



Crisis, Inequality, and Community Strength: Examining Dual Resilience in Tourism-Dependent Marginal Communities

I Gusti Ngurah Oka Widjaya¹, I Putu Andre Adi Putra Pratama², Ni Kadek Sri Mirayani¹,
 Putu Ade Wijana²

¹Faculty of Tourism, Department of Hotel Management, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

²Faculty of Tourism, Department of Travel Industry Management, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Submitted: Oct 17st, 2025

Revised: Nov 15th, 2025

Accepted: Dec 10th, 2025

Section: Tourism and Hospitality

Corresponding Author: I Gusti Ngurah Oka Widjaya

Corresponding Author Email: ngurah.oka@unud.ac.id

ABSTRACT: This study investigates how poor households in the Tanjung Bena Traditional Village in Bali navigated the socioeconomic collapse triggered by the Covid 19 interruption of tourism. Using a qualitative case study grounded in in-depth interviews, participant observation, and thematic analysis, the research introduces the concept of Dual Resilience to explain how communities endure chronic structural marginalisation while simultaneously responding to an acute crisis. The findings show that long-term tourism dependency, limited access to productive assets, and erosion of traditional livelihood spaces intensified the shock. Households adopted four interconnected strategies, namely subsistence economic diversification, limited occupational returns to fisheries, asset based coping, and collective cooperation embedded in customary social capital. Customary institutions emerged as the most effective support mechanism, while government and industry interventions were perceived as short term. The study advances a grassroots understanding of tourism vulnerability and highlights the need for more inclusive development pathways.

Keywords: dual resilience, structural poverty, social capital, tourism shock, Tanjung Bena.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is widely promoted as a catalyst for economic transformation in developing regions and is frequently associated with investment growth, employment creation, and the promise of broad-based prosperity (Fikri et al., 2025; Sumandi & Rizkikadduhani, 2024). In Bali, these expectations are particularly pronounced because tourism has evolved into the province's dominant economic sector and has shaped its cultural identity and spatial development patterns (Widjaya et al., 2025). Yet an expanding body of research increasingly questions the premise that tourism driven development automatically benefits local communities. Studies across the Global South show that rapid tourism expansion in contexts characterised by external ownership and concentrated capital often reproduces structural inequalities, limits participation by indigenous residents, and embeds poverty within new forms of labour precarity (Cantika Yuli et al., 2025). These critiques have revived concerns about the limitations of pro poor tourism and its inability to address deeper political economic and institutional constraints.

The fragility of tourism dependent regions became especially visible during the Covid 19 pandemic. The collapse of international and domestic mobility produced an unprecedented halt in tourism activities worldwide and exposed the acute vulnerability of destinations that rely heavily on a single industry. Recent



empirical work demonstrates that households embedded within tourism monocultures experienced immediate livelihood insecurity, rapid income loss, and limited access to safety nets, particularly where social protection systems were weak. In Indonesia, Bali represents a critical case because its gross regional domestic product is overwhelmingly driven by tourism, rendering its population highly exposed to external shocks and prolonged disruptions.

Within Bali, Badung Regency is the most intensive node of tourism development and hosts internationally recognised destinations such as Kuta, Seminyak, Canggu, Jimbaran, Nusa Dua, and Uluwatu (Wijana et al., 2025). Tanjung Bena, a marine tourism enclave dominated by luxury accommodations and high value water sport industries, exemplifies the paradox of prosperity amid persistent marginalisation. Despite the visible affluence of mass tourism, many indigenous residents remain structurally excluded from its economic benefits. Their gradual shift from traditional small-scale fisheries to low wage and insecure tourism employment created a dependence that magnified vulnerability when the pandemic halted visitor arrivals. Layoffs were widespread, income loss was immediate, and households with limited savings faced rapid socioeconomic deterioration.

Although the scholarship on tourism crises is extensive, existing research tends to focus on three dominant strands, namely macroeconomic assessments of sector level losses and recovery trajectories, debates on pro poor tourism and benefit distribution, and analyses of informal sector adaptation (Azizurrohman et al., 2021; Tz-Li et al., 2024; Yasin et al., 2025). These literatures provide valuable insights but share two important limitations. First, they often privilege macro or institutional perspectives, thereby overlooking how long-standing structural poverty shapes the capacity of marginal communities to respond to crises. Second, they rarely examine highly industrialised tourism enclaves where traditional livelihoods have been displaced and where the intersection of structural precarity and crisis is most acute. Consequently, there remains limited qualitative evidence that centres the lived experiences of poor households and connects historical marginalisation with everyday survival practices during crisis periods.

