



THE POLITICS OF TOUR GUIDING

Image Management in Indonesia

Heidi Dahles

Vrije University Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract: The concept of tourist guides as “mediators” of local culture fails to capture the political component of guiding. Governments use tourism strategically in order to address issues of national significance. Based on an analysis of the policies of tourist guiding of the Indonesian government under Suharto’s New Order regime, this article discusses the impact of state propaganda on the narratives of tourist guides there. Two related questions are raised: what strategies does the government apply to professionalize and to control tourist guides, and to what extent does government intervention constitute restrictions to and opportunities for the guides’ activities? **Keywords:** tourist guides, mediators, training, government intervention, Indonesia. © 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Résumé: Le gouvernement et les guides touristiques: gestion de l’image en Indonésie. La notion des guides comme médiateurs de la culture locale ne tient pas bien compte de l’élément politique de la profession de guide. Les gouvernements utilisent le tourisme stratégiquement afin d’aborder des questions d’importance nationale. Basé sur une analyse de la politique du gouvernement indonésien sous le régime du Nouvel Ordre de Suharto pour le métier de guide touristique, cet article discute de l’impact de la propagande de l’état sur les narrations des guides indonésiens. On soulève deux questions liées: quelles stratégies le gouvernement utilise-t-il pour promouvoir le professionnalisme des guides et diriger leur travail, et dans quelle mesure l’intervention du gouvernement crée-t-elle des limitations et des occasions pour les activités des guides? **Mots-clés:** guides touristiques, formation, intervention du gouvernement, Indonésie. © 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Tour guiding constitutes a strategic factor in the representation of a destination area and in influencing the quality of the tourist experience, the length of stay, and the resulting economic benefits for a local community. Tourism based on cultural heritage in particular, demands a specific body of knowledge and a high standard of tourist guiding. The role of guides in conveying information, offering explanations, and developing narratives has become a current research theme. The industry, the media, and government officials are beginning to see that a guide’s role extends well beyond welcoming and informing tourists. The guide is entrusted with the public relations missions to encapsulate

Heidi Dahles is Associate Professor of Organizational Anthropology in the Department of Culture, Organization and Management at the Vrije University of Amsterdam (COM, De Boelelaan 1081c, 1081 HV Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Email <h.dahles@scw.vu.nl>). Her current research interests focus on ethnicity and organizational culture in transborder business networks in Southeast Asia.

the essence of a place and to be a window onto a site, region, or country (Pond 1993).

In many studies the focus is on the guide's role as information-giver (Holloway 1981). As research has shown (Bowman 1992; Cohen 1985; Holloway 1981; Schmidt 1979) guides are of crucial importance in cultural tourism, as theirs is the task of selecting, glossing, and interpreting sights. They must translate "the strangeness of a foreign culture into a cultural idiom familiar to the visitors" (Cohen 1985:15). Sensitive guided tourists may be convinced that the experiences from their visit are a rewarding way of cultural contact (Bowman 1992). A "sensitive" way of guiding demands that the guides display a high level of professional skills and an intimate knowledge of local culture. Extensive expertise is regarded as a prerequisite by which to establish the guide's professional status as a mediator of culture, either as a "pathfinder" who "provides access to an otherwise non-public territory" or as a "mentor" who "services as a guru to the novice, adept, or seeker, guiding him towards insight, enlightenment or any other exalted spiritual state" (Cohen 1985:10, 8). The former facilitates access whereas the latter builds on that to which the tourist has access, integrating what is seen into a coherent and meaningful image of place.

One aspect which the different approaches to guiding have in common is a strong emphasis on the mediation activities of guides: mediation among hosts and guests, mediation between the tour operator/travel agency and the tourists, mediation among the tour leader and the local tourist scene, mediation between the hotel sector and the tourist. The guide is portrayed as someone who builds bridges among different groups of people through the deployment of money, services, access, and information (Gurung, Simmons and Devlin 1996). This approach paints an idealized picture of guiding. That they in some way or other are intermediaries cannot be denied, but it is doubtful whether their work can be interpreted purely according to a harmony model of "mediation", of keeping all parties involved satisfied, and the tourism development in a specific area in balance. In tourism practice, the process of mediation is not as innocent and unproblematic as this perspective implies.

As Bras (2000a) points out, guides are not altruistic mediators by vocation, nor can they be expected to submit blindly to government rules and regulations exacting them to tell pre-fabricated stories. Instead, they sell images, knowledge, contacts, souvenirs, access, authenticity, ideology, and sometimes even themselves. Their knowledge of the local culture is not limited to facts, figures, and *couleur locale*, it includes the art of building a network, of monopolizing contacts, a familiarity with the operations of the tipping and commission system, a notion of trends in tourism and of the characteristics of tourists and their countries of origin—all this converging to make the encounter with tourists as profitable as possible for the guides themselves. Successful guides know how to turn their social relations and narratives into a profitable enterprise (Bras 2000a; Dahles 1998a; Dahles and Bras 1999a, 1999b).

Moreover, limiting the role of guides to "mediators" of local culture

fails to capture the political component of guiding. Governments use tourism strategically in order to address issues of national significance. The Indonesian government under Suharto's New Order regime (as will be discussed below) promoted the expansion of tourism to implement two major points on its political agenda: one, to polish the image of the country and to obtain international esteem in terms of an economically prosperous, politically stable, and culturally advanced nation before a world audience through international tourism and, two, to promote national unity through domestic tourism (Dahles 2001). One year after the empirical research on which this article is based was finalized (September 1996), the Asia-wide economic crisis hit Indonesia. The economic malaise unleashed political unrest that finally forced president Suharto to step down in May 1998. This put an end to his regime stretching over the period 1965 to 1998 denoted as the "New Order" in contrast to the "Old Order" under Sukarno, the first president of the republic. When the role of tourism in post-Suharto Indonesia is discussed in public, references to national unity are conspicuously absent. It is tourism's contribution to the national economy that is of major concern. Although Abdurrahman Wahid, the first democratically chosen president of Indonesia, has confirmed the importance of tourism to the Indonesian economy on several occasions, the fact is that tourism collapsed because of the political unrest during and after the May events of 1998, and has failed to recover because of ongoing ethnic and religious unrest in various provinces.

