



Revitalizing Destination Social Responsibility through Regenerative Tourism: A Case Study of Penglipuran Village, Bali

I Putu Andre Adi Putra Pratama¹, I Gede Gian Saputra², I Gusti Ngurah Oka Widjaya³, Putu Ade Wijana¹

¹Faculty of Tourism, Department of Travel Industry Management, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

²Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

³Faculty of Tourism, Department of Hotel Management, Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Submitted: Oct 17st, 2025

Revised: Nov 15th, 2025

Accepted: Nov 16th, 2025

Section: Tourism and Hospitality

Corresponding Author: I Putu Andre Adi Putra Pratama

Corresponding Author Email: andreadiputra@unud.ac.id

ABSTRACT: This study investigates how regenerative tourism can revitalize Destination Social Responsibility within a mature and economically successful community based destination. Using a qualitative case study approach, data were generated through a Focus Group Discussion with ten key stakeholders representing customary leadership, tourism governance, academic expertise, and youth perspectives. The analysis reveals that Penglipuran's long standing commitment to Tri Hita Karana constitutes an Organic DSR model that predates contemporary responsibility frameworks. However, this foundation is increasingly undermined by an economic euphoria that erodes collective governance and by an intergenerational gap in cultural knowledge transmission. These dynamics reflect an erosion by success paradox that remains insufficiently addressed in existing DSR scholarship. The findings show that regenerative tourism offers a practical pathway to restore Organic DSR by reorienting destination success toward measurable cultural, social, and ecological regeneration. The study's single case focus suggests the need for comparative and longitudinal research.

Keywords: destination social responsibility, regenerative tourism, sustainable development.

INTRODUCTION

Bali has long been the epicentre of Indonesian tourism, an island whose success in attracting global visitors reflects an enduring paradox. Tourism functions as the economic backbone for a large share of its population, yet the rapid and often uncontrolled expansion of mass tourism has produced consequences that increasingly threaten the very foundations of Balinese culture and ecology (Januar, 2024; Pratama et al., 2023). These pressures resonate with global critiques of tourism as a system that frequently facilitates neoliberal injustice and exploitation, privileging economic profit while neglecting social and environmental well-being (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). In Bali, such tensions are visible in the growing commercialization of the Tri Hita Karana philosophy, a normative framework that emphasizes harmony among humans, nature, and spirituality (Adnyani & Purnamawati, 2020). This philosophical foundation is continually tested by the expansion of profit driven tourism, prompting urgent reflection on the future trajectory of Balinese tourism development (Bagus Satya Wira et al., 2025).

Amid these global and local pressures, various community based initiatives have emerged to safeguard cultural and ecological integrity while supporting economic vitality (Bramwell & Lane, 2011). Penglipuran



Tourism Village is one of the most cited examples, often portrayed as a model of community based tourism rooted in local wisdom. Long before achieving national and international recognition, Penglipuran had preserved a traditional settlement structure passed down through generations. Its characteristic linear village layout, uniform architectural design, and extensive bamboo forest create a landscape that embodies cultural continuity and ecological stewardship. The community is governed by *awig-awig*, customary rules that shape collective life and sustain social harmony.

Yet, Penglipuran's tourism success has also generated significant challenges. The sharp rise in tourist arrivals has begun to strain environmental and social carrying capacities. Early signs of overtourism are evident, with the influx of visitors disrupting communal spaces, diminishing the quality of visitor experiences, and threatening the preservation of natural and cultural heritage. Many tourists visit solely for visual consumption, often without engaging with local communities or supporting local products such as *lolob cemcem*, bamboo crafts, or village culinary traditions. At the same time, community perceptions of tourism are shifting. While tourism was once understood as a mechanism for cultural protection and social cohesion, some residents now prioritise short term economic gains (Pyke et al., 2019; Widjaya et al., 2025). The proliferation of profit oriented enterprises has supported local income, yet also risks undermining aesthetic integrity and long standing cultural values. These developments raise concerns about an erosion of conservation ethics that have historically been central to Penglipuran's identity.

In response to such dynamics, regenerative tourism offers a promising reorientation in destination management (Paddison & Hall, 2024). Rather than merely minimising negative impacts, regenerative tourism aims to produce positive outcomes that restore and enhance social, cultural, and ecological systems (Bellato, 2025; Dredge, 2022; Lund-Durlacher, 2015). This approach aligns closely with Destination Social Responsibility, which asserts that destinations have moral and social obligations to support community well-being and environmental preservation as core components of tourism development (Wijana et al., 2025). Within this framework, destinations are expected not only to enjoy economic benefits but also to actively cultivate social value through participatory governance, cultural protection, and ethical resource management (Lan et al., 2024). Regenerative tourism can therefore be understood as a concrete operationalisation of DSR, advancing restoration and transformation of socio cultural and ecological systems rather than mere sustainability maintenance (Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005; Agapito et al., 2023). These principles resonate with Tri Hita Karana, suggesting that regenerative tourism and DSR may together serve as mechanisms to revitalise cultural, social, and environmental harmony disrupted by contemporary tourism pressures (Pertiwi et al., 2013).

