



Sanitation Policy in Community-Based Tourism in East Java and Western Australia: A Comparative Analysis

Achmad Room Fitrianto¹, Asif Iqbal Siddiqui Siddiqui², Ajeng Tita Nawangsari¹, Nadine Elizabeth Gibbons³, Hapsari Wiji Utami¹, Iftekhar Ahmed Robin⁴

¹The State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

²School of Management & Marketing, Faculty of Business and Law, Curtin University, Australia

³Formerly employed in an Australian Federal Government library, Australia

⁴Research Fellow, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

ARTICLE INFORMATION	A B S T R A C T
<p>Received: August 21, 2025 Revised: March 17, 2026 Accepted: March 28, 2026 Available online: April 21, 2026</p>	<p>This study examines how sanitation, cultural sensitivity, and tourism policy intersect within community-based tourism (CBT) in East Java, Indonesia, and Western Australia. At its heart, the research seeks practical ways to improve sanitation infrastructure while honoring local cultures and safeguarding the environment—an effort that contributes to ongoing conversations about building truly sustainable tourism. Using a qualitative approach, the study looks closely at public policies, challenges on the ground, and best practices that shape sanitation in CBT settings. Case studies from East Java and Western Australia provide a comparative lens, highlighting both the shared struggles and unique solutions emerging from different contexts. Data were gathered through policy documents, interviews with decision-makers, and direct field observations to capture both structural frameworks and lived experiences. The findings reveal that in Indonesia, efforts to integrate traditional knowledge with modern sanitation practices show promise, but issues of access and long-term maintenance remain pressing. In contrast, Australia demonstrates how consistent attention to hygiene, accessibility, and sustainability can set a strong standard for CBT sanitation. The study underscores that effective sanitation is never the task of a single actor—it depends on collaboration between governments, private partners, and local communities. Lessons from both contexts highlight the value of cross-cultural exchange, policy alignment, and technology in reducing gaps in infrastructure and service delivery. Ultimately, fostering inclusive and sustainable sanitation in CBT requires more than facilities: it calls for policy reforms rooted in cultural respect, investment in green technologies, and the empowerment of communities to lead change. Future research should continue to explore creative solutions that keep sanitation excellence at the center of community-based tourism, ensuring that local well-being and visitor experience advance hand in hand.</p>
<p>KEYWORDS</p> <p>Inclusive sanitation; sustainable tourism; public policy, community-based tourism; cultural sensitivity; sanitation infrastructure; East Java; Western Australia</p>	
<p>CORRESPONDENCE</p> <p>Name: Achmad Room Fitrianto Email: ar.fitrianto@uinsa.ac.id</p>	

INTRODUCTION

Sanitation is a fundamental yet frequently overlooked dimension of tourism development (Mensah et al., 2023). Beyond its basic hygienic function, sanitation infrastructure shapes visitor satisfaction, influences perceptions of destination quality, and contributes to environmental sustainability and social inclusion. In tourism settings, the availability and quality of sanitation facilities affect not only public health but also the comfort, accessibility, and cultural acceptability of tourism experiences (Han et al., 2021; UNWTO, 2022). Despite its importance, sanitation remains relatively underexamined within tourism research, which has traditionally focused more heavily on attractions, accommodations, and marketing strategies (Craik, 2002; Fesenmaier & Pearce, 2019). As tourism destinations increasingly compete within a global leisure economy, the quality of supporting infrastructure, including sanitation systems, plays a critical role in shaping visitor perceptions and long-term sustainability (Elgin & Elveren, 2024; Naumov et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2019).

The significance of sanitation becomes particularly evident within Community-Based Tourism (CBT), where local communities actively participate in managing tourism activities and infrastructure (Mtapuri et al., 2022; Zielinski et al., 2021). CBT has been widely promoted as a development strategy that empowers communities while preserving cultural heritage and environmental resources (Goodwin & Santilli, 2020). A

substantial body of research demonstrates that CBT can strengthen local economies, distribute tourism benefits more equitably, and reinforce cultural identity (Aquino, 2025). However, much of this literature concentrates on economic outcomes, community participation, and cultural preservation, while paying limited attention to the governance and provision of supporting infrastructure. In particular, sanitation systems are rarely treated as a central element of tourism governance, even though they directly influence visitor experience and environmental sustainability (Robina-Ramírez et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2025).