From a political point of view on guiding, a clear perspective on power relations within which guides have to operate, has to be added to the often-quoted "mediation" role of guides. In this paper two related questions will be raised: what strategies the Indonesian government applied to professionalize and to control tourist guides, and to what extent government intervention set restrictions to and offered opportunities for their activities.

POLITICS AND POLICIES OF TOUR GUIDING

There are several synonyms for tourist guides, like tour guide, city guide, and step-on guide. Other terms with slightly different connotations are tour manager, escort, tour escort, or tour leader (Pond 1993:17). In this paper the term tourist guide is used, and specific concepts are applied to distinguish particular tasks and functions of guides in the local context.

Among the first to study tourist guides systematically is Holloway. Starting from role-theory, Holloway regards them as information-giver and fountain of knowledge, teacher or instructor, motivator and initiator into the rites of tourist experiences, missionary or ambassador for their country, entertainer or catalyst for the group, confidant, shepherd, and ministering angel, group leader and disciplinarian (1981:385–386). Cohen (1985) explores more deeply the interpretative role of guides. He distinguishes their different styles in terms of "pathfinding" and "mentoring". Pathfinders are guides who restrict

themselves to pointing out the route and the attractions, without offering elaborate explanations. They are geographical guides who lead the way through an environment in which tourists lack orientation or through a socially defined territory to which they have no access (Cohen 1985:7). This category emerges mainly in literally inaccessible areas like mountains—less so in cities which, nonetheless, can be “rugged” in a social and cultural sense. Besides finding the way in an unmarked territory, guides are faced with the necessity to ensure themselves of the goodwill and hospitality of the natives of an area. Gaining access to a remote social environment and making themselves and their party welcome is a difficult task that makes heavy demands on the guides’ mediation talents which makes them the pivotal link in an encounter among total strangers. If they operate in a new, still underdeveloped tourism area, they are called pathbreakers, who literally select new objects of interest and make them accessible (Cohen 1985:25).

The role of the mentor resembles the role of teacher, instructor, or advisor. The mentor points out the objects of interest, explains them, and tells tourists where and when to look and how to behave. Mentors may select the objects of interest in accordance with their own personal preferences or tastes, their professional training, directions received from their employer or the authorities, or the assumed interest of their party (Cohen 1985:14). Their narrative may be interspersed with historical facts, comments on architecture, or pieces of cultural information. Information is considered to be a vital element in the mentor’s task. This type of guide blossoms in mature destinations where the transfer of information takes on an almost academic character. An extensive body of knowledge is required to establish the professional status of the mentor. The organizational, practical, and entertaining activities are of minor importance. In contrast to the pathfinder, the mentor focuses on organized mass tourism. Having had formal education and being employed by a tour operator allows them to work in the center of the tourism system. Unlike pathfinders, mentors work on established attractions and do not discover new sites or produce new narratives (Cohen 1985:26).

Cohen makes two points that are of interest here. First, he observes that the pathfinder/pathbreaker type is predominant in young and as yet undeveloped sites and in areas characterized by nature-based tourism. The mentor type of guide is commonly found in developed areas, and especially in cultural destinations. Second, he argues that the role of the guide is evolving and shifting from the logistical aspect to the facilitation of the experience, from the pathfinder to the mentor role, away from leadership towards mediating and away from outer and towards the inner-directed sphere, with the communicative component becoming the center of the professional role (Cohen 1985:21). Guides are becoming interpreters; they are not “translators” of other cultures in the limited sense of the word, but are mediators who enable tourists to experience the other culture; they are guides who encourage tourists to see, hear, smell, taste, and feel the other culture (Urry 1990). Pivotal to the interpreter’s approach is the art of storytelling. In Urry’s terms (1995:146), there is a shift away from the didactic legislator who

instructed tourists where to look, what to look for, and when to look, towards an encouragement to look with interest at an enormous diversity of artifacts, cultures, and systems of meaning with the help of an expert whose role it is to interpret the different elements for the visiting guest. In this context, Gurung et al have come up with the distinction between tour management and experience management. The task of guides necessarily involves both approaches to management: the organization of the itinerary and the selection and interpretation of sites in an interactive process with tourists. This implies that they are cultural brokers whose pivotal role is “to influence the visitors’ impressions and attitudes, as well as enhance their appreciation and understanding of their surroundings”. Further, according to Gurung et al guides in their role as brokers “serve as a buffer, insulating many travelers from the difficulties and possibly, some delights of the visited culture ... indigenous guides play an important role in building better host-guest relationships” (1996:11–12).

Tourist guides construct backstages in a contrived and artificial manner (Urry 1990). Tourism spaces are thus organized around what MacCannell (1973) calls “staged authenticity”. Guides take a pivotal role in the staging of these spaces: they construct attractions—both frontstages and “staged backstages”—in response to the tourists’ quest for authenticity and, at the same time, to take advantage of the opportunities it presents for profit. As Schmidt (1979:449) observes, guided tours are most functional in places which have ongoing activities, such as institutions and businesses (and one may add “political systems”). This way, tourists are enabled to observe the “inner workings” of these institutions, but not at the expense of their efficiency; they must not be disturbed from their tasks by invasions of tourists. Guided tours assure that tourists are channeled into the right place at the right time, doing so under the control of someone “responsible”. Package tours, as an extreme case, entail minimal interaction with the host society. In this situation, the presence of the guide constitutes a buffer between tourists and the social environment, arranging transport, interpreting, and handling problems which might arise (Schmidt 1979:443). The guides’ intercessionary role in shepherding the group and explaining the attractions reduces the opportunity for interaction with locals, and the group’s attention becomes inwardly directed towards the guide rather than outwardly the setting (Holloway 1981:382).

