iBRICS
Journal of Multidisciplinary Study

Vol. 1, No. 2, 2025, Pg.99-116

Sustainable Livelihood on Coastal Tourism: Moderating Role of Livelihood Strategies and Institutional Arrangements

Prihartini Budi Astuti*[1], Suliyanto[2], Abdul Aziz Ahmad[3]

[1]Universitas Putra Bangsa

[2,3]Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

Email: prihartini1977@gmail.com[1], suli_yanto@yahoo.com[2], abdul.ahmad@unsoed.ac.id[3]

ABSTRACT

This study aims to apply the sustainable livelihood framework for tourism and analyze the influence of livelihood assets on livelihood outcomes moderated by livelihood strategies and institutional arrangements at Menganti Beach. Using the Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Square, the analysis's conclusions demonstrate that while livelihood strategies and institutional arrangements moderate the impact of human capital, economic capital, and institutional capital on livelihood outcomes, all three types of capital have a positive impact on livelihood outcomes. Based on that finding, it can be said that Menganti Beach's existence has been able to sustain the local community's livelihood.

Keywords: sustainable livelihood for tourism; livelihood assets; livelihood strategies; institutional arrangements; livelihood outcomes

INTRODUCTION

The tourism industry is one of the sectors that is highly calculated in terms of job creation and poverty alleviation (Scheyvens, 2007; Blake et al., 2008; Harrison, 2008; Wattanakuljarus & Coxhead, 2008; Chok et al., 2007; Mitchell & Ashley, 2009; Mahadevan et al., 2017; Holden et al., 2011; Mitchell, 2012; Kennedy K. Akrong, 2019;). The tourist industry can assist in reducing poverty in developing nations because it can become a sustainable means of income and savings for the impoverished (World Tourism Organization, 2002; C. Ashley et al., 2001; UNDP, 2011; Carrascal Incera & Fernández, 2015; Zhao & Xia, 2020; Duan, 2020; Zhang et al., 2006; W.-T. Fang, 2020; Suliyanto et al., 2023). These findings suggest that the tourist industry has a lot of potential to reduce poverty (Goodwin et al., 1998; UNWTO, 2002).

However, because it ignored the availability of livelihoods in rural areas and the reduction of poverty, this premise was later criticized. Numerous scholarly works contend that the notion of a Sustainable Livelihoods Approach provides a means of addressing this shortcoming (C. Ashley et al,. 2001; Ashley, Boyd, & Goodwin, 2000; Cater & Cater, 2007; Lee, 2008; Ritchie & Peirce, 2007; Simpson, 2009; Tao & Wall, 2009).

Early in the 1990s, a new strategy for reducing poverty—sustainable livelihood for tourism (SLFT)—arose as a result of the tourism sector's significant contribution to the development of jobs, higher income, foreign exchange, and economic growth. So far, research on sustainable livelihoods for tourism has been widely applied in various sectors, including plantation-based tourism (Jezeer et al., 2019; Woyesa & Kumar, 2021), community-based tourism (Afandi et al., 2014; Pasanchay & Schott, 2021; Arintoko et al., 2020) and culture-based tourism (Srijuntrapun et al., 2018; Ma, 2021), but only a few have implemented it in coastal tourism. This study aims to apply a sustainable livelihood framework to coastal tourism at Menganti Beach, Kebumen. Coastal tourism is a unique combination of resources, a combination of land and sea, that offers facilities such as water, beaches, scenic beauty, land and sea biodiversity, diverse cultural and historical heritage, healthy food, and good infrastructure (United Nations Environment Programme, 2009).

The Menganti Beach tourist destination is managed jointly by the Sengkuyung Makmur Forest Village Community Institute (LMDH), Perhutani, Karangduwur Village Government, Karangtaruna Karangduwur Village, All Indonesian Fishermen's Association (HNSI) and the local community. This joint management shows the existence of institutional arrangements in the management of the Menganti Beach tourist destination. The framework of links between institutions engaged in a joint venture is known as an institutional arrangement. People, governments, non-governmental organizations, businesses, and tourists all interact in the context of tourism, and each party's actions can directly or indirectly affect someone's ability to make a living. Thus, to guarantee that the tourist system functions as harmoniously as feasible, mediation procedures in vertical and horizontal institutional arrangements are crucial (Shen et al., 2008).

