

ISSN: 0038-111X

**SOLID
STATE
TECHNOLOGY**

Blind Peer Review
Referred Journal

Value People First: How Governor Papua Responses to the COVID-19 Pandemic?

Nuphanudin, Muhammad Zainal Rifie, Dudung Abdurachman, Ayu Alnadira Akib, Rahayu Irjayanti

1379 - 1389



Employment Status Transformation of Online Transportation Workers at the City of Palembang in the Demographic Bonus Era

Wahyu Saputra, Sri Rum Giyarsih, Agus Joko Pitoyo

1390 - 1402



Local Community Involvement in the Tourism Development of Borobudur Temple

Ely Triasih Rahayu, Hartati, Anggita Stovia, Bagus Reza Hariyadi, Roch Widjatini

1403 - 1418



Diversity of Woody Plant Species in the West Papua Momiwaren Protection Forest

Rima H. S Siburian, Rusdi Angrianto

1419 - 1430



Health Behavior of Stroke Patients: A qualitative study of the Bugis ethnic in South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia

Kasman, Amran Razak, Alimin Maidin, Darmawansyah, Toto Sudargo, Muh. Asdar, Burhanuddin Bahar, Hasnawati Amqam

1431 - 1439



Solid State Technology

[Home](#) [Current](#) [Aims and Scope](#) [For Authors](#) [Archives](#) [Ethics & Policies](#) [About](#)

[Home](#) / [Archives](#) / [Vol. 63 No. 1 \(2020\)](#) / [Articles](#)

Local Community Involvement in the Tourism Development of Borobudur Temple

Ely Triasih Rahayu, Hartati, Anggita Stovia, Bagus Reza Hariyadi, Roch Widjatini

 PDF

Issue
[Vol. 63 No. 1 \(2020\)](#)

Local Community Involvement in the Tourism Development of Borobudur Temple

Ely Triasih Rahayu¹, Hartati², Anggita Stovia³, Bagus Reza Hariyadi⁴,
Roch Widjatini⁵
^{1,2,3,4,5}Humanities Faculty of Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto,
Indonesia

Abstract:

Local community participation in Borobudur Village of Magelang Regency in the development of tourist attraction Borobudur Temple is a process in which the community serves to be the stakeholder in planning, implementation, sharing benefit, and evaluation of tourism development. From the data of 100 respondents, the community's mean planning and evaluation participations rate in the tourism development is still low with a percentage of 33.45%. Only the sharing benefit participation in Borobudur tourism development is classified into good category with a percentage of 61%. Local community's low mastery of foreign language proves that they are not ready yet to welcome and serve foreign tourists professionally. Some of local people complain about local government's lack of concern about their hardship in earning a living without government's fund aid and trade permit, not to mention private sector competitors from other areas. From human resource perspective, many local people are only high school graduates, so that they still lack of concept and foreign language mastery. Such exiting condition shows that local community still needs tourism and entrepreneurial training programs as well as local government's support to determine their tourism development strategy as an effort for the people around Borobudur temple to prosper.

Keywords: Borobudur, Magelang, Community Involvement, Local Business.

1. INTRODUCTION

Borobudur Temple has been a tourist destination for a long time. The management of Borobudur Temple as tourism industry has started since July 15, 1980, marked with the establishment of PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur, Prambanan, dan Ratu Boko. During Joko Widodo regime, Borobudur Temple is designated as one of ten priority tourist destinations in Indonesia. Many researches have discussed Borobudur Temple, including those bringing the theme of participation of local community around Borobudur Temple as tourism industry players. Some researches relevant to the topic of this research will be discussed in this sub-chapter.

Wiratmoko (2012) discusses the role of local community around Borobudur Temple in tourism in a research entitled "*Pengaruh Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur Terhadap Kondisi Kehidupan Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat Kabupaten Magelang Tahun 1980 - 1997.*" The research results show that Borobudur Temple as a tourist destination renders positive impacts to surrounding society, particularly from the perspective of economy. In 1980, most of the people around Borobudur Temple work as farmers to earn a living. In addition, local community also works

as livestock farmers by raising livestock in cages. Many of the people around Borobudur Temple have been working as hawkers around the tourist attraction, but their income is still deemed low compared to the income from agriculture and animal husbandry. Along with time, the tourist visits rate in Borobudur Temple increases. This encourages surrounding society to open business around the tourist attraction, such as: souvenir, food and drink, and other services. Some people manufacture souvenirs in the form of handicrafts, Borobudur Temple replica, batik, etc. However, the merchants around Borobudur Temple state that their turnover is currently declining because of the increasing number of hawkers, which makes competition gets stricter.

