SOCIAL CAPITAL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OF PENGLIPURAN BALI TOURISM VILLAGE

Christian Wiradendi Wolor[1]*, Ayatulloh Michael Musyaffi[1], Usep Suhud[1], and Ahmad Nurkhin[2]

[1] Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Corresponding author:
Christian Wiradendi Wolor
christianwiradendi@unj.ac.id

Citation:
Wolor, C. W., Musyaffi, A. M., Suhud, U., & Nurkhin, A. (2023). Social capital and community development of Penglipuran Bali Tourism Village. Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies, 23(2), 308–315.

Current social capital theory development is focused on community, although several studies have shown that relationships can hinder creativity and confine people within their networks. This research contributes to the current literature by offering a rigorous theoretical description and critique of social capital discourse. Furthermore, it provides a different perspective on social capital as a tool for analyzing community development. The research aimed to identify if there are close social ties in the Penglipuran village community that support a common goal and if the government and traditional elders involve village communities in a development context. The unit of analysis is the community of the tourism village of Penglipuran, Bali, which was included in the Top 100 World Sustainable Destinations. A qualitative approach with a case study was used for data collection and analysis, while information was obtained through observations and semi-structured interviews. The results found that the indigenous people of Penglipuran have substantial social capital in supporting the development of the community. The people hold regular formal meetings and are willing to help government and non-government groups with education, training, and village development grants. Therefore, this research impacts local government policies to maintain Penglipuran's social capital sustainability with community empowerment programs and human resource development.

Keywords: Social capital; community development; tourism village

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of social capital theory is focused on community. The level is dictated by its historical growth, which has established the community's pattern. Furthermore, the establishment of trust, mutual understanding, and reciprocal partnerships based on shared norms and values to achieve common goals are all factors contributing to the creation of social capital (Kay, 2006; Saegert & Winkel, 2004).

This concept describes how social relationships may assist individuals and communities in achieving their goals. This approach has become increasingly popular in policy circles, focusing on scientific debate across several social science disciplines. Moreover, it can be comprehended by scholars, policymakers, and practitioners from various disciplines (Kilpatrick et al., 2003).

Increasing social capital is very important for advancing society and the economic life of a region. It has a direct relationship with adult education in the context of community development, defined as a learning process to empower individuals and groups (McClenaghan, 2000).

Several factors can be criticized about social capital, as reported in the research conducted by DeFilippis, J. (2001), where the use of the concept in community economic development is misguided. Flora (1998) stated that social capital is necessary for growth but more consideration is needed. Furthermore, Flora (1998) added another form of social infrastructure and, by implication, strengthened social capital. McClenaghan (2000) argued that a high level of social capital does not necessarily guarantee the development of society.

Several researchers have shown how links stifle creativity and keep people trapped in their networks. This is considered a fresh perspective on social ties to improve people's perceptions of society. The growing emphasis on social capital has been hailed for integrating issues into economic development plans and ensuring the long-term viability of communities (Edwards & Onyx, 2007; Wakefield & Poland, 2005).

McClenaghan (2000) emphasized the connection between social capital and community development, stating that they are both abstract and represent homogeneous societal institutions. In addition, social capital and community are clarified in a limited fashion, further aggravating the logical problem with the narrow concept of development (Kilpatrick et al., 2003).

The benefits of socioeconomic growth have been demonstrated in a considerable body of work on social capital and community empowerment (Islam, 2014). However, the vital relationship between the two concepts has not been shown. It is only anticipated that increasing social capital can improve efforts to create a sustainable society (Bridger & Luloff, 2001). The potential competitive advantage of the community and the confidence in its capacity should be analyzed (Labonte, 1999).

This research contributes to the existing literature by providing a theoretical description and critique of the overly restricted discourse and addressing the empowerment of community development education to increase social capital. It provides a unique perspective on social capital as an analytical tool for community development. Furthermore, this research aims to learn more about the role of social capital in community development and empowerment.

To provide a clear picture of the role of social capital in community development of Penglipuran, Bali, observations and interviews were conducted by asking semi-structured questions without limiting the answers from participants. The research questions included the following:

    a. Are there close social ties in the Penglipuran village community that support a common goal?

    b. Are the government and traditional elders involving village communities in village community development?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Social capital

The concept of social capital refers to the life, conventions, and values allowing society to achieve common goals (Dolan, 2008; Kilpatrick et al., 2003; Perkins et al., 2002; Saegert & Winkel, 2004). The core premise is that well-connected people can better mobilize other resources to achieve their goals (Agnitsch et al., 2006). Meanwhile, social capital is only partially built through fully elected identities and unity. It is also shaped by domination, resistance, and experience (Wakefield & Poland, 2005).