The limited attention given to sanitation infrastructure reflects a broader pattern within tourism research, where studies often address infrastructure in general terms without examining the institutional and policy mechanisms that shape its development (Clements et al., 2023; Dipura, 2026). In practice, sanitation systems represent a form of public service provision embedded within tourism governance structures. Their development requires coordination among public authorities, tourism operators, and community organizations, as well as regulatory oversight and sustainable financing mechanisms. Research on tourism governance highlights that infrastructure outcomes are strongly influenced by institutional arrangements, funding structures, and regulatory enforcement capacity (Pastras & Bramwell, 2013; Zapata et al., 2011). Yet few studies explicitly

analyze how these governance factors influence sanitation development in community-based tourism destinations.

The governance dimension of sanitation becomes particularly relevant in rapidly growing tourism regions where communities are actively developing new attractions and tourism services. In East Java, Indonesia, community-based tourism initiatives have expanded significantly over the past decade as rural communities seek to diversify local economies and benefit from tourism opportunities. Destinations such as SETIGI (Selo Tirto Giri) in Sekapuk Village and WAGOS (Wisata Alam Gosari) in Gosari Village illustrate how CBT initiatives can successfully combine local cultural identity, natural attractions, and community participation to create distinctive tourism experiences (Fitrianto, 2019; Halim et al., 2024). Existing research on CBT in Indonesia has largely focused on its economic impacts and cultural dimensions, highlighting how community participation can enhance local livelihoods and strengthen social cohesion (Goffi et al., 2019). However, relatively little attention has been paid to how sanitation infrastructure is developed, managed, and maintained within these community-led tourism destinations.

Where sanitation has been discussed within tourism research, the focus has often been limited to its role in hygiene, public health, or environmental management. Studies have shown that sanitation quality can influence visitor satisfaction, disease prevention, and the overall reputation of tourism destinations (Han et al., 2021). At the same time, sanitation systems also reflect broader cultural and social norms. In Muslim-majority societies such as Indonesia, for instance, public sanitation facilities frequently incorporate water-based cleansing practices and ablution spaces that reflect Islamic principles of cleanliness (Henderson, 2016; Jawad, 2024). These culturally embedded practices illustrate how sanitation infrastructure must respond not only to technical standards but also to local social and religious expectations.

Despite this growing recognition of sanitation's broader significance, infrastructure provision in many developing tourism destinations remains uneven. In Indonesia and other developing countries, investments in tourism infrastructure have often prioritized accommodations and attractions while public sanitation facilities receive less systematic attention (Saner et al., 2015). As a result, many rural CBT destinations continue to face challenges in maintaining sanitation systems that meet international expectations for hygiene, accessibility, and sustainability (Tan et al., 2023). Limited financial resources, uneven policy enforcement, and varying administrative capacity often constrain efforts to upgrade sanitation facilities, particularly in community-managed tourism areas (Djuwendah et al., 2025).

A comparison with developed tourism economies highlights the importance of governance and policy frameworks in shaping sanitation outcomes. In Australia, tourism sanitation systems are supported by strong regulatory standards emphasizing universal accessibility, environmental sustainability, and public health protection. Tourism facilities frequently incorporate technological innovations such as water-efficient systems, automated cleaning mechanisms, and touchless sanitation technologies designed to improve hygiene and environmental performance (Loehr et al., 2021; Othman & Buys, 2016). Destinations such as Araluen Botanic Park in Western Australia demonstrate how sanitation infrastructure can be integrated with environmental education and visitor awareness initiatives, reinforcing broader sustainability objectives (Ikku, 2024;

Jones & Newsome, 2015; Phau et al., 2013).

These contrasting experiences point to the importance of governance arrangements and multi-level policy coordination in shaping sanitation infrastructure development. Tourism sanitation systems typically operate across multiple institutional levels, including national tourism strategies, regional planning frameworks, and local community management. Differences in policy institutionalization, regulatory enforcement, and financial capacity can therefore produce significant variation in sanitation outcomes across destinations (Anguelovski et al., 2016; Odunga et al., 2024). In highly institutionalized policy environments, sanitation standards are embedded within regulatory frameworks and supported by stable funding mechanisms. By contrast, in decentralized governance systems sanitation provision may vary substantially depending on local administrative capacity and stakeholder coordination (Chong et al., 2016; Ostrom, 2002).

