

**THE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS OF RURAL TOURISM
DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF TANJUNG VILLAGE
IN SLEMAN REGENCY**

**DAMPAK SOSIAL BUDAYA PENGEMBANGAN WISATA PERDESAAN:
STUDI KASUS DESA TANJUNG DI KABUPATEN SLEMAN**

Nurlena

Telkom University, Bandung

Riza Taufiq

Telkom University, Bandung

Musadad

Riau University, Pekanbaru
musadad@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Submitted: 15-12-2020; Revised: 15-03-2021; Accepted: 19-04-2021

ABSTRAK

Perkembangan pariwisata di daerah perdesaan dapat dipahami mengalami dinamika yang khas dalam kehidupan sosial masyarakat. Hal ini juga berpengaruh pada kolektivitas dan kohesivitas diantara penduduk. Dalam keterkaitan dengan faktor sosial budaya dalam bidang pariwisata dapat tercermin di berbagai desa wisata di Yogyakarta. Dengan mengambil studi kasus di desa wisata Tanjung, Sleman, Yogyakarta, studi ini mencoba untuk menginvestigasi dampak sosial dan budaya atas pengembangan pariwisata perdesaan bagi masyarakat tuan rumah (*host community*). Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif, data penelitian diambil dari wawancara mendalam dengan ketua pengelola wisata dan warga desa, diskusi kelompok terarah, dan observasi langsung di lapangan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dari aspek sosial, pengembangan pariwisata perdesaan dalam konteks desa wisata memiliki dampak positif pada keterlibatan dan pemberdayaan masyarakat, termasuk bagi para perempuan. Selain itu, hubungan antara tuan rumah dan pengunjung terjalin secara positif walaupun sifatnya dangkal (*superficial*). Dari aspek budaya, pariwisata telah memainkan peran penting dalam pelestarian budaya dan seni lokal. Beberapa pertunjukan kesenian dan tradisi lokal akhirnya hidup kembali dengan adanya pariwisata. Namun demikian, selain dampak-dampak positif yang ada, pengembangan pariwisata perdesaan telah menimbulkan beberapa masalah yang berpotensi menjadi konflik di tengah masyarakat, yaitu dualisme pengelolaan dan persepsi warga buruk atas pembagian manfaat ekonomi.

Kata Kunci: *Dampak pariwisata; Sosial budaya; Wisata perdesaan; Pengembangan wisata.*

*Corresponding author: musadad@lecturer.unri.ac.id.

Copyright© 2021 THE AUTHOR (S). This article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International license. Jurnal Kawistara is published by the Graduate School of Universitas Gadjah Mada.

ABSTRACT

It has been commonly understood that tourism development in rural areas can generate a unique dynamic in the social life of the village communities. This includes a recognition of the collective and cohesive village communities. The significance of socio-cultural factors in tourism is reflected in many villages in Yogyakarta. Taking a case study in Tanjung village as a rural tourism destination in Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta, this study investigated the social and cultural impacts of rural tourism development on the host community. By using a qualitative method, the data in this study came from in-depth interviews with the head of village tourism management and village residents, focus group discussions, and field observations. As the result, this study found that rural tourism has brought a positive impact on community involvement and empowerment, including women. In addition, the host-visitor interactions are positive but superficial. From the cultural aspect, tourism has played an important role in the preservation of local culture and arts. Several local art performances and traditions have been revived due to tourism. However, apart from the positive impacts, the development of rural tourism has generated problems that could turn into conflicts among community members, especially those concerning dualistic tourism management and negative perception over economic benefit distribution.

Keywords: *Tourism impacts; Socio-culture; Rural tourism; Tourism development.*

INTRODUCTION

The impact of tourism has been widely studied. The impact includes social, economic, cultural, and environmental impacts (Archer, Cooper, & Ruhanen, 2005). These consist of negative and positive sides. In general, the host community will receive the positive impacts of tourism activities in terms of socio-culture, environment, economy, and politics (Zaei & Zaei, 2013). However, the negative impacts of tourism on local communities are juxtaposed with the environment and the economy for the sake of economic income alone (Archer, Cooper, & Ruhanen, 2005).

Zaei & Zaei (2013) broke down the socio-cultural effects of tourism development into five viewpoints, i.e. improved local facilities,

the existence of various events, preserved local cultural inheritance, decreased travel of local people, and improved programs of youth exchange. Meanwhile, Poria, Reichel, & Cohen (2013) found the host community has national and local pride due to the development of tourism in their living area.