This study addresses this gap by examining how poor households in the Tanjung Bena Traditional Village navigated both chronic tourism induced marginalisation and the acute livelihood disruption generated by the Covid 19 collapse. The analysis develops the concept of Dual Resilience to capture the intertwined processes through which households endure structural constraints while simultaneously adopting strategies to cope with crisis conditions. The study identifies four interrelated livelihood practices, namely subsistence economic diversification, occupational shifts such as partial returns to fisheries, asset based coping, and collective cooperation rooted in customary social capital. The research further assesses how these strategies interact with institutional responses from customary leaders, government agencies, and tourism industry actors.

The purpose of this study is to analyse the socioeconomic conditions of vulnerable households before and during the pandemic, to document their survival strategies, and to evaluate the perceived effectiveness of stakeholder interventions. The study contributes to contemporary debates in pro poor tourism and tourism resilience by offering a grassroots perspective that foregrounds structural vulnerability, community agency, and the limitations of tourism dependent development models. Practically, the findings highlight the need for policies that strengthen human and financial capital, expand livelihood diversification, and reduce reliance on large scale tourism recovery as the primary pathway to resilience.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

Tourism Development and Livelihood Transformation

Tourism development is widely viewed as a catalyst for economic opportunity, yet its distributional outcomes for local communities remain uneven. As destinations deepen their integration into global tourism networks, traditional livelihood systems frequently become secondary to service-oriented employment. Sharpley (2014) argues that this transition often fragments local economies and increases dependency on volatile visitor flows, thereby reducing livelihood diversity and heightening exposure to external pressures.

In many developing and coastal regions, tourism led restructuring intensifies rather than alleviates vulnerability. Scheyvens (2007) notes that tourism commonly reinforces power asymmetries by confining local residents to low wage or insecure work, while displacing traditional occupations such as small-scale fisheries. These shifts restrict access to natural resources and weaken adaptive capacities that historically supported livelihood stability. Reliance on a single dominant sector therefore amplifies susceptibility to crises.

Such dynamics are particularly evident in destinations undergoing rapid tourism expansion. [Nepal and Karki \(2020\)](#) contend that tourism monocultures leave communities with limited alternatives during disruptions, constraining their ability to cope or recover. Understanding this structural transformation is essential in contexts such as Tanjung Benoa, where the reconfiguration of livelihoods has increased exposure to economic shocks and shaped the conditions under which households experience risk and resilience.

Poverty, Vulnerability, and Marginalisation in Tourism Areas

Poverty in tourism destinations is increasingly conceptualised as a multidimensional condition shaped by structural constraints rather than merely by income deprivation. [Sen \(1999\)](#) frames poverty as a deprivation of capabilities, which in tourism contexts is reinforced by unequal access to resources, skills, and decision making. These structural limitations become more pronounced where tourism development privileges external investors and commercial interests, thereby limiting community control over land, labour, and capital.

Marginalisation often emerges through land conversion, labour precarity, and exclusion from profitable segments of the tourism value chain. [Foucault's \(1980\)](#) discussion of power relations is reflected in empirical tourism studies that show residents frequently occupying low skill and low mobility positions, which restrict economic security and intensify vulnerability to shocks. [Hall \(2003\)](#) further argues that such structural inequalities form part of broader mechanisms through which tourism development reproduces social exclusion.

These vulnerabilities are magnified in tourism dependent regions. [Adger \(2006\)](#) contends that exposure to shocks increases where individuals lack diverse assets, adaptive capacities, and institutional support. In such settings, preexisting marginalisation not only limits livelihood choices but also reduces the ability of households to withstand crises, leading to rapid socioeconomic decline when disruptions occur.

Crisis and Tourism: Impacts of Shocks on Local Livelihoods

Tourism is highly sensitive to external disturbances, and crises often trigger immediate disruptions in mobility, employment, and income. [Faulkner \(2001\)](#) characterises tourism crises as systemic shocks that destabilise destinations by interrupting visitor flows and undermining the functioning of related industries. For households dependent on tourism as their primary economic base, even short interruptions can lead to steep declines in livelihood security.