Nurhidayah (2017) in her research entitled “*Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Kegiatan Pariwisata di Desa Candirejo Kecamatan Borobudur, Kabupaten Magelang*” states that the community participation in tourism activities around Borobudur Temple, particularly in Candirejo Village, is still classified as medium participation. This means that the people participate in the development of tourism there, but still not optimal. After designation as a Tourism Village in 2003 by Minister of Culture and Tourism, I Gede Ardika, the surrounding society has shown their active participation in planning, implementation to evaluation phases.

That Borobudur Temple is designated as one of the priority tourist destinations in Indonesia encourages the formation of Village Economy Agencies (Balkondes) around Borobudur Temple. Balkondes is a program of the Ministry of State Owned Enterprises formed aiming at growing village community’s economy, particularly in Borobudur Subdistrict. Until 2019, there are 20 Balkondes established by the Ministry of State Owned Enterprises in cooperation with 19 State Owned Enterprises in Indonesia. The research conducted by Hidayah and Agustinah (2019) discusses “*Balkondes Candirejo Magelang Sebagai Bentuk Pengembangan Desa Wisata yang Berkelanjutan*”. The research results state that Balkondes is able to attract foreign tourists (domestic and overseas) to come. The high rate of tourist visits renders positive impacts to the improvement of the people’s income in Candirejo Village, Magelang Regency. The community participation after Balkondes is established includes: local guide, Balkondes management, catering, local art, horse-drawn tour carriage, bicycle rental, food and drink home industry, handicrafts home industry, batik, homestay, etc.

Pursuant to President Joko Widodo’s Order through *Surat Sekretariat Kabinet Nomor B 652/ Seskab/ Maritim/ 2015 tanggal 6 November 2015 perihal Arahan Presiden pada Sidang Kabinet Awal Tahun pada 4 Januari 2016*, it stipulates to designate 10 destinations as the 10 Priority Tourist Destinations. Borobudur Temple is chosen as one of the priority destinations on the reason that this destination is designated as a World Heritage Site by the UNESCO. When a tourist destination is acknowledged by the world, its management and development should be of world class (Andriyani, 2019). Below are some reasons the UNESCO designates Borobudur Temple as a World Heritage Site:

- a. Borobudur Temple complex is pyramid shaped without roof, consisting of 10 terraces to the top. This temple is a combined building of stupa and mount, an architectural masterpiece and Buddhist monumental art.
- b. Borobudur Temple complex is an extraordinary sample of Indonesian architecture and art since early 8th century and end of 9th century. This work

greatly influences the revival of Indonesian architecture in early 13th century to 16th century.

- c. Borobudur Temple complex has lotus shape, a flower sanctified in Buddhist tradition.

The fact that Borobudur Temple is a destination widely known by both domestic and foreign tourists makes it important to conduct a research on the tourism management of this tourist attraction. The community around Borobudur Temple, that is one supporting factor of the success of tourism management, should certainly be much involved and given with important role. Community involvement in case of profit sharing should be studied thoroughly, considering that many people who works as hawkers complain about declining turnover because of too many merchants, thus their chance of having consumers gets lower.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Community Participation

The concept of participation, which is one concept of community development, starts to be applied publicly and widely (Ife, 2008:295). The definition of this concept of participation is a centralized concept and the fundamental principle of community development itself since, among many things, participation is closely related to the idea of Human Rights (Ife, 2008:295). In detail, with regard to tourism, Drake (1991:132) explains that local community participation (local participation) is local community's competence in influencing appropriate outcome of development to the community's condition, for example, ecotourism for area which needs responsible and preserving tourism management.

To put it simply, the concept of participation is also related to a party's involvement in other party's activity. According to Tikson (2001), participation is a process of community's position as a stakeholder to get involved in, influence and control the development of their respective area. Community plays an active role in undertaking their life, through a process of decision making and resource acquisition and utilization. Therefore, government and private sector's involvement is limited only to facilitate, educate and motivate the community as the main player of tourism development to understand more of any natural and cultural potentials and determine the prospect of their village's tourism product.

Phases And Forms Of Participation

Drake (1991:133) states that local community may participate in tourism development program in planning, implementing and sharing benefit phases as written in the book "Nature Tourism-Managing for the Environment". Meanwhile, according to Timothy (1999:372), community participation in tourism consists of two perspectives: local participation in decision making and local participation related to benefit received by the community from tourism development. According to Kartasubrata (1986), drive and stimulation to participate include opportunity, willingness, capability and guide factors. Participation may be divided into two types:

- a. Participation in policy, planning and evaluation.
- b. Participation in implementation.