Despite this conceptual alignment, an important gap persists in the empirical literature. Few studies investigate how regenerative tourism can function as a practical methodology to revitalise DSR within destinations that are already economically successful yet facing internal erosion of social responsibility (Lan et al., 2024; Paddison & Hall, 2024; Puh, 2014; Shafiee et al., 2016). Existing research typically focuses on emerging or environmentally degraded destinations, not on community-based models experiencing the paradox of success. Moreover, limited attention has been given to socio psychological barriers that inhibit DSR implementation within such contexts, particularly when internal economic euphoria becomes a more significant obstacle than external constraints such as capital or skills.

To address this research gap, this study examines how regenerative tourism principles can be enacted as a concrete expression of Destination Social Responsibility in Penglipuran Tourism Village. Three research questions guide the inquiry. First, how is DSR organically manifested within the indigenous Tri Hita Karana framework. Second, what contemporary challenges, particularly socio psychological, hinder its implementation. Third, how can regenerative tourism serve as a methodology to overcome these barriers and revitalize DSR. The study aims to deepen understanding of regenerative practices and governance challenges in achieving a balanced integration of economic, cultural, and environmental sustainability.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

This chapter synthesizes the core theoretical frameworks that ground the present research, namely Destination Social Responsibility, the regenerative tourism paradigm, and the Balinese philosophy of Tri Hita Karana. Together, these concepts form an integrated analytical lens for examining the socio cultural and ecological dynamics in Penglipuran Tourism Village.

Destination Social Responsibility

Destination Social Responsibility extends the principles of Corporate Social Responsibility into the tourism sphere, positioning destinations as collective social actors with ethical and moral obligations to manage tourism impacts consciously and proactively (Agapito et al., 2023; Lund-Durlacher, 2015). Within this framework, all tourism stakeholders share responsibility for maximizing positive contributions and minimizing harm to social, cultural, economic, and environmental systems. Similar to CSR, which obliges firms to support sustainable development, DSR emphasises that destinations must generate tangible benefits for local communities rather than prioritising short term financial gains (Font & Lynes, 2020; Lan et al., 2024)

Sheehan & Ritchie (2005) identify three interrelated dimensions of DSR. Economic responsibility concerns the equitable distribution of tourism derived prosperity among residents. Socio cultural responsibility involves safeguarding cultural identity, values, and practices from the pressures of tourism driven commodification. Environmental responsibility focuses on the ethical management of natural resources to ensure the long-term viability of the destination's ecological system. A socially responsible destination must balance these dimensions to sustain community well-being and ecosystem integrity.

Regenerative Tourism

Regenerative tourism represents a paradigm shift from sustainability, which primarily aims to reduce negative impacts, toward a framework that seeks to restore, regenerate, and enhance socio ecological systems (Day, 2024). Rather than treating tourism as an industry that must manage its harm, regenerative tourism positions it as a catalyst for ecological renewal, cultural vitality, and community empowerment. The central aspiration is to ensure that destinations are left measurably better, more resilient, and more vibrant because of tourism activity.

Operationally, regenerative tourism encompasses several key dimensions. The ecological dimension emphasises ecosystem restoration through conservation, reforestation, circular resource systems, and effective waste management. The socio-cultural dimension highlights participatory governance, cultural transmission, and intergenerational knowledge regeneration. The spiritual and emotional dimension recognises the importance of sense of place and the emotional ties that foster human responsibility toward land, culture, and community (Bellato, 2025). These dimensions collectively shift tourism success indicators from arrivals and revenue toward regenerative metrics such as biodiversity restoration, strengthened cultural transmission, and improved local resilience.

Although DSR and regenerative tourism are often examined separately, they operate at complementary conceptual levels. DSR provides the ethical orientation and the collective goal of social, cultural, and ecological responsibility (Agapito et al., 2023; Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005). Regenerative tourism provides the transformative methodology required to achieve that goal, emphasising active restoration rather than minimal mitigation (Bellato, 2025; Day, 2024). Consequently, if DSR defines what destinations ought to achieve, regenerative tourism describes how such outcomes can be operationalised. This study therefore positions regenerative practices as the mechanism that revitalises and enacts DSR in practice.