Health emergencies, natural disasters, and global economic fluctuations consistently reveal how crises exacerbate preexisting vulnerabilities in tourism dependent areas. [Becken \(2013\)](#) shows that workers in low skill or informal tourism roles experience the most severe impacts due to precarious contracts, minimal savings, and limited social protection. Crises therefore expose deep inequalities within tourism economies and reveal the disparate capacities of households and organisations to absorb disruption.

The Covid 19 pandemic represented an unprecedented global shock. The abrupt cessation of mobility halted tourism activities on a scale unseen in modern history. [Gössling, Scott, and Hall \(2020\)](#) emphasise that the pandemic exposed the unsustainable nature of tourism monocultures and highlighted the heightened fragility of communities dependent on a single sector. Recovery has also been uneven, with informal workers experiencing prolonged instability and reduced access to formal employment. These patterns underscore the need to view crisis impacts as processes that interact with and intensify structural vulnerability rather than as temporary disturbances.

Livelihood Strategies and Survival Frameworks

Livelihood strategies encompass the activities and decisions that households employ to secure their wellbeing within dynamic social and economic contexts. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework developed by [DFID \(1999\)](#) highlights the importance of assets, institutional structures, and vulnerability contexts in shaping how individuals generate and maintain livelihoods. In tourism dependent communities, this framework is particularly relevant because reliance on a single sector restricts the range of strategies households can pursue.

A central distinction in livelihood scholarship is between coping and adaptive strategies. Coping strategies involve short term responses to immediate shocks, such as asset liquidation or dependence on informal support networks. Adaptive strategies refer to longer term adjustments aimed at building stability and reducing future risks ([Ellis, 2000](#)). When structural poverty limits access to financial or physical capital,

households often prioritise subsistence over long term resilience. Scott's (1976) subsistence ethic captures this orientation by demonstrating how vulnerable households act to secure minimum survival thresholds in contexts of uncertainty.

Recent research also highlights the significance of social capital and collective action in enabling communities to survive and recover from crises. Empirical evidence shows that community networks, mutual assistance, and place based identities act as critical buffers, especially where formal support systems are weak or inaccessible. Karampour et al. (2021) illustrate how social ties sustain local functioning during crises by facilitating resource sharing, emotional support, and collaborative problem solving. These insights underscore the importance of integrating livelihood strategies with broader resilience frameworks to understand how structurally marginalised communities navigate periods of disruption.

METHODS

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design situated within a bounded case study framework to examine how vulnerable households in Tanjung Bena navigated livelihood disruptions during the Covid 19 collapse of tourism. A qualitative approach was selected because it enables the researcher to capture depth, meaning, and contextual complexity from the perspectives of community members. This orientation aligns with the interpretive logic described by Creswell (2014), which emphasises constructing understanding from field generated data. Although the study was not designed as a full ethnography, it adopted an ethnographic sensibility by prioritising lived experiences, everyday practices, and culturally embedded forms of cooperation, following the interpretive stance associated with Geertz (1973).

The research was conducted in the Tanjung Bena Traditional Village located in the South Kuta District of Badung Regency, Bali. The site was chosen purposively based on Patton's (2015) critical case logic. Tanjung Bena illustrates a tourism paradox in which high value marine tourism and luxury accommodations coexist with persistent structural poverty among indigenous residents. This juxtaposition amplified household vulnerability during the pandemic and rendered the site analytically appropriate for examining survival strategies. Over several decades, the community has shifted from traditional small scale fisheries to precarious service employment, creating a livelihood structure highly dependent on tourism and therefore sensitive to crisis.

Data collection incorporated methodological triangulation to enhance credibility, following Denzin's (1970) principles. Three primary techniques were used: in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. In-depth interviews captured household experiences of crisis, livelihood strategies, and perceptions of institutional responses. Participant observation allowed documentation of daily behaviours, adaptive routines, and social interactions that might not be articulated in interviews. Village documents, assistance records, and policy materials provided contextual evidence that complemented primary data.