Guided tours which weave in and out of everyday life so as not to be obtrusive, but at the same time do provide tourists with a glimpse of what is going on without revealing undesirable aspects, have been extremely appealing to the Indonesian New Order government. They form highly effective instruments of controlling the tourists and their contacts with the host society as well as the images and narratives by means of which the host society presents itself before a domestic and international audience of visitors. The reasons behind the New Order’s tourism policy with its emphasis on guidance and control are clear. Qualified guides in Indonesia are trained by government institutions and forced by their employment situation to follow the official, authorized narrative. For fear of losing their jobs, they may stick to their

assignment to keep tourists away from backstages that represent the undesirable aspects of the host society that should not be displayed. They play a pivotal role in the social construction of local identity. On a guided tour, tourists view and interpret local sights through the words of the tour guides. Moreover, they are made to experience the environment according to the way in which the guide constructs and represents it. However, the type of information and explanations provided for certain situations may be quite different from both the information that the government requires to be disseminated about a place and the information which a local resident would provide, even when the guides are local residents.

Research Methods and the Setting

The author conducted anthropological fieldwork during intermittent periods in 1994 to 1996 among local tourist guides in the city of Yogyakarta on the Island of Java, a long-standing and well-developed cultural destination in Indonesia. The research focused on the social construction of attractions and, more specifically, on the role of local guides in the establishment of tourism discourses. Field data were obtained through informal and structured interviews with different actors in the local industry and by recording life-histories of licensed and unlicensed local guides. The author conducted ethnographical interviews with 50 local guides and participated in a large number of excursions organized by several categories of local guides. Part of this article is based on transcriptions of guides' narratives that were recorded during these excursions. The guided tours formed the arena where the interaction between local guides and tourists could be examined.

The information generated by participant observation was supplemented by interviews with government representatives, respondents working in the industry and in tourism education, and other experts in Yogyakarta. As the fieldwork was spread over three years, the author was able to follow local guides over a considerable period of time and record changes in development in the Yogyakarta area. Additionally, secondary data, statistics, and case studies were obtained from government agencies, educational institutions, and consultancies.

Yogyakarta, which is the name of both the special region of Yogyakarta (*Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*) and its capital city, is situated in one of the most productive agricultural areas on earth, with a rural population density that is among the world's highest. The province's 3.2 million people inhabit just 3,169 sq km, for an average density of over 1,000 persons per sq km. Tourism policy under the Suharto regime has strongly favored Yogyakarta since the late 60s. Defining it as the second core region of tourism development (second to Bali), the central government made conspicuous efforts to extend the city's communications and transportation systems, to build hotels and improve the shopping facilities, to restore historic relics, to establish monuments of the "revolutionary period", and to preserve cultural artifacts and art forms pervaded by a traditional Javanese quality (Tsuchia

1984). Heritage tourism appeared to be a very successful strategy which paid off for Yogyakarta (Timothy 1998a, 1998b, 1999; Timothy and Wall 1995, 1997; Wall 1997). The complexes of Borobudur and Prambanan, the sultan's palace (Yogyakarta is also a sultanate headed by a dynasty that traces its origins to the first rulers of the island of Java), performances of gamelan music, court dances, the Ramayana ballet and shadow puppet plays, the production of batik and other handicrafts have all been promoted as "typical" Yogyanese attractions by both government agencies and the industry (Hughes-Freeland 1993). In the global tourism market, images of Yogyanese cultural assets (alongside Balinese temples and dance) represent the dominant national image which may illustrate the centrality of Yogyakarta to Indonesian identity.

Although the development of international tourism has been strongly advocated by the national and provincial government, it has been the domestic market which has formed the major target for the industry in Yogyakarta. In this domain, the city's role in the struggle for independence became a major marketing asset. Representing the revolutionary spirit, national pride, and the defeat of the colonial power (the city was the capital of the new republic of Indonesia from 1946 to 1950), the city emerged as the center of political pilgrimages. The location in Yogyakarta of Gadjah Mada University, the first Indonesian university, established in 1949, along with a large number of other educational institutions, is also significant. The city is an obligatory place for Indonesians to visit in order to learn "Indonesian-ness", national culture, and history. The image favored by government and tourism was that of a destination with a multifaceted cultural heritage. As a historic city, Yogyakarta represents the diverse religious and cultural traditions that have characterized the area through the ages; as a heroic city, it represents the struggle for independence and national unity; and as a cultural city, it represents the uniqueness of a "traditional Javanese community".

Urbanization has been accelerated since the 80s. While such development projects devoted enormous efforts to the improvement of the housing conditions of the poor and to poverty reduction, flourishing tourism left the most visible impact on the city. Until the onset of the economic crisis in 1997, there was a construction boom in highrise buildings and the local tourism industry was expanding. The impact of a foreign-oriented consumer culture—of which international tourism is an example—was clearly visible in the inner city (Mulder 1994). Budget accommodation, restaurants offering fast food, shops with blaring popmusic and flashing neon-lights sprang up everywhere. In the major tourism areas alcohol and drugs were as easily available as international tourist menus. At the same time, the number of star-rated hotels increased considerably to accommodate what the authorities preferred to call "quality" tourism.