Vol. 1, No. 2, 2025, Pg.99-116

(Source: satudata.kebumenkab.go.id)

Figure 1. Map of the Kebumen Regency Area

Using SEM-PLS as a data analysis method, this research aims to determine whether the Menganti Beach tourist destination can become a sustainable livelihood for the people of Karangduwur Village, Ayah District, Kebumen Regency, by applying a sustainable livelihood framework for tourism that places livelihood assets as independent variables, livelihood strategies, and institutional arrangements as moderating variables, and livelihood outcomes as dependent variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Variables and Data Collections

The variables in this research are livelihood assets (human capital, natural capital, social capital, economic capital, and institutional capital) as independent variables, livelihood strategies and institutional arrangements as moderating variables, and livelihood outcomes as the dependent variable. The primary data in this study are the perceptions of stall traders, street vendors, and managers of the Menganti Beach tourist destination regarding the variables of livelihood capital, livelihood strategies, institutional arrangements, and livelihood outcomes. Primary data collection was carried out by distributing questionnaires and interviews with seafood traders, stall traders, street vendors, and managers of the Menganti Beach tourist destination, with a total of 155 respondents, consisting of 29 seafood traders, 58 stall traders, 24 street vendors, and 44 tourist destination managers.

Conceptual Framework

1. Sustainable Livelihoods

Based on the World Commission on Environment and Development's definition, Chambers and Conway describe sustainable livelihoods (SL) as those that include activities required for a means of subsistence, assets, and capabilities. Livelihoods are sustainable if they can recover from shocks and stresses, maintain or improve their assets and capabilities, offer opportunities for livelihood to the next generation, and support other livelihoods both locally and globally, both in the short and long term (Chambers & Conway, 1992; Scoones, 1998; Department for International Development, 2001). The SL approach is a method of considering the goals, scope, and priorities of development. This strategy is founded on changing perspectives about the way of life, the lives of the impoverished, and the significance of institutions and policies. This method aids in the creation of activity formulas that are dynamic, sustainable, people-centred, responsive, participative, multi-level, and implemented in collaboration with the public and commercial sectors (Caroline Ashley & Carney, 1999; Serrat, 2017). The livelihood assets, vulnerability context, policies and institutions, livelihood strategies, and livelihood outcomes are the core components of the SL framework (DFID, 2001; United Nations Development Program, 2017; Natarajan et al, 2022).

2. Sustainable Livelihoods for Tourism

SLFTs are sustainable livelihoods that are integrated into the tourism industry and able to overcome vulnerabilities to create economically, socially, and environmentally sustainable without jeopardizing the livelihoods of others (Chambers & Conway, 1992; Ellis & Biggs, 2001; Shen et al., 2008; Tao & Wall, 2009). The goal of SLFT is to integrate the fundamental ideas of both sustainable livelihood and tourism. The SLFT pinpoints the essential elements of a tourism livelihood system, such as livelihood assets, livelihood strategies, livelihood outcomes, institutional arrangements, and vulnerability contexts. Livelihood assets in this study are human capital, natural capital, social capital, economic and institutional capital. Livelihood strategies are defined as a combination of activities and choices made by households to achieve prosperity as a manifestation of a better standard of living. Livelihood strategies include ways in which households carry out various activities to earn income, ways of utilizing various assets,

choices of assets for investment, and how households maintain their assets and income (Scoones, 1998). Institutional arrangements are defined as the structure of relationships between institutions involved in some type of joint venture. In the context of tourism, individuals, governments, NGOs, companies, and tourists interact, and the behavior of each party may have a direct or indirect influence on one's livelihood. Sustainable livelihood outcomes must be achieved, especially for the rural poor, while maintaining the sustainability of tourist destinations in the long term. To maintain the sustainability of livelihoods and tourism, the tourism sector must economically: be able to offer a reliable source of long-term income to local communities, socio-culturally, be able to maintain the stability of the condition and culture of local communities, be able to protect local natural resources; and institutionally, be able to maximize opportunities for the involvement and participation of local communities.

