Stakeholder Analysis in Community-Based Ecotourism Development in Gedong Pass
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Abstract: This research aimed to identify stakeholders in community-based ecotourism development to get description on stakeholders’ potential resource, role, interest, and intervention strategy to support the successful ecotourism in Gedong Hamlet (G-Pass). This study was a descriptive qualitative research with case study approach. Informants, selected using purposive sampling technique, consisted of stakeholders including NGO and Gedong Hamlet citizens, related local government institution; non-profit institution and business institution interested in Gedong Hamlet ecotourism development. Data collection was carried out using observation, in-depth interview, FGD, and documentation study; qualitative data analysis using interactive model of analysis encompassing data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles and Huberman, 1992). Stakeholders were identified using Freeman’s (1984) classification and stakeholder analysis was conducted using Eden and Eckerman’s (in Bryson, 2004) analysis technique. The result of research showed that key stakeholders (village and local government institution) having legal authority have not undertaken their both institution and human resource reinforcing functions legally well. Capacity developing function of Gedong Hamlet has been undertaken more by civil society including UNS’ Study Service Students and facilitator. Business institutions have not been involved widely. This research recommended a community development model as strategy to develop G-Pass ecotourism.

1 INTRODUCTION

A form of tourism called ecotourism is developing recently. Ecotourism can be defined as the tourist travel to a remote or still natural area aiming to enjoy the nature or to study the history and culture of a community. Ecotourism pattern is to help local community’s economy and to support natural preservation (Department of Culture and Tourism and WWF of Indonesia, 2009; Masud et al, 2017). Ecotourism principle is to elicit welfare to local people by preserving the nature and the local community’s culture intactness.

Ecotourism can be defined as an alternative to a conventional tourism model tending to be mass in nature (mass tourism), very commercial, and benefiting the global tourism industry, thereby paying less attention to the natural preservation aspect and cultural value and local people empowerment aspects. The shift to ecotourism model occurs due to tourists’ saturation with man-made tourist objects and they switch to choosing adventure by visiting the remote natural areas relatively not intervened with by physical change and technology (Dowling, 2013; Fennel, 2003; Satria, 2009).

Gedong pass is one of tourist destinations in Getasan Sub District of Semarang Regency developing from local community’s initiative. Natural mountain beauty in Gedong Hamlet is hidden from tourists’ reach so far. Its people live quietly with their routine life as farmers far from urban modernity. Tourism potency of Gedong Hamlet began to be published as the tourist object exactly on January 29, 2017 with the title “Gedong Pass”. Gedong ecotourism is promoted intensely by Student Study Service (Kuliah Kerja Nyata or KKN) easing number over times. Six months since G-Pass marketing, the number of tourist visiting recorded
manually has achieved almost 8,000s (interview with Karang Taruna or Youth Organization and UNS’ students conducting Student Study Service, May 15, 2017).

Rozemeijer (in Stone, 2015) states that the ecotourism management is ideally conducted by one or more communities, or in partnership with private sector by keeping considering community participation, natural resource preservation, and improved local community welfare. Rocharungsat (in Ronrigues et al, 2017) found that in some Asian countries the successful community-based ecotourism results from the strong partnership with external organization supporting financially and in human resource development. The important determinant of partnership sustainability is benefit sharing between groups entering into partnership (Pfueller et al, 2011).

Community-based ecotourism development should be considered as a part of an integrated development planning conducted in a region. For that reasons, the involvement of stakeholders from community, society, government, business world, to non-organization levels is expected to build a network and to undertake a good partnership corresponding to their own role and skill, by keeping oriented to local community’s wellbeing (Directorate General of Tourist Destination Development of Department of Culture and Tourism with WWF Indonesia, 2009).

Considering the problems above, it is important to identify the stakeholders in community-based ecotourism development in Gedong Hamlet to get a description on potential resource, role, and interest and strategy of reinforcing stakeholders to support the successful G-Pass ecotourism.

2 THEORETICAL

2.1 Community-based Ecotourism: Concept, Characteristic, and Problem

The term ‘ecotourism’ was introduced first by Hetzer, a Mexican ecologist, in 1965 to call a form of tour activity based on four normative pillars: (1) with minimum environmental effect, (2) with minimum effect on local culture, (3) bringing maximum economic benefit into grass root society, and (4) giving recreational satisfaction to tourist (Björk, 2007). The International Ecotourism Society (in Ghodeswar, no date) and Nash (2001) defines ecotourism as a trip to natural location conducted accountably, by keeping natural preservation and intactness and improving the local people’s wellbeing thereby can support environment conservation.

Local community interest becomes the main focus of ecotourism; therefore it is called Community-Based Ecotourism or CBE or Community Based Tourism (CBT). In broad sense, community is a group of individual with shared culture, values, and interest, based on social or territorial identity, and having the means of identifying and acting based on this communal bond (Gregory in Ronrigues et al, 2017; Masud et al, 2017; Getz, 2013). Community-based ecotourism can be defined as tourism practice in which local people participate and play important role in tourism management and as the largest beneficiary of tour activity. Community-based ecotourism is the tour activity owned and managed by community and for all communities’ wellbeing (Goodwin and Santili in Annuar et al, 2017). Public participation becomes key factor to the successful community-based ecotourism (Tosun in Ronrigues et al, 2017).