Viewed from the economic point of view, tourism has caused residents' positive attitudes and perception of the economic impacts due to improved education and infrastructure (Piuchan, Chan, & Kaale, 2018), poverty alleviation, and pro-poor policies (Dillimono & Dickinson, 2015), and incomes and costs of the local economy (Marzuki, 2009). On a larger scale, tourism often constitutes an important sector to improve the national economy in developing countries (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005).

The benefits of rural tourism development are perceived by the community around the tourism destination, especially due to the increased income. In addition, various kinds of facilities will emerge, such as hotels, transportation, accommodation, souvenir centers, and others that directly or indirectly contribute economically to the community. The interaction between visitors and the local community will make the community more knowledgeable.

In the context of the environmental aspect, a study conducted in Lombok, Indonesia indicated that tourism development has promoted environmental preservation by the rural inhabitants (Saufi, O'Brien, & Wilkins, 2014). Another study also found positive attitudes of local community towards tourism since they can live a healthier life as the environmental condition is improved (Pramanik & Ingkadijaya, 2018). Nevertheless, tourism also caused negative impacts on the environment due to massive exploitation of tourism activities thus causing environmental degradation (Kolawole, Mbaiwa, & Mmopelwa, 2016).

In terms of the cultural perspective, scholars have identified positive impacts of tourism on the local culture, including improved understanding of other cultures

(Spanou, 2007) and revitalized local cultures (Mbaiwa, 2018). Nevertheless, tourism also generates negative impacts on the cultural aspect, for instance, weakened local value and wisdom due to acculturation (Piuchan, Chan, & Kaale, 2018) and changed indigenous identities (Spanou, 2007). The deviations in ethics or principles hover the identity of indigenous peoples, and these transformations frequently modify communal structures, household relations, conservative communal lifestyles, rituals, and standards.

All the impact aspects must be managed collectively to create sustainable tourism development. The society, environment, and economy are closely related to each other (Río-Vázquez, Rodríguez-Rad, & Revilla-Camacho, 2019). As a consequence, tourism planners have to think holistically and comprehensively when designing and formulating sustainable tourism development projects.

In countries where tourism depends much on natural and cultural resources, rural areas would play an important role in sustainable tourism development. It is because most of the cultural and natural attractions are situated in rural areas. In this case, Ayazlar & Ayazlar (2015) claimed that rural tourism can contribute to the sustainability of rural areas.

Rural tourism is situated in a remote setting outside tourist centers or cities (Pesonen et al., 2011). It could play a strategic role in economically developing rural areas in a country (Đorđević, Šušić, & Janjić, 2019). A factor contributing to sustainable rural tourism includes the involvement or participation of the local communities in empowerment, knowledge acquisition, and decision-making about tourism (Fong & Lo, 2015).

In addition to the complex definitions of rural tourism, it is understood differently among countries, for instance, Hungary has a special term "village tourism" to refer to rural tourism (Ayazlar & Ayazlar, 2015). In Indonesia, the concept of rural tourism is closer to village tourism as the country has been massively developing its villages into

tourism destinations. Nuryanti (1993) explicitly mentioned "village tourism" to refer to a type of rural tourism that integrates tourism components with cultural aspects. She claimed that village tourism components consist of accommodation and attractions (Nuryanti, 1993). Moreover, the rural tourism dimensions include location characteristics, purpose of visit, attractions/activities, sustainability, and stakeholders (Nair et al., 2015).

Village tourism in recent years has become increasingly popular in various regions in Indonesia (Hamzah & Irfan, 2018). In the country, Yogyakarta is the region with the most village tourism destinations. Concerning the impact of tourism development on rural communities, the present study employed Tanjung village as a case study. This village was chosen considering that it has been recently developed into a village tourism destination and is well known in Yogyakarta Region. The village has now transformed from a common village into a rural tourism destination.

Mathew & Sreejesh (2017) found that rural tourism has brought impacts on the host community's quality of life. Sometimes rural inhabitants have a negative perception of change due to tourism development. As found by Diedrich & Aswani (2016), the rural inhabitants of Solomon Islands have mostly negative expectations of change, particularly the socio-cultural one. They doubt the positive impacts of tourism in that kind of impact. Therefore, the present study was aimed at identifying the social and cultural impacts of rural development tourism in the context of village tourism.

As tourism is an activity that directly touches and engages the host community, it certainly brings various impacts to the host community. The tourism impacts on the local community are inevitable since the visitors directly or indirectly interact with both them and the environment they are living in. At first, visitors are well received with the hope that they would bring development to the visited destination. With the increase

in the number of visits, some local communities begin providing various facilities that are specifically prepared and intended for the visitors. Relations begin to occur between visitors and tourism businesses as well as between the visitors and local communities. For host communities, interaction with visitors is also clearly valued but expresses a generally positive, but often superficial, evaluation of these contacts (Peters, Chan, and Legerer, 2018).