Informants were selected purposively based on their relevance to the research questions. Participants included vulnerable residents who experienced income loss, customary leaders, administrative leaders, and representatives from tourism industries and local government. Interviews were conducted between September and October 2020 using a flexible semi structured guide that encouraged participants to narrate experiences of economic disruption and adaptation. Each participant was assigned a code to protect anonymity. Data collection continued until thematic saturation was achieved.

A consolidated list of informant codes and roles is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Informant Codes and Roles

Informant Code	Role / Position
I-WR-01 (2020)	Vulnerable resident, former water sports worker
I-WR-02 (2020)	Vulnerable resident, household head
I-KL-01 (2020)	Kelian Dinas (administrative village leader)
I-KL-02 (2020)	Kelian Adat (customary leader)
I-TK-01 (2020)	Community leader in traditional organisation
I-PI-01 (2020)	Representative from tourism industry

Note: Additional informants were included in the broader fieldwork but only those referenced in the findings are listed here for clarity. Codes protect anonymity and maintain internal consistency across data sources.

Data analysis followed Miles and Huberman's (1994) Interactive Model, proceeding through iterative cycles of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction involved coding and organising significant segments from interviews, observations, and documents. Thematic matrices and narrative summaries supported data display by illustrating emergent patterns across participants. Conclusion drawing and verification entailed comparing themes across all sources to ensure analytic coherence and strengthen interpretive validity. This systematic approach ensured that findings remained closely grounded in empirical realities and reflected the complex interplay between structural vulnerability and community adaptation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Structural Vulnerability and the Pandemic Shock

The findings demonstrate that the severity of the Covid 19 crisis in Tanjung Benoa cannot be understood apart from the long standing structural vulnerabilities that shaped community life well before the pandemic. Although tourism development in the area produced highly visible prosperity through luxury resorts and high value marine recreation, local households remained only marginally integrated into these economic gains. Most indigenous residents occupied low skill, low wage, and insecure positions within the tourism labour market, reflecting the patterns of labour precarity described by Mowforth and Munt (2015). Employment in these roles provided fluctuating income, minimal job protection, and limited prospects for upward mobility. As a result, poverty was reproduced not merely as a shortage of financial capital but as constrained access to stable work, productive assets, and traditional livelihood spaces that had been converted for tourism infrastructure.

The onset of the Covid 19 pandemic transformed these preexisting vulnerabilities into an acute socioeconomic shock. The abrupt halt in visitor arrivals led to an almost instantaneous collapse of the tourism labour market. Village records indicate that approximately 380 workers were furloughed and 15 were permanently dismissed, illustrating the rapid contraction of employment opportunities. This pattern reflects the tourism induced livelihood shocks noted by Becken (2013). Many residents described the speed of income loss as unprecedented. One informant who had worked in marine recreation stated, "I usually worked in water sports. Suddenly everything closed, no tourists, no income. My savings lasted only two weeks. After that we were back to zero, like fishermen again, even though we no longer have the equipment" (I-WR-01, 2020). Similar accounts emerged across households that had transitioned from traditional fisheries to tourism jobs, leaving them without the means to return fully to their former occupations.

Local leaders reinforced the view that the crisis exposed deeper structural issues rather than short term disruptions. The Kelian Dinas explained, "When the tourists disappeared, hundreds of people were laid off instantly. They do not have farmland, and much of the sea area has been taken over for water sports. This shows that their poverty is structural, no longer natural. Tourism builds them, but tourism also brings them down" (I-KL-01, 2020). This perspective highlights the fragility inherent in a monocultural tourism economy and aligns with critiques by Gössling, Scott, and Hall (2020), who argue that destinations dependent on a single sector are exceptionally vulnerable to external shocks.

Overall, the pandemic did not generate new vulnerabilities in Tanjung Benoa but rather exposed and intensified long standing structural inequalities. The sudden loss of income, limited livelihood alternatives, and restricted access to natural resources converged to produce a crisis that was both immediate and deeply rooted in the area's historical trajectory of tourism driven socioeconomic transformation.