Although the importance of sanitation for tourism sustainability is increasingly recognized, several gaps remain within the existing literature. First, research on community-based tourism continues to prioritize economic and social dimensions while overlooking the governance and policy structures that shape infrastructure provision. Second, studies on tourism sanitation tend to focus either on technical aspects of hygiene and environmental management or on cultural practices related to sanitation use, without integrating these perspectives within a broader governance framework. Third, there is limited comparative research examining how sanitation policies and institutional arrangements influence tourism infrastructure development across different national contexts.

This study addresses these gaps by examining sanitation governance within community-based tourism through a comparative analysis of East Java, Indonesia, and Western Australia. By analyzing how policy frameworks, institutional capacity, and cultural considerations shape sanitation infrastructure in tourism destinations, the study contributes to the literature in three key ways. First, it provides a comparative public policy analysis of sanitation governance in CBT contexts, highlighting how different institutional arrangements influence infrastructure development. Second, it explores how cultural and religious practices can be integrated into sanitation design while maintaining inclusivity and sustainability standards. Third, it advances understanding of how governance coordination across multiple policy levels affects the implementation of sanitation infrastructure in tourism destinations.

Given the distinct cultural, institutional, and environmental contexts of East Java and Western Australia, this study investigates how public policy frameworks shape sanitation development in community-based tourism. Specifically, it addresses the following research questions: (1) How do public policy frameworks influence sanitation infrastructure in community-based tourism destinations?; How are inclusivity and cultural sensitivity incorporated into sanitation facilities in CBT contexts?; and (3) What governance mechanisms support sustainable sanitation practices in tourism destinations? By addressing these questions, this research seeks to contribute to broader debates on sustainable tourism governance while offering practical policy insights for improving inclusive and environmentally responsible sanitation infrastructure in community-based tourism destinations.

METHOD

Population and Samples

This study employs a qualitative research design to investigate how inclusive and sustainable sanitation is governed within community-based tourism (CBT). Sanitation provision in tourism settings involves institutional arrangements, regulatory frameworks, and community practices that interact in complex ways. Quantitative indicators alone are often insufficient to capture how policies are interpreted and implemented in practice. A qualitative approach therefore allows for a deeper examination of governance processes, stakeholder perspectives, and contextual factors that shape sanitation infrastructure in tourism destinations (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Yin, 2018).

The research adopts a comparative case study strategy focusing on two tourism contexts: East Java in Indonesia and Western Australia in Australia. The selection of these cases reflects a deliberate effort to examine sanitation governance under different institutional conditions. Indonesia represents a decentralized governance environment in which local governments and community organizations play a central role in tourism development and infrastructure provision. In contrast, Australia operates within a more institutionalized regulatory framework characterized by established accessibility standards and environmental management policies. Comparing these contexts provides an opportunity to explore how different governance structures influence sanitation outcomes in community-based tourism settings.

Case locations were selected through purposive case selection, a strategy commonly used in qualitative policy research to identify information-rich sites that illustrate key governance dynamics (Patton, 2015). In East Java, the study focuses on two well-known CBT initiatives: the SETIGI tourism destination in Sekapuk Village and the WAGOS tourism site in Gosari Village. Both destinations have gained recognition for their community-driven tourism development and locally initiated sanitation facilities. These sites provide valuable insight into how grassroots tourism initiatives attempt to integrate environmental sustainability and cultural identity into sanitation infrastructure.

For comparative purposes, the study also examines sanitation practices at Araluen Botanic Garden in Western Australia. The site was selected because it represents a tourism destination operating within a regulatory environment that mandates inclusive public infrastructure. Its sanitation facilities reflect established accessibility standards and environmental management practices, offering a useful point of comparison with community-managed tourism sites in Indonesia.

Participants were selected through purposive stakeholder sampling in order to capture perspectives from actors directly involved in sanitation governance and tourism management. The sample includes local government officials responsible for tourism and sanitation planning, managers of CBT destinations, tourism planners, environmental and public health specialists, and visitors who regularly use sanitation facilities in the selected sites. Engaging these groups allows the study to capture different dimensions of sanitation governance, ranging from policy formulation and infrastructure implementation to user experience.

This multi-stakeholder sampling strategy strengthens the analytical depth of the study by incorporating perspectives from both policy actors and end users. It allows the research to examine how sanitation policies are translated into infrastructure on the ground, while also revealing the practical

challenges faced by tourism managers and communities. By integrating these perspectives, the study develops a more comprehensive understanding of how governance structures, policy frameworks, and local practices shape sanitation provision in community-based tourism.