For the rural residents, the relationship with tourists is perceived noticeably, but commonly expresses a positive appraisal of the contacts which are, however, often superficial (Kastenholz et al., 2013). This could be the causal factors of the low interactions between rural inhabitants and visitors in tourism destinations. Carneiro and Eusébio (2015) found that the interactions between hosts and visitors are low and superficial. However, the host and visitor interactions have generated impacts on both visitors and the host communities (Su & Wall, 2010).

A study conducted by Gonzalez, Coromina, & Galí (2018) confirmed that the host community's willingness to have an exchange relationship with the visitors is affected primarily by tourism dependence as well as by gender and education. Thus, the interaction between visitors and the host community is complex as it could be positive (constructive) like friendliness or negative (destructive) like bullying. So, it cannot be simplified as a simple interaction.

The negative impact of the tourism industry arises because tourism development is solely performed with an economic and tourism approach which is perceived as an instrument to increase income, especially by the private sector and government (Archer, Cooper, & Ruhanen, 2005). Meanwhile, many experts are aware that if tourism development does not pay attention to environmental carrying capacity and environmental vulnerability to the number of visitors, tourism will have a negative impact. Therefore, an approach to tourism development emerg-

es, known as alternative tourism or special interest tourism, including rural tourism.

Rural tourism is getting more popular among urban residents as it is seen as an enjoyable way of relaxing and doing healthier activities like jogging or strolling in a fresh environment or consuming local healthy foods (Ayazlar & Ayazlar, 2015). Thus, Tanjung as a village tourism destination is also getting more prevalent to be developed. Such tourism development must have consequences specifically to the rural inhabitants as the host community. Concerning this, Chang et al (2018) showed that socio-cultural impacts serve as the most important aspect that contributes to the positive perception of rural tourism development after economic and environmental aspects. Therefore, this study was aimed to explore and investigate the social and cultural impacts of rural tourism development on the host community in the context of a village tourism destination.

This study employed a qualitative method where the primary data was collected through making direct observations in Tanjung village and conducting in-depth interviews with three informants, i.e. the Head of *Pokdarwis* (village tourism management) and two villagers. We selected the *Pokdarwis* chairman (Informant 1) as he was the person who supervised and coordinated tourism activities in the village. He was also an important figure in the development of rural tourism in his village as he was the initiator. We also chose two villagers as the informants because one was a member of *Pokdarwis* (Informant 2) and another one was an owner of a homestay (Informant 3). We considered them as adequately representing the village's residents in tourism activities.

Before the interviews, we formulated structured interview questions with open-ended questions as the guideline to perform the interviews. Some questions asked to the informants included the history of tourism development in the village, the people engaging in tourism activities, the attractions and accommodation, the interaction between

villagers and visitors, and the changes before and after.

We also elicited primary data through a *Focus Group Discussion* (FGD) by summoning the *Pokdarwis* members in one place. Meanwhile, the secondary data was collected from the official documents owned by the village tourism management.



Figure 1.
FDG with *Pokdarwis* Members
Source: Research Documentation, 2019.

After the primary data from the results of observations and interviews were collected, they were then analyzed inductively. To analyze the collected data, this study followed the “three concurrent flows of activity” as proposed by Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña (2014), including (1) data condensation, (2) data display, and (3) drawing and verifying conclusions. In the data condensation, we processed field notes, interview transcripts, and documents. To display the data, we employed the extended text. Lastly, we drew and verified data by being open and skeptical at first, and then being increasingly explicit and grounded.

This qualitative study utilized two triangulations to confirm the findings, i.e. (1) the method triangulation which includes observations, interviews, and FGD, and (2) the data source triangulation which includes three different informants (Denzin, 2009). In these triangulations, we did not expect much that such a comparison would result in the same views, opinions, or thoughts. In this case, the most important thing was to be able

to find out the reasons behind these differences.

DISCUSSION

Research Area at A Glance

Tanjung Village is located in Ngaglik Subdistrict, Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta. After being developed into a tourist destination, this village has been visited by local and foreign tourists, especially during the school holiday season.

Tanjung Village has a large area of rice fields. Visitors can do farming activities in the fields to learn to cultivate the land, planting seedlings, and harvesting the crops. Not only having rural natural attractions, but Tanjung Village also offers cultural attractions such as traditional arts and home-made crafts. The traditional arts usually performed at the village include *Jathilan*, *Karawitan*, and *Pek Bung*. Visitors can learn the making of crafts such as children’s toys. They can also learn the process of cooking traditional food and making batik. The traditional ceremonies that are usually performed in this village include *Mantenan*, *Sunatan*, *Kenduri*, and *Wiwid*.