Community participation may be divided into some phases. Cohen and Uphoff (1977) classify participation into four phases:

- a. Participation in decision making.
Participation in which community is instructed to express their opinion or aspiration in assessment of a planned activity. Community is also given opportunity to consider a decision to be made.
- b. Participation in implementation.
Participation by which community participate in operational activity based on mutually agreed plan.
- c. Participation sharing benefit.
Community participation in using and sharing the benefits of development, both distribution of welfare and facilities in the community.
- d. Participation in evaluation and monitoring.
Participation in evaluation. Community participation in assessing and supervising the development and maintaining the output of development. Sánchez (2009) states that “the aim of this stage (monitoring and evaluation) is to assess the performance of the project as well as to identify mistakes in the implementation phase”.

According to Damanik and Weber (2006:108-109), the indicator of community participation in sharing benefit phase is their involvement in managing tourism businesses. Community participation in planning phase may be taken as the indicator of involvement frequency in planning meetings, opportunity to present ideas and expectation of development plan. In monitoring or evaluation, the following parameter may be employed: participation in monitoring or authority in monitoring. Meanwhile, according to Ericson in Slamet (1993:89), the phases of community participation in development include:

- a. Participation in planning phase, including: Presence rate in meeting, Activeness in making suggestion, and Involvement in decision making.
- b. Participation in implementation phase. Participation is detailed into manpower, money and material or any other forms.
- c. Participation in infrastructure supervision phase. In this phase, the effectiveness and efficiency of whole implementation of infrastructure development and appropriateness of infrastructure development in the field with designated plan may be observed.

Factors to Affect Community Participation

According to Slamet (1993:97,137-143), the factors which affect community participation are:

- a. Sex
Men and women make different participations in development, since the social stratification system formed in the community which differentiates this position and level will cause differences in rights and obligations between men and women. According to Soedarno et al. (1992), in this sex

based stratification system, men have preferential right over women. Therefore, men tend to participate more.

b. Age

There is difference in position and level based on seniority in the community, which will bring up old group and young group, which differ in certain matters, for example, in expressing opinion and in decision making, Soedarno et al. (1992). Age affects individual's participatory activeness (Slamet, 993:142). In this case, the old group, that is deemed more experience or senior, will give more opinions in decision making.

c. Educational Level

Litwin (1986) in Yulianti (2000:34) states that one of participant's characteristics in participative development is community's knowledge level of participative undertakings made by the community in development. One of the factors to affect knowledge level is educational level. The higher the educational background, a person will certainly have more extensive experience of development and know participatory form and procedure of participation to make. Education is deemed important since with it, individual will communicate with outsider more easily and be more responsive to innovation.

d. Income Level

According to Barros (1993) in Yulianti (2000:34), richer people mostly pay spending in cash and infrequently perform physical work personally. Meanwhile, people with mediocre income tend to participate with their manpower. The level of income gives the community opportunity to participate. This income level affects community's financial capability in investment.

e. Livelihood

This is related to individual's income level. Therefore, we may state that livelihood may affect community participation in a development. The reason is that employment affect individual's leisure time to get involved in development, for example, attending meeting, civic service, etc.

Definition Of Community Based Tourism

Community based Tourism, according to Häusler and Strasdas (2002:1), has some definitions:

- a. CBT is a form of tourism which give local community opportunity to control and get involved in tourism management and development;
- b. Community that is not involved in tourism businesses also gain benefit; and
- c. It requires political empowerment, democratization and distribution of benefit to disadvantaged community in countryside.

The community involvement is very salient, from economic, social, political, cultural to environmental aspects. In addition, the tourism management by the community also marks the application of this concept of CBT.

Community Based Tourism Development

In relation to the concept to develop an area to a tourist attraction, Damanik and Kusworo (2005:108) claim that the perspective of tourism development should change by reconstructing the concept of conventional tourism development to the

concept of community-based tourism development. They assume that this method is one consideration which should be applied related to the role of tourism in eradication of poverty.

Their notion conforms to the participatory and sustainable national tourism development pattern under *Surat Keputusan Menteri Negara Pariwisata dan Kesenian No.S-29/MNPK/1999 tentang Program Pariwisata Inti Rakyat (PIR) dan Program Desa Wisata*. Participatory tourism development pattern is a pattern which requires community involvement in tourism development activity or commonly known as community-based tourism. Meanwhile, sustainable tourism development is an environmental pattern which adapts to environmental carrying capacity, grows and preserves the nature and is supported with development zoning and mapping expressly contained in Master Tourism Development Plan (RIPP).