Tri Hita Karana Philosophy

Tri Hita Karana is an indigenous Balinese philosophical system rooted in Hindu values and centred on achieving harmony across spiritual, social, and ecological domains. The term derives from *Tri* (three), *Hita* (well-being or happiness), and *Karana* (cause), referring to the three causes of a harmonious life (Adnyani & Purnamawati, 2020; Peters, 2013). These comprise *Parhyangan*, the human relationship with the divine, expressed through spiritual practices and reverence for sacred values. *Pawongan*, the relationship among humans, embodies solidarity, cooperation, and collective responsibility. *Palemahan*, the human relationship with nature, stresses stewardship of natural resources as integral to human existence.

Tri Hita Karana serves as the indigenous conceptual foundation linking DSR and regenerative tourism. The principle of *Pawongan* mirrors the socio cultural responsibility within DSR by emphasising community cohesion and well-being (Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005). *Palemahan* aligns with both DSR's environmental responsibility and regenerative tourism's ecological restoration ethos (Bellato, 2025). Meanwhile, *Parhyangan* provides the spiritual rationale that imbues these responsibilities with cultural depth and meaning. Consequently, THK is not merely a cultural context; it constitutes an organic form of DSR that predates

modern responsibility frameworks and offers fertile ground for regenerative tourism initiatives (Pertwi et al., 2013).

METHODS

Data for this study were collected through a single, intensive Focus Group Discussion conducted on 26 September 2025, with a duration of approximately two hours. The group consisted of ten participants, a size selected in accordance with methodological best practices and the principle of saturation in qualitative inquiry (Krueger, 2014; Morgan, 1997). The two hour discussion generated recurring thematic patterns, particularly related to economic euphoria and the intergenerational gap, indicating that no substantially new insights were emerging and that thematic saturation had been achieved.

Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on their expertise, authority, and central roles in village governance, customary affairs, or cultural preservation. Recruitment began by identifying key gatekeepers, namely the Customary Leader and the Head of the Tourism Village, who assisted in nominating individuals who met the selection criteria. Potential participants were then formally invited by the lead researcher through letters distributed via community channels, followed by personal communication to ensure commitment and procedural clarity. The final composition included academics, the Head of the Tourism Village, the Customary Leader, the community head, a customary official, and youth representatives. This heterogeneous group ensured representation of the multiple stakeholder perspectives necessary for examining Destination Social Responsibility, which is inherently collective in nature (Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005).

Ethical considerations were prioritised throughout the research process. All participants received an information sheet detailing the study's purpose, voluntary participation, rights to withdraw, and data management procedures. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant, including consent for audio recording and anonymised use of their statements in academic dissemination. To maintain confidentiality, identifiable names were removed and participants are referred to by functional roles, such as a customary leader or a youth representative.

The FGD took place in a familiar community meeting hall in Penglipuran Village and was moderated by the lead researcher. A semi structured protocol guided the discussion, with questions derived from the theoretical foundations of Destination Social Responsibility, regenerative tourism, and *Tri Hita Karana*. The protocol was organised into three thematic domains that aligned with the research objectives. The first domain addressed conceptual understanding of sustainable and regenerative tourism. The second explored existing practices and governance, including tensions between economic and cultural orientations. The third examined future pathways, including barriers to participation, cultural regeneration among youth, and potential regenerative strategies. The discussion was conducted primarily in Bahasa Indonesia to allow for more nuanced articulation of cultural concepts and lived experiences.

Data were analysed using thematic analysis according to the procedures outlined by (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A hybrid coding strategy was employed, beginning with deductive coding informed by the study's theoretical frameworks. This provided an initial analytical structure, yet the process remained open to inductive coding so that unanticipated insights could emerge from the data. This inductive component proved essential for identifying themes such as economic euphoria and intergenerational knowledge gaps, which were not predetermined in the theoretical model. Coding was conducted manually to facilitate close immersion in the data, and the research team collaboratively reviewed and refined emerging themes to ensure coherence and analytic rigour. Findings are presented as a descriptive analytical narrative illustrating how regenerative values manifest in community practices and governance processes as expressions of destination social responsibility.

The researchers also acknowledge their positionality. As Indonesian scholars familiar with Balinese cultural systems, including the *Tri Hita Karana* philosophy, they possessed an interpretive advantage in recognising cultural nuances. This familiarity also introduced the potential for insider bias. To mitigate this risk and enhance trustworthiness, the researchers engaged in ongoing reflexivity, documented through analytic memos, and participated in peer debriefing sessions. These practices helped ensure that interpretations remained grounded in participants' accounts rather than shaped by researchers' assumptions (Lincoln & Guba, 1988).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) data reveals a complex dynamic between entrenched tourism practices in Penglipuran Village and the contemporary challenges it faces. These findings can be analyzed in depth through the conceptual frameworks of Destination Social Responsibility (DSR) and regenerative tourism.

