The Role of Villagers Melung as a Social Innovations to Advocacy the Pagubugan Melung Tourism Through the Involvement

Lusi Suwandari[1*], Devani Laksmi Indyastuti[2*], Meutia Karunia Dewi[3*]

[1*]Jenderal Soedirman University, lusi.suwandari@unsoed.ac.id, Indonesia
[2]Jenderal Soedirman University, devani20092010@gmail.com, Indonesia
[3]Jenderal Soedirman University, meutia.dewi@unsoed.ac.id, Indonesia
*Lusi Suwandari

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the positive relationship between social innovation, involvement and advocasy tourism in the Melung Community.
The hypothesis test will be conducted between social innovation and advocacy tourism through community involvement. The amount pf research sample is 100 melung villagers who have the criteria of age 18 to 50 years and familiar with social media. Path analysis test is used to test the hypothesis which results that social innovation and engagement have a positive effect on advocacy and involvement variable is able to mediate the relationship between innovation and advocacy.

Keywords: Social Innovation, Involment, Advocay, Village Tourism

1. Introduction

Active support from village communities can be very important for successful tourism development. The villagers aware of the attractive characteristics of the area and involved in developing sustainable tourism promotion (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012). Community attitudes towards tourism mostly focus on residents' perceptions of the impact of tourism and tourism development in their area. Relatively little attention has been paid to the role of communities as ambassadors to promote tourism.

Villagers or main actors in village development are individuals who take responsibility for the development process in their village. In the era of information technology, the role of rural communities as a digital social innovation (DSI). DSI is to analyze citizen participation as a necessary actor related to social innovation in rural areas. (Neumeier, 2017, p. 43). The actors involved and their role in DSI initiatives and digital technology towards cooperation and community development in the village. The involvement of villagers as DSI actors will change their behavior, especially towards tourist destinations. The DSI actors will promote the tourism by recommending or advocating.

Advocacy appears as an indirect effect of identity that creates a sense of belonging and involvement with tourism activities in their area. The role of word of mouth for potential tourists has long been recognized as one of the most influential sources of information (Litvin, Goldsmith, & Pan, 2008).

This study focuses on individual identity regarding the possibility of villagers to share knowledge, innovate, provide ideas that reside in the area as a tourism destination. Engagement can be both the causes and consequences of social innovation. Residents as the main actors in tourism development can act as

innovators, supporters and collaborate with the community to attract tourists to visit the tourist site.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Social Innovation

Studies related to social innovation provide references for various actors and their roles as developers, promoters, supporters and knowledge providers from public and private as well as civil society (Butzin & Terstriep, 2018, p. 78). According to them, promoters initiate and operate innovations. Promoters are partners who provide tools, funding or connections to policy programs. Advocates facilitate the diffusion of social innovations and providers (supporters) offer specialized knowledge relevant to the development process (Butzin & Terstriep, 2018, p. 78–79).

According to Bria 2015, actors in social innovation are described as being identified as innovators, users and communities who collaborate to jointly provide solutions for social needs. In a village they are called village volunteers (Laschewski, et.al 2019). Users are facilitating actors based on a higher level than innovators. They develop or manage applications, make arrangements, correct or provide training according to their profession

Social innovation is characterized by actors using digital social innovation (DSI) which is defined as a type of social and collaborative innovation in which innovators, users, and communities. They collaborated using digital technology to jointly create knowledge and solutions for various social needs and in scale (Bria, 2015, p.9). Individual actors who take responsibility for the digitization process in their village. Individual actor who have the characteristics of social innovation in rural areas.

2.2 Involvement

In the field of social psychology, Achterberg et al. (2018) provides a definition of social cohesion as a sense of initiative, commitment and appropriate response to social stimuli, participating in social activities and interacting with others.

Social exchange theory suggests that residents are more likely to have identification with purpose. Attitudes towards tourists will be positive if the perceived benefits of getting involved with tourism exceed the estimated costs. If economic benefits are considered attractive, community members are more likely to participate and welcome visitors to their area (Scott & Yutyunyong, 2009). As a result, positive feelings and deep identification with tourist destinations tend to increase residents' participation in local tourism attractions.