Community-based tourism development is also one of the traditions of tourism planning as expressed by Getz (1986) in Cooper and Hall (2008:200). One of the traditions is a community-oriented approach. The five tourism planning traditions are:

- a. boosterism;
- b. an industry oriented approach;
- c. a physical/spatial approach;
- d. a community-oriented approach;
- e. a sustainable tourism approach.

Long before community approach is recognized, Murphy (1985) in his book *Tourism: A Community Approach* has presented a relatively influential statement in community as an tourism development approach. Cooper and Hall (2008:200) state that Murphy gives the term of ecologic approach for tourism planning that emphasizes the need for local control over the development process).

However, regardless of the prospect of sustainability and benefit of this concept of CBT, one thing to be aware of is that one weakness of community-based tourism is the concept's vulnerability creates conflict among the community. According to Häusler and Strasdas (2002) in *Training Manual for Community-based Tourism*, conflict which commonly takes place is conflict with neighboring village/sub-village or even between members (local conflict exacerbated, especially with neighboring village who do not benefit from CBT in the same region and conflict among members of the community regarding income distribution). Therefore, any efforts to avoid any existing or potential conflict should be settled immediately.

Community Participation in Community-Based Tourism Development

Local community involvement as the main key of community-based tourism development principle may, according to Drake (1991), be implemented in three phases: planning, implementation and sharing benefit.

- a. Planning phase
This phase positions the community as the subject of development that plays an active role in planning process. Conducted by positioning the community as the subject, this planning process includes identifying

problems, formulating alternatives, planning activities, and allocating existing resources (for example, potentials and facilities).

b. Implementation phase

Implementation phase is mainly related to community participation in performance of development program and in the management.

c. Sharing benefit aspect

In this aspect, community participation is realized in their role and position to obtain significant benefit value, either economically, politically, socially or culturally, either individually or in group/collectively.

3. METHOD

In a humanity social research, the first thing to do before study is to determine the research's paradigm. Research paradigm may be taken as the base for a researcher to understand the phenomena of object to be studied, thus it will affect the cognitive thinking process, affective behavior and conative behavior. The paradigm of this research arises from observing the existing condition of Borobudur village people.

Based on the paradigm and phenomena above, the most appropriate approach for this research is using a mixed method, that is, a qualitative research which aims at examining the form and measuring the local community participation level in the development of Borobudur village. A qualitative research confirms the theory and reality found in the field based on scientific data in the form of figures or numbers. The measurement of community participation level may become more accurate when supported with the quantitative data. Meanwhile, qualitative research aiming at obtaining the meaning understanding upon the concrete data is considered as one effort to deeply reveal the existing phenomena in more details. The research conducted with a mix method is intended to mutually complete the research result descriptions related to the phenomena under study and to strengthen the research analysis.

In addition, qualitative approach which is descriptively conducted aims at understanding and explaining any hidden or little-known cultural phenomena (Blaxter et al, 2006; Moleoang, 1989; Strauss & Corbin, 2003; Santosa, 2017).

The researcher works based on the data observed, followed by classifying the data into categories, displaying each category in matrix form to find any inter-category relationship and interpreting the pattern, theory, supporting data and context in a complex and simultaneous manner to find its cultural theme (Spradely, 1980; Santosa, 2017).

Providing data is an effort to provide adequate data as specific lingual phenomena directly related to the concerned issue, of which substance has valid and reliable quality for the purpose of analysis (Sudaryanto, 2015:6).

This research employs primary and secondary data. The primary data are related to local community involvement directly collected by the research from the research location (Blaxter et al, 2006; Santosa, 2014:51). The secondary data are collected

from official website and documents related to tourism management, particularly in Magelang.

The data collected from the informants are collected using questionnaires distributed to 100 respondents and in-depth interviewing which is conducted freely and openly. The interview time and place are taken flexibly following the informants who are taken as ones who understand the issues to be enquired. This interview cannot be conducted in a structured manner, but it focuses on the issues studied.

The data generated from interview will be used as knowledge of lingual service from the perception of local community involvement and tourism development strategy. To collect observational data of event and place, the author employs field work, photo shooting, and audio or video recording techniques. The recording output is taken as supporting material for analysis of data collected from interview (Spreadley, 1980).

The data collected in this research are also derived from relevant documentations and archives. The archives or documents are obtained from documenting videos showing interaction between tour guide and tourist. For more accurate and complete information data, the author conducts a literary study on tourism development strategy with tourism service offices.