In Yogyakarta, a major destination area since the 70s, one should expect to be dealing predominantly with the mentor guide, and less so with the pathfinder/pathbreaker. With the former type dominating the scene, it could be expected that tours are well established and standardized, and that the art of storytelling is becoming more pro-

nounced. This is somewhat precarious as the position of interpreter and communicator makes local guides extremely susceptible to outside intervention and manipulation. After all, decisions regarding the “true” story or the “most appropriate” interpretation are subject to relations of power and dependence. In many countries, guides can go about their activities as they please as this job does not constitute a well-established and formalized profession (Crick 1992), but in Indonesia it is subject to government regulations in compliance with the tourism policy.

Government Policies on Guiding

Under the New Order, government intervention in tourism extended to the regulation of tourist guiding in terms of licensing, certification, training, pay and benefits, marketing and conducting tours, and the organization and professional ethics of guides. The New Order established formal training and the possession of a license to be the criteria in deciding who may or may not operate as a guide. In government terms, the boundaries of the profession were well-defined and guides were organized and used strategically to serve political objectives. Government regulation even extended to the content of the information and explanations provided by guides at the tourist sites.

In the early 80s when international tourism in Indonesia began to boom and the deregulation policy facilitated the establishment of what later came to be called “quality” tourism (Dahles 1998b), guiding was a field that could be entered by anyone. There were no requirements as to training, diplomas, and accreditation. This period did not last long as the New Order government quickly began to formalize the as yet unregulated economic activities, including guiding. This concern with professionalism reflected the New Order’s ideas about order and security: whereas guiding without a proper license was perceived as a threat to the state’s carefully manufactured imagery of tamed cultural diversity, professionalism promised uniformity and central control (Adams 1997). In emerging destinations with a shortage of licensed guides and a growing demand for guided tours—like Lombok (Bras 2000a) and South Sulawesi (Adams 1997)—upgrading measures were indeed offering opportunities to practicing but as yet unlicensed guides to acquire professional status. In established destinations like Yogyakarta, however, with their oversupply of accredited guides and a diminishing demand for tours, the government regulations became an instrument for protectionism in the established industry. In Yogyakarta, the so-called professionalization of guiding contributed to a decline in opportunities for unlicensed guides to enter the profession and to stricter control of the practices of licensed ones.

The first step towards more control on guiding was the establishment in 1983 of a national association, Himpunan Duta Wisata Indonesia, renamed as Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia (HPI) shortly after. This national organization was constituted by provincial sections that operated in those provinces which had a substantial number of guides (Dewan Pimpinan Daerah Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia 1991).

In the bylaws of the association the *pancasila* state ideology naturally formed the basic philosophy on which the organization was built. In both the etiquette and the ethical code as defined in the bylaws, the first responsibility of the guide was towards the state, the nation, and its culture. Adherence to the "Guide to the Realization and Application of *pancasila*", i.e., the "P4" program, was obligatory (Dewan Pimpinan Daerah Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 1991).

Pancasila as state ideology had been designed in pre-Independence days primarily by Sukarno as a foundation for what at present is known as the Old Order. *Pancasila* (literally "five pillars") consisted of the following ordered principles: monotheism or the belief in one supreme being, specified in the world religions (Islam, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, and Buddhism); a just and civilized humanitarianism; Indonesian nationhood and unity; unanimous consensus or democracy led by wise policies decided in a process of discussion and representation; and social welfare and social justice for all people of Indonesia. *Pancasila* aimed at establishing a compromise between the divergent social, cultural, and religious forces which raised their voices in the debates that preceded the proclamation of Indonesian Independence on August 17, 1945, and which still characterize the nation state more than fifty years later. The new country was designed as a "*pancasila* state", which implied belief in one supreme being, national unity, a humanitarian society, a consensus-based democracy, and prosperity for all Indonesian people culminating in the motto of "Unity In Diversity" (Dharmaputera 1988:150). The five pillars of *pancasila* had been given much attention in educational curricula and speeches delivered by government officials throughout the New Order regime. Scholars have debated the impact of this ideology on Indonesian people, but many have acknowledged its smoothing effect on the highly explosive religious, ethnic, and class relations in this extremely diverse country (Warren 1989).

The HPI Yogyakarta was established in 1983 immediately following the inauguration of the national guiding association. The provincial sections are subdivided into "language groups" (guides are organized according to the language in which they conduct their tours). In Yogyakarta, the largest group are the English guides followed by the Japanese and French guides, with the Japanese showing a rapid increase reflecting the shift towards the Asian market (Sub Dinas Diklat 1994). Usually the leader of the strongest group becomes chairman at new elections. According to the chairman of the Yogyaneese section, the provincial association was not initiated by the guides operating in the area, but by the tourism department of the provincial government, Diparda (*Dinas Pariwisata Daerah*). Diparda introduced the HPI as an instrument to effectuate the new licensing regulations and to enforce their observance. The guides in the area were reluctant to become members of the association from the start. In 1996 about 450 guides were registered as members in the Yogyakarta area, not because the association had proven beneficial to them, but because travel agencies required HPI-membership to employ them. If they wanted to acquire

and renew their licenses, guides had to be members, especially as the renewal of the guiding license was effectuated through the association, which shows that the government and the industry strongly promote it among the tourist guides.