Dual Resilience and Household Survival Strategies

The empirical findings reveal that households in Tanjung Benoa demonstrated a form of Dual Resilience, a condition in which communities must simultaneously endure chronic structural marginalisation and navigate the acute livelihood disruption produced by the Covid 19 collapse. This dual process reflects the subsistence oriented rationality described by Scott (1976), whereby vulnerable households prioritise strategies that secure minimum survival thresholds when confronted with uncertainty. In Tanjung Benoa, these strategies did not emerge as isolated reactions but as interconnected practices shaped both by long standing dependence on tourism employment and by the immediate shock of income disappearance.

A central component of this resilience was subsistence economic diversification. Furloughed workers rapidly sought any available income generating activity, including small vending, motorcycle transport services, informal catering, and irregular labour. Although these micro enterprises produced modest

earnings, they were critical in preventing total livelihood collapse. Residents described this period as one of “taking any job that exists,” underscoring the necessity of expanding livelihood portfolios in the absence of formal employment. This pattern aligns with Ellis’s (2000) distinction between coping and adaptive strategies, in which households combine short term survival measures with longer term adjustments to maintain basic wellbeing.

A second recurrent strategy involved the liquidation of household assets. Many families pawned or sold jewellery, tools, and other personal valuables once their savings were depleted. One informant explained, “To survive, my wife sold her gold bracelet. It was a family asset, but the children had to eat. This was our last resort after all savings disappeared” (I-WR-02, 2020). Such reliance on asset based coping mechanisms illustrates how households drew on long term security buffers to meet immediate needs, while simultaneously increasing future vulnerability due to the erosion of material safety nets.

A third strategy observed in the community was a partial return to traditional fisheries. Households with historical ties to fishing attempted to return to the sea to secure food and limited income. However, their ability to do so was constrained by reduced access to coastal areas that had been converted for tourism activities, as well as limited equipment and weakened networks. These constraints highlight how structural marginalisation shaped the feasibility of adaptive responses. The return to fisheries thus represented both a symbolic and material attempt to reclaim earlier livelihood pathways, even when such pathways were no longer fully viable.

The fourth and most influential dimension of Dual Resilience was collective cooperation. Social capital embedded in the customary system functioned as the community’s strongest safety net. Residents shared rice, lent small amounts of money, and organised informal labour exchanges. The practice of gotong royong emerged as a cultural foundation that sustained households in the absence of sufficient formal assistance. As one community leader stated, “Without krama *adat*, many would have gone hungry. We shared rice and basic needs. Our strength is not in money but in gotong royong and *menyama braya*” (I-1K-01, 2020). These actions reflect the pivotal role of community based networks in navigating crises, consistent with findings by Karampour and colleagues (2021) regarding the importance of social ties in sustaining local functioning during severe disruptions.

Collectively, these strategies illustrate the multifaceted nature of Dual Resilience. Households confronted the immediate shock of income loss while simultaneously responding to structural constraints that limited their options. Their actions were shaped not only by economic necessity but also by cultural norms of solidarity, long term experiences of precarity, and the historically constrained opportunities characteristic of tourism dependent economies.

Stakeholder Responses and Community Perceptions

The crisis in Tanjung Benoa generated a range of responses from customary institutions, government agencies, and tourism industry representatives. The empirical findings show that although each stakeholder attempted to mitigate the impacts of the pandemic, their efforts were uneven, short term, and often perceived by residents as insufficient to address the structural vulnerabilities that had intensified the crisis. As a result, households relied predominantly on community based mechanisms even when formal assistance was available.

Customary institutions, particularly the Kelian Adat, emerged as the first and most responsive source of support. These leaders suspended traditional fees, mobilised community donations, and coordinated the distribution of food assistance. Residents consistently characterised these actions as timely, culturally grounded, and morally compelled, underscoring the role of *adat* as both a symbolic authority and a practical safety net. As one leader explained, “We waived *sekebe* fees and helped distribute food aid so no poor residents would be overlooked. We focused on social and spiritual support so people would not fall into despair” (I-KL-02, 2020). This response aligns with broader evidence that customary organisations in Indonesia function as core resilience infrastructures, offering rapid and localised assistance where bureaucratic systems operate more slowly.

Government interventions were present but comparatively limited in reach and duration. The Badung Regency government prioritised cash transfers, basic needs assistance, and small scale training for micro and small enterprises. Although these initiatives provided short term relief, many residents perceived them as insufficient to address prolonged income loss or deeper livelihood instability. The narrow focus of these measures reflects common tendencies in tourism dependent regions, where crisis governance emphasises

immediate welfare distribution rather than long term structural transformation. This mirrors the early stage emergency responses described by [Faulkner \(2001\)](#), which prioritise temporary support while delaying more substantive recovery and diversification efforts.