The data collection technique is only an instrument. It is the author who determines the quality of data. The author as the research's main instrument may take a role as the research's instrument to reveal the meaning of various interactions (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Borobudur village is one of twenty villages in Borobudur district, Magelang Regency. Based on the demographic data gained from official site of Borobudur village (*desaborobudur.magelangkab.go.id*) in 2018, the number of Borobudur citizens are 9.150 with the sex composition as follows: 4.597 (50,24%) male and 4.553 (49,76) female. Viewed from the age level, most of Borobudur citizens are old aged (5.193 persons = 56,71%), adult 1.776 persons (19,41%), and the rest are children 1.699 (18,57%), under five year old 482 (5,27%).

Based on BPS Provinsi Jawa Tengah 2018, most of Magelang citizens work in farming, forestry, and fishery (206.769 persons), processing industry (140.354 persons), and trade (116.325). Unfortunately, Sayangnya most of potential workforce aged from 15 years old and above are dominated by graduates of Elementary School. (346.364 person, Secondary school (130.451 persons), and only 42.976 persons are university graduates,

Administratively, Borobudur temple is situated in Borobudur village, district of Borobudur, Magelang Regency. Before 1980, the area around Borobudur was an area which is densely populated and housing, shops and hotels which are not in good order. This condition indirectly decreased the greatness of and beauty of Borobudur in the effort of maintaining the sustainability of the building and its

environment the government established an institution namely PT Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur. This institution was established under a cultural awareness of maintaining securing and retaining historical and cultural heritage. Besides, it becomes a source of national pride, such as putting it as an admirable and lovable site.

PT Taman Wisata Candi (TWC) Borobudur was established on 15 July 1980. The mission is supporting the maintenance of cultural heritage and tourism business, and its vision is growing a company that has a high competence and professionalism with a support of qualified workforce to make Borobudur temple and park an international level tourism resort and education and knowledge center. To carry out the mission, supporting facilities were developed such as museum of archeology, offices, restaurants, parks, souvenirs centers, information centers, research centers, conservation centers, parking lots, etc. The area of Borobudur temple tourist resort is around 87 hectare.

Borobudur temple is famous as international level tourist resort, so many tourists domestic as well as foreign visit Borobudur to enjoy holiday and to have a study tour programs. Because of the high number of the tourists coming to the site, the administrator of TWC did an effort to create a more comfortable and attractive environment of Borobudur temple. Moreover, they provided facilities in order to bring the visitors to a higher level of satisfaction.

Borobudur temple tourist resort open opportunities for the people around to open business such as opening food stalls, shops, and souvenirs shops. This means that Borobudur tourists resort helps people around to improve their income and prosperity. The merchants occupy all parts in the area of Borobudur. The communication happens between the merchants and the tourists also changes the behavior of the merchants especially the social economics behavior. The existence of Borobudur temple tourist resort also creates social interactions among the merchants.

The respondents of the research are the people living and working around Borobudur temple resort. The number of the respondents are 100 consists of various professions. The following is the distribution of the characteristics of the respondents:

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondents at Borobudur Village

Characteristics of the respondents	Category	Numbers
Age	Young (<20)	11
	Adult (21-40)	50
	Old (>41)	39
	Total	100
Sex	Male	63
	Female	37
	Total	100
Education	Elementary (SD)	5
	Secondary (SMP-SMA)	65
	University	30

	Total	100
Professions	Company staff	28
	Entrepreneur	26
	Tour guide	17
	Parking staff	3
	Civil servant	14
	Merchant	5
	Students	3
	Jobless	4
	Total	100
Income	Low (< 1 million rupiahs)	21
	Medium (1-2 million rupiahs))	43
	High (>2 million rupiahs)	36
	Total	100

Source: field data (2019)

From age perspective, most of the respondents, who are people who live and work around the tourist attraction Borobudur, are classified into medium category (21-40 years old), and the remaining are of high category (>41 years old) and low category (<20 years). Based on sex found in the research field, the respondents consist of 63 male respondents (63%) and 37 female respondents (37%).

Most of respondents have medium education (Junior-Senior High School) of 65 people, followed with those with high education (Higher Education) of 50 people and low education (Elementary School) of 5 people. Most of respondents work as employees around Borobudur Temple area with a total number of 28 people, the second highest number of profession is business actors with a total number of 26 people, and the third highest number of profession is Tour Guide with a total number of 17 people. Based on the income rate, the first position is those with medium income (1-2 million rupiahs) with a total number of 43 people, followed by those with high income (>2 million rupiahs) of 36 people, and the remaining is with low income (<1 million rupiahs) with a total number of 21 people.