Data Analysis

The data in this study will be analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling-Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS). This study uses SEM-PLS because of its ability to test complex and multilevel hypotheses, in the process of analysis, there is a combination of regression analysis and factor analysis, which helps solve complex models.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

Analysis of the respondent's profile is needed to obtain a complete picture of the research subject. The profile of respondents in this study includes age, gender, education level, type of business, length of business, and income level.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

Respondent Profile	Details	Total	Percentage
Age	17 – 25 years old	21	13,55
	26 – 34 years old	36	23,23
	35 – 43 years old	50	32,25
	≥ 44 years old	48	30,97
		155	100
Gender	Man	62	40
	Woman	93	60
		155	100

Education level	Elementary school	49	31,61
	Junior high school	53	34,19
	Senior high school	45	29,03
	Diploma	1	0,65
	Bachelor	6	3,87
	Postgraduate	1	0,65
		155	100
Type of business	Seafood traders	29	18,71
	Stall traders	58	37,42
	Tourist destination manager	44	28,39
	Others	24	15,48
		155	100
Length of business	<1 years	7	4,52
	1 – 3 years	46	29,68
	4 – 6 years	30	19,35
	7 – 9 years	39	25,16
	≥ 10 years	33	21,29
		155	100
Total Income	< IDR 1.000.000	11	7,09
	IDR 1.000.000 – 2.000.000	134	86,45
	IDR 3.000.000 – 4.000.000	3	1,94
	IDR 4.000.000 – 5.000.000	2	1,29
	>IDR 5.000.000	5	3,23
		155	100

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

Validity and Reliability Test

1. Convergent Validity

Convergent validity can be seen from the outer loading value. An indicator can be declared to meet convergent validity and have a high level of validity when the outer loadings value is > 0.70, while the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value is > 0.50 (Chin & Todd, 1995). Convergent validity can be seen from the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value. Table 2 shows that the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values of all variables are above 0.5. This value illustrates adequate convergent validity, which means that one latent variable can explain more than half of the variance of its indicators on average.

Table 2. Convergent Validity Test

Variable	AVE
Human Capital	0.890
Natural Capital	0.844
Social Capital	0,864
Economic Capital	0.873
Institutional Capital	0.914
Livelihood Strategies	1.000
Institutional Arrangements	0.896
Livelihood Outcomes	0.894

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

2. Discriminant Validity

The discriminant validity test was carried out to ensure that the variables are not correlated and measure different constructs. To measure discriminant validity, a calculation is performed using the cross-loading value. Table 3 shows that all variable indicators have a cross-loading value above 0.5, meaning that each indicator is not correlated with each other and measures a different construct.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Test

	MM	MA	MS	ME	MK	SM	PK	HM
MM1	0.894	0.062	-0.048	-0.039	0.037	-0.138	-0.010	0.225
MM2	0.911	-0.087	-0.038	0.041	-0.059	0.020	0.276	-0.212
MM3	0.882	0.166	0.016	-0.011	0.037	-0.145	-0.079	-0.017
MM4	0.872	-0.169	0.179	-0.030	-0.009	0.189	0.154	-0.209
MM5	0.889	0.028	-0.105	0.037	-0.005	0.077	-0.346	0.212
MA1	-0.149	0.808	0.363	-0.158	0.182	-0.035	0.156	-0.134
MA2	0.123	0.864	-0.167	0.064	-0.050	0.142	-0.118	-0.094
MA3	0.021	0.862	-0.225	-0.060	-0.011	-0.076	-0.038	0.214
MA4	-0.006	0.838	0.053	0.148	-0.113	-0.034	0.009	0.006
MS1	0.237	0.366	0.825	0.088	0.074	-0.034	-0.065	-0.098
MS2	-0.076	-0.059	0.882	-0.032	0.003	0.062	0.151	-0.243
MS3	0.022	-0.050	0.896	-0.050	0.072	0.034	0.286	-0.022
MS4	0.011	0.032	0.887	-0.135	0.179	-0.162	0.017	0.108
MS5	0.004	-0.088	0.827	-0.163	-0.130	0.062	-0.062	0.157
MS6	-0.186	-0.186	0.866	0.295	-0.209	0.040	-0.346	0.103
ME1	0.171	0.020	-0.139	0.853	-0.140	0.075	0.391	-0.435
ME2	-0.056	0.022	-0.045	0.876	0.004	0.094	-0.208	-0.022
ME3	-0.110	0.012	0.088	0.881	-0.077	-0.143	-0.042	0.294
ME4	0.000	-0.054	0.091	0.883	0.208	-0.022	-0.129	0.148
MK1	0.022	0.084	-0.034	0.048	(0.890)	-0.251	0.293	-0.195
MK2	-0.080	-0.095	0.034	-0.009	(0.912)	0.169	-0.196	0.235
MK3	-0.007	0.015	0.027	-0.019	(0.925)	-0.013	0.089	-0.088
MK4	-0.028	-0.075	0.063	0.023	(0.920)	0.138	-0.122	0.027
MK5	0.093	0.072	-0.091	-0.042	(0.923)	-0.049	-0.055	0.017
SM	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.000