In the mid-90s aspirant-members were required to pay an entrance fee of 25,000 *rupiah* (1000 *rupiah*=\$0.46 at the time of the research) to the HPI and, subsequently, a contribution of 5,000 *rupiah* per month (the equivalent to about two hours guiding on a free-lance basis). However, said the chairman, only about 20% of the members paid their contribution; the others usually promised to do so when their license was about to come up for renewal. When it came to the employment of guides, the HPI claimed to have little impact, as the association did not function as a labor union. Guides had to maintain a network of their own to find travel agents willing to employ them. In fact, guides depended more on the Association of Indonesian Travel Agents, the organization of their employers, than on their own interest group. It was the latter association which established a pricing system to fix the guides' honorarium to be paid by the travel agent for whom a guide conducted a tour. According to the official 1995 list, the maximum fee per hour was 5,000 *rupiah* (\$2.30 at the time of the research), but generally a free-lancer did not make more than about 3,500 *rupiah* per hour. Provided that a guide maintained good relations with local travel agencies, about 15,000 to 20,000 *rupiah* per day could be earned.

Another crucial step towards professionalization was a decree issued by the government tourism department, Depparpostel (*Departmen Pariwisata, Pos dan Telekomunikasi*) in 1988, stipulating the requirements and responsibilities of guides in Indonesia (Depparpostel 1988). In accordance with the guidelines, licensing procedures and courses were established by the Diparda in many provinces to upgrade the knowledge and morals of young people aspiring to a career in tourist guiding and prepare them for an examination that had to be passed to acquire a license. Basically, all Indonesian citizens with a minimum age of 18 with a permanent address and a secondary school diploma, able to speak *bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian national language) and at least one other foreign language fluently were eligible to enter the profession. Provided that a person met these basic requirements, he or she could apply for admittance to a course organized by the Diparda in the province where the person was registered as permanent resident. Upon passing the final examination, the person acquired a certificate that gave access to the license and the badge testifying professional status. These rules were enforced by the provincial Department of Justice and implemented by the tourist police, a branch of the local law enforcement entrusted with tourism-related issues.

The government makes a basic distinction between tourist guides and tour managers. The latter accompany roundtrips passing through a number of provinces according to government rules. They are representatives of an operator; their presence is required on all tours organized for foreign tourists. They supervise transportation, lodging, sightseeing tours, excursions, and other activities and coordinate aid

in case of accidents. As tour managers operate at a trans-provincial level, they fall under the authority of the *Depparpostel*. These provincial guides wear a red badge, the *cenderawasih*, the bird of paradise identifying the licensed guide. In the guides' jargon this badge is called a "wing". On the other hand, tourist guides conduct tours in a specific province. There are two basic categories operating at the regional level: provincial and local tourist guides. The former cover tours in the province for which they have been authorized by the Diparda. Generally they are "senior" guides (*pramuwisata madya*). They wear the yellow "wing". The latter operate at two levels. First, there is the general group authorized to guide tourists within the boundaries of a specific town or district (*kabupaten*). These are "junior" guides (*pramuwisata muda*) wearing the green "wing". Second, there are "special" tourist guides (*pramuwisata khusus*) operating at a specific place, for example, in the Kraton (sultan's palace) or at Prambanan temple. They usually wear an identification badge of the specific attraction. These different categories overlap, as some guides hold a number of licenses. Tour guides combine the round-trip coaching with guiding tourists in the province where they live; and many special guides also hold the general license.

This classification system corresponds to government-run courses preparing guides to pass the compulsory examinations. Although the Diparda is responsible for the content of the guiding courses for regional guides, the ministry in Jakarta (Depparpostel) issued a number of "guidelines" in 1989 and again in 1991 that have to be observed by the Diparda division for Education and Training (*DIKLAT, Pendidikan dan Latihan*). These guidelines are compulsory in the sense that the authorization of the guides depends on whether they have successfully passed the subjects as defined (Depparpostel 1988, 1989, 1991, 1991-92). There is one remarkable exception to the rule: the guides in the Kraton of Yogyakarta where royal autonomy reigns. Kraton guides are not under the control of any governmental authority except that of the sultan. They receive private training from Kraton instructors. All the other guides are subject to the government guidelines, which prescribe three different subject clusters. The first are "basic" subjects that focus on "good citizenship": that is, *pancasila*, the Indonesian language, HANKAMNAS (*Pertahanan dan Keamanan Nasional*, defense, and national security), national history, culture, and the arts. The subjects have to be taken by all levels, which means that a guide, who goes for the senior level after having succeeded at the junior level, has to go through these subjects all over again. The second cluster focuses on "main" subjects that vary with the level of education. For example, while the candidates for junior guides have to study the attractions at the district level, the candidates for senior guide have to expand their knowledge of these at the provincial level. The special guide has to learn the details about where he will be guiding, while the tour manager has to be informed about the major attractions of Indonesia. Third, there is a cluster of "supplementary knowledge", like traffic rules, hygiene, and sanitation, which again vary according to the level of guiding.

The guidelines are one thing; the way in which they are

implemented at the local and provincial levels is another. As Bras (2000a) reports from Lombok, the Diparda course lasted only 10 days, while Adams (1997) found in Sulawesi that crash courses in guiding were taught for one month. In Yogyakarta the course takes four months, said the head of the Diparda in 1996. However, a perusal of the course syllabus showed unequivocally that it took two months (July to September 1994). Nor was this course offered regularly (less than once in three years), access was restricted and subject to favoritism by government officials. Little effort was made by the government to provide more licensed guides in Yogyakarta. The last guiding course was organized in 1994. Its target group was junior guides who could try for the senior status. This implied several things. One, the 1994 course was an upgrading course for already licensed guides. As Diparda officials stated, 200 people applied for acceptance, 60 were admitted, of whom 50 received the certificate and a license. The 1994 course did not offer new opportunities to those young people with a high school and even university degree who looked for a job in professional guiding. Two, as no other course was planned until 1997 and it was still unclear whether it would be at the level of junior or rather special or again senior guide, the opportunities for becoming one at all were extremely scarce in Yogyakarta. Three, it may well be asked whether a two-month course could provide all the knowledge and training that the task of senior guides requires. A brief glance at the list of subjects taught within this period shows that the Yogyanese authorities attempted to put the minister's guidelines that were designed for a two semester course into these two months, plus piling in additional subjects focusing on matters typically Yogyanese (Sub Dinas Diklat 1994). There were 42 subjects taught by 42 different lecturers recruited from Gadjah Mada and other universities and academies, from provincial government departments, and tourism organizations like the aforementioned travel agent association, the HPI, and the hotel sector. While the program looked impressive, only a few hours were available to discuss the complex matters introduced in the lectures. Quite a large amount of time was spent on the *pancasila* subjects and field trips to the attractions in the area.