Research Instrument

To maintain the rigor of the study, multiple qualitative data collection methods are employed. Semi-structured interviews with policymakers, tourism managers, and infrastructure planners provide insights into policy development and implementation challenges. Focus group discussions (FGDs) with community members in East Java capture grassroots perspectives on sanitation needs, cultural sensitivities, and public acceptance. Field observations at the case study locations assess the physical condition, accessibility, and sustainability of sanitation facilities. Additionally, document analysis of policy papers, regulatory frameworks, and environmental reports contextualizes findings within broader policy discourse. The combination of these instruments ensures a well-rounded and credible dataset by cross-verifying multiple perspectives and information sources.

Collection of Data

The data collection process is structured to capture both macro-level policy frameworks and micro-level stakeholder experiences. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with key stakeholders, allowing flexibility to explore emerging themes while maintaining a structured approach to sanitation policy discussions. FGDs provide community insights on the practical challenges of implementing sanitation initiatives in CBT, emphasizing local participation and cultural adaptation. Field observations document real-time conditions of sanitation facilities, including hygiene standards, maintenance practices, and accessibility features. Additionally, policy and environmental documents are reviewed to analyze regulatory guidelines, sustainability measures, and best practices in sanitation management. The triangulation of these diverse data sources enhances the reliability and validity of the study, ensuring a holistic understanding of sanitation's role in sustainable tourism.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis is employed to systematically identify recurring themes and policy implications. Initially, transcriptions from interviews and FGDs are reviewed to identify key patterns. An open coding process is applied to categorize data into themes such as policy effectiveness, infrastructure accessibility, cultural influences, and sustainability strategies. These themes are synthesized into broader categories, facilitating cross-case comparisons between East Java and Western Australia. Comparative analysis highlights policy gaps, best practices, and opportunities for policy adaptation in different tourism contexts. By integrating qualitative insights with policy analysis, the study offers a comprehensive understanding of inclusive sanitation in CBT, providing valuable recommendations for policymakers and practitioners working toward sustainable tourism infrastructure development.

To enable systematic comparison, this study applied a cross-case analysis framework. After thematic coding, findings from East Java and Western Australia were compared across four analytical dimensions: governance structure, policy enforcement, inclusivity standards, and sustainability practices. This cross-

case approach allows the study to identify both contextual differences and transferable policy lessons.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Governance Structure and Policy Coherence in Sanitation Management

Sanitation management in community-based tourism (CBT) is strongly influenced by governance structures and the degree of policy coherence across administrative levels. The comparative findings show that decentralization plays a central role in shaping sanitation outcomes in Indonesia. Under Indonesia’s decentralized governance system, local governments are responsible for planning, funding, and implementing sanitation infrastructure in tourism destinations. While this arrangement allows communities to adapt infrastructure to local cultural contexts, it also produces uneven implementation across regions.

Field observations in CBT destinations such as SETIGI in Sekapuk and WAGOS in Gosari illustrate both the strengths and limitations of decentralized sanitation governance. In some cases, local actors have introduced innovative sanitation initiatives that incorporate environmental sustainability and cultural identity. For instance, eco-toilets in SETIGI were designed to reflect local aesthetics while reducing environmental impact. As a community leader explained, “We designed our eco-toilets to reflect local traditions while ensuring environmental sustainability.” These initiatives demonstrate the potential of decentralized governance to encourage locally adapted infrastructure solutions.

However, decentralization also creates disparities in policy implementation when administrative capacity and funding differ across regions. Several CBT destinations continue to experience sanitation infrastructure deficiencies due to limited financial resources and weak regulatory enforcement. Previous research suggests that decentralized governance systems often generate policy fragmentation when coordination between national and local authorities remains weak (Ostrom, 2002). In the Indonesian context, sanitation development in tourism areas therefore depends heavily on local administrative capacity and the availability of community-driven funding.