	MM	MA	MS	ME	MK	SM	PK	HM
PK1	0.320	0.126	-0.432	-0.157	0.152	-0.063	0.846	0.303
PK2	-0.126	0.011	0.055	-0.045	0.082	-0.064	0.909	0.046
PK3	0.047	-0.045	0.023	-0.034	0.016	-0.029	0.940	0.022
PK4	-0.071	0.023	0.072	0.031	0.195	0.159	0.932	-0.070
PK5	0.251	0.161	-0.331	-0.134	0.158	0.164	0.865	-0.003
PK6	-0.156	-0.183	0.319	0.102	-0.093	0.086	0.899	-0.265
PK7	-0.090	-0.059	0.082	0.137	-0.035	-0.025	0.919	-0.072
PK8	-0.150	-0.020	0.178	0.088	-0.491	-0.239	0.857	0.062
HM1	0.116	0.082	-0.182	0.056	-0.178	0.035	-0.034	0.879
HM2	0.185	0.023	0.017	-0.123	0.033	-0.259	0.237	0.878
HM3	-0.189	-0.002	0.111	0.178	-0.111	0.066	-0.048	0.911
HM4	-0.070	-0.122	0.120	-0.123	0.265	0.081	-0.070	0.896
HM5	-0.032	0.021	-0.070	0.007	-0.010	0.070	-0.080	0.907

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

3. Reliability Test

The reliability test is used to determine the reliability or consistency of the instrument (questionnaire). The reliability test in PLS can use two methods, namely Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability. Cronbach's alpha measures the lower bound of the value of reliability, while composite reliability measures the actual value of the reliability of a construct (Chin & Todd, 1995). Composite reliability is considered better for estimating the internal consistency of a construct. The rule of thumb for Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability must be greater than 0.70, although a value of 0.60 is still acceptable (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability

Variable	*Cronbach's Alpha*	*Composite Reliability*	Conclusion
Human Capital	0.934	0.950	Reliable
Natural Capital	0.865	0.908	Reliable
Social Capital	0.932	0.947	Reliable
Economic Capital	0.896	0.928	Reliable
Institutional Capital	0.951	0.962	Reliable
Livelihood Strategies	1.000	1.000	Reliable
Institutional Arrangements	0.965	0.970	Reliable
Livelihood Outcomes	0.937	0.952	Reliable

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

Table 4 shows that the value of Cronbach's Alpha, and composite reliability for all variable constructs each has a value greater than 0.70, thus the research model construct consists of human capital, natural capital, social capital, economic capital,

institutional capital, livelihood strategies, institutional arrangements, and livelihood outcomes are declared reliable.

Structural Model Analysis (Inner Model)

1. The Analysis of the Coefficient of Determination (R-Square)

The assessment of Adjusted R-Square is divided into three, namely ≤0.70 (strong model), ≤0.45 (moderate model), ≤0.25 (weak model). Based on the results of data processing, an Adjusted R Square value of 0.438 is obtained, less than 0.45, which means that the model in this study is included in the "moderate" category. An adjusted R Square value of 0.438 means that the independent variables human capital, natural capital, social capital, economic capital, and institutional capital can explain the livelihood outcomes variable of 0.438 while the remaining 0.562 is explained by other factors outside the model.

2. Goodness of Fit

Evaluation of the next structural model is the evaluation of the fit model through Goodness of Fit (GoF). Researchers used 5 sizes of the fit model, namely Average Path Coefficient (APC), Average R-Square (ARS), Average Adjusted R-Squared (AARS), Average Block VIF (AVIF) and Average Full Collinearity VIF (AFVIF) which can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. Goodness of Fit

Model Fit	Value	*P-Value*
APC	0.126	0.027
ARS	0.492	< 0.001
AARS	0.438	<0.001
AVIF	2.139	-
AFVIF	3.767	-

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

Table 5 shows the p-values of APC, ARS, and AARS are 0.027, <0.001, and <0.001, respectively. This means that the research model meets the model fit criteria because the p-value is less than 0.05. The results of the AFIV and AFVIF values in this study were 2.139 and 3.767, which means that they met the requirements of less than ≤5,

although ideally ≤3.3. This shows that there is no collinearity problem in the research model.