2.3 Adcocacy

This research is related to the advocacy carried out by local residents as a tourism destination. Advocacy is associated with attitud and behavioral dimensions related to loyalty and advocacy. Some arguementation that self-consumption of goods and services can be a form of advocacy, where the consumption implicitly or explicitly signals recommendations to people to buy (O'Shaughnessy & O'Shaughnessy, 2003).

Tourist attractions often make local residents a potential target market. In this study, we limit advocacy behavior to communications made by residents to tourists that have the implicit or explicit effect of encouraging them to revisit the tour. In the tourism sector, information (eg from community members via getok tular) has more credibility than other sources (eg official travel brochures).

2.3.1 Hypothesis Development

- Social innovation on Advocacy

In the tourism sector, the role of local residents to promote the tourism through word of mouth advocacy. Local resident have identity and experiencing a sense of being a member of a community. They understand that they are social innovators in rural areas who act as drivers, supporters and users (Bria 2015). Social innovations carried out by villagers are by collaboratively using and implementing how to provide ideas, being active in tourism and technology activities. In the context of tourism, Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012) find that their identity influences their support for tourism, and that self-identity as a social innovator is a determinant of behavior. We formulate the first hypothesis:

H1: Social Innovation has an effect on advocacy.

- Social Innovation on engagement

Social innovation occurs naturally in human engagement because social innovation is supported by community networks, involves new ways of relating socially and requires commitment from all parties involved (Hazelkorn, E 2009).

Villagers involved in the social innovation process have a vertical level, they can be distinguished by top-down actors (professionals from outside the village) and bottom-up actors (volunteers, who come from the village). At the horizontal level, inspired by arguments in the literature (Bria, 2015; Butzin & Terstriep, 2018), three groups of actors were identified: 1) drivers, 2) support and 3) users. The relationship between engagement and social innovation is a complex and reciprocal one, social innovation identity can be both a cause and a consequence of engagement. (Algesheimer et al., 2005; Muniz & O'Guinn, 2001). We formulate hypothesize:

H2: social innovation has an effect on engagement.

2.4 Involvement in Advocacy

In tourism studies, there is a positive relationship between citizen involvement in tourism (Caneday & Zeiger, 1991; Sharma & Dyer, 2009). Intention to engage in a behavior, such as recommending a service or product is predicted by attitudes toward the behavior and subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991). Engagement with a product or service will result in increased word of mouth (Dichter, 1966). Thus, if citizens engage with the tourism industry (e.g. through visiting tourist attractions) and display an affective attitude that supports tourists, they are more likely to become supporters of tourism. Therefore, we formulate hypothesis;

H3 : Engagement has a positive effect on advocacy.
H4 : Social innovation towards advocacy through involvement.

3.   Research Methodology

The sample in this study were villagers who lived in Melung, Kec. Kedung Banteng District. Banyumas aged 17 to 50 years consisting of villagers, tourism awareness groups, Melung Village government and village business manager. Consideration aged 17 to 50 years they have internet access and are members of social networks. A total of 110 respondents. The data analysis technique used Path Analysis to describe and test the causal model of the relationship between variables.

4.   Results

4.1 Validitas dan Reliability test

Testing the validity of the questionnaire used the product moment correlation and testing reliability used Cronbach's Alpha coefficient. Based on the data, it can be seen that the coefficient value so that all items from the statement for each variable in this study are validity dan reliable.

Using the Kolmogrov-Smirnov non-parametric statistical, the result of normality test is normally distributed. The Asymp value is 0.300. Multicollinearity test is known that each Social Innovation (X) and Involvement (Y) variable has a VIF value < 10 so it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity in the regression model used in this study.

The heteroscedasticity test that has been carried out is known to have a significant value of visual packaging variable of 0.00 and verbal packaging of 0.014 less than (0.05), so it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity.