The ideal guide in terms of New Order regulations was educated in a government-run course, instructed in *pancasila* state ideology, operated only in the travel agent sector, held the required certificates and licenses, paid HPI membership, and renewed it in due time, attended HPI meetings and took upgrading courses, did not indulge in any jobs on the side, limited contacts with foreigners to a purely professional exchange and focused representation of Indonesia on the officially approved "facts". This reveals that the government-approved guide in Indonesia is the mentor-type rather than the interpreter. They themselves were instructed where and when to tell what and how to behave so as to be a worthy representative of the country and the nation. They were supposed to convey this image and information to the tourists without questioning it. By submerging them in a plethora of education, regulations, and licenses, the interpretative role of guides was minimized. Education in particular played a key role in their control. As was

the case with all educational and training programs in Indonesia, every offering required government approval, and to acquire this approval a number of compulsory subjects had to be taught, like state ideology, the national language, culture and history, defense and national security. Throughout a person's education, these were recurrent themes that took up the time that could otherwise have been spent on subjects relevant to the discipline or job a person was trained for.

Politics and Practice of Guiding

Almost all the guides investigated by the author tell the story of Yogyakarta from the *pancasila* perspective in one way or another, a story that they have basically learned by heart and repeat over and over again on every tour they conduct. However, the reproduction of the rehearsed narratives is never complete or devoid of deviation from the government guidelines. The question is to what extent the control-system that is to enforce *pancasila* tourism in Yogyakarta puts a stamp on the working routine of the guides. In the narratives there are more or less clumsy references to *pancasila* ideology, especially references that underline nationhood and unity, the first and most pivotal of the five principles. For example, guides who usually accompany excursions organized by local tour operators to attractions in the vicinity, start their narrative on the bus with a lengthy account of the political structure of Indonesia in general and the province of Yogyakarta in particular.

Yogya—we say Yogya, not Yogyakarta—is a small city, only 400,000 inhabitants, much smaller than Jakarta, big city which has three times more inhabitants. Yogya is situated in Java; Java is one of the 15,000 islands of the Republic Indonesia. These 15,000 islands are different but the same. They are united by one language, “bahasa Indonesia”. Every region has its own language. Indonesia has 27 provinces and many, many groups with their own language. And different religion. But all talk the same language, “bahasa Indonesia”, means Indonesia language. Indonesia language in fact many languages at the same time, with words from Malaysia, Java, Dutch and English

These “facts” are quoted from the *pancasila*-oriented course book on “facts and figures” of the Indonesian nation state, in complete disregard to the tourists' interests. After all, by the time that they arrive in Yogyakarta, they have passed through other places in Java where most probably they were also told the same. These general introductions to the “modern developed nation” were witnessed over and over again on the dozens of tours taken to the local attractions.

There are other ideology-related issues. Some of the reliefs of Borobudur depict scenes from everyday life in the ninth century. Many guides take these scenes as a starting point for dwelling on the ideal Indonesian family which according to government guidelines of mother, father, and two children. Family planning—promoting the nuclear family with two children—has been the widely advertised policy of the New Order. At the same time, pre-Javanese history is appropriated as an early extension of national culture as orchestrated by the

New Order. The issue of religion, of course, is a thorny one. The government guiding course instructs guides never to discuss religion or race. Needless to say this advice is difficult to live up to at temple complexes. These represent two of the five officially recognized religions (Hinduism at Prambanan and Buddhism at Borobudur)—and thus the first of the five “pillars” of *pancasila*. Some of the guides at Borobudur declare Buddha God which makes him fit in with the “one Lordship” of *pancasila* ideology. Buddhism has to be a religion and Buddhists have to believe in one god to be worthy Indonesian citizens. Other guides do have a problem with this and ask questions like: Is Buddhism a philosophy or a religion? If it is a religion, who is Buddha? What about Borobudur? A place of worship for the Buddhists from Indonesia and the rest of the world? Or a dead monument and theme park?

The elevation of the temple complexes to World Heritage sites by UNESCO in 1991 expands the cultural uniqueness to the level of a common civilized humanity, the second principle of *pancasila*. This theme is elaborated in lengthy explanations about the process of restoration of the temples with international support, a very important and time-consuming part of a guided tour at Borobudur. Without downplaying the role of UNESCO and the generous financial support of many countries (“Borobudur belongs to the world”), no doubt is left about the good stewardship of the Republic of Indonesia to which the world owes these sites. Cogently, the history of the restoration reveals the failure of the former colonial power to rebuild the temples, despite their alleged technical and scientific superiority. In all narratives the blunders in the process of restoration committed by well-reputed Dutch architects and archaeologists are dwelt on at length:

Historically, the temple was built around the end of the eighth century, and it took about three generations to finish it and around two million blocks of volcanic or lava stone, the stone we saw the statues were made of when we came here. ... For about 700 years it was buried, but not totally buried. The stupa on top of the hill was visible, at the time a broken stupa. It means that people here knew about the temple, but they didn't care. Only in 1813, Sir Raffles discovered the monument, and in 1835 the structure of the monument was nearly excavated by the Dutch. Now you can see the whole, but then the temple was broken... and mainly underground. In 1907 the Dutch engineer Van Erp supervised the restoration until 1911. Only a few years later the temple was ruined because the restoration did not make drainage system and also because of an earthquake. That's why in 1973 the Indonesian government in cooperation with UNESCO started the second restoration spending about \$25 million.