Results of Hypothesis Testing

Table 6 shows the results of testing the hypothesis of the influence of human capital, natural capital, social capital, economic capital, and institutional capital on livelihood outcomes moderated by livelihood strategies and institutional arrangements.

Table 6. Hypothesis Testing Results

No	Influence Between Variables	Path Coefficient	p-value	Result
H-1	Human Capital ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.219	0.002	Supported
H-2	Natural Capital ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.070	0.188	Not supported
H-3	Social Capital ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.066	0.201	Not supported
H-4	Economic Capital ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.295	<0.001	Supported
H-5	Institutional Capital ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.349	<0.001	Supported
H-6	Human Capital*Livelihood Strategies ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.207	0.004	Supported
H-7	Natural Capital*Livelihood Strategies ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.048	0.275	Not supported
H-8	Social Capital*Livelihood Strategies ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.007	0.464	Not supported
H-9	Economic Capital*Livelihood Strategies ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.118	0.067	Not supported
H-10	Institutional Capital*Livelihood Strategies ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.127	0.052	Not supported
H-11	Human Capital*Institutional Arrangements ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.117	0.068	Not supported
H-12	Human Capital*Institutional Arrangements ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	-0.080	0.156	Not supported
H-13	Human Capital*Institutional Arrangements ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.043	0.296	Not supported
H-14	Human Capital*Institutional Arrangements ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	0.131	0.048	Supported
H-15	Human Capital*Institutional Arrangements ➔ Livelihood Outcomes	-0.018	0.411	Not supported

Source: Processed primary data (2023)

Table 6 shows that human capital, economic capital, and institutional capital have a direct effect on livelihood outcomes; livelihood strategies moderate the effect of human capital on livelihood outcomes and institutional arrangements moderate the effect of economic capital on livelihood outcomes. The variables human capital, economic capital, and institutional capital have positive coefficient values, meaning that the better the value of each of these indicator variables, the higher the livelihood outcomes.

Discussion

The results of the hypothesis test show that human capital has a positive effect on livelihood outcomes, which means that human capital has a positive and important influence on improving livelihood outcomes. The better the quality of human resources, the better livelihood outcomes will be. The respondents in this study have quite good adaptability, as evidenced by the success of the Menganti Beach tourist destination in overcoming the downturn in the tourism sector that occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. The

lockdown policy implemented by the government forced the manager of the Menganti Beach tourist destination to close the beach for 3 months, from April to June 2020. Entering July 2020, by following the CHSE guidelines issued by the Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy, the Menganti Beach tourist destination began to reopen its tourism, although with certain restrictions, for example, limiting the number of visitors and implementing strict health protocols. CHSE is a Kemenparekraf program in the form of implementing health protocols based on Cleanliness, Health, Safety, and Environment Sustainability. Business actors (stall traders, seafood stall traders) at Menganti Beach are required to provide hand-washing facilities and hand-washing soap for visitors to reduce the risk of transmission of the COVID-19 virus. The results of this study support research on sustainable livelihoods that have been conducted previously by Shen et al. (2008), Y. P. Fang et al. (2014), Su et al. (2019), Kaskoyo et al., (2017), Aazami & Shanazi (2020), Liu-Lastres et al. (2020), Westoby et al. 2021) which prove that human capital influences livelihood outcomes.

The results of the data analysis also show that economic capital has a positive effect on livelihood outcomes, which means that ownership of economic capital has an important influence on improving livelihood outcomes. Respondents in this study consisted of stall traders, seafood stall traders, and managers of tourist destinations, so equipment, machinery, and vehicles are vital in carrying out their livelihoods. The infrastructure available at tourist destinations includes shuttle bus stops (3 units), shuttle buses (4 units), 11 units of huts or gazebos, a camping ground, toilets (12 units), some prayer rooms (2 units), a large parking area, and homestays, which were completed in early 2014. The location of Menganti Beach, which is on a high plateau and quite far from the centre of Kebumen city (± 44.9 km), requires good infrastructure support, especially roads, public transportation facilities, and telecommunications facilities so that people's interest in visiting Menganti Beach will increase. The results of this study are in line with the theory of sustainable livelihoods, which states that economic capital has an important contribution to livelihood outcomes. These results also support previous studies from Soini (2005), Shen et al. (2008), Akudugu (2011), Makoza & Chigona (2012), Aazami & Shanazi (2020), (Pasanchay & Schott (2021), which state that economic capital has a positive influence on livelihood outcomes.