One attraction that is typical of Tanjung Village is the historical Joglo house named *Joglo Tanjung*. It is now more than 200 years old and was used to belong to the village head. The old house has undergone two renovations. Although the ground floor has now been changed into a ceramic tile floor, the original parts and ornaments are still well preserved. Some parts of the Joglo house include the *pendopo*, *pringgitan*, *ndalem longkangan*, *pawon*, *carriage garage*, and a horse stable which is currently functioned to store gamelan instruments.

Sociocultural Impacts

The impacts discussed in this paper are not the real impacts, but the perceived impacts as we explored the perceptions of the rural inhabitants concerning various issues in social and cultural aspects of tourism. Woo, Uysal, & Sirgy (2016) found that the impact of the host community’s perceptions

of tourism impact and their life satisfaction depends on whether the locals are engaged or not engaged with the tourism activities. Thus, the locals' participation will affect their perception of the impacts of tourism in their living place. The social and cultural impacts of tourism in Tanjung village are presented as follows.

1. Social Impacts

Global Code of Ethics for Tourism (UNWTO, 1999) asserts that rural inhabitants must be involved in tourism activities and receive an equitable distribution of benefits in economic, social, and cultural aspects, and especially in the creation of employment, both directly and indirectly. This proves that rural tourism development cannot be separated from the social and cultural impacts that must be taken into account by the stakeholders. The host community is the actor in the delivery of tourism products and services, so it is common sense that they have to have a positive perception and attitude towards the tourism running in their living place.

As is well known, tourism can have various impacts on local communities, especially when it comes to a small community with a high volume of tourist visits. In Tanjung village, tourism is well regulated which after all is an ideal example for small-scale tourism which has both positive and negative social impacts. Fortunately, the positive impact is more dominant (major) than the negative impact. The results of the interviews indicate that the local inhabitants have positive opinions about existing tourism activities, including the visiting tourists.

The visitor interaction with the host community is very complex. Visitors are interested in all attractions and activities performed by the community. From the interviews, it was known that visitors are interested in staying and involving in activities. However, some only observe the attractions. Informant 1 admitted,

"From our experience, most visitors are interested in the daily activities of the villagers here, such as planting, gardening,

even feeding cows. Some even stay for longer to enjoy our village attractions."

This shows that the visitors who come to Tanjung village, in general, are those who want to feel the natural features of the rural area. This is in line with the study by Huang et al (2016) that most rural tourism visitors were interested in nature-based activities and sport-related activities. The latter activities, unfortunately, do not exist in Tanjung village. To create attraction diversification, sport-related activities could be added to the existing attraction.



Figure 2.
Cattle Feeding as a Visitor Attraction
Source: Research Documentation, 2019

Based on the interviews, it is known that most of the visitors are students. They are more interested in learning and experience rural activities like feeding cattle or planting rice seedlings. That is why Tanjung is well-known as a cultural and educational tourism destination in Yogyakarta Special Region, especially in Sleman Regency. Not only students but the visitors also come from private companies and foreign countries.

In terms of lifestyle, some informants of the FGD admitted that there is a visitor lifestyle that is slightly imitated by the rural inhabitants, including the discipline of foreign visitors, friendliness, and a strong desire to learn new things. Nevertheless, most of the informants claim no visitor's lifestyle was imitated by the rural inhabitants. Conversely, many visitors try the lifestyle of the local community. One of the FDG participants asserted,

“... it is they [visitors] who imitate our lifestyle. [For example] They eat our food and participate in our activities in the fields.”

This is not surprising since the tourists coming to the village are attracted to experiencing the rural life, including taking part in agricultural activities or eating traditional dishes. They want to undergo a life different from theirs. That is why some of them overstay at the village to obtain more rural life experiences.

Another social change in society, which may not be entirely due to the development of tourism, is that women in Tanjung village have a significant role in tourism development. The field observation showed that, apart from their limited role in cooking and preparing the conditions for hosting guests, they are now involved in homestay planning. They usually have a dialogue with the village tourism manager regarding furniture, cooking, and others related to the homestay. Until now, there have been 20 homestays managed by villagers. Information 1 claimed,

“We usually involve the women in preparing meals for welcoming guests and homestay-related supplies.”