2.2 Stakeholder Analysis

The term stakeholder refer to “every group or individual that can affect or be affected by the achievement of company’s objective” (Freeman, 1984). The definition of stakeholder in business management literature (Freeman, 1984; Mitchell et al, 1997) involves the group having power to influence the organization’s future. On the contrary, for public and non-profit, Bryson (2004) argues that the nominally powerless people deserve to be taken into account, so that stakeholder is “any one, group, or organization that can file claim on organization’s attention, resource or output, or affected by the output”.

Stakeholder analysis is a process of identifying key stakeholders in a program, of assessing their interest in the program and the extent to which the interest can affect the successful program. In the presence of information on stakeholder, their interest, and their capacity to oppose or to support reform policy, implementers of institutional reform can choose the best alternative to accommodate the stakeholders’ interest, thereby ensuring that the policy adopted politically is realistic and sustainable (World Bank, Guidance Note: Stakeholder Analysis; World Bank, Stakeholder Analysis).

Freeman (1984) defines stakeholders as any group or individual that can affect or be affected by
the achievement of organization’s objective. Primary stakeholders are those affected directly (either positively or negatively) by the program. Key stakeholders are those having authority legally related to the program (in this case, executive or bureaucratic element). Secondary stakeholders are those having no direct interest in policy/program but concerned with the implementation of a policy or program.

To map stakeholders and to classify corresponding to their power and interest in a policy, Eden and Eckerman (in Bryson, 2004) formulates Power - Interest Grid model of stakeholder mapping technique dividing stakeholders into 4 quadrants: quadrant A – Crowd type (weak in power and interest), quadrant B – context setters type (having power but small direct interest); quadrant C – subject type (having interest but small power); and quadrant D – Player type (having significant power and interest). The result of stakeholder mapping will then determine the action to be taken for each type of stakeholders. Key stakeholder type (Players) should be involved completely in policy stage and the best effort should be taken to satisfy them (manage closely). Context Setter type should be invited to establish cooperation; for that reason they should be satisfied, but not compelling many messages so that they will be saturated (keep informed). Subject type should be given adequate information in order to ensure that no big problem arises. Those belonging to this category can be very helpful to the successful program (keep satisfied); and stakeholder types in quadrant A (Crowd), people in this type should be monitored, but never make them bored with excessive communication (Monitor, Minimum Effort).

3 METHOD

This study was a descriptive qualitative research with case study approach. Informants consist of: (a) people of Gedong Hamlet, (b) Local government apparatus of Tajuk Village, Getasan Sub District, and Tourism Office; (c) KKN UNS’ students, and (d) private business interested in Gedong Hamlet ecotourism development. Informants were selected using purposive sampling and data was collected using non-participatory observation, in-depth interview, Focus Group Discussion (FGD), library study and documentation study. Qualitative data analysis was conducted using an interactive model of analysis encompassing three components: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles and Huberman, 1992). Stakeholders were identified using Freeman’s classification (1984) and stakeholder analysis was carried out using Eden and Eckerman’s analysis technique (in Bryson, 2004).

4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Gedong Pass Ecotourism Development

Gedong Pass Ecotourism develops purely from the villagers’ wish to make their hamlet the tourist destination and facilitated by UNS’s students who were undertaking Student Study Service (KKN) in 2017. For marketing purpose, the name Gedong Pass or G-Pass was chosen. The existence of G-Pass ecotourism is disseminated through social media and within about 6 months, 8,322 tourists come to GPass, as reported in google local guide (interview with KKN UNS’s students undertaking June 18, 2019).

Idea of developing tourist facilities and the type of tourism activities to be offered are explored jointly by Karang Taruna and KKN students, but the decision concerning the type of facilities to be constructed and its development implementation are submitted to Karang Taruna with citizens (villagers)’ approval. Every problem arising will be solved jointly by the villagers.

Tourism activities in Gedong is still managed by the hamlet people themselves so far, as there has been no institution, either public or private, participating in its management. This very promising prospect of Gedong ecotourism development attracts the Tourism Office of Semarang Regency’s interest to contribute to managing the tourist potency existing in order to give maximum benefit to the increased local income. In addition local government, private investor also begins to offer a large investment to contribute to Gedong ecotourism development. Economic and business motives in conventional tourism are of course in contradiction with the spirit of ecotourism oriented to local people wellbeing, natural conservation and originality, and local wisdom.