Vol. 1, No. 2, 2025, Pg.99-116

Source: Author's personal collection

Figure 2. View of Menganti Beach

The results of the data analysis show that livelihood strategies have succeeded in moderating the influence of human capital on livelihood outcomes. Livelihood strategies moderate the influence of human capital on livelihood outcomes, meaning that by choosing the right livelihood strategy, stall traders, seafood stall traders, and managers of the Menganti Beach tourist destination will be able to obtain better livelihood outcomes. The livelihood strategies implemented by respondents, including becoming stall traders, seafood traders, street vendors, and tourist destination managers, have been proven to be able to strengthen the influence of human capital (level of health and nutrition, level of education, knowledge and skills, ability to work, and ability to adapt) on livelihood outcomes. Choosing the right livelihood strategy will improve livelihood outcomes. The majority of respondents work as food stall traders, seafood stall traders, and tourist destination managers, which require more physical activity, so the level of health and nutrition as well as the ability to work are important so that they can work better and obtain better livelihood results.

On the other hand, the results of the data analysis also show that institutional arrangements have succeeded in moderating the influence of economic capital on livelihood outcomes. The location of Menganti Beach, which is on high ground and quite far from the city centre of Kebumen, requires good infrastructure support, especially roads, public transportation, and telecommunications facilities. Providing good infrastructure requires support from various parties, including the central government, regional governments, and other stakeholders. This

is what causes institutional regulation variables to moderate the influence of economic capital on livelihood outcome variables.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the data analysis, it can be concluded that human capital, economic capital, and institutional capital have a positive effect on livelihood outcomes; livelihood strategies variables moderate the effect of human capital variables on livelihood outcomes; and institutional arrangements variables moderate the effect of economic capital on livelihood outcomes. Based on these conclusions, the manager of the Menganti Beach tourist destination is recommended to improve the quality of the potential young generation of human resources in Karangduwur Village by providing scholarships to higher levels of education, for example, by being admitted to a tourism college. It is hoped that this improvement in the quality of human resources will provide provisions for the young generation of Karangduwur Village to be able to manage Menganti Beach better in the future. Tourist destination managers are also advised to increase the knowledge and skills of business actors by providing practical training, for example, digital marketing training to promote seafood products for seafood stall owners and promote tourist destinations for tourist destination managers. To increase the knowledge and skills of managers of the Menganti Beach tourist destination, they can also be included in training in the fields of ticketing managers, tour leaders, CHSE (Cleanliness, Health, Safety, and Environment Sustainability), occupational safety and health training, management of tourist destinations, and homestay management because, in the tourist destination of Menganti Beach, there are homestays and resorts. In addition to improving the quality of human resources, managers of the Menganti Beach tourist destination are expected to continue to maintain, improve, and add to existing infrastructure at tourist destinations. One of the infrastructures that needs to be repaired is the access road to Menganti Beach, which until now has not been accessible by public transportation. The location of the Menganti Beach tourist destination, which is in the mountains with roads that are uphill and winding, is one of the obstacles for visitors when going on a trip to Menganti Beach. Coordination with the Kebumen Regency Government and Perhutani needs to be carried out more intensely by LMDH Sengkuyung Makmur so that the hopes of business actors who want road access that can be reached by public transportation modes can be realized soon. The telecommunications network also needs to be improved so that when they are at Menganti Beach, visitors can broadcast live on Instagram or live stream on YouTube so that they can support the promotion

of the Menganti Beach tourist destination. There is still a lack of understanding among respondents about the policies, systems, and processes carried out to make laws and policies related to the tourism sector. There is also a lack of understanding of how political conditions, the central government, local government, and private companies influence the sustainability of the Menganti Beach tourist destination, causing respondents' answers in the questionnaire to not represent the actual conditions. Further research can be carried out with a mixed method to obtain a better understanding of sustainable livelihoods for coastal tourism.

REFERENCES

Aazami, M., & Shanazi, K. (2020). Tourism wetlands and rural sustainable livelihood: The case from Iran. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, *30*, 100284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2020.100284

Afandi, A., Ananda, C. F., Maskie, G., & Khusaini, M. (2014). Analysis of Sustainable Tourism Livelihoods in Batu (East Java, Indonesia): SLFT Approach (Sustainable Livelihood Framework for Tourism). *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, *5*(10), 148–157.