Social capital trusts concern reciprocity, mutuality, shared behavioral norms, commitment, and a sense of belonging. The concept also entails formal and informal social networks and practical information pathways. Members of society can put these characteristics to good use to benefit individuals, groups, and communities. Meanwhile, the stronger the bond and the higher the social capital, the more organizations or individuals will trust and form relationships with others (Kay, 2006).

Social capital plays a significant role in economic growth across all sectors at the local level. There is no need for written agreements between communities because of trust and mutual understanding. The private sector employs residents and offers local services to the community. Additionally, communities, organizations, and businesses collaborate and integrate to foster overall growth and improve citizens' quality of life (Kay, 2006). Previous research explained that some areas are low in social capital, which can be seen from income inequality and low levels of trust. Social capital can alleviate poverty and bring people into economic market activities (Labonte, 1999).

In general, there are two dimensions of social capital:

    a. Individuals, groups, and organizations are bound together.

    b. Social capital is 'bridging,' allowing a group to reach out to, engage with, and network innovatively with others.

2.2 Community development

Individuals and social groups are involved in socioeconomic regeneration, development, and transformation to be empowered (McClenaghan, 2000; Servon, 1998). Individual empowerment is fostered in the direction of communal control and accountability for society's problems and requirements. The critical goals of community development include increased participation, empowerment, resource mobilization and integration, collective control and accountability, self-determination, access and equity, created relationships, community welfare, and social justice (Islam, 2014).

Additionally, community development can be carried out sustainably, emphasizing the balance of environmental concerns and development goals while increasing local social relations (Bridger & Luloff, 2001). The concrete form helps the community to mobilize resources, think critically, and build their organization by bringing trust and concern among community members (Labonte, 1999). Another type of schooling is anticipated to build social capital (Kilpatrick et al., 2003).

Community development should rely on more than current resources, mainly when it is homogeneous, marginalized, and disadvantaged and coexists with other distinct groups (Kilpatrick et al., 2003). Recognizing and altering the network of institutional links that generate and control a community's resources is vital to its success (Perkins et al., 2002). Good governance and enlargement of the public sphere to incorporate a lively and dynamic third sector are key hurdles to achieving sustainable development (Dale & Newman, 2010).

2.3 The role of social capital in community development

Bonding is a crucial initial step in creating and defining shared values and goals that influence the type and scope of social interventions such as community development (Kay, 2006; Kilpatrick et al., 2003). Social capital and empowerment are significant concepts in community development (Islam, 2014). This development relies heavily on social capital as a facilitator and consequence (Wakefield & Poland, 2005). The concept theoretically and philosophically connects community development with social capital (Agnitsch et al., 2006).

Social capital can guide community development by exploring different instances (Halstead et al., 2022), and harnessing the concept is critical for community development over time (Dale & Newman, 2010). Several researchers studying this concept assumed that participation in social groups generates engagement evenly, regardless of a community's resources or socioeconomic status (Wakefield & Poland, 2005). There is a growing belief in the public and nonprofit sectors that programs empower communities to increase the resources delivered to individuals. From this approach, community and individual growth are intertwined, and social capital serves as a glue that binds the two together (Wallis et al., 1998).

3. METHODOLOGY

This qualitative research was conducted to understand people and their actions (Idrus & Priyono, 2014). The research method is a case study in data collection and analysis, which explored information about a person, social setting, event, or group to understand the process and functions (Kurniadi, 2011).

Exploration helps to dig deeper into participants' thinking to understand the occurrence of the value creation process. Qualitative technique suits this context because it explores the meanings, individuals, or groups attached to a person or social problem (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

3.1 Research sample

The unit of analysis is the creative business factor in the Bali tourism village of Penglipuran (Figure 1), where a total of 10 participants were included in the study. Location determination was carried out purposively considering the survival of the creative business factors of Penglipuran in the World's Top 100 Sustainable Destinations. The Office of Research Ethics of Universitas Negeri Jakarta placed its stamp of approval on the ethical requirements on July 31, 2022. It is the division's responsibility to ensure that the consent form adequately describes the research objectives, promotes participants to participate voluntarily, and protects the confidentiality of their responses. Meanwhile, this research was carried out from June to September 2021.

Figure 1: Penglipuran Tourism Village

3.2 Data collection process

There were 10 participants (4 women and 6 men, aged between 35 and 57) who represented the indigenous people of Penglipuran, Bali. Interview guides, coding sheets, photos, notes, and videos were used in data collection. Photos and videos were taken with the participants' permission. Furthermore, data from the participants were monitored and analyzed.