4.2 Path Analysis

The indirect effect of social innovation through involvement in advocacy is the multiplication between the value of standardized coefficients beta of perception of social innovation on engagement. The value of standardized coefficients beta of involvement in advocacy based on figure 4.1 show that the 0.588 x 0.252 = 0.148. Then the total effect given by social innovation to advocacy is the direct effect plus the indirect effect, namely 0.408 + 0.148 = 0.556. It can be concluded that indirectly price perception through consumer satisfaction has no significant effect on repurchase intention. Based on the results, the value of Adjusted R Square (R2adj) is 0.339. The hypotesis result is defined at below table :

Table 1. Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis	T test		T table	Result
Social Innovation → Involvement	7,199	>	1,98	Hypothesis **received**
Social Innovation → Advocacy	4,036	>	1,98	Hypothesis **received**

Involvement → Advocacy	2,497	>	1,98	Hypothesis **received**
Social Innovation → Advocacy through Involvement	2.360	>	1,96	Hypothesis **received**

Partially   test   the hypothesis using the t test and for the mediating variable using the Z test.

Based on the Sobel test, it is known that the Z count is 2.360 and the Z table is 1.96. The variable of social innovation on advocacy through involvement is 2.360 > from the Z table value of 1.96. Therefore, Ha accepted, it is evident that involvement mediates the relationship between social innovation and advocacy

5.   Discussion

Social Innovation has a positive effect on advocacy because social innovation is a process that occurs in the community. Information technology is growing about the influence of social networking media in disseminating such organic information, it has also been proven that the opinions of local residents are considered to be a very useful source of information about tourist destinations.

Social innovation has a positive effect on the involvement of Melung residents in Pagubugan Melung Village tourism, Kab. Banyumas. The actors involved and their role in DSI initiatives and digital technology towards cooperation and community development in the village. Using eight social innovation measurement items, namely initiative, being active in social media, using mobile applications, looking for opportunities, establishing networks and volunteers so as to increase the involvement of villagers in developing Pagubugan Melung village tourism.

The involvement of villagers as DSI actors will change their behavior. This is in line with indicators from research conducted by Bria 2015 where villagers who identify with their area as a tourist destination will support tourism. Having an identity and experiencing a sense of being a member of a community so that they understand that they are social innovators in rural areas who act as drivers, supporters and users. The results of the study are in line with Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012) that in the context of tourism, it was found that not only the attitude of the population towards the impact of tourism but their identity affects their support for tourism, and that self-identity as a social innovator is a determinant of behavior.

Involvement has a positive and significant impact on the advocacy of Melung villagers by providing information about Pagubugan Melung tourism to others through social media. The answers from respondents indicate that respondents agree that the involvement of villagers has a positive effect on advocacy, using six assessment indicators on the involvement variable, namely helping operational activities, being a community administrator, being in Pagubugan Melung, having a social media account and replying to comments on social media will strengthen their advocacy in attracting tourists.

This is in line with research indicators conducted by Sharma & Dyer, 2009 and Dichter, 1966 Engagement with a product or service will result in increased word of mouth. Thus, if citizens engage with the tourism industry (eg through visiting tourist attractions) and display an affective attitude that supports tourists, they are more likely to become supporters of tourism.

The involvement of villagers as administrators or the Pagubugan Melung community can mediate the relationship between social innovation and advocacy, by using a measure of the involvement of villagers as administrators and the tourism community so that they are willing to help operationalize tourism activities, are often at tourist attractions, have social media accounts to answer comments and provide information about the Melung Association. Of the six indicators, it shows that Melung residents have involvement with the Melung Community tourism because they identify themselves as drivers, support and users (Bria 2015).

Therefore, involvement is able to mediate the relationship between social innovation and advocacy

6. Conclusion

The benefits of research results for academics are that there are variables of social innovation and involvement that can increase advocacy in attracting tourists to visit Pagubugan Melung village tourism in Banyumas regency

References

Bria, F. (2015). Growing a digital social innovation ecosystem for Europe: DSI final report. Luxembourg: Publications Office.

Butkeviciene, E. (2009). Social innovation inrural communities: Methodological framework and empirical evidence. Socialiniai Mokslai: Social Sciences, 1, 80–88.

Butzin, A., & Terstriep, J. (2018). Actors and roles in social innovation.

Capra, C. F. (2016). The smart city and its citizens. International Journal of E Planning Research, 5(1), 20–38.

Cardullo, P., & Kitchin, R. (2019). Being a 'citizen' in the smart city: Up and down the scaffold of smart citizen participation in Dublin, Ireland. GeoJournal, 84(1), 1–13.