This is contradictory to the study conducted by Akpınar et al (2005) that the tendency of women to engage in tourism is quite low. The observations indicated that women in Tanjung village are actively and highly participate in tourism activities. Women who are commonly involved in tourism activities are those who run homestays and who become the members of *Pokdarwis*. When visitors coming to the village, the women are usually assigned to welcome them and prepare foods and beverages for them. They also manage homestays like cleaning and tidying up to welcome the guests staying in their houses. In other words, there has been a shift in the role of women in terms of earning a living but not all of them. Before the tourism development in the village, earning a living was the husbands' obligation. However, after the village becomes a tourist destination, the women begin to realize that they can also

help their husbands to make a living by utilizing the skills they have including cooking skills and managing homestays.



Figure 3.

A Homestay in Tanjung Village
Source: Research Documentation, 2019

The *Pokdarwis* claimed that the locals are engaged, mostly, in two activities: welcoming visitors and taking part in the formation of the village tourism organization (*Pokdarwis*), including tourism-related programs.

In a society, conflicts often occur. No society is forever safe and peaceful. Conflict will always accompany every process of community development and progress. However, a conflict not only has a negative impact but also has a positive impact because behind the conflict the people will open their insights and increase their knowledge in understanding every life phenomenon that occurs so that they can produce more critical and wise solutions. In the context of Tanjung village, it still has potential conflicts. Several years ago, Tanjung village was managed by two managements, i.e. *Tanjung Wisata* and *Dewita*.

Based on the FGD, it can be inferred that the cold conflict occurs due to the different opinions between *Tanjung Wisata* Management and *Dewita* Management concerning who has the right to manage tourism in Tanjung village. *Dewita* considers that they are eligible to use the name *Tanjung Wisata* and manage tourism activities in the village. On the other hand, *Tanjung Wisata* feels disappointed with *Dewita* as they lack financial transparency. To solve this problem, eventu-

ally, *Dewita* manages tourism in three hamlets, while *Tanjung Wisata* focuses on managing tourism in one hamlet, i.e. Banteran hamlet. However, both *Dewita* and *Tanjung Wisata* use Tanjung Village as their brands.

Not only dualistic management, but Tanjung village also deals with another issue which is related to the placement of visitors in homestays. If there are a lot of visitors and they wish to stay at homestays, it is the manager who determines which homestays to be occupied. Meanwhile, if there are only a few visitors, the manager lets the visitors choose which homestays they are going to occupy. In our perspective, these ways are quite fair, but some are not satisfied with them as they consider that the distribution of homestays is less fair.

The management also applies a way to avoid conflict between hosts and tourists. In Tanjung village, homestays are owned by villagers with different religious backgrounds. Therefore, before visitors choose which homestay to occupy, they are also informed about the religious background of the homestay owners. This is done to avoid conflict in the communities.

Conflicts arising from community-based tourism are common as villagers perceive that they have the same rights over the tourist attractions. Once they perceive something is unfair in the distribution of economic benefits, a conflict will immediately emerge. Häusler & Strasdas (2002) claimed that local conflicts are usually getting worse, especially with neighboring villages or hamlets not benefiting from community-based tourism in the same area and conflicts between village residents over revenue distribution. Therefore, efforts to avoid conflicts both that occur and those that are potential must be resolved immediately.

Conflicts in rural tourism development have been widely studied by scholars. However, most of them found conflicts between rural inhabitants with the local/private authorities (Al Haija, 2011; Kim & Jamal, 2015; Wang & Yotsumoto, 2019). Therefore, the conflict which occurs in Tanjung village is

unique in which there are two managers in one destination. Although Häusler & Strasdas (2002) claimed that conflicts among residents are prevalent but the conflict is commonly involving residents as individuals, not as tourism managers. Therefore, further studies are necessary to address this conflict phenomenon, especially in the context of rural tourism.

2. Cultural Impacts

Village tourism is a form of integration between attractions, accommodation, and supporting facilities that are presented in a structure of community life that is integrated with the prevailing ethics and traditions (Nuryanti, 1993). As a village tourism destination, Tanjung village must have its own ethics and traditions which become an integral part of rural life. Hence, its cultural aspects are unavoidably affected by tourism development.

From the direct observations performed in Tanjung village, in general, the cultural elements typical of the local community are still well maintained. The knowledge and awareness of the local community about the sustainability of local traditions and local cultural heritage serve as the reinforcement of elements of tourist attractions in Tanjung village. These things are then packaged attractively to attract and welcome the visitors. Informant 1 said,

“In the first stage, the Pokdarwis members made an inventory of the past and present traditions and art performances. Our village is also still very natural and traditional.”