The Form of Social Responsibility of *Tri Hita Karana*-Based Destinations

The research results show that before the term Destination Social Responsibility (DSR) was academically recognized, the community of Penglipuran Tourism Village had already organically implemented the principles of destination social responsibility through the local wisdom values of *Tri Hita Karana*. The foundation of this collective responsibility is the *Tri Hita Karana* philosophy, which inherently instills an awareness of the obligation to maintain a harmonious relationship between humans and God (*Parahyangan*), humans with other humans (*Pawongan*), and humans with the environment (*Palemaban*). The FGD results confirmed that the *Tri Hita Karana* practices implemented in the village are a concrete manifestation of DSR based on local wisdom.

In this context, ecological responsibility is one of the most tangible manifestations of the *Palemaban* value. The Penglipuran community maintains environmental sustainability by preserving the bamboo forest surrounding the village. The forest not only serves as the lungs of the ecosystem and provides traditional building materials but also has spiritual and social significance as a symbol of balance in life. Furthermore, the community has implemented an independent liquid waste management system to prevent environmental pollution. These practices demonstrate a strong ecological awareness, where preserving the environment is not an administrative obligation, but rather a form of shared moral and social responsibility towards nature. Thus, these ecological practices reflect the main pillar of DSR, namely responsibility for the destination environment as an integral part of the community's collective well-being.

Regarding the *Pawongan* (social) pillar, this key finding was realized through structured cultural regeneration mechanisms. The most concrete example revealed in the FGD was the regular involvement of elementary school-aged children in local art performances. This activity is more than just a tourist attraction; it is a long-term social investment. A customary leader (*Kelian Adat*) in the FGD explained this sense of responsibility:

"The cultural strengthening, like the performances... the barong macan and barong lawang involving the elementary school children every Sunday... that is where we maintain, fix, and restore." (Customary Leader, FGD).

This sentiment was echoed by other participants, including the youth generation representatives (*Sekaa Teruna Teruni*), who agreed this practice is a concrete manifestation of the community's responsibility to ensure future generations are not uprooted. This quote is a direct example of the community fulfilling its responsibility to keep its intangible cultural assets alive; it is a concrete manifestation of the community's responsibility to ensure that future generations are not uprooted, a direct response to concerns about the lack of cultural knowledge among young people (Lund-Durlacher, 2015; Pertiwi et al., 2013). By making children active participants in cultural preservation, the Penglipuran community is consciously fulfilling its responsibility to keep their intangible cultural assets alive and relevant.

Although the spiritual realm (*Parahyangan*) was not explicitly discussed in the FGD, the harmonious relationship between humans and God has become an umbrella that encompasses the other two realms. All conservation practices, both natural and cultural, are grounded in a spiritual belief that such actions are part of an obligation to honor ancestors and maintain cosmic balance. Thus, DSR in Penglipuran is not an externally imposed concept or driven by market demands. It is a living responsibility, integrated with communal identity, and has stood the test of time, thus being called Organic DSR, a value system that operates internally and serves as the village's primary source of strength in facing the dynamics of global tourism.

The organic DSR defining as a form of collective responsibility that is not externally imposed (like corporate CSR) or market-driven, but is internally derived from, and indivisible with, the community's core spiritual and philosophical worldview. This concept extends the traditional understanding of DSR (Agapito et al., 2023; Su & Swanson, 2017), which often focuses on stakeholder management and institutional pressures. 'Organic DSR' contributes a new dimension by demonstrating how indigenous frameworks like

Tri Hita Karana function as endogenous drivers of responsibility, grounding social and ecological ethics in a spiritual (*Parahyangan*) mandate long before modern tourism interventions, which has long been a stronghold of ethical values in Penglipuran Village, but currently under pressure from economic hegemony. The euphoria surrounding tourism has created a value imbalance, where short-term interests often override long-term responsibilities for the village's social and cultural sustainability. This situation emphasizes the need to revitalize DSR values so that tourism becomes not merely an economic engine but also a vehicle for fostering social learning, cultural preservation, and ecological restoration, in line with the essence of the *Tri Hita Karana* philosophy. In summary, *Tri Hita Karana* provides a powerful, pre-existing 'Organic DSR' foundation, which serves as both the village's greatest strength and its primary point of cultural vulnerability. Thus, the primary challenge to DSR in Penglipuran is no longer external, but internal, originating from an economic-driven erosion of the community's own social capital and collective governance.