Tourism industry actors also attempted to assist affected workers, primarily through partial rehiring and informal communication with former employees. However, the slow pace of sectoral recovery limited the industry's ability to reabsorb its workforce. One industry representative noted, "We tried to prioritise local workers, but recovery is gradual. At first, we could only take back about thirty percent. The rest had to find other pathways. We encouraged them to join digital training to sell marine products online" (I-PI-01, 2020). These efforts, while well intentioned, revealed the inherent constraints of a sector facing its own economic collapse.

Residents interpreted these formal interventions with a mixture of appreciation and critical awareness. While many expressed gratitude for government assistance or industry communication, they emphasised that such support did not address the underlying issues of unemployment, asset scarcity, or restricted access to traditional fisheries. A dominant perception across informants was that grassroots networks provided more reliable, consistent, and culturally embedded assistance than formal institutions. This aligns with findings by [Zenker and Petersen \(2021\)](#), who argue that communities often rely on internal social capital when formal systems lack coverage, speed, or contextual sensitivity.

Taken together, the findings reveal a clear hierarchy of perceived effectiveness. Customary institutions were viewed as the most responsive and culturally attuned actors, government programs were seen as moderately helpful but limited in scope, and industry efforts were constrained by the sector's own financial fragility. This hierarchy illustrates how structural vulnerabilities shape not only the availability of assistance but also the meanings that households assign to different forms of support. Ultimately, these patterns demonstrate that community based support systems, rather than formal interventions, formed the backbone of household resilience during the pandemic.

Discussion

The findings from Tanjung Benoa demonstrate that the impacts of the Covid 19 crisis cannot be interpreted merely as a sudden economic disruption. Instead, they must be understood in relation to the historical and structural conditions that shaped household vulnerability long before the pandemic. The crisis exposed deep seated inequalities produced by decades of tourism led development, particularly the displacement of traditional fishing livelihoods and the concentration of local labour in precarious, low wage tourism employment. These dynamics reflect the critiques advanced by [Sharpley \(2014\)](#) and [Scheyvens \(2007\)](#), who argue that tourism often reinforces asymmetrical labour structures, marginalises indigenous residents, and restricts the distribution of economic benefits. In Tanjung Benoa, these long standing inequalities created an environment in which households possessed limited buffering capacity once the tourism sector abruptly collapsed.

A central theoretical contribution of the study is the articulation of Dual Resilience, a form of resilience shaped concurrently by chronic structural marginalisation and acute crisis conditions. This concept extends livelihood and resilience scholarship by revealing how communities confront multiple, overlapping layers of vulnerability rather than responding to crises in isolation. The strategies observed in Tanjung Benoa align with [Scott's \(1976\)](#) subsistence oriented decision making, wherein vulnerable groups prioritise guaranteeing minimum survival thresholds over long term security. Subsistence economic diversification, asset liquidation, partial returns to fisheries, and collective cooperation illustrate that resilience in this context emerges not from individual agency alone but from adaptive behaviours situated within structurally constrained environments.

These findings contribute to the broader literature on tourism crises by illustrating how household responses are profoundly shaped by the institutional and economic configuration of tourism dependent destinations. The vulnerability observed in Tanjung Benoa reflects patterns documented in other contexts across the Global South, where tourism monocultures have replaced diversified economies. The fragility of such systems supports the argument advanced by [Gössling, Scott, and Hall \(2020\)](#), who contend that destinations reliant on a single sector experience disproportionate impacts during global disruptions. The present case extends this argument by demonstrating that even where tourism is economically dominant, it remains socially and institutionally insufficient to protect marginalised residents during periods of crisis.