Informant 1's statement above is consistent with the results of observation in the village which indicated that some traditions that are still frequently performed include *kenduri* and *wiwit*. On the other hand, farming tradition still exists while maintaining traditional methods (e.g. employing cattle/buffalo) compared to using a tractor, because the level of soil softness is better or softer when using animals compared to using a tractor.

For cultural heritage, the village still has an old traditional Javanese house with the *joglo* roof. He said that the house was built about 200 years ago. The building is still preserved now. He also said that the concern for the natural environment such as trees is still well maintained as a form of environmental preservation. This is a form of hope that the village's natural environment will be kept green by following the village's slogan of Sleman Regency: *Hijau desaku, lestari budayaku* (My village is green, my culture is long-lasting).

Some pieces of information were also obtained from Informant 2 who worked as a factory worker concerning arts, traditions, behavior, and language as a means of interaction among communities and between local community and visitors. Informant 2 said,

"We usually performed *gamelan*, *karawitan*, *jatilan*, and also *pek bung* for tourists."

Pek bung means a traditional dance accompanied by simple musical instruments such as musical instruments made from used materials, *kentongan* and drums. This type of art has been passed down for generations and indeed existed before the tourism development in Tanjung village. For example, *jatilan* performing art, which according to him has long since the time of his grandfather. Asked about the preparations they made for this art performance, he admitted that his training was rare, but if he called to be called for a performance, they were certainly ready. In addition to traditional arts, the other popular ones in Tanjung village are *Pek Bung*.

Pek bung is a dance performed by six teenage female dancers. The accompaniment is a musical instrument made of used pipes covered in rubber tires. *Pek bung* is typical of Tanjung village, even though other villages have a similar dance performance. It has been used for a long time but it has not yet been staged. Due to the tourism development in the village, it is now performed for the visitors. Besides that, there are also *gamelan* and *karawitan*. Uniquely, the youth play these two musical instruments on Thursdays while

the old people perform them every Saturday night. The difference here occurs because the young people have modified the *gamelan*, while the old ones still stick to the traditional or original *gamelan*.

Informant 2 also revealed that the elders in Tanjung village are mostly planting and harvesting paddy rice, especially the *Ciherang* and IR 64 varieties. Some of them work in other people's paddy fields and some work in their own fields. Meanwhile, the youth is mostly factory workers or working outside the town. Responding to this, the question arises as to who and how the community manages the village tourism activities, especially during their working hours. Informant 2 said,

"Usually, the elders are the ones who manage and administer tourism activities in our village."

It shows that those who manage the village tourism activities are the elders since they have more free time. The young people are working in the industrial sector, so it is difficult to obtain permits from their companies. This phenomenon could negatively affect the sustainability of natural attractions, especially those related to the farming activities in paddy fields, as most younger generations prefer working as employees or workers, not farmers. Moreover, the total area of paddy fields in Sleman Regency decreased 47% from 2007-2017 (Herdiansyah et al, 2020). To address this issue, there should be a program initiated by the tourism management of Tanjung village to attract young people to engage in tourism activities or at least teach them how to do certain activities in paddy fields like planting, treating, plowing, or harvesting.

When visitors want to enjoy or do farming activities in the paddy fields, the village farmers will immediately go to the paddy fields to show farming activities. Thus, the village has created an artificial attraction served or offered to the tourists. However, these farming activities are managed in such a way that does not affect crop yields. The

management has allocated a parcel of unused land specifically for agricultural tourism activities such as planting rice seedlings, plowing the paddy fields, and so on.



Figure 4.
Visitors Plowing a Paddy Field with Cattle in
Tanjung Village
Source: sedesa.id

When asked about the most dominant type of visitors visiting Tanjung village, Informant 2 said that most of them are school students, especially high school students, both from Yogyakarta and from out of town. The village is also visited by several foreign tourists. In line with this, Petroman et al (2015) found that students are the main segments in educational rural tourism as they can have a better understanding of rural tourism life and learn the rural culture.

Informant 3 who worked as a furniture businessman claimed that the traditions and arts in his village are still well-maintained. He said,

“We always performed our traditional music and dance when tourists are coming to our village.”

Informant 3 who is one of the homestay owners usually takes part in the interactions with domestic and foreign tourists. When asked about the response to tourists and their impact on the culture in his village, he admitted that he is less concerned about the cultural differences. People in his village also take for granted the visitors' appearances or behaviors. For him, it does not really affect the culture they already have, and he is not

so interested in imitating tourists' behaviors although some tourists stay for a relatively long time as they usually stay at his homestay for three until seven days. Besides, most of the visitors are school students so their lifestyles tend to be not relevant to the villagers.