Table 1. Policy Frameworks for Sanitation in CBT (Indonesia vs. Australia)

Aspect	Indonesia	Australia
Governance	Decentralized, varied local regulations	Centralized health and accessibility mandates
Cultural Integration	High (e.g., traditional designs in eco-toilets)	Moderate (art and environmental themes)
Sustainability	Emerging eco-friendly initiatives	Strong water conservation and waste management
Accessibility	Limited, improving in urban areas	Universal access mandated by law
Funding	Dependent on local government and community initiatives	Government-supported infrastructure grants

Sources: Field observation, 2024

By contrast, sanitation governance in Australia operates within a more centralized regulatory framework. National and state regulations require tourism facilities to comply with strict public health and accessibility standards. In destinations such as Araluen Botanic Garden, sanitation infrastructure is implemented according to standardized requirements emphasizing hygiene, environmental management, and accessibility (Othman & Buys, 2016). A tourism policymaker interviewed for this study emphasized that “public sanitation infrastructure is an integral part of visitor experience, and accessibility is non-negotiable in our planning.”

These findings suggest that regulatory enforcement plays a critical role in ensuring consistent sanitation infrastructure quality. Centralized policy frameworks allow governments to establish uniform standards and provide financial support through infrastructure grants. As a result, sanitation facilities across Australian tourism destinations tend to demonstrate greater consistency in quality and accessibility.

The comparison therefore highlights an important governance trade-off. Decentralization enables cultural adaptation and community participation in infrastructure design, but it may also produce uneven policy outcomes. Conversely, centralized regulatory frameworks can ensure consistent sanitation standards but may limit local flexibility. Understanding this balance is essential for designing effective sanitation governance strategies in CBT contexts.

Inclusivity as Policy Commitment and Social Practice

Inclusivity represents a central objective of sustainable tourism policy, yet the implementation of inclusive sanitation infrastructure varies significantly between countries. The findings indicate that sanitation inclusivity depends not only on infrastructure design but also on the strength of policy commitments related to universal access.

In many CBT destinations in Indonesia, sanitation facilities remain insufficiently accessible for individuals with disabilities, elderly tourists, and families with young children. Field observations indicate that many facilities lack ramps, handrails, or adequate maneuvering space for wheelchairs. As a tourism officer in SETIGI noted, “We recognize the need for inclusive sanitation, but financial and technical constraints hinder widespread implementation.” These constraints reflect broader challenges in translating policy aspirations for inclusive tourism into concrete infrastructure development.

The findings suggest that inclusivity in sanitation infrastructure often remains a social aspiration rather than a fully institutionalized policy standard in many developing tourism contexts. In decentralized governance systems, local tourism managers frequently prioritize basic infrastructure needs before implementing specialized accessibility features. Consequently, inclusive sanitation infrastructure develops gradually and unevenly.

In contrast, Australia has institutionalized inclusivity through legally mandated accessibility standards. Public sanitation facilities must comply with universal design principles that ensure accessibility for individuals with disabilities, elderly users, and families. These requirements include wheelchair-accessible restrooms, gender-neutral facilities, and baby-changing stations (Othman & Buys, 2016). This policy framework reflects what scholars describe as universal design governance, in which accessibility becomes embedded in regulatory standards rather than treated as optional infrastructure improvements.

Research suggests that inclusive infrastructure not only promotes social equity but also enhances tourism competitiveness by expanding the potential visitor base. As one Australian planner explained, “Inclusivity in sanitation facilities is not simply a regulatory obligation; it ensures that tourism destinations remain accessible to diverse visitor groups.” These findings highlight the importance of inclusive infrastructure policy, which integrates accessibility considerations into the planning and financing of tourism infrastructure.

Sustainability Mechanisms in Sanitation Infrastructure

Sustainability considerations increasingly shape sanitation infrastructure in tourism destinations. The findings indicate that environmental sustainability in sanitation systems depends on both technological innovation and long-term maintenance capacity.

In Indonesia, several CBT destinations have introduced eco-friendly sanitation initiatives, including composting toilets and water-efficient sanitation systems. For example, WAGOS has implemented eco-toilets designed to reduce water consumption. However, these initiatives often face implementation challenges. A community leader in WAGOS explained that “while eco-toilets reduce water consumption, many residents still prefer traditional systems due to familiarity and concerns about maintenance.”