3.3 Data analysis

This research used operational definitions to conceptualize and categorize data from participants. Operational purposes defined the units used to encode data. Meanwhile, the data obtained from interviews, videos, photos, and observations were analyzed for better understanding. Triangulation method was used to analyze research data to ensure validity (Creswell, 2007; Idrus & Priyono, 2014; Miles & Huberman, 2013; Sugiyono, 2013).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Penglipuran is labeled a tourism village due to its attractiveness in integrating culture, local wisdom, customs, accommodations, and existing facilities in the area (Figure 2). Despite its small scale, the data sources produce a broad and exciting range of results.

Figure 2: Penglipuran Village Environment

4.1 Role of social ties

The interviews showed that the Penglipuran traditional village community has a strong bond of solidarity, norms, and trust between fellow indigenous villagers. Shared values and standards accelerate the construction and growth of social capital. According to Kay (2006), individual social capital is substantial. It holds communities together and allows collective action to benefit the group. Two participants (P2, P3) stated that regular meetings are held to strengthen the sense of community and solve problems in the village. Community development benefits from the development of social capital resources, and creation can be a part of the community development process (Kilpatrick et al., 2003).

Figure 3: Garden of One of the House in the Village

The interviews with another participant (P4) showed solidarity of the Penglipuran community in advancing tourism by maintaining its good name as the cleanest village and for its handicraft entrepreneurship (Figure 3). Economic development related to social capital is in line with previous research, where social life allows fruitful collaboration in aspects of life. Consequently, social capital promotes economic growth (Lang & Hornburg, 1998).

Figure 4: Local Crafts

Economic growth was stimulated by arts (Figure 4), bamboo farming (Figure 5), renting traditional clothes, and guest houses for tourists (Figure 6). This is supported by previous literature, including how empowerment solidarity can be conducted transformatively. For example, a program promotes entrepreneurship while maintaining the existing culture (Mayer & Rankin, 2002). Micro-enterprise initiatives can be used as an economic development approach and to build social capital, according to Servon's research (Servon, 1998).

Figure 5: The Road to the Bamboo Forest

Another participant (P5) explained that the government and companies support Penglipuran to improve infrastructure, transportation access, and public awareness. Furthermore, governmental and non-governmental organizations that care about the environment (Gittell et al., 2000) have a strong relationship by improving the economy of rural communities (Warner, 2001). Communities can maximize the opportunities of the digitalization era, specifically in building social capital to improve themselves and the wider community (Matthews, 2016). Several previous researchers have explained that social capital provides considerable dialogue and collaboration in various disciplines (Kilpatrick et al., 2003).

Figure 6: Homestay

4.2 Efforts of government and traditional elders

A participant highlighted that the government and traditional elders involved the village its development, such as having formal meetings discussing development, religious activities (Figure 7), and the economy. Other participants (P7, P8) stated that the local government actively allocates funds to support village development. The bonding relationship between rural communities shows commitment among the community, which is helpful for relations, resources, and seizing various opportunities (Agnitsch et al., 2006). This is accomplished by beginning a series of self-organizing meetings and seminars to strengthen social capital links (Dale & Newman, 2010). Most successful initiatives in sustainable community development result from democratic engagement, which is impossible to achieve using a top-down approach. This underlines the notion that local communities' knowledge and efforts are critical for long-term development (Bridger & Luloff, 2001).

Figure 7: Temple

Participants further explained that the elders support companies to improve village development and education for rural communities through corporate social responsibility. As indicated by the expansion of education and training initiatives to rebuild or enhance social capital, education and training have seeped into community development methods (Kilpatrick et al., 2003; McClenaghan, 2000). Other participants (P9, P10) added that elders supported the community to innovate as a result of the economic slowdown due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This is conducted by selling artworks online and supporting bamboo farming activities where the yields are being sold online. Acceptance of diversity demonstrates an openness to new ideas and a readiness to change, which are necessary for community development (Kilpatrick et al., 2003). Developing locally based production and distribution systems helps the environment and boosts social capital (Edwards & Onyx, 2007). Sustainable development relies heavily on new collaborative methods and social innovation (Ling & Dale, 2014).

The potential competitive advantage of a community that has not been fully developed should be analyzed (Labonte, 1999). Finally, as it puts the concept of sustainability into context, sustainable community development can be the most effective way to demonstrate the possibility for long-term progress on a larger scale (Bridger & Luloff, 2001).

5. CONCLUSION

Social capital is an exciting concept in many disputes and has become a focal point for community development efforts. The idea has sparked scientific debate and empirical investigation in various disciplines and domains of community development. Therefore, this research analyzed the relationship between social capital and community development. The results indicate that the indigenous people of the Penglipuran tourism village have substantial social capital in supporting the development of rural communities. This research impacts local government policies to maintain the sustainability of Penglipuran's social capital with community empowerment programs and human resource development.