All the positive impacts of culture in Tanjung village are beneficial for the tourism development itself. Chang et al (2018) suggest that culture-related impacts constitute the primary factor that makes the rural inhabitants supportive of rural tourism development. They also found that socio-cultural impacts rank first in the residents' perception of tourism, followed by economic and environmental impacts. Furthermore, Jaafar, Ismail, & Rasoolimanesh (2015) suggest that the tourism program in Kinabalu National Park has stimulated numerous cultural activities.

CONCLUSION

Rural tourism development inevitably creates impacts on the host communities. The rural inhabitants are affected by the changes in their living place. They now see more crowds as the visitors come and stay at their village. They also have to interact with the visitors as they have to deliver tourism services and products to them. They are now tourism service providers, passively or actively.

Villagers are among the most affected by the transformation of their village into a tourist destination. Viewed from the social aspect, rural tourism development in Tanjung village has brought positive impacts on community involvement and empowerment, including women. Tourism has also created positive, but superficial, interactions between the villagers and the visitors. A more intimate and deeper host-visitor interaction occurs when the visitors overstay in the village's homestays. Meanwhile, in the context of the cultural aspect, rural tourism has become a driver in the preservation and revival of the village's local traditions and arts.

Apart from the positive changes above, social conflict turns out to appear in Tan-

jung village such as complaints from some residents regarding “fairness” of income received by the homestays. It should be realized that homestay is an economic generator that can contribute directly to rural inhabitants. In addition, no organization serves to regulate the circulation of tourism products such as souvenirs and food ingredients for visitors. Therefore, the related stakeholders have to be aware of and address these issues immediately as rural tourism serves as an increasingly prevalent instrument of national economic growth institutions for raising the earnings of rural residents (Fong et al., 2014).

Tourism development often leads to both positive and negative impacts. Therefore, concerning the socio-cultural impacts of tourism, Mbaiwa (2008) claims that tourism is required to be perceptive to host cultural customs and values to be admitted by local residents and encourage sustainable development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akpinar, N., I. Talay, C. Ceylan, and S. Gündüz. (2005). Rural women and agrotourism in the context of sustainable rural development: A case study from Turkey. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 6(4): 473-486.
- Al Haija, A. A. (2011). Jordan: Tourism and conflict with local communities. *Habitat International*, 35, 93-100.
- Archer, B., Cooper, C., and Ruhanen, L. (2005). The Positive and Negative Impacts of Tourism. In: Theobald, W. F. (Ed). *Global Tourism*. 3rd ed. Burlington: Elsevier Limited, 79-102.
- Ayazlar, G. and Ayazlar, R. A. (2015). Rural Tourism: A Conceptual Approach. In *Tourism, Environment and Sustainability*. Sofia, Bulgaria: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Carneiro, M. J., and Eusebio, C. (2015). Host-tourist interaction and impact of tourism on residents' quality of life. *Tourism and Management Studies*, 11(1): 25-34.
- Chang, K. G., H. Chien, H. Cheng, and H. Chen. (2018). The impacts of tourism development in rural indigenous destinations: An investigation of the local residents' perception using choice modeling. *Sustainability*, 10(12): 47-66.
- Choi, H. S. C. and Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude towards sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43: 380-394.
- Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The research act: a theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. London: Routledge.
- Diedrich, A. and Aswani, S. (2016). Exploring the potential impacts of tourism development on social and ecological change in the Solomon Islands. *Ambio*, 45(7): 808-818.
- Dillimono, H. D. and Dickinson, J. E. (2015). Travel, tourism, climate change, and behavioral change: travelers' perspectives from a developing country, Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23: 437-454.
- Đorđević, D. Ž., V. Šušić, and I. Janjić. (2019). Perspectives of Development of Rural Tourism of The Republic of Serbia. *Economic Themes*, 57(2): 219-232.
- Fong, S. F., M. C. Lo, P. Songan, and V. Nair. (2014). The Impact of Local Communities' Involvement and Relationship Quality on Sustainable Rural Tourism in Rural Area, Sarawak. The Moderating Impact of Self-efficacy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144: 60-65.
- Fong, S. F. and Lo, M. C. (2015). Community Involvement and Sustainable Rural Tourism Development: Perspectives from the Local Communities.