The temples are also acknowledged as *pusaka*, sacred heirlooms, which are believed to confer good fortune and strength on the Indonesian people (the welfare of the nation being the fifth of the five pillars). However, in this respect, a lot remains to be desired in the New Order. According to a guide:

And one statue of Buddha according to the legend is fortune or lucky Buddha. So for the people it is symbol of nirwana. If you believe it,

but it's a legend only. Because there are many European, American, Australian, especially followers of Buddhism, like the Chinese, Korean, Indian. They come always and try to make a wish But for you, you are lucky, you have long arm. For our people with the short arm, lucky Buddha is difficult to reach, lucky Buddha is only for people with long arm. This is why you European and American people are so lucky, you can touch the Buddha. Luck is not for people like us, Indonesian people.

That the "short arm" of Indonesian people can be regarded as a metaphor for the failing political system based on a rather shaky third pillar of *pancasila* (the alleged "unanimous consensus") remains implicit.

CONCLUSION

In the attraction system of Yogyakarta, guides do not act as pathfinders or pathbreakers. The "paths" are generally well developed roads leading to well-managed tourist objects which are serviced by professional guides. Their performance is staged and routinized, and their role as "mediator" of knowledge is quite limited. The authorities promote the mentor type of guide operating standardized and well-managed tours and reproducing well-rehearsed narratives. The art of storytelling is systematically curtailed. Acting as interpreter and communicator would make local guides extremely prone to outside intervention and manipulation. After all, decisions regarding the "true" story or the "most appropriate" interpretation are subject to relations of power and dependence. Direct control enforced by the tourist police and indirect control exerted through training and compulsory organization (under employers' associations and the HPI) have produced a striking uniformity in the way in which guides arrange their tours, select the objects of interest, and present them to tourists. The guides are always pressed for time, caught between their obligation to please their employers and the tourists, and subject to government regulations.

There seems to be plenty of leeway but the guides' dependence on Association of Indonesian Travel Agents' organized touroperators encourages uniformity and standardization of the narratives. The rather striking consensus about which objects to select, what details to elaborate on, and which jokes to tell is not solely enforced by the Diparda compulsory training course, but comes about in the job routine. The obligatory division of tasks guarantees local guides a protected position in the system. They hold the exclusive right to conduct the guiding in and provide the authorized narrative at specific spaces, but they are expected to do so in the spirit of state ideology. As has been shown, the five principles of *pancasila* are intertwined with their narratives, especially as far as the theme of "national unity" and "belief in one superior being" are concerned. Their presentation of the *couleur locale* has to materialize within the national context. However, there are significant limits to the extent that their narratives can be policed. The insinuations and jokes that often exhibit a hidden political message point to insecurities of the existing government-controlled dis-

courses. It seems that the stringent efforts by the New Order to enforce *pancasila* ideology onto the tourism presentations of Yogyakarta only partly pay off, for the creativity of guides stimulates them to sprinkle their narratives with subversive elements.

In Yogyakarta tourism spaces are organized around what MacCannell terms "staged authenticity" (1973). Formal guides, trained by the government in politically and ideologically correct narratives and demeanor, play a pivotal role in staging backstages. They verbally construct attractions and maintain the carefully established boundary between tourism space and local community. They act as buffers between tourists and the social environment. They reduce the opportunity for interaction between hosts and guests. As Holloway (1981) observes, on a tour the tourists' attention is directed inwardly towards the guide rather than outwardly towards the setting. The tourists view and interpret local sites through mediators' words and also made to experience the environment according how the guides construct and represent it. In New Order Indonesia they were not supposed to facilitate access to back regions at all. Instead they were instructed to control the front regions properly and direct tourists to staged backstages (Bras 2000b). After all, planning under the New Order was about concentrating tourists in certain areas or resorts made especially available to them and to demarcate their frivolous holiday behavior from the everyday life of Indonesian people "unaffected" by tourism.

Since the fall of former president Suharto, tourism in Indonesia has seen many changes. The decline of international arrivals due to ongoing political unrest has had an impact on the economy. In provincial areas, many travel agencies closed their doors, and flights to and, more importantly, within Indonesia have been reduced. Testifying to the industry being a politically sensitive domain, tourism has changed ministries several times in the cabinets of the post-Suharto era. In the present cabinet, the industry is the responsibility of the state minister for "tourism and the arts". One of the first acts of the democratically elected cabinet of President Wahid, was the abolishment of the compulsory *pancasila* modules in the curricula of all educational institutes in Indonesia. These recent changes raise a number of questions that a follow-up investigation of guiding under a less restrictive regime should focus on. To what extent have guides in the Yogyakarta area responded to the more liberal atmosphere and the lifting of restrictions? Has the obligatory reference to *pancasila* disappeared from their narratives and what has taken its place? More profoundly, what has happened to the guides now that the tourists stay away from Indonesia? What coping strategies have they developed? ■

REFERENCES

- Adams, K.
 1997 Touting Touristic "Primadonas": Tourism, Ethnicity, and National Integration in Sulawesi, Indonesia. *In* Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies, M. Picard and R. Wood, eds., pp. 155–180. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bowman, G.