Table 2. Sustainability Comparison of Sanitation Facilities in CBT

Sustainability Aspect	Indonesia	Australia
Water Conservation	Limited, pilot projects in eco-toilets	High, widespread water-saving technologies
Waste Management	Emerging, composting toilets in some sites	Advanced, centralized waste treatment
Energy Efficiency	Low, dependence on conventional power	High, use of solar and energy-efficient systems

Sources: Field observation, 2024

This observation highlights a common challenge in sustainable infrastructure development. Technological innovation alone cannot ensure sustainability unless local users possess the technical knowledge and resources needed for long-term maintenance. As a result, sustainable sanitation initiatives in many CBT destinations remain pilot projects rather than fully institutionalized infrastructure systems.

In contrast, sustainability practices in Australian tourism destinations benefit from strong regulatory frameworks and consistent infrastructure investment. Many sanitation facilities incorporate water-saving technologies, greywater recycling systems, and energy-efficient infrastructure such as solar-powered lighting (Loehr et al., 2021). These systems are supported by environmental regulations that promote resource efficiency and sustainable tourism development.

The comparative findings therefore suggest that sustainability in sanitation infrastructure depends not only on technological innovation but also on governance capacity, regulatory enforcement, and infrastructure funding.

Comparative Policy Implications for Community-Based Tourism

The comparison between Indonesia and Australia demonstrates that sanitation infrastructure functions not merely as a technical facility but as a governance instrument shaping tourism development outcomes. Differences in sanitation infrastructure quality reflect broader variations in governance capacity, regulatory enforcement, and policy coordination.

In Indonesia, decentralized governance structures encourage community participation and cultural adaptation in sanitation design. However, limited funding and fragmented policy implementation often restrict the scale and consistency of infrastructure improvements. By contrast, Australia’s centralized regulatory framework ensures standardized sanitation quality across tourism destinations, supported by stable funding mechanisms and strong institutional capacity.

Table 3. Comparative Governance Analysis of Sanitation Infrastructure

Analytical Dimension	Indonesia (Decentralized Governance)	Australia (Centralized Regulatory Framework)
Governance Structure	Decentralized governance with strong involvement of local governments and community actors in sanitation planning and implementation.	More centralized regulatory framework with national and state-level standards guiding sanitation infrastructure.
Policy Coordination	Coordination between national and local authorities is often fragmented, leading to uneven implementation across tourism sites.	Strong institutional coordination ensures consistent application of sanitation standards.
Community Participation	High level of community participation in infrastructure design, allowing sanitation facilities to reflect local cultural identity and tourism narratives.	Community participation exists but is typically structured within formal regulatory planning processes.
Regulatory Enforcement	Enforcement of sanitation standards varies depending on local administrative capacity and available resources.	Strict regulatory enforcement ensures compliance with public health, environmental, and accessibility standards.
Funding Mechanisms	Funding often relies on local government budgets and	Stable funding mechanisms through

	community initiatives, which may be limited or inconsistent.	government programs and infrastructure grants.
Infrastructure Consistency	Quality and availability of sanitation infrastructure vary significantly across CBT destinations.	Standardized sanitation facilities across tourism sites due to regulatory compliance.
Tourism Development Outcome	Encourages culturally embedded tourism experiences but may face limitations in infrastructure quality and scalability.	Provides consistent visitor experience and high sanitation standards across tourism destinations.
Strategic Policy Insight	Strength in community participation and cultural integration.	Strength in regulatory consistency and institutional capacity.

Sources: Field observation, 2024

These findings suggest that effective sanitation governance in community-based tourism requires a hybrid policy approach. Community participation remains essential for maintaining cultural authenticity and local ownership of tourism infrastructure. At the same time, stronger regulatory frameworks and financial support are necessary to ensure consistent sanitation standards.

Sanitation should therefore be understood as a governance tool within sustainable tourism policy, linking public health protection, environmental sustainability, and social inclusion. Strengthening sanitation governance can enhance visitor experience, improve destination competitiveness, and support the long-term sustainability of community-based tourism.

CONCLUSION

Sanitation is a fundamental pillar of Community-Based Tourism (CBT), directly impacting visitor experiences, public health, and environmental sustainability. This study underscores the significance of effective sanitation policies by comparing Indonesia and Australia, highlighting best practices, challenges, and areas for improvement. The findings reveal that while Indonesia has made strides in integrating cultural aesthetics into sanitation design, inconsistencies in governance, funding constraints, and limited accessibility remain significant barriers. In contrast, Australia's centralized policy approach, coupled with stringent health and accessibility regulations, ensures uniform sanitation standards across tourism destinations.