The income rate of people around Borobudur is mostly influenced by the tourism activities due to the tourists' visits. This tourism activity positively influences the people's financial capability to make investment, such as opening food stall, kiosk, money changer, homestay, tour guide service, and other business which may improve their welfare.

Community participation around Borobudur Temple area is divided into planning, implementation, sharing benefit and evaluation. Below are the levels of participation:

Tabel 2 The average level of Borobudur Village Community Participation

Form of Participation	Indicator	Total	Percentage %
Planning participation	attend meeting for planning of development activity of tourist attraction Borobudur	33	33%
	give ideas during meeting for planning of development activity of tourist attraction Borobudur	19	19%
	participate in decision making in meeting for planning of development activity of tourist attraction Borobudur	4	4%
	Average	18.6	18.6%
Implementation participation	participate in administrative duties of the development of tourist attraction Borobudur	12	12%
	participate in various tourism activities in tourist attraction Borobudur	26	26%
	participate in disseminating information of tourist attraction Borobudur	78	78%
	Average	38.6	38.6%
Sharing benefit participation	acquire new knowledge by participating in development activity of tourist attraction Borobudur	50	50%
	acquire new skill by participating in development activity of tourist attraction Borobudur	43	43%
	positive impact with the existence of tourist attraction Borobudur	90	90%
	Average	61	61%
Evaluation participation	participate in evaluation meeting of the development of tourist attraction Borobudur	16	16%
	participate in assessing/evaluating the implementation of development of tourist attraction Borobudur	13	13%
	participate in giving ideas/suggestion of success and issues of the development of tourist attraction Borobudur	18	18%
	Average	15.6	15.6%
Percentage of total average participation (planning-implementation-sharing benefit-evaluation)			33.45%

Source: field processed data (2019)

Below is interval of classification category of participation phase according to Arikunto (2010):

Tabel 3. Classification Category of Participation

INTERVAL	CATEGORY
0-20%	Very Low
21-40%	Low
41-60%	Medium
61-80%	Good
81-100%	Very Good
FORM OF PARTICIPATION	CATEGORY
Planning (18.6%)	Low
Implementation (38.6%)	Low
Sharing Benefit (61%)	Good
Evaluation and Monitoring (15.6 %)	Low
AVERAGE PARTICIPATION LEVEL (33.45 %)	LOW

Source: Arikunto(2010) and field processed data (2019)

Based on the data above, the total average of participation level of the people around the tourist attraction Borobudur Temple is generally classified into low (33.45%). This condition needs a serious attention considering that people's awareness and care for development of tourism attraction, amenity and accessibility in Borobudur village is still far from the word active.

The score of people's participation phase in sharing benefit is classified into Good category (61%). This score is reasonable considering the high economic benefit they obtain from the tourism activities and profit from selling products or services around the tourist attraction Borobudur.

The effort to develop the tourist attraction Borobudur Temple as one tourist destination of international class surely requires local community participation as its driver. Local community's awareness as the local host needs to be enhanced to keep the environment clean and trained to serve tourists professionally. According to current field condition, the people's way of selling traditional crafts, foods and drinks is still as is and less innovative. There is no attractive packaging and marketing techniques, thus they lack of tourists' interest.

The reason is that tourism and entrepreneurial training programs are still poor. The local people's foreign language mastery is also still limited. There are few local people who communicate well with foreign tourists. Signs of restaurants, stalls and shops around the tourist attraction Borobudur also still in Indonesian language, proving that local community is not ready yet to welcome and serve foreign tourists professionally.

Many local people complain about the lack of local government's concern for their fate of ups and downs to earn a living without funding assistance and trade permit from the government, not to mention the high competition with private sectors out of the area. From the perspective of human resource, many local people are only

senior high school graduates, thus their mastery of concept and information and foreign language are still low.

The high visit rate of tourists, particularly foreign tourists, to Borobudur Temple is responded by the people, mainly tour guides, by providing tour guide service. The impact also results in new employments such as bicycle rental, homestay and local transportation (horse drawn carriage called *delman*).