Akudugu, M. A. (2011). Rural banks' financial capital and livelihoods development of women farmers in Ghana. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, *5*(4), 248–264. https://doi.org/10.1108/17506201111177307

Almalki, O., Duan, Y., & Frommholz, I. (2013). Developing a conceptual framework to evaluate e-Government portals' success. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on e-Government, ECEG* (pp. 19–26). https://api.elsevier.com/content/abstract/scopus_id/84906077055

Arintoko, A., Ahmad, A. A., Gunawan, D. S., & Supadi, S. (2020). Community-based tourism village development strategies: A case of Borobudur tourism village area, Indonesia. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, *29*(2), 398–413.

Ashley, C., Roe, D., & Goodwin, H. (2001). Pro-Poor Tourism Strategies : Making Tourism Work For The Poor A review of experience. *PPT Strategies For- Poor Tourism*, *1*, 1–64.

Ashley, Caroline, & Carney, D. (1999). Sustainable livelihoods: Lessons from early experience. In *Development* (Vol. 7, Issue 1). Department for International Development London.

Blake, A., Arbache, J. S., Sinclair, M. T., & Teles, V. (2008). Tourism and poverty relief. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *35*(1), 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.06.013

Carrascal Incera, A., & Fernández, M. F. (2015). Tourism and income distribution: Evidence from a developed regional economy. *Tourism Management*, *48*, 11–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.10.016

Cater, C., & Cater, E. (2007). *Marine ecotourism: Between the devil and the deep blue sea* (Vol. 6). Cabi.

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. R. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. In *IDS Discussion Paper* (Vol. 296). Institute of Development Studies (UK).

Chin, W. W., & Todd, P. A. (1995). On the use, usefulness, and ease of use of structural equation modeling in mis research: A note of caution. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, *19*(2), 237–246. https://doi.org/10.2307/249690

Chok, S., Macbeth, J., & Warren, C. (2007). Tourism as a Tool for Poverty Alleviation: A Critical Analysis of 'Pro-Poor Tourism' and Implications for Sustainability. *Pro-Poor Tourism: Who Benefits?: Perspectives on Tourism and Poverty Reduction*, *10*(2–3), 34–55. https://doi.org/10.2167/cit303

Duan, S. (2020). A Study on Poverty Alleviation Mechanism of Jinggangshan Tourism. *2019 3rd International Conference on Education, Economics and Management Research (ICEEMR 2019)*, 425–430. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.191221.102

Ellis, F., & Biggs, S. (2001). Evolving themes in rural development 1950s-2000s. *Development Policy Review*, *19*(4), 437–448. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7679.00143

Fang, W.-T. (2020). Tourism in Emerging Economies. In *Tourism in Emerging Economies*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-2463-9

Fang, Y. P., Fan, J., Shen, M. Y., & Song, M. Q. (2014). Sensitivity of livelihood strategy to livelihood capital in mountain areas: Empirical analysis based on different settlements in the upper reaches of the Minjiang River, China. *Ecological Indicators*, *38*, 225–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.11.007

Goodwin, H., Malthouse, P., John, S., & Me, K. (1998). Sustainable Tourism and Poverty Elimination A Discussion Paper. In *Transport* (Vol. 44, Issue October). https://www.haroldgoodwin.info/resources/dfidpaper.pdf

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective. In *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective* (Vol. 7th). Pearson Education. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=SLRPLgAACAAJ

Harrison, D. (2008). Pro-poor tourism: A critique. *Third World Quarterly*, *29*(5), 851–868.

Holden, A., Sonne, J., & Novelli, M. (2011). Tourism and poverty reduction: An interpretation by the poor of Elmina, Ghana. *Tourism Planning and Development*, *8*(3), 317–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2011.591160

Jezeer, R. E., Verweij, P. A., Boot, R. G. A., Junginger, M., & Santos, M. J. (2019). Influence of livelihood assets, experienced shocks and perceived risks on smallholder coffee farming practices in Peru. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *242*, 496–506.

Kaskoyo, H., Mohammed, A. J., & Inoue, M. (2017). Impact of community forest program in protection forest on livelihood outcomes: A case study of Lampung Province, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, *36*(3), 250–263. https://doi.org/10.1080/10549811.2017.1296774

Kennedy K. Akrong. (2019). Pro-Poor Tourism: Critical Perspective and Implications for Future Research. *J. of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, *7*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.17265/2328-2169/2019.01.003

Liu-Lastres, B., Mariska, D., Tan, X., & Ying, T. (2020). Can post-disaster tourism development improve destination livelihoods? A case study of Aceh, Indonesia. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *18*, 100510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100510