The findings also highlight the uneven effectiveness of stakeholder responses. Customary institutions emerged as the most immediate, trusted, and contextually relevant sources of assistance, underscoring the significance of social capital as a core component of community resilience. This resonates with Community Resilience Theory, particularly the emphasis by Norris et al. (2008) on social connectedness, collective efficacy, and shared identity as foundational adaptive capacities. In contrast, government interventions were appreciated but perceived as short term, fragmented, and insufficient to address structural barriers. Industry responses, while sympathetic, were constrained by the sector's own economic collapse. This divergence between grassroots and formal mechanisms reveals a broader governance issue in tourism dependent regions, where crisis responses tend to be reactive, short lived, and poorly aligned with the structural nature of vulnerability.

The study further contributes to debates within Pro Poor Tourism by demonstrating the limitations of poverty reduction frameworks that do not address structural constraints such as asset scarcity, labour precarity, and unequal access to natural resources. The inability of many households to return fully to traditional fisheries due to coastal conversion for tourism embodies how development processes can erode long term livelihood security. This finding echoes Sen's (1999) critique of capability deprivation and illustrates that resilience is fundamentally shaped by the distribution of power and resources within tourism economies.

Taken together, the empirical patterns suggest that crises do not create new vulnerabilities but intensify existing ones. The predominance of community based coping mechanisms over formal institutional responses indicates that resilience in tourism dependent destinations remains heavily informal, relational, and culturally embedded. This presents a significant challenge for policymakers, who often prioritise short term relief rather than structural transformation. Strengthening human capital, diversifying economic opportunities, restoring access to traditional livelihood spaces, and embedding cross sectoral governance mechanisms are essential for reducing the structural foundations of vulnerability.

Overall, the Tanjung Benoa case is not anomalous but indicative of broader conditions in tourism dependent regions worldwide. Dual Resilience provides a useful conceptual lens for understanding how marginalised communities navigate crises within structurally unequal tourism systems, and it underscores the importance of development approaches that move beyond sector centric growth toward socially inclusive and resilient transformation.

CONCLUSION

This study explored how poor households in the Tanjung Benoa Traditional Village navigated the profound livelihood disruptions caused by the Covid 19 collapse of tourism and demonstrated that the crisis intensified long standing structural inequalities rather than creating new forms of vulnerability. The displacement of traditional fishing livelihoods, the expansion of precarious tourism based employment, and restricted access to productive assets had already produced a socio economic environment with minimal protective buffers. Within this context, the study advanced the concept of Dual Resilience to explain how households simultaneously confronted chronic marginalisation and acute crisis conditions. The strategies they adopted, including subsistence economic diversification, liquidation of household assets, partial returns to fisheries, and strong collective cooperation, showed that resilience emerged not from individual agency alone but from adaptive practices shaped by structural constraints and culturally embedded social capital. The differentiated effectiveness of stakeholder responses further illustrated that customary institutions played a central role in sustaining households, while government programs and industry efforts offered limited and short lived support due to their restricted scope and the broader collapse of the tourism economy.

Although the study contributes meaningful insights into resilience in tourism dependent communities, it is not without limitations. The data reflect experiences primarily during the early phase of the pandemic, which limits understanding of long term recovery and shifting livelihood trajectories. The focus on a single tourism enclave also restricts the generalisability of the findings to other contexts with different institutional arrangements or resource conditions. In addition, the qualitative nature of the study offers depth but cannot quantify variation in vulnerability or resilience across the wider population. These limitations suggest several avenues for future research. Longitudinal studies are needed to trace how households rebuild or transform their livelihoods as tourism gradually recovers or restructures. Comparative research across multiple tourism dependent regions in Indonesia or the Global South would help clarify how governance structures, social

capital formations, and access to natural resources shape resilience outcomes. Mixed methods approaches that integrate qualitative insights with quantitative indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity could further strengthen empirical understanding. Future studies might also examine the emergence of digital livelihoods, cooperative economic models, or alternative development pathways that reduce dependence on tourism and promote more inclusive, equitable, and shock resistant community resilience.

Taken together, the findings underscore that resilience in tourism dependent regions cannot rely solely on temporary relief or the expectation of tourism recovery. Structural transformation that strengthens human capital, diversifies livelihoods, restores access to traditional resource spaces, and embeds cross sectoral governance mechanisms is essential for building resilience that is socially inclusive and sustainable over the long term.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the community members and stakeholders in Tanjung Benoa who willingly participated in interviews and focus group discussions, providing valuable insights for this research. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues at the Faculty of Tourism, Universitas Udayana, for their constructive feedback and academic support during the research process.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

All authors contributed equally.