5. CONCLUSION

The tourists' increasing visits and the development of Borobudur Temple Recreation Park provide both positive and negative influences to the local people's social, cultural and economic, life. The positive impacts include; better education level; increasing new employments in areas around Borobudur Temple and the increasing opportunities to do businesses. Meanwhile, the negative impacts include the Borobudur Village community is not yet considered in good prosperity related to their income and occupation although the number of employments and businesses are increasing due to the existing tourism site of Magelang competitors gradually put the local people in a corner. Although employment and business opportunities are increasing due to the tourism positive impacts, the Borobudur village community is still unable to maximize those opportunities due to their limited Human Resource capacity and quality. Minimum government guidance, empowerment, trainings show their poor participation and Human Resource quality. Tourism may have both positive and negative impacts within an area. Various positive advantages resulted from tourism, especially the economic advantages, may support and motivate the Borobudur Village community to more actively engage in tourism activities.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. D. Andriyani, Djatmika, Sumarlam, and E. T. Rahayu, "Learning from the face-threatening acts by tourist workers in bali: Impacts of cross-cultural misunderstanding," *J. Soc. Stud. Educ. Res.*, 2019.
- [2] Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [3] Baiquni, M.2002."Integrasi Ekonomi dan Ekologi dari Mimpi Menjadi Aksi," dalam *Jurnal Wacana*, edisi 12, tahun III
- [4] Blaxter, et.al. (2006). *How To Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- [5] Cernea, M. 1988. *Mengutamakan Manusia di dalam Pembangunan*. Jakarta: UI
- [6] Cohen, J. M & T. Uphoff. 1977. *Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design: Implementation and Evaluation*. New York: CornellUniversity, Ithaca
- [7] Cohen, John M. dan Normat T. Uphoff.1980."Participation"s Place in Rural Development: Seeking Clarity Trough Specificity" dalam *World Development*.

- [8] Cooper, Chris and C. Michael Hall. 2008. Contemporary Tourism: an International Approach. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- [9] Damanik, Junianton dan Helmut F. Weber. 2006. Perencanaan Ekowisata: Dari Teori ke Aplikasi. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi
- [10] Damanik, Junianton dan Hendrie Ajie K. 2005. Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Melalui Pariwisata: Sebuah Catatan AkhirdalamDamanik, dkk (ed)Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Melalui Pariwisata. Yogyakarta: Kepel Press
- [11] Data Strategis Kabupaten Magelang 2018. Katalog: 1103003.3308.ISBN: 976-602-53242-5-3. No Publikasi : 33080.1902. Diterbitkan oleh BPS KABUPATEN MAGELANG
- [12] Dinas Pariwisata DIY. 2013. Statistik Kepariwisata 2013. Yogyakarta: Dinas Pariwisata DIY
- [13] Drake, Susan P. 1991. Local Participation in Ecotourism Projects in Whelan, T. (ed). Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment. Washington DC: Island Press
- [14] Feighery, William G. 2002. Community Participation In Rural Tourism Development: A Social Representations Approach. Makalah dipresentasikan di: Tourism Research 2002: An Interdisciplinary Conference In Wales, Cardiff, September 4-7, 2002
- [15] Getz, D. 1986. Models in tourism planning towards integration of theory and practice. *Tourism Management* 7 (1), 21-32
- [16] Hall, M. C., & Lew, A. A. 2009. Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach. New York: Routledge
- [17] Häusler, Nicole & Wolfgang Strasdas. 2002. Training Manual for Communitybased Tourism. Leipzig: InWent
- [18] Husein, Umar. 2009. Metode Penelitian untuk Skripsi dan Tesis Bisnis Edisi Kedua. Jakarta: Rajawali Press
- [19] Ife, Jim & Frank Tesoriero. 2008. Community Development: Alternatif Pemberdayaan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- [20] Kabupaten Magelang Dalam Angka. *Magelang Regency in Figures* 2018. ISSN: 2338-8048, No. Publikasi/Publication Number: 33080.1805. Diterbitkan oleh BPS KABUPATEN MAGELANG
- [21] Kartasubrata, J. 1986. Partisipasi Rakyat Dalam Pengelolaan dan Pemanfaatan Hutan di Jawa. Tesis. Program Pasca Sarjana IPB, Bogor
- [22] Kusmayadi dan Sugiarto, Endar. 2000. Metodologi Penelitian dalam Bidang Kepariwisata. Jakarta: Gramedia
- [23] Mametja, M.C.E. 2006. Local Community Participation in the Case of the Manyeleti Game Reserve, Limpopo Province, South Africa. Tesis: University of Pretoria, South Africa
- [24] Michael, Muganda. 2009. Community Involvement and Participation in Tourism Development in Tanzania. Tesis. Victoria University of Wellington
- [25] Miles dan Huberman. 2007. Analisis Data Penelitian Kualitatif. Diterjemahkan oleh Tjetjep Rohendi Rohidi. Jakarta: UI Press
- [26] Moleong, Lexy. (1989). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung : Remaja Karya.
- [27] Moswete, Naomi. 2008. "Resident Involvement and Participation in Urban Tourism Development: A Comparative Study in Maun and Gaborone, Botswana." *Urban Forum* (2008) 19:381–394
- [28] Murphy, P.E. 1985. *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Methuen