- European Journal of Tourism Research*, 11: 125-146.
- Gonzalez, V. M., L. Coromina, and N. Galí. (2018). Overtourism: residents' perceptions of tourism impact as an indicator of resident social carrying capacity - case study of a Spanish heritage town. *Tourism Review*, 73(3): 277-296.
- Hamzah, A. S. and Irfan, M. (2018). Tourism Village Expansion in the Concept of Sustainable Tourism Development (Indonesia Experience). *Jurnal Notariil*, 3(1): 1-12.
- Häusler, N. and Strasdas, W. (2002). *Training Manual for Community-Based Tourism*. Leipzig: InWent.
- Herdiansyah, A., N. Hastari, H. Ramdani, and R. Putri. (2020). Landuse change and its impact on rice productivity in Sleman Regency 2007-2017. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 451: 012054.
- Huang, W-J., J. A. Beeco, C. Hallo, and W. C. Norman. (2016). Bundling attractions for rural tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(10): 1387-1402.
- Jaafar, M., S. Ismail, and S. M. Rasoolimanesh. (2015). Perceived social effects of tourism development: A case study of Kinabalu National Park. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 10: 5-20.
- Kastenholz, E., M. J. Carneiro, C. Eusébio, and F. Elisabete. (2013). Host-guest relationships in rural tourism: evidence from two Portuguese villages. *Anatolia*, 24(3): 367-380.
- Kim, S. and Jamal, T. (2015). The co-evolution of rural tourism and sustainable rural development in Hongdong, Korea: complexity, conflict and local response. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8-9): 1363-1385.
- Kolawole, I. O., J. E. Mbaiwa, and G. M. Mmopelwa. (2016). The environmental impacts of tourism on community people's quality of life in Maun, Botswana. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(4): 1-14.
- Marzuki, A. (2009). Impacts of Tourism Development. *Anatolia*, 20(2): 450-455.
- Mathew, P. V. and Sreejesh, S. (2017). Impact of responsible tourism on destination sustainability and quality of life of community in tourism destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31: 83-89.
- Mbaiwa, J. E. (2008). The Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism Development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 2(3): 163-185.
- Miles, M. B., A. M. Huberman, and J. Saldana. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. Third Edition. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Nair, V., U. T. Munikrishnan, S. D. Rajaratnam, and N. King. (2015). Redefining rural tourism in Malaysia: a conceptual perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(3): 314-337.
- Nuryanti, W. (1993). Concept, Perspective and Challenges. In: Nuryanti, W. (Ed). *Universal Tourism Enriching or Degrading Culture?*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1-7.
- Pesonen, J., R. Komppula, C. Kronenberg, and M. Peters. (2011). Understanding the Relationship Between Push and Pull Motivations in Rural Tourism. *Tourism Review*, 66(3): 32-49.
- Peters, M., C.-S. Chan, and A. Legerer. (2018). Local Perception of Impact-Attitudes-Actions towards Tourism Development in the Urlaubsregion Murtal in Austria. *Sustainability*, 10: 2360.

- Petroman, L., M. Varga, C. E. Constantin, C. Petroman, B. Momir, B. Turc, and L. Merce. (2016). Agritourism: An Educational Tool for the Students with Agro-Food Profile. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39: 83-87.
- Piuchan, M., C. W. Chan, and J. Kaale. (2018). Economic and socio-cultural impacts of Mainland Chinese tourists on Hong Kong residents. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39: 9-14.
- Poria, Y., A. Reichel, and R. Cohen. (2013). Tourists perceptions of World Heritage Site and its designation. *Tourism Management*, 35: 272-274.
- Pramanik, P. D. and Ingkadijaya, R. (2018). The Impact of Tourism on Village Society and its Environmental. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. Bristol, UK: IOP Publishing.
- Río-Vázquez, M.-E. S., C. J. Rodríguez-Rad, and M.-Á. Revilla-Camacho. (2019). Relevance of social, economic, and environmental impacts on residents' satisfaction with the public administration of tourism. *Sustainability*, 11: 6380.
- Saufi, A., D. O'Brien, and H. Wilkins. (2014). Inhibitors to host community participation in sustainable tourism development in developing countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22: 801-820.
- Spanou, E. (2007). The Impact of Tourism on the Sociocultural Structure of Cyprus. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 2(1): 145-162.
- Su, M. and Wall, G. (2010). Implications of host-guest interactions for tourists' travel behaviour and experiences. *Tourism*, 58: 37-50.
- UNWTO 13th General Assembly. (1999). *Global Code of Ethics for Tourism*. Santiago: UNWTO.
- Wang, L. and Yotsumoto, Y. (2019). Conflict in tourism development in rural China. *Tourism Management*, 70: 188-200.
- Woo, E., M. Uysal, and M. J. Sirgy. (2016). Tourism Impact and Stakeholders' Quality of Life. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 42(2): 260-286.
- Zaei, M. E. and Zaei, M. E. (2013). The impacts of tourism industry on host community. *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Research*, 1(2): 12-21.