Certomà, C., Corsini, F., & Rizzi, F. (2015). Crowdsourcing urban sustainability: Data, people and technologiesin participatory governance. Futures,

Christmann, G. B. (2017). Analysing changes in discursive constructions of rural areas in the context of demographic change: Towards counterpoints in the   dominant discourse on "dying villages." Comparative Population Studies, 41(3/4), 359–378.

Christmann, G. B. (2019). Innovationen in ländlichen Gemeinden [Innovations in rural municipalities]. In interdisciplinary handbook] (pp. 235–240).

Christmann, G. B. (2020). Introduction: Struggling with innovations: Social innovations and conflicts in urban development and planning. European Planning Studies, 4(1), 423–433.

Christmann, G. B., Ibert, O., Jessen, J., & Walther, U.- J. (2020). Innovations in spatial planning as a social process: Phases, actors, conflicts. European Planning Studies, 3(1), 496–520.

Crick, A. P. (2003). Internal marketing of attitudes in Caribbean tourism. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15(3),

Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice.

Diez, T. (2012). Personal fabrication: Fab labs as platforms for citizen-based innovation, from microcontrollers to cities. Nexus Network Journal, 14(3), 457–468.

Eder, J. (2019). Innovation in the periphery: A critical survey and research agenda. International Regional Science Review, 42(2), 119–146.

Fink, M., Lang, R., & Richter, R. (2017). Social entrepreneurship in marginalized rural Europe: Towards evidence-based policy for enhanced social innovation. Regions Magazine, 306(1), 6–10.

Fleischmann, K., Hielscher, S., & Merritt, T. (2015). Making things in fab labs: A case study on sustainability and co-creation. Digital Creativity, 27(2), 113–131.

Howaldt, J., & Schwarz, M. (2019). Soziale Innovation [Social innovation]. [Handbook on innovation research] (pp. 1–17). Heidelberg: Springer

Butzin, A., & Terstriep, J. (2018). Actors and roles in social innovation. New practices for a better future (pp. 78–81). Dortmund: Sozial for schungsstelle

Garner, W. C. (1993). Image process formation. Annals of Tourism Research, 25(3), 758-760

Getz, D (1991) Festivals, special events, and tourism., Van Nostrand Reinhold New York

Ollins, W. (2000). Trading identities: why countries and companies are taking on each others' roles. London: Foreign Policy Centre

O'Shaughnessy, J., & O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2003). The marketing power of emotion. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Laschewski, L., Steinführer, A., Mölders, T., & Siebert, R. (2019). The village as object of social sciences research and theory (pp. 3–56). Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Litvin, S. W., Goldsmith, R. E., & Pan, B. (2008). Electronic word-of-mouth in hospitality and tourism management. Tourism Management, 29, 458-468

Lundberg, D. E. and Lundberg, C. B. (1985) International Traveland Tourism, pp. 186-188. Wiley, New York.

Mumford, M. D. (2002). Social innovation: Ten cases from Benjamin Franklin Creativity Research Journal, 14(2), 253–266

Middleton, Victor T.C. (1988), "Marketing in Travel and Tourism," Heinemann Professional Publishing, Oxford

Neumeier, S. (2017). Social innovation in rural development: Identifying the key factors of success. The Geographical Journal, 183(1), 34–46

Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: an identity perspective. Annals of

Tourism Research, 39(1), 243e268.

Pitana, I Gde. dan Surya Diarta, I Ketut. (2009). Pengantar Ilmu Pariwisata. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Skinner, H. (2005). Wish you were here? Some problems associated with integrating marketing communications when promoting place brands. Place Branding, 1(3), 299e315

Scott, N., & Yutyunyong, T. (2009). The integration of social exchange theory and social representations theory: a new perspective on residents' perception research.

Sukoco, B. M., & Wu, W. Y. (2010). The personal and social motivation of customers' participation in brand community. African Journal of Business Management,4(5),614-622

Swarbrooke, J. 1995. The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions.|Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd. 382 p. ISBN 0 7506 1979 1.

Simon, J & Davies Anna 2013 : People P eople Powered Social Inno ed Social Innovation: The Need for Citiz ation: The Need for Citizen Engagement. Singapore Management University Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University.

Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorisation. English manuscript of 'La categorization sociale'. In S. Moscovici (Ed.). Introduction a la Psychologie Sociale, Vol. 1, (pp.272-302). Paris: Larouss