4.2 Stakeholder Analysis in Gedong Pass Ecotourism

Building on Freeman’s stakeholder classification (1984), this research identified stakeholders in G-Pass ecotourism development: Firstly, Primary
Stakeholder are Gedong Hamlet people as the beneficiary of G-Pass community-based ecotourism development. The benefit impacting directly the improvement of people wellbeing is economic benefit coming from ecotourism activity in the form of additional income gotten from offering tour guide service, parking retribution, lodge, farm product and cow milk selling, culinary, and etc. The problem encountered by primary stakeholder concerns the economic benefit gotten from tourist visit not enjoyed equally by all people. Social agitation arising as the effect of such tourism activity should be dealt with immediately in order primary stakeholder concerns the cow milk selling, culinary, and etc. The problem service, parking retribution, lodge, farm product and of additional income gotten from offering tour guide benefit coming from ecotourism activity in the form improvement of people wellbeing is economic development. The benefit impacting directly the Stakeholder are Gedong Hamlet people as the citizens.

Secondly, Secondary Stakeholder are those not benefiting directly from the G-pass ecotourism activity but concerned with the improvement of Gedong Hamlet people’s capacity and wellbeing, includes KKN UNS students, and business performers making business transaction with citizens.

Thirdly, Key Stakeholder are those having legal authority to support the development of G-pass ecotourism in this case is local village apparatuses. The development of G-Pass ecotourism will be the source of local income, but regency government has not contributed maximally yet so far to supporting the development of tourism infrastructure and giving legal support or reinforcing the capacity of human resource.

Stakeholder mapping and intervention is conducted to find out the stakeholders that can support or inhibit the success of G-Pass ecotourism. Every stakeholder plays varying roles and interests but they should be in synergy to support the successful community-based ecotourism in Gedong Hamlet. For that reason, there should be stakeholder mapping corresponding to their power and interest in a policy. Out of 4 stakeholder types suggested by Eden and Eckerman (in Bryson, 1984), only 3 (three) types exist in G-Pass ecotourism development: Subject, Context Setter and Player.

Gedong Hamlet people as primary stakeholder has weak power due to limited capacity including skill, technology, financial resources and authority so that they can be categorized into Subject type, the stakeholders with high interest but limited power.

KKN UNS student team as the initiator and facilitator of G-Pass development coming from NGO and academicians belong to secondary stakeholder as they have interest or are very concerned with villagers’ wellbeing, but they have very weak power and authority thereby categorized into Subject type. Employer group, although have large financial resource viewed from power side, has not had strong interest in contributing to developing G-Pass ecotourism, thereby can be classified into Context Setter.

Government institution – from the bottom level Hamlet and Village Heads and Tourism Office of Semarang Government – is the actor with legal authority of making decision or policy to develop G-Pass ecotourism and having interest and responsibility for improving the villagers’ advance and wellbeing, thereby can be classified into Players type or key stakeholder.

The result of stakeholder mapping will further determine the form of intervention to be taken for each of stakeholders. Government institutions, as key stakeholders (players), have not supported maximally yet the development of G-Pass ecotourism, because only a few of them have reinforced institution in the form of legal support, facility and infrastructure support and local community empowerment. The form of intervention taken is to improve the capacity and the political commitment of local officials to establish the foundation of sustainable tourism development policy based on the local community wellbeing.

Civil society institutions involving KKN UNS student team, UNS lecturers and non-government institution, are Subject-type stakeholder, as they are concerned with G-Pass ecotourism development but do not have adequate financial resource (budget) to facilitate the activity of reinforcing the local community capacity. The action to be taken by this stakeholder is to reinforce the power by improving the bargaining position through mastering competent human resource in facilitating and reinforcing the villagers’ capacity.

Business institutions belong to Context Setter-type, because despite adequate financial source (power), employers’ interest in this case is still on assessment stage due to their profit orientation rather than local community empowerment-orientation. The action to be taken for this stakeholder is to attract their interest in tourism potency relevant and compatible to business realm, by keeping prioritizing people wellbeing and environment conservation.

Gedong Hamlet people as the direct beneficiary of ecotourism activity or primary stakeholder, play strategic part in supporting the successful G-Pass ecotourism. However not all of them can contribute maximally. In power-interest matrix theory, key stakeholders (Players) as the holder of authority is the key actor to the successful program thereby
should get larger portion of attention than other stakeholders, but in a community-based ecotourism development, the initiative of development comes from the bottom rather than from the state authority or top-down model. Therefore, the action to be taken for primary stakeholders is not only mobilization but also the reinforcement of individual and institutional capacity to enable them to manage G-Pass through internal power or to build independency (self-help).

5. CONCLUSION

Key stakeholders (players) are the very decisive ones because they hold the legal authority determining the successful G-Pass ecotourism, so that they should get more attention than other stakeholders. However, in the context of community-based ecotourism context, the key actor that should be the focus of attention is citizen wellbeing and local natural resource sustainability. Key stakeholder is not on the player’s hand holding the authority, but community-based ecotourism development should be built on the initiative from the bottom, from local interest and wisdom. Thus community development is more appropriate than the top-down approach. Therefore, all forms of G-Pass ecotourism development plan are oriented to the empowerment and the reinforcement of local community’s capacity in order to be able to plan need, to implement, to evaluate, and to formulate the solution to the problem.
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