A key takeaway from this study is the need for Indonesia to strengthen its regulatory frameworks and funding mechanisms to achieve a more consistent and inclusive sanitation system in CBT. Lessons from Australia's government-supported infrastructure grants and universal design principles could serve as a model for Indonesia to enhance sanitation equity and sustainability. Additionally, fostering multi-sectoral collaborations between

government agencies, local communities, and international organizations could accelerate the adoption of best practices.

Sustainability remains a crucial concern for both countries, with Australia demonstrating advanced waste management, water conservation, and renewable energy integration in sanitation facilities. While Indonesia has initiated eco-friendly sanitation projects, their scalability is hindered by inconsistent maintenance and public acceptance challenges. Addressing these gaps requires comprehensive policy alignment, increased investment in green technology, and stronger community engagement.

Future research should expand on these findings by incorporating quantitative assessments of sanitation effectiveness, including tourist satisfaction surveys and infrastructure impact analyses. Comparative studies involving other countries with diverse socio-economic contexts could further enrich the discourse on sanitation in CBT. By adopting a balanced approach that integrates cultural sensitivity with regulatory strength, Indonesia can enhance its tourism sector's global competitiveness while ensuring equitable and sustainable sanitation solutions for all visitors.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to the Directorate of Islamic Higher Education (DIKTIS), Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, for the research grant support provided under the decree No. B-669/DJ.I/Dt.I.III/HM.00/08/2024 on the allocation of research funding based on the Output Cost Standard (SBK) for the fiscal year 2024, within the cluster of International Collaboration Development Research. Special thanks are also extended to Curtin University and Araluen Botanical Park for their invaluable support and collaboration, which have greatly contributed to the completion and [enrichment of this article](#).

REFERENCES

- Anguelovski, I., Shi, L., Chu, E., Gallagher, D., Goh, K., Lamb, Z., Reeve, K., & Teicher, H. (2016). Equity Impacts of Urban Land Use Planning for Climate Adaptation: Critical Perspectives from the Global North and South. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 36(3), 333–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X16645166>
- Chong, J., Abeyesuriya, K., Hidayat, L., Sulistio, H., & Willetts, J. (2016). Strengthening Local Governance Arrangements for Sanitation: Case Studies of Small Cities in Indonesia. *Aquatic Procedia*, 6, 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aqpro.2016.06.008>
- Clements, R., Alizadeh, T., Kamruzzaman, L., Searle, G., & Legacy, C. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of Infrastructure Governance: Cross-sectoral Lessons for Transformative Governance Approaches. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 38(1), 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08854122221112317>
- Craik, J. (2002). *The culture of tourism*. In J. U. Chris Rojek (Ed.), *Touring Cultures Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (4th ed.). In Sage Publications.
- Dipura, R. (2026). Heterogeneous sanitation infrastructure and the governance of trade-offs in Cape Town: A critical institutionalist perspective. <https://doi.org/10.35308/jpp.v12i2.11802>