- [29] Nasution, S. 2009. *Metode Research (Penelitian Ilmiah)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- [30] Naulta, Sebastien dan Paul Stapleton. 2010. "The community participation process in ecotourism development: a case study of the community of Sogoog, Bayan-Ulgii, Mongolia" dalam *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* Vol. 19, No. 6, July 2011, 695–712
- [31] Pramesti, Anestiya. 2012. *Prospek Dan Upaya Pengembangan Pariwisata Cavetubing Goa Pindul Di Desa Bejiharjo Kecamatan Karangmojo Kabupaten Gunungkidul Yogyakarta*. Skripsi. Fakultas Ilmu Sosial, UNY
- [32] Sánchez, M. 2009. *Local Participation as a Tool for Tourism Development in La Goajira, Colombia*. Tesis: Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid
- [33] Scheyvens, R. 2002. *Tourism for Development: Empowering Communities*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- [34] Slamet, Y. 1993. *Pembangunan Masyarakat Berwawasan Partisipasi*. Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University Press
- [35] Sianturi, Jhonny. 2007. *Sikap Dan Partisipasi Masyarakat Lokal Terhadap Pengembangan Wana Wisata Curug Kembar Batu Layang*. Skripsi. Fakultas Kehutanan, IPB, Bogor
- [36] Soedarno P., L. E. Wiwoho, dan B. Simangunsong, 1992. *Ilmu Sosial Dasar: Buku Panduan Mahasiswa*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- [37] Sudarmadji dan Eko Haryono. 2013. *Pengembangan Wisata Alam, Implikasinya Terhadap Lingkungan Hidup Dan Risiko Bencana Yang Dihadapi Di Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta (Wisata Goa Pindul: Daya Dukung Goa Untuk Pengembangan Wisata)*. Hibah Penelitian. Sekolah Pasca Sarjana, UGM
- [38] Suparjan dan Hempri Suyatno. 2003. *Pengembangan Masyarakat, dari Pembangunan sampai Pemberdayaan*. Yogyakarta: Aditya Media
- [39] Surat Keputusan Menteri Negara Pariwisata dan Kesenian No.S-29/MNPK/1999
- [40] Sutami. 2009. *Partisipasi Masyarakat Pada Pembangunan Prasarana Lingkungan Melalui Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Kelurahan (PPMK) Di Kelurahan Marunda Jakarta Utara*. Tesis. Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang
- [41] Tikson, 2001. *Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Manajemen Perkotaan*. Makalah PPS Unhas. Unhas, Makassar
- [42] Timothy, D.J. "Participatory Planning a View of Tourism in Indonesia" dalam *Annuals Review of Tourism Research*, XXVI (2) 1999.
- [43] Timothy, D. J. (2002). "Tourism and Community Development Issues". In R. Sharpley & D. J. Telfer (eds), *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney: Channel
- [44] Tosun, C. (2000). "Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries". *Tourism Management* 21, 613-633.
- [45] UNWTO 13th General Assembly, 1999. *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism* [Online] Santiago: UNWTO. [http://www.unwto.org/code_ethics/eng/brochure.htm]
- [46] Van Breugel, Liedewij. 2013. *Community-based Tourism: Local Participation and Perceived Impacts - A Comparative Study Between Two Communities in Thailand*. Tesis. Radboud University Nijmegen

- [47] World Health Organisation, 2002. Community participation in local health and sustainable development: approaches and techniques [Online] European Sustainable and Health Series 4. Tersedia di: [www.health.vic.gov.au/localgov/downloads/who_book4.pdf]
- [48] World Tourism Organization. 2012. Annual Report 2011. UNWTO, Madrid
- [49] Yoelianto, Imam. 2008. Pengembangan Obyek Wisata Pantai Sepanjang Di Kabupaten Gunungkidul. Skripsi. Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta
- [50] Yulianti, Rina. 2000. Efektivitas Metode Peran Serta Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan dan Pengelolaan Limbah Perkotaan di Perumnas Mojosongo Surakarta. Tesis. Program Studi Pembangunan Wilayah dan Kota, Fakultas Teknik Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang
- [51] *www.bps.go.id*
- [52] *www.desaborobudur.magelangkab.go.id*