Shifting Orientation and Weakening Collective Responsibility

Despite having a strong and organic foundation of Destination Social Responsibility (DSR), Penglipuran Tourism Village now faces serious challenges that could threaten its fundamental sustainability. Research findings indicate significant gaps in the implementation of DSR values, stemming from a shift in the community's value orientation from collectivism to an individualistic economy. This phenomenon was explicitly expressed by the Customary Leader (*Kelian Adat*) who stated that:

"Currently, it is more inclined towards the economy, where the community is starting to be economically oriented. the community is very euphoric about tourism." (Customary Leader, FGD).

This "euphoria" was identified as the most fundamental challenge, weakening collective sustainability. This sentiment was echoed by other community leaders, including the *Kepala Lingkungan* (Community Head), who agreed that this shift presents a fundamental governance challenge. The Customary Leader elaborated on this impact:

"The difficulty in our journey... is forums within the community are limited and decision-making is difficult to achieve because the community is so euphoric... The community's awareness of a better direction for tourism is still not well-received, and this is why we find it difficult to implement regenerative ideas." (Customary Leader, FGD).

The statement also serves as a crucial indicator for understanding the current vulnerability of DSR in Penglipuran, namely, when the economic orientation begins to displace the social, ecological, and cultural awareness that has long supported village harmony. This erosion of collective responsibility is manifested in several critical symptoms (Szigeti, 2020). First, and most fundamentally, there has been a shift in orientation that now prioritizes the economy over collective sustainability. As community focus shifts toward individual financial gain, commitment to the long-term responsibility of the destination begins to weaken. The phenomenon indicates failure in the DSR governance mechanism, where short-term economic considerations override the long-term vision of preservation, which should be a shared responsibility. Theoretically, this phenomenon can be analyzed as erosion of social capital; referring to the community resilience framework Pyke et al. (2019) difficulties in collective decision-making indicate a decline in "collective trust" and "shared norms" being core components of social capital which are now being replaced by individual financial interests (Kerr, 2018).

Furthermore, this shift in focus on the economy has a direct impact on the failure of cultural knowledge regeneration. One of the most fundamental social responsibilities of a traditional destination is ensuring the transmission of values and knowledge to the next generation. The Penglipuran Village Customary Leader's concern that:

"Our weakness right now is that the children's orientation is towards mobile phones, especially playing games... the regeneration of knowledge about culture, like the stories of the elders, needs to be strengthened." (Customary Leader, FGD 2025).

This cultural gap is perceived to create a more extractive tourism model. As the Village Tourism Manager noted:

"The phenomenon right now is that many tourists just come to take photos and do not purchase... souvenirs, culinary, or enjoy the local products." (Village Tourism Manager, FGD 2025).

The "*children on phones*" quote is a critical failure in the socio-cultural dimension of DSR, threatening the Pawongan pillar. This is not simply a matter of individual preferences, but rather an indicator that the destination, through its families and traditional institutions, is facing challenges in fulfilling its responsibility to regenerate its most vital cultural assets (Purwasih & Hadi, 2017). This cultural gap is also directly linked to the "*photos-only*" phenomenon, which is a clear symptom of cultural commodification (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). The village's 'Organic DSR' is being challenged by a transactional logic, where its cultural life is at risk of being reduced to a mere visual backdrop for passive consumption. The clear implication is that 'regenerative' solutions must directly address this knowledge gap, using tourism revenue not just as profit, but as a tool to actively fund the cultural revitalization the community needs."

Regenerative Tourism as a Path to Revitalizing Destination Social Responsibility

Facing the "economic euphoria" and "knowledge gap" identified in the previous section, the FGD discussion shifted to identifying revitalization pathways. The key finding that emerged was that regenerative tourism was identified by participants as the strategic approach to restore these eroded DSR values. Practitioners in the FGD demonstrated a clear conceptual understanding of this shift. The Village Tourism Manager explicitly distinguished it from sustainability:

"While Sustainable is oriented towards activities that are just continuous, what differentiates it from regenerative is that tourism must provide a positive benefit." (Village Tourism Manager, FGD).