- 1992 The Politics of Tour Guiding: Israeli and Palestinian Guides in Israel and the Occupied Territories. *In* *Tourism and the Less Developed Countries*, D. Harrison, ed., pp. 121–134. London: Belhaven.
- Bras, K.
 2000a Image-Building and Guiding on Lombok: The Social Construction of a Tourist Destination. Ph.D. dissertation. Department of Leisure Studies, Tilburg University.
 2000b Dusun Sade: Local Tourist Guides, the Provincial Government and the (re-)Presentation of a Traditional Village in Central Lombok. *In* *Local Perspectives on Global Tourism in Southeast Asia and the Pacific Region*, H. Dahles and T. van Meijl, eds., *Pacific Tourism Review* 4(4):forthcoming.
- Cohen, E.
 1985 The Tourist Guide: The Origins, Structure and Dynamics of a Role. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12:5–29.
- Crick, M.
 1992 Life in the Informal Sector: Street Guides in Kandy, Sri Lanka. *In* *Tourism and the Less Developed Countries*, D. Harrison, ed., pp. 135–147. London: Belhaven.
- Dahles, H.
 1998a Of Birds and Fish. Streetguides, Tourists and Sexual Encounters in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *In* *Sex Tourism and Prostitution*, M. Oppermann, ed., pp. 30–41. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
 1998b Tourism, Government Policy, and Petty Entrepreneurs in Indonesia. *South East Asia Research* 6(1):73–98.
 2001 *Tourism, Heritage and National Culture in Java. Dilemmas of a Local Community*. London: Curzon.
- Dahles H., and K. Bras eds.
 1999a *Tourism and Small Entrepreneurs. Development, National Policy and Entrepreneurial Culture. Indonesian Cases*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Dahles, H., and K. Bras
 1999b *Entrepreneurs in Romance. Tourism in Indonesia*. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26:267–293.
- Depparpostel
 1988 Departemen Pariwisata, Pos dan Telekomunikasi. Keputusan Menteri Pariwisata, Pos dan Telekomunikasi. Jakarta: Depparpostel.
 1989 Departemen Pariwisata, Pos dan Telekomunikasi. Direktorat Jenderal Pariwisata. Keputusan Direktur Jenderal Pariwisata. Nomor: KEP-17/U/IV/89 Tentang Pedoman Pembinaan Pramuwisata dan Pengatur Wisata.
- Depparpostel
 1991 Keputusan Menteri Pariwisata, Pos dan Telekomunikasi nomor: KM.105/PW.304/MPPT-91 Tentang Usaha Jasa Pramuwisata; and Surat Direktur Jenderal Pariwisata nomor: 51/D.2/XI/91 Perihal Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Usaha Jasa Pramuwisata. Usaha Jasa Pramuwisata (1991–1992).
 1991–92 Decree nr. KM.82/PW.102/MPPT-88. Usaha Jasa Pramuwisata, Direktorat Jenderal Pariwisata, Proyek Peningkatan Industri Pariwisata.
- Dewan Pimpinan Daerah Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia
 1991 Dewan Pimpinan Daerah Himpunan Pramuwisata Indonesia. Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta.
- Dharmaputera, E.
 1988 *Pancasila and the Search for Identity and Modernity in Indonesian Society. A Cultural and Ethical Analysis*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gurung, G., D. Simmons, and P. Devlin
 1996 The Evolving Role of Tourist Guides: The Nepali Experience. *In* *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples*, R. Butler and T. Hinch, eds., pp. 107–128. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Holloway, J.
 1981 The Guided Tour: A Sociological Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8:377–402.
- Hughes-Freeland, F.
 1993 *Packaging Dreams: Javanese Perceptions of Tourism and Performance*.

- In Tourism in South-East Asia*, M. Hitchcock, V. King and M. Parnwell, eds., pp. 138–154. London: Routledge.
- MacCannell, D.
1973 Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Sociological Review* 79:589–603.
- Mulder, N.
1994 Inside Indonesian Society. An Interpretation of Cultural Change in Java. Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol.
- Pond, K.
1993 *The Professional Guide: Dynamics of Tour Guiding*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Schmidt, C.
1979 The Guided Tour: Insulated Adventure. *Urban Life: A Journal of Ethnographic Research* 8:441–468.
- Sub Dinas Diklat
1994 Laporan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Pramuwisata Budaya/Umum. Propinsi DIY. Sub Dinas Diklat. Dinas Pariwisata Propinsi DIY. Buku 1 dan Buku 2.
- Timothy, D.
1998a Cooperative Tourism Planning in a Developing Destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 6(1):52–68.
1998b Incremental Tourism Planning in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Tourism Recreation Research* 23(2):72–74.
1999 Participatory Planning: A View of Tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26:371–391.
- Timothy, D., and G. Wall
1995 Tourist Accommodation in an Asian Historic City. *The Journal of Tourism Studies* 6:63–73.
1997 Selling To Tourists: Indonesian Street Vendors. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24:322–340.
- Tsuchia, K.
1984 Yogyakarta in a Time of Transition. *In “States” in Southeast Asia. From “Tradition” to “Modernity”*, K. Tsuchia, ed., pp. 209–210. Kyoto: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University.
- Urry, J.
1990 *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
1995 Tourism, Travel and the Modern Subject. *In Consuming Places*, pp. 141–151. London: Routledge.
- Wall, G.
1997 Linking Heritage and Tourism in an Asian City: The Case of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *In Quality Management in Urban Tourism*, P. Murphy, ed., pp. 137–148. Chichester: Wiley.
- Warren, C.
1989 Balinese Political Culture and the Rhetoric of National Development. *In Creating Indonesian Cultures*, P. Alexander, ed., pp. 39–54. Sydney: Oceania Publications.

Submitted 14 December 2000. Resubmitted 4 May 2001. Accepted 4 June 2001. Final Version 27 July 2001. Refereed anonymously. Coordinating Editor: Geoffrey Wall