Ma, L. (2021). Understanding non-adopters' intention to use internet pharmacy: Revisiting the roles of trustworthiness, perceived risk and consumer traits. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management - JET-M*, *59*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2021.101613

Mahadevan, R., Amir, H., & Nugroho, A. (2017). Regional impacts of tourism-led growth on poverty and income: Inequality: A dynamic general equilibrium analysis for Indonesia. *Tourism Economics*, *23*(3), 614–631. https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2015.0534

Makoza, F., & Chigona, W. (2012). The livelihood outcomes of ict use in microenterprises: The case of south africa. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *53*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2012.tb00374.x

Mitchell, J. (2012). Value chain approaches to assessing the impact of tourism on low-income households in developing countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *20*(3), 457–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.663378

Mitchell, J., & Ashley, C. (2009). Tourism and Poverty reduction: Pathways to prosperity. In *Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Pathways to Prosperity*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849774635

Natarajan, N., Newsham, A., Rigg, J., & Suhardiman, D. (2022). A sustainable livelihoods framework for the 21st century. *World Development*, *155*, 105898.

Pasanchay, K., & Schott, C. (2021). Community-based tourism homestays' capacity to advance the Sustainable Development Goals: A holistic sustainable livelihood perspective. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *37*, 100784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100784

Ritchie, B., & Peirce, S. (2007). National Capital Tourism: Marketing, Planning and Development Issues. In *Sustainable Tourism CRC, Gold Coast Australia*. Sustainable Tourism CRC Gold Coast, Australia. http://www.crctourism.com.au/CRCBookshop/Documents/Ritchie_NationalCapitalTourism.pdf

Scheyvens, R. (2007). Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *10*(2–3), 231–254.

Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis. *IDS Working Paper*, *72*, 22. http://forum.ctv.gu.se/learnloop/resources/files/3902/scoones_1998_wp721.pdf

Serrat, O. (2017). The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. *Knowledge Solutions*, 21–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0983-9_5

Shen, F., Hughey, K. F. D., & Simmons, D. G. (2008). Connecting the sustainable livelihoods approach and tourism: A review of the literature. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *15*(1), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1375/jhtm.15.19

Simpson, M. C. (2009). An integrated approach to assess the impacts of tourism on community development and sustainable livelihoods. *Community Development Journal*, *44*(2), 186–208. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsm048

Soini, E. (2005). Livelihood capital, strategies and outcomes in the Taita hills of Kenya. In *ICRAF Working Paper no. 8* (Issue May). World Agroforestry Centre, Eastern and Central Africa Regional Programme.

Srijuntrapun, P., Fisher, D., & Rennie, H. G. (2018). Assessing the sustainability of tourism-related livelihoods in an urban World Heritage Site. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, *13*(5), 395–410. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2017.1373779

Su, M. M., Wall, G., Wang, Y., & Jin, M. (2019). Livelihood sustainability in a rural tourism destination - Hetu Town, Anhui Province, China. *Tourism Management*, *71*, 272–281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.10.019

Suliyanto, Setyanto, R. P., & Fauzi, D. R. (2023). the Market Competition of Intention To Revisit Nature Tourism Destinations. *Corporate and Business Strategy Review*, *4*(2 Special Issue), 260–269. https://doi.org/10.22495/cbsrv4i2siart5

Tao, T. C. H., & Wall, G. (2009). Tourism as a sustainable livelihood strategy. *Tourism Management*, *30*(1), 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.03.009

Wattanakuljarus, A., & Coxhead, I. (2008). Is tourism-based development good for the poor?. A general equilibrium analysis for Thailand. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, *30*(6), 929–955. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2008.02.006

Westoby, R., Gardiner, S., Carter, R. W., & Scott, N. (2021). Sustainable livelihoods from tourism in the "10 New Balis" in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *26*(6), 702–716. https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2021.1908386

Woyesa, T., & Kumar, S. (2021). Potential of coffee tourism for rural development in Ethiopia: a sustainable livelihood approach. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *23*(1), 815–832. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00610-7

Zhang, L., Xue, X., Fang, Q., & Shen, S. S. (2006). A proposal for the application of Integrated Coastal Management for institutional arrangements in Xiamen. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Management*, *9*(1), 111–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/14634980600561466

Zhao, L., & Xia, X. (2020). Tourism and poverty reduction: Empirical evidence from China. *Tourism Economics*, *26*(2), 233–256. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354816619863266

https://satudata.kebumenkab.go.id/index.php/web/peta_tematik