This quote aligns with the expert view that regenerative tourism aims to restore, enhance, and create a positive impact on social and environmental ecosystems (Day, 2024; Dredge, 2022; Paddison & Hall, 2024). The implication is that the village leadership is conceptually ready for this paradigm shift. In this context, regenerative tourism is seen as an instrument to reactivate the community social responsibility that was diminished by the short-term economic orientation. Crucially, the FGD participants identified how to apply this "positive benefit" to directly counter the "economic euphoria". The key finding was the need to redefine tourism success indicators. An academic participant explained the practical next step:

"After this, we as researchers will develop regenerative tourism indicators... to measure community knowledge, understanding, and involvement, and to identify barriers to participation." (Academic, FGD).

This is the most important finding of the section, as it provides a direct solution to the problem identified by the Customary Leader. This finding supports from literature calling for new, non-economic metrics (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015; Puh, 2014). The practical implication also is clear: to revitalize DSR, Penglipuran must shift its Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Instead of measuring success by tourist arrivals (which fuels the "euphoria"), a regenerative model demands measuring new metrics like "increased youth cultural knowledge" or "community involvement," thereby using tourism as a tool to heal the Pawongan pillar.

In the context of Penglipuran, regenerative tourism can be an instrument to reactivate community social responsibility, which has been diminished by short-term economic orientation. Through a regenerative approach, the community is encouraged to view tourists not merely as consumers, but as collaborative partners in social and environmental recovery projects (Dredge, 2022; Indrawati et al., 2024; Pyke et al., 2019). For example, tourists can be involved in bamboo planting activities, integrated waste management, or participation in local arts and culture preservation programs. This approach not only increases tourist engagement but also strengthens community awareness that tourism activities can be a means to improve the collective quality of life (Pratama et al., 2023). Within the DSR framework, this constitutes active responsibility, a responsibility manifested through concrete actions to strengthen the social and ecological sustainability of destinations (Bellato, 2025; Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005; Utama Dewayani, 2024). Furthermore, regenerative tourism also encourages a redefinition of tourism success indicators. Destination success is no longer measured solely by the number of tourist visits or economic revenue, but by the extent to which tourism activities strengthen the quality of community life, increase youth participation in traditional

activities, and improve environmental conditions (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2015; Puh, 2014). For example, indicators of success could include increased cultural awareness among young people, the sustainability of ecological practices such as bamboo forest conservation, or the emergence of innovative local products such as *lolob cemcem*, which have economic value and reflect cultural identity. This approach positions communities as the primary subjects, not the objects of tourism, so success is measured based on the regenerative impacts they generate on the social and cultural ecosystem (Bellato, 2025; Lazic & Della Lucia, 2024).

From a governance perspective, the application of regenerative principles requires reinforcing the role of traditional institutions and village collective forums. These institutions hold a strategic position in formulating policies aligned with the values of *Tri Hita Karana* and the spirit of social responsibility (Pertwi et al., 2013). Through customary authority, village forums can establish policies that support regeneration, such as limiting the number of daily visitors (carrying capacity), arranging spatial and architectural arrangements in accordance with local values, or designing culturally and environmentally based educational tourism packages (Dredge, 2022; Lane & Kastenholz, 2015). Thus, regenerative governance serves as a form of returning social authority to local communities, while simultaneously strengthening the DSR system, which is based on participation and collective awareness (Font & Lynes, 2020; Lan et al., 2024).

However, proposing regenerative tourism as a pathway to revitalize DSR is not without significant challenges. The very 'economic euphoria' identified in the previous section acts as the primary commercialization pressure and barrier to implementation. This pressure means any regenerative policy (such as implementing a strict tourist cap or allocating funds to non-profit cultural programs) that is perceived as threatening short-term individual income is likely to face strong internal resistance. Furthermore, there are clear resource limitations, specifically the "human resource challenges" and the "weak regeneration of cultural knowledge" identified in the FGD. Implementing complex regenerative models requires a highly engaged and knowledgeable younger generation, yet the data suggests this generation is currently more "interested in gadgets," posing a significant policy constraint on the village's future adaptive capacity.

Conceptually, the integration of regenerative tourism and DSR in Penglipuran Tourism Village demonstrates a paradigm shift from sustainability to regeneration. While sustainable tourism seeks to minimize negative impacts, regenerative tourism demands the creation of positive impacts that can improve the destination's socio-cultural and ecological systems (Day, 2024; Lestari et al., 2025). In the context of DSR, this approach restores the balance disrupted by economic euphoria by placing social responsibility at the heart of destination development (Paddison & Hall, 2024). Thus, regenerative tourism is not only a solution to the weakening value of DSR but also a practical framework capable of revitalizing the spirit of collectivity, ecological solidarity, and cultural awareness of the Penglipuran community in facing the challenges of modern tourism. Therefore, while regenerative tourism offers a compelling theoretical pathway, its success is contingent on the community's ability to first navigate these significant internal barriers to its implementation.