This qualitative research has limitation since it only focused on Penglipuran village with a small number of participants. Therefore, future research is expected to be carried out in several tourism villages with a quantitative approach for additional knowledge.

REFERENCES

Agnitsch, K., Flora, J., & Ryan, V. (2006). Bonding and bridging social capital: The interactive effects on community action. *Community Development, 37*(1), 36–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/155753306094 90153

Bridger, J. C., & Luloff, A. E. (2001). Building the sustainable community: Is social capital the answer? *Sociological Inquiry, 71*(4), 458–472. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2001.tb01127.x

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design, choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dale, A., & Newman, L. (2010). Social capital: A Necessary and sufficient condition for sustainable community development? *Community Development Journal, 45*(1), 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn028

DeFilippis, J. (2001). The myth of social capital in community development. *Housing Policy Debate, 12*(4), 781–806. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2001.9521429

Dolan, P. (2008). Social support, social justice, and social capital: A Tentative theoretical triad for community development. *Community Development, 39*(1), 112–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330809489745

Edwards, M., & Onyx, J. (2007). Social capital and sustainability in a community under threat. *Local Environment, 12*(1), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830601098206

Flora, J. L. (1998). Social capital and communities of place. *Rural Sociology, 63*(4), 481–506. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.1998.tb00689.x

Gittell, M., Ortega-Bustamante, I., & Steffy, T. (2000). Social capital and social change: Women's community activism. *Urban Affairs Review, 36*(2), 123–147. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243993.n12

Halstead, J. M., Deller, S. C., & Leyden, K. M. (2022). Social capital and community development: Where do we go from here? *Community Development*, *53*(1), 92–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2021.1943696

Idrus, M., & Priyono. (2014). *Penelitian kualitatif di manajemen & bisnis* [Qualitative Research in Management & Business]. Zifatama.

Islam, M. R. (2014). Non-governmental organizations' role for social capital and community empowerment in community development: Experience from Bangladesh. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review, 8*(3), 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1111/aswp.12039

Kay, A. (2006). Social capital, the social economy and community development. *Community Development Journal, 41*(2), 160–173. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsi045

Kilpatrick, S., Field, J., & Falk, I. (2003). Social capital: An analytical tool for exploring lifelong learning and community development. *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(3), 417–433. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920301859

Kurniadi, B. D. (2011). *Praktek penelitian kualitatif: Pengalaman dari UGM* [Qualitative Research Practices: Experience from UGM]. Research Centre for Politics and Government.

Labonte, R. (1999). Social capital and community development: Practitioner emptor. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 23(*4), 430–433. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467842X.1999.tb01289.x

Lang, R. E., & Hornburg, S. P. (1998). What is social capital and why is it important to public policy? *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.1998.9521284

Ling, C., & Dale, A. (2014). Agency and social capital: Characteristics and dynamics. *Community Development Journal, 49*(1), 4–20. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bss069

Matthews, P. (2016). Social media, community development and social capital. *Community Development Journal, 51*(3), 419–435. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsv040

Mayer, M., & Rankin, K. N. (2002). Social capital and (community) development: A north/south perspective. *Antipode, 34*(4), 804–808. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00273

McClenaghan, P. (2000). Social capital: Exploring the theoretical foundations of community development education. *British Educational Research Journal, 26*(5), 565-582. https://doi.org/10.1080/713651581

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2013). Qualitative data analysis: A Methods Sourcebook (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Perkins, D. D., Hughey, J., & Speer, P. W. (2002). Community psychology perspectives on social capital theory and community development practice. *Journal of the Community Development Society, 33*(1), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330209490141

Saegert, S., & Winkel, G. (2004). Crime, social capital, and community participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 34*(3–4), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-004-7416-2

Servon, L. J. (1998). Credit and social capital: The community development potential of U.S. microenterprise programs. *Housing Policy Debate, 9*(1), 115–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.1998.9521288

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D* [Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative, and R & D]. ALFABETA.

Wakefield, S. E. L., & Poland, B. (2005). Family, friend or foe? Critical reflections on the relevance and role of social capital in health promotion and community development. *Social Science & Medicine, 60*(12), 2819–2832. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2004.11.012

Wallis, A., Crocker, J. P., & Schechter, B. (1998). Social capital and community building: Part one. *National Civic Review, 87*(3), 253–271.

Warner, M. (2001). Building social capital: The role of local government. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 30*(2), 187–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-5357(00)00105-0