FUNDINGS

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors. The study was conducted independently as part of the author's academic research initiative

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest associated with the conduct of this research, the analysis of the data or the preparation of this manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The qualitative data supporting this study are available from the author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- Adger, W. N. (2006). Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 268–281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006>
- Azizurrohman, M., Hartarto, R. B., Lin, Y.-M., & Nahar, F. H. (2021). The Role of Foreign Tourists in Economic Growth: Evidence from Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Studi Pembangunan*, 22(2), 313–322. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jesp.v22i2.11591>
- Baiquni, M. (2007). *Strategi strategi nafkah rumah tangga pedesaan berbasis hutan: Studi kasus di Desa Bunder, Kecamatan Patuk, Kabupaten Gunung Kidul* (Doctoral dissertation). Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Becken, S. (2013). The importance of power and change agency for tourism resilience. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 7, 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2013.04.001>
- Cantika Yuli, S. B., Azizurrohman, M., Angga Pramuja, R., & Ginting, Y. M. (2025). Tourism-driven development: Evaluating the benefits of the Mandalika Special Economic Zone. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), 2460317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2460317>
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose reality counts? Putting the first last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. Aldine.
- Department for International Development. (1999). *Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets*. Author.
- Ellis, F. (2000). *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. Oxford University Press.
- Faulkner, B. (2001). Towards a framework for tourism disaster management. *Tourism Management*, 22(2), 135–147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00048-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00048-0)

- Fikri, Y., Rhalma, M., & Rifqi, H. M. (2025). Education and Economic Growth in Morocco: What's new through Vector AutoRegressif (VAR) approach? *Global Review of Tourism and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 118–131. <https://doi.org/10.53893/grtss.v2i1.435>
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. Basic Books.
- Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2020). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID 19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
- Hall, C. M. (2003). *Tourism and transport: Issues and agendas for the new millennium*. Routledge.
- Karampour, K., Pourabedin, Z., Malekian, M. R., & Yazdani, S. (2021). Resilience and COVID 19: Investigating the role of social capital and networks among small businesses in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 46, 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.11.013>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2015). *Tourism and sustainability: Development, globalisation and new tourism in the third world* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Nepal, S. K., & Karki, M. (2020). Tourism and global change: Impacts, vulnerabilities and adaptations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(7), 1011–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1730864>
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1–2), 127–150. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9156-6>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism poverty nexus in the Pacific. *Tourism Geographies*, 9(3), 253–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680701407940>
- Scott, J. C. (1976). *The moral economy of the peasant: Rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007>
- Sumandi, S., & Rizkikadduhani, A. (2024). Empowering Communities through Sustainable Tourism: A Systematic Review of Participation, Governance, and Resilience. *Advances in Tourism Studies*, 2(1), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.53893/ats.v2i1.50>
- Timothy, D. J. (1999). Tourism and the globalization of inequality. *Geoforum*, 30(4), 375–390. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(99\)00025-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00025-X)
- Tz-Li, W., Azizurrohman, M., & Angga Pramuja, R. (2024). Attracting tourists to Indonesia: How SEZs and visa-free policies influence international arrivals. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2024.2432634>
- Widjaya, I. G. N. O., Mirayani, N. K. S., Putra, I. P. A. A., & Wijana, P. A. (2025). Identifikasi potensi plural tourism di Desa Adat Denpasar, Kota Denpasar, Bali. *Journal of Responsible Tourism*, 5(1), 549–558.
- Wijana, P., Pratama, I. P., Pitanatri, I., Mirayani, N. K., & Widjaya, I. G. (2025). Studi perilaku penggunaan media sosial wisatawan milenial dalam pencarian informasi daya tarik wisata di Kabupaten Badung. *Journal of Responsible Tourism*, 5(1), 615–624.
- Yasin, M., Azizurrohman, M., Mulyono, L. E. H., Haneng, J. J., Damarwulan, L. M., & Rahayu, S. (2025). How non-Muslim tourists experience halal tourism in Lombok, Indonesia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2025.2510446>
- Zenker, S., & Petersen, S. (2021). The effects of COVID 19 on the tourism workforce: A social network perspective. *Tourism Management*, 85, Article 104313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104313>