Implications

This study provides several concrete implications for destination governance in Penglipuran and other mature community based tourism villages facing the erosion by success paradox. First, the identification of Organic Destination Social Responsibility suggests that policy interventions should not replace existing cultural governance systems but reinforce them. Strengthening *amig-amig* based decision making and restoring the authority of customary forums is essential for counteracting the rising individual economic orientation. These forums can serve as structured spaces to negotiate tourism income distribution, manage visitor flows, and set collective priorities for cultural preservation.

Second, the findings demonstrate that regenerative tourism must be operationalised through specific programmes that directly address cultural knowledge gaps among youth. Revenue from entrance tickets and tourism packages can be allocated for structured cultural apprenticeship initiatives, children's art training, and intergenerational storytelling sessions facilitated by elders. These activities would revitalise the *Pawongan* and *Palemahan* principles while supporting long term cultural resilience.

Third, tourism managers should redesign visitor experiences to require deeper interaction with the community rather than passive visual consumption. Regenerative packages might include bamboo forest stewardship activities, guided cultural learning, or participatory craft workshops. Finally, government

agencies should shift their support toward governance capacity building, including facilitation training, conflict mediation, and community monitoring systems to ensure that regenerative indicators become part of routine destination management.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Penglipuran Village maintains a deeply rooted and organically internalised form of Destination Social Responsibility grounded in the *Tri Hita Karana* philosophy. Yet this Organic DSR foundation is increasingly threatened by a growing economic euphoria that weakens collective governance and disrupts the transmission of cultural knowledge across generations. The primary theoretical contribution of this study is the articulation of Organic DSR as an endogenous, philosophy driven responsibility model that broadens existing DSR scholarship. The study also introduces the erosion by success paradox, highlighting how internal pressures such as social capital erosion emerge within mature and economically successful community based destinations, a setting that remains underexamined in the literature.

From a practical standpoint, customary forums must be strengthened to mediate economic pressures, and village managers should design regenerative experiences that reinvest tourism benefits into cultural education and community resilience. Government support likewise needs to shift from a focus on infrastructure toward governance capacity building.

Given the limitations of a single case study, future research should employ comparative designs to refine the Organic DSR construct and pursue longitudinal investigations to assess the long term effects of regenerative practices. Overall, this study contributes to global debates on reimagining tourism by asserting that regeneration is not merely a technical innovation but an enduring ethical imperative, one that aligns with the principles of balance and collective responsibility embedded in indigenous philosophies such as *Tri Hita Karana*.

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. Data include official discussion notes and thematic analyses derived from Focus Group Discussion (FGD) conducted in Penglipuran Village.

REFERENCES

- Adnyani, N. K. S., & Purnamawati, I. G. A. (2020). Tri Hita Karana and Tourism Village Management Models for Wellbeing. *Target: Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 2(2), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.30812/target.v2i2.750>
- Agapito, D., Kronenburg, R., & Pinto, P. (2023). A review on destination social responsibility: Towards a research agenda. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 26(4), 554–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2022.2091432>
- Bagus Satya Wira, S. N., Rusadi, N., Negara, I., Permadi, K., Mirayani, N., Suta, P., Andre Adi Putra Pratama, I. P., Pitanatri, I., Wijana, P., Juniarta, P., Widjaya, I., & Dananjaya, I. (2025). *Etika Bisnis Pariwisata: Persoalan Etis dalam Industri Pariwisata*.
- Bellato, L. (2025). Regenerative Development Approaches Involving Tourism: Insights Derived from Place. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 22(6), 960–980. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2024.2415119>
- Bramwell, B., & Lane, B. (2011). Critical research on the governance of tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 411–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology: Qualitative Research in Psychology: Vol 3, No 2*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706QP063OA>