- Journal of Urban Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jum.2026.01.006>
- Djuwendah, E., Rasmikayati, E., & ... (2025). Integrating the 5A Framework within Community-Based Tourism: A Case Study of Hanjeli Tourism Village, Indonesia. *Global Review of Tourism*
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.53893/grtss.v2i1.444>
- Elgin, C., & Elveren, A. Y. (2024). Unpacking the economic impact of tourism: A multidimensional approach to sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 478, 143947.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.143947>
- Fesenmaier, D. R., & Pearce, P. L. (2019). *Searching...for what is important Tourist behaviour* (pp.). Philip L. Pearce: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Fitrianto, A. R. (2019). *Potensi Wisata Enam Desa Di Ujungpangkah Wisata desa berbasis komunitas di Banyuurip, Gosari, Kebonagung, Pangkahkulon, Pangkahwetan, dan Sekapuk*. 123.
- Fitrianto, A. R., Halim, A., & McMichael, H. (2024). Empowering a Local Economy in Indonesia Through Tourism and Good Practice. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies*, 24(1), 158–172.
<https://doi.org/10.69598/hasss.24.1.261046>
- Goffi, G., Cucculelli, M., & Masiero, L. (2019). Fostering tourism destination competitiveness in developing countries: The role of sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 209, 101–115.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.208>
- Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R. (2020). (2020). *Community-Based Tourism: A Success? ICRT Occasional Paper*.
- Han, J., Zuo, Y., Law, R., Chen, S., & Zhang, M. (2021). Service Quality in Tourism Public Health: Trust, Satisfaction, and Loyalty. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731279>
- Henderson, J. C. (2016). Muslim travellers, tourism industry responses and the case of Japan. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 41(3), 339–347.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2016.1215090>
- Ikku, S. (2024). (2024). *Interview with the customer service manager at Araluen Botanic Park about Araluen Botanic Park Operate*.
- Isabelle Aquino. (2025). The Role of Community-Based Tourism in Achieving Inclusive Growth: A Pathway to Sustainable and Equitable Development. *Innovative Tourism Horizons*, 1(2), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.64229/8jrs0p09>
- Jawad, A. (2024). Bridging Faith and Science: Quranic Principles for Sustainable Water Energy Management. *Al-Qur'an and Water Science*, 1(1), 11–19.
- Jones, C., & Newsome, D. (2015). Perth (Australia) as one of the world's most liveable cities: a perspective on society, sustainability and environment. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 1(1), 18–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-08-2014-0001>
- Loehr, J., Dwipayanti, N. M. U., Nastiti, A., Powell, B., Hadwen, W., & Johnson, H. (2021). Safer destinations, healthier staff and happier tourists: Opportunities for inclusive water, sanitation and hygiene in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 40, 100883. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100883>
- Mensah, J., Tachie, B. Y., & Potakey, H. M. D. (2023). Open defecation near a world heritage site: causes and implication for sustainable tourism and heritage management. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(1), 167–184.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-11-2020-0164>
- Mtapuri, O., Camilleri, M. A., & Dłużewska, A. (2022). Advancing community-based tourism approaches for the sustainable development of destinations. *Sustainable Development*, 30(3), 423–432.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2257>
- Naumov, N., Varadzhakova, D., & Naydenov, A. (2021). Sanitation and hygiene as factors for choosing a place to stay: perceptions of the Bulgarian tourists. *Anatolia*, 32(1), 144–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2020.1771742>
- Odunga, S., Szente, V., & Szabó, K. (2024). Community Support and Socioeconomic Impacts of Cultural Tourism Development in Western Kenya. *Tourism and Hospitality*, 5(4), 1510–1524.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp5040084>
- Ostrom, E. (2002). Handbook of Agricultural Economics Chapter 24: Common-pool resources and institutions: Toward a revised theory. In *Handbook of Agricultural Economics* (Vol. 2, Issue PART A).
- Othman, Z., & Buys, L. (2016). Towards more culturally inclusive domestic toilet facilities in Australia. *Frontiers of Architectural Research*, 5(3), 383–391.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foar.2016.06.004>
- Pastras, P., & Bramwell, B. (2013). A strategic-relational approach to tourism policy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 390–414.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.06.009>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Phau, I., Lee, S., & Quintal, V. (2013). An investigation of push and pull motivations of visitors to private parks. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 19(3), 269–284.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766712471232>
- Robina-Ramírez, R., Ravina-Ripoll, R., & Castellano-Álvarez, F. J. (2023). The trinomial health, safety and happiness promote rural tourism. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1), 1177. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15849-8>
- Saner, R., Yiu, L., & Filadoro, M. (2015). *Tourism Development in Least Developed Countries* (pp. 229–255). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-8606-9.ch013>
- Scott, D., Hall, C. M., & Gössling, S. (2019). Global tourism vulnerability to climate change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77, 49–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.05.007>
- Tan, S. R., Jang, H., & Wood, J. (2023). *Economic Growth and Development in the Tropics*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003349204>
- UNWTO. (2022). Global and regional tourism result. In *The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)*. <https://www.unwto.org/tourism-data/global-and-regional-tourism-performance>
- Wang, S., Imbaya, B., Matiku, S., Nthiga, R., & Rop, W. (2025). Community-Based Tourism: Global Perspectives, Benefits, Challenges, and Research Frameworks for Sustainable Development. *Events and Tourism Review*, 8(1), 36–51.
<https://doi.org/10.18060/29458>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications:*

Design and Methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 30(1).

- Zapata, M. J., Hall, C. M., Lindo, P., & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lessons from nicaragua. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725–749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2011.559200>
- Zielinski, S., Jeong, Y., & Milanés, C. B. (2021). Factors that influence community-based tourism (CBT) in developing and developed countries. *Tourism Geographies*, 23(5–6), 1040–1072. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1786156>