in overcoming the gap in urban tourism development is assessed from how the City government policies provide opportunities for micro-scale entrepreneurs in all three space production activities. The observation focused on three forms of activities: 1) process of spatial practice in the form of focus on tourism development policy; 2) representation of space in the form of urban center spatial planning arrangement; and 3) space of representation in the form of efforts to establish the image of a place as a tourism space through propaganda.

C. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The focus of tourism development in Bogor City is formally in the Master Plan of Regional Tourism Development (MPRTD) year 2016-2025 in Regional Regulation No. 9/2016. Micro-scale tourism providers are not part of the vision, mission, and objectives. Small and medium industries are mentioned in tourism development goals. The goal of tourism development in MPRTD mentions "creating a regional tourism industry that promotes a sustainable local economy and alignments in small and medium industries...." (article 6 point c). It shows that the government will not make micro-scale businesses become the primary purpose of tourism development.

Poverty reduction is the goal of tourism development, but micro-scale enterprises are not the main actors in tourism development. MPRTD mentions "... local economic growth, increasing employment opportunities, reducing poverty ..." (article 8 point c). Poverty reduction is not already done through strengthening micro-scale tourism providers. Article 10 concerning Tourism Industry Development Policy, point c mentions "the development of large industrial partnerships in the field of Tourism or industries that are cross Regency/City with tourism and micro, small and medium scale industries in providing a list of tourism businesses and tourism business certification." The micro-scale industry is mentioned, but the goal of tourism development policy does not lead to strengthening the micro-scale industry itself but through partnerships with large industries. The substandard urban community that can only have micro-scale businesses is not encouraged to have particular urban tourism spaces without partnering with large industries.

Small-scale providers are not becoming a focus of tourism development objects by the government of Bogor City. Analysis conducted based on Bogor City Tourism Data documents (CBS Bogor City, 2014-2020), the official website of Bogor City www.KotaBogor.go.id and tourism promotion documents which showed Bogor Botanical Garden (BBG), The Jungle, and Morcopolo Cimanggu City as the most frequently mentioned tourist attraction in each document. The government manages BBG, A large-scale business that owns the Jungle and Morcopolo Cimanggu City.

Micro-scale tourism providers are not present in the tourism business, which the most developed in Bogor is the culinary business. The culinary business was ratified as a part of the tourism business through the Minister of Tourism Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 18/2018. The total regional income from the culinary sector is 52.15% of the total income of the tourism sector. Restaurants, cafes, catering, and restaurants are many tourism service providers in Bogor City (81.15%), and micro-scale tourism providers manage no one. The micro-scale tourism providers are not present in the policy, focusing on tourism development objects and the most developed tourism sector in Bogor City.

At the level of urban spatial planning, the formation of a City center in Bogor City can be observed on the Bogor City Spatial Plan 2011-2031. The City center location is the most accessible location for visitors via Jagorawi toll road or train station. The City center and sub-center of Bogor City mostly contain germ-plasm protection areas, government facilities, trade and services, educational facilities, and high-density residential areas. The downtown area where can be accessed for trade and service businesses is only along the main road of Bogor City, which is part of Pajajaran Street, throughout H. Juanda Street, Jalak Harupat Street and Otto Iskandar Dinata Street, part of Suryakencana Street, Ahmad Yani Street, Paledang Street, and Merdeka Street. Those areas are the highest tax area in Bogor City and can only be accessed legally by the government or companies that can pay taxes. On the other hand, tourism services are 27,4% are located in the City center of Bogor.

Table 1. The Number of Tourism Services in the Urban Center Area by the Scale of Business or Management

Tourism Service	Sum	In the urban center area	Percentage (%)	The scale of business/management
Tourism object	22	7	31.8	Middle-large
Museum	7	7	100	Government
Heritage sites	60	29	48.3	Government
Swimming pool	16	1	6.2	Middle
Cinema	5	3	60	Middle
Hotel	78	36	46.2	Middle -large
Culinary providers	818	191	23.4	Small- middle
Street food	2	2	100	Micro
Total	1008	184	27.4	

Source: Bogor City Tourism Data (Department of Tourism and Culture of Bogor City 2020), Bogor City in Figures (CBS Bogor City 2020)

The potential area where can be accessed by micro-scale tourism providers is only the street food area. Based on observations, both locations are more occupied by Street Food Vendors (SFVs) from micro-scale food providers and are not yet officially registered at the Regional Revenue Service. The arrangement and empowerment of SFVs are included the construction and revitalization of the SFVs zone, relocation, technical guidance, and installation of the SFVs banned zone sign (Regional regulation Bogor City No. 14/2019 about Regional Medium-Term Plan Bogor City 2019-2024). However, the SFVs priority program still shows that the spirit of structuring has not included SFVs as the focus of culinary tourism. Control of SFVs along the main road in the downtown area shows that the City center is a closed area for SFVs.

The City center area and sub-center of the City are more legally accessible by the government and small-large entrepreneurs. However, the opportunities ability of micro-scale culinary providers to access the City center can only occur if there is any support from government policies by providing a special place for them (Leng & Badaruzaman, 2014). Without any exceptional policies, access to small-large tourism providers is more likely to occur.

MPRTD of 2016-2025 does not show the form of distinctive urban tourism developed by the government of Bogor City. MPRTD only mentions nine strategic tourism development areas referring to tourism objects that will be developed. The Mayor of Bogor said that Bogor City would be directed as a green City, heritage City, and smart City (<https://www.KotaBogor.go.id>). However, all of them are not explicitly mentioned in MPRTD. There is no focus on the three forms of this City. This finding causes an analysis of propaganda done by Lin (2015) can not be applied in Bogor City.