- Buhalis, D., & Amaranggana, A. (2015). Smart Tourism Destinations Enhancing Tourism Experience Through Personalisation of Services. In I. Tussyadiah & A. Inversini (Eds.), *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015* (pp. 377–389). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14343-9_28
- Day, J. (2024). Regenerative Tourism. In J. Jafari & H. Xiao (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism* (pp. 861–862). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74923-1_907
- Dredge, D. (2022). Regenerative tourism: Transforming mindsets, systems and practices. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 8(3), 269–281. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-01-2022-0015>
- Font, X., & Lynes, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Corporate Social Responsibility for Sustainable Tourism* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429027383>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1192–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.020>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020). Socialising tourism for social and ecological justice after COVID-19. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1757748>
- Indrawati, S. M., Satriawan, E., & Abdurrohman. (2024). Indonesia’s Fiscal Policy in the Aftermath of the Pandemic. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00074918.2024.2335967>
- Januar, R. (2024). Implementation and challenges of sustainable tourism programs in Bali. *Bali Tourism Journal*, 8(2), 33–37. <https://doi.org/10.36675/btj.v8i2.109>
- Kerr, S. E. (2018). Social Capital as a Determinant of Resilience. In *Resilience* (pp. 267–275). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-811891-7.00022-0>
- Krueger, R. A. (2014). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. SAGE Publications.
- Lan, M. T. K., Hoàng, H. T., Nguyễn, N. T. T., Võ, P. M., & Phương, N. T. H. (2024). The effect of destination social responsibility on residents’ pro-environmental behaviors in Da Lat City. *VNUHCM Journal of Economics - Law and Management*, 8(4), 5555–5571. <https://doi.org/10.32508/stdjelm.v8i4.1378>
- Lane, B., & Kastenholz, E. (2015). Rural tourism: The evolution of practice and research approaches – towards a new generation concept? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8–9), 1133–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1083997>
- Lazic, S., & Della Lucia, M. (2024). A holistic and pluralistic perspective for justice through tourism: A regenerative approach. *Tourism Geographies*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2024.2372114>
- Lestari, F., Prabowo, Y. D., Nugraheni, M. D. (2025). Geotrails: blending geotourism and geological discovery at the Bayah Dome Geopark, Indonesia. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 59(2), 725–736. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.59219-1451>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1988). *Criteria for Assessing Naturalistic Inquiries as Reports*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED297007>
- Lund-Durlacher, D. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility and Tourism. In G. Moscardo & P. Benckendorff (Eds.), *Education for Sustainability in Tourism* (pp. 59–73). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47470-9_4
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. SAGE.
- Paddison, B., & Hall, J. (2024). Regenerative tourism development as a response to crisis: Harnessing practise-led approaches. *Tourism Geographies*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2024.2381071>
- Pertiwi, I. D. A. E., Ludigdo, U., & Universitas Brawijaya. (2013). Implementasi Corporate Social Responsibility Berlandaskan Budaya Tri Hita Karana. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*. <https://doi.org/10.18202/jamal.2013.12.7208>
- Peters, J. H. (2013). *Tri Hita Karana*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Pratama, I. P. A. A. P., Mananda, I. G. P. B. S., & Sari, N. P. R. (2023). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on The Resiliency of Communities Working in Non-Star Accommodation Business in Ubud Village Post-Pandemics Covid-19. *Journal of Social Research*, 2(5), 1538–1547. <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v2i5.768>
- Puh, B. (2014). Destination Image and Tourism Satisfaction: The Case of a Mediterranean Destination. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2014.v3n3p86>
- Purwasih, J. H. G., & Hadi, N. (2017). The Failure of Regeneration Traditional Pottery Handicraft: 2nd International Conference on Sociology Education, 1218–1223. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0007113512181223>
- Pyke, J., Pyke, S., & Watuwa, R. (2019). Social tourism and well-being in a first nation community. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77, 38–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.04.013>

- Shafiee, M. M., Tabaeian, R. A., & Tavakoli, H. (2016). The effect of destination image on tourist satisfaction, intention to revisit and WOM: An empirical research in Foursquare social media. *2016 10th International Conference on E-Commerce in Developing Countries: With Focus on e-Tourism (ECDC)*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ECDC.2016.7492964>
- Sheehan, L. R., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2005). Destination Stakeholders Exploring Identity and Saliency. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 711–734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.10.013>
- Su, L., & Swanson, S. R. (2017). The effect of destination social responsibility on tourist environmentally responsible behavior: Compared analysis of first-time and repeat tourists. *Tourism Management*, 60, 308–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.011>
- Szigeti, A. (2020). The Discursive Dilemma and Collective Responsibility. In S. Bazargan-Forward & D. Tollefsen (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Collective Responsibility* (1st ed., pp. 297–312). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107608-24>
- Utama Dewayani, E. K. (2024). Assessing Village Development Institutions' Role in Responsible Tourism: A Case Study of Rewaranga, Indonesia. *Global Review of Tourism and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.53893/grtss.v1i1.321>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.47492/jrt.v5i1.3905>
- Wijana, P. A., Pitanatri, I. A., & Pratama, I. P. A. A. P. (2025). Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengembangan Konsep Edu-Tourism Melalui TPS 3R KSM Nangun Resik Desa Paksewali. *Gemawisata: Jurnal Ilmiah Parwisata*, 21(2), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.56910/gemawisata.v21i2.692>