The only document showing the image has created of Bogor City as a tourism space can be found in the promotion of tourism of Bogor City. Tourism promotion documents are tourist guidebooks, brochures/leaflets, tourist signs, tourism VCDs, tourist directions signs, Bogor City maps, and culinary books. Tourism promotion documents contain tourist attractions managed by the government and the private sector on a small-large scale. Micro-scale tourism providers are only in the culinary book on street food. Street food promotions only mention the type of food but unspecifically mention the food vendors. This matter may cause visitors can recognizing the kind of food but will have no information about the food vendors. Food sellers can be replaced by producers who also sell food with a larger scale of business (Chuang, 2009; Sims, 2009; Stoffelen & Vanneste, 2016).

The MPRTD's document states that tourism development in Bogor City will be carried out based on international management and service standards (article 10 points c). Based on observation, street vendors in street food locations are not applied standardized serving and processing of food yet. Street vendors are not part of the urban tourism development built by the City government.

D. CONCLUSION

The study found that tourism development policies in Bogor City do not indicate the opportunity specifically given to micro-scale tourism providers. Analysis of three space production activities found that urban tourism space leads to a closedness urban tourism space to micro-scale tourism providers. As an implication, tourism development policies did not sufficiently overcome gaps in urban tourism development through opportunities given to micro-scale tourism providers. The study suggests that tourism development policy must insert the micro-scale tourism providers as the focus of City tourism development, provide legal access to the City center area, and include them in tourism propaganda.

This case study is a short study and preliminary study for further, more in-depth research. It is already done because research on space productions was discussed at the micro, medium, and macro-level processes, and a deep understanding of the history of production space in cities at the government policy level (Lefebvre 1991, 2004). That also becomes a limitation of this study. This study only discusses what is happening and does not discuss the historical process that causes the process. This research's limitation is a recommendation for further research.

References

- Bapenas. 2017. *Prakarsa pemerintah daerah dalam upaya pengurangan kesenjangan wilayah dan pembangunan daerah*. Jakarta: Bapenas.
- CBS Bogor City. 2014-2020. *Kota Bogor dalam angka*. Bogor: BPS.
- Christie P. 2013. Space, place, and social justice: Developing a rhythmanalysis of education in South Africa. *Qualitative Inquiry* 19(10): 775-785.
- Chuang H.T. 2009. The rise of culinary tourism and its transformation of food cultures: The national cuisine of Taiwan. *The Copenhagen Journal of Asian Studies* 27(2): 84-108.
- Cosma, S.A. 2012. Measurement tourism performance of urban destinations. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, Special Issue Destination Management-2012.
- Department of Tourism and Culture of Bogor City. 2020. *Bogor City tourism data*. Bogor: Department of Tourism and Culture of Bogor City.
- Donnelly, L. 2017. Producing space and locality through cultural displays: A Creole case study. *Space and Culture* (20)1: 81-93.
- Gottdiener, M. & Hutchison, R. 2011. *The new urban sociology*. 4th ed. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Indraprahasta, G. S., & Derudder, B. (2019). World City-ness in a historical perspective: Probing the long-term evolution of the Jakarta metropolitan area. *Habitat International*, 89, 102000.
- Ismail, H. & Baum, T. 2006. Urban tourism in developing countries: In the case of Melaka (Malacca) City, Malaysia. *Anatolia*, 17(2): 211-233.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. UK: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time, and everyday life*. London: Continuum.
- Lin, C. 2015. Red tourism: Rethinking propaganda as a social space. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*: 1-19.
- Luo, F., Brent D., Moyle, J.B., & Zhong, Y. 2016. The role of institutions in the production of space for tourism: National Forest Parks in China. *Forest Policy and Economics* 70(2016): 47-55.

- Manuel-Navarrete, D. & Redclift, M. 2012. Spaces of consumerism and the consumption of space: tourism and social exclusion in the 'Mayan Riviera' In A.C. Pertiera & J. Sinclair (ed.), *Consumer culture in Latin America: 177-193*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mordue, T. 2007. Tourism, urban governance and public space. *Leisure studies*, 26(4): 447-462
- Mullins, P. 1991. Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 15:3, 326-342.
- Nasongkhla, S. & Sintusingha, S. 2013. Social production of space in Johor Bahru. *Urban Studies* 50(9): 1836-1853.
- Purnomo A.M. 2016b. Strategi pengembangan usaha makanan khas Bogor berbasis masyarakat. In Agussani et.al. (ed.), *Indonesia menuju SDGs*, National Conference of Social and Politic Sciences 2016: 16-30. Medan: Fisip UNSU.
- Purnomo, A.M. 2016a. The roles of food industries as a part of food tourism development for woman empowerment in Bogor. In A.M. Morrison, S. Leo & A.G. Abdullah (ed.), *A new approach to wonderful tourism (sustainable, responsible and quality of tourism)*: 0368-0373. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research* vol 19. Amsterdam: Atlantis Press.
- Ritzer, G. & Goodman, D.J. 2016. *Teori sosiologi modern*. 7th ed. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Sims, R. 2009. Food, place and authenticCity: Local food and the sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of sustainable tourism* (17)3: 321-336.
- Stoffelen, A. & Vanneste, D. 2016. Institutional (dis)integration and regional development implications of whisky tourism in Speyside, Scotland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* (16): 42-60.
- Urry, J. (2002). *Consuming places*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Winarso, H., Hudalah, D., & Firman, T. (2015). Peri-urban transformation in the Jakarta metropolitan area. *Habitat International*